

Income and Democracy

By DARON ACEMOGLU, SIMON JOHNSON, JAMES A. ROBINSON, AND PIERRE YARED*

Existing studies establish a strong cross-country correlation between income and democracy but do not control for factors that simultaneously affect both variables. We show that controlling for such factors by including country fixed effects removes the statistical association between income per capita and various measures of democracy. We present instrumental-variables estimates that also show no causal effect of income on democracy. The cross-country correlation between income and democracy reflects a positive correlation between changes in income and democracy over the past 500 years. This pattern is consistent with the idea that societies embarked on divergent political-economic development paths at certain critical junctures. (JEL D72, E21)

One of the most notable empirical regularities in political economy is the relationship between income per capita and democracy. Today, all OECD countries are democratic, while many of the nondemocracies are in the poor parts of the world, for example sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia. The positive cross-country relationship between income and democracy in the 1990s is depicted in Figure 1, which shows the association between the Freedom House measure of democracy and log income per capita in the 1990s.¹ This relationship is not confined solely to a cross-country comparison. Most countries were nondemocratic before the modern growth process took off at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Democratization came together with growth. Robert J. Barro (1999, 160), for example, summarizes this as follows: “Increases in various measures of the standard of living forecast a gradual rise in democracy. In contrast, democracies that arise without prior economic development ... tend not to last.”²

This statistical association between income and democracy is the cornerstone of the influential modernization theory. Lipset (1959) suggested that democracy was both created and consolidated by a broad process of “modernization” which involved changes in “the factors of industrialization, urbanization, wealth, and education [which] are so closely interrelated as to

*Acemoglu: Department of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 50 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, MA 02139 (e-mail: daron@mit.edu); Johnson: Sloan School of Management, MIT, 50 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, MA 02139, and International Monetary Fund (e-mail: sjohnson@mit.edu, sjohnson@imf.org); Robinson: Department of Government and IQSS, Harvard University, 1737 Cambridge St., Cambridge MA 02138 (e-mail: jrobinson@gov.harvard.edu); Yared: Columbia University, Graduate School of Business, Uris Hall, 3022 Broadway, New York, NY 10027 (e-mail: pyared@columbia.edu). We thank David Autor, Robert Barro, Sebastián Mazzuca, Robert Moffitt, Jason Seawright, four anonymous referees, and seminar participants at the Banco de la República de Colombia, Boston University, the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, the Centre for Economic Policy Research annual conference on transition economics in Hanoi, MIT, and Harvard University for comments. Acemoglu gratefully acknowledges financial support from the National Science Foundation.

¹Details on various measures of democracy and other variables are provided in Section I. All figures use the three-letter World Bank country codes to identify countries, which are provided in Appendix Table A2, except when multiple countries are clustered together. When such clustering happens, countries are grouped together, the averages for the group are plotted in the figure, and the countries in each group are identified in the footnote to the corresponding figure.

²See also, among others, Seymour Martin Lipset (1959), John B. Londregan and Keith T. Poole (1996), Adam Przeworski and Fernando Limongi (1997), Barro (1997), Przeworski et al. (2000), and Elias Papaioannou and Gregorios Siourounis (2006).




FIGURE 1. DEMOCRACY AND INCOME, 1990S

Notes: See Appendix Table A1 for data definitions and sources. Values are averaged by country from 1990 to 1999. GDP per capita is in PPP terms. The regression represented by the fitted line yields a coefficient of 0.181 (standard error = 0.019), $N = 147$, and $R^2 = 0.35$. The “G” prefix corresponds to the average for groups of countries. G01 is AGO and MRT; G02 is NGA and TCD; G03 is KEN and KHM; G04 is DZA and LBN; G05 is BFA, NER, and YEM; G06 is GAB and MYS; G07 is DOM and SLV; G08 is BRA and VEN; G09 is BWA, DMA, POL, and VCT; G10 is HUN and URY; G11 is CRI and GRD; G12 is BLZ and LCA; G13 is KNA and TTO; G14 is GRC and MLT; G15 is BRB, CYP, ESP, and PRT; G16 is FIN, GBR, IRL, and NZL; G17 is AUS, AUT, BEL, CAN, DEU, DNK, FRA, ISL, ITA, NLD, NOR, and SWE; and G18 is CHE and USA.

form one common factor. And the factors subsumed under economic development carry with it the political correlate of democracy” (80). The central tenet of the modernization theory, that higher income per capita causes a country to be democratic, is also reproduced in most major works on democracy (e.g., Robert A. Dahl 1971; Samuel P. Huntington 1991; Dietrich Rusechemeyer, John D. Stephens, and Evelyn H. Stephens 1992).

In this paper, we revisit the relationship between income per capita and democracy. Our starting point is that existing work, which is based on cross-country relationships, does not establish causation. First, there is the issue of reverse causality; perhaps democracy causes income rather than the other way round. Second, and more important, there is the potential for omitted variable bias. Some other factor may determine both the nature of the political regime and the potential for economic growth.

We utilize two strategies to investigate the causal effect of income on democracy. Our first strategy is to control for country-specific factors affecting both income and democracy by including country fixed effects. While fixed effect regressions are not a panacea for omitted variable biases,³ they are well suited to the investigation of the relationship between income and democracy,

³ Fixed effects would not help inference if there are time-varying omitted factors affecting the dependent variable and correlated with the right-hand-side variables (see the discussion below). They may, in fact, make problems of measurement error worse because they remove a significant portion of the variation in the right-hand-side variables. Consequently, fixed effects are certainly no substitute for instrumental-variables or structural estimation with valid exclusion restrictions.

especially in the postwar era. The major source of potential bias in a regression of democracy on income per capita is country-specific, historical factors influencing both political and economic development. If these omitted characteristics are, to a first approximation, time-invariant, the inclusion of fixed effects will remove them and this source of bias. Consider, for example, the comparison of the United States and Colombia. The United States is both richer and more democratic, so a simple cross-country comparison, as well as the existing empirical strategies in the literature, which do not control for fixed country effects, would suggest that higher per capita income causes democracy. The idea of fixed effects is to move beyond this comparison and investigate the “within-country variation,” that is, to ask whether Colombia is more likely to *become* (relatively) democratic as it *becomes* (relatively) richer. In addition to improving inference on the causal effect of income on democracy, this approach is more closely related to modernization theory as articulated by Lipset (1959), which emphasizes that individual countries should become more democratic if they are richer, not simply that rich countries should be democratic.

Our first result is that once fixed effects are introduced, the positive relationship between income per capita and various measures of democracy disappears. Figures 2 and 3 show this diagrammatically by plotting changes in our two measures of democracy, the Freedom House and Polity scores for each country between 1970 and 1995 against the change in GDP per capita over the same period (see Section I for data details). These figures confirm that there is no relationship between *changes* in income per capita and *changes* in democracy.

This basic finding is robust to using various different indicators for democracy, to different econometric specifications and estimation techniques, in different subsamples, and to the inclusion of additional covariates. The absence of a significant relationship between income and democracy is *not* driven by large standard errors. On the contrary, the relationship between income and democracy is estimated relatively precisely. In many cases, two-standard-error bands include only very small effects of income on democracy and often exclude the OLS estimates. These results, therefore, shed considerable doubt on the claim that there is a strong causal effect of income on democracy.⁴

While the fixed effects estimation is useful in removing the influence of long-run determinants of both democracy and income, it does not necessarily estimate the causal effect of income on democracy. Our second strategy is to use instrumental-variables (IV) regressions to estimate the impact of income on democracy.⁵ We experiment with two potential instruments. The first is to use past savings rates, and the second is to use changes in the incomes of trading partners. The argument for the first instrument is that variations in past savings rates affect income per capita but should have no direct effect on democracy. The second instrument, which we believe is of independent interest, creates a matrix of trade shares and constructs predicted income for each country using a trade-share-weighted average income of other countries. We show that this predicted income has considerable explanatory power for income per capita. We also argue that it should have no direct effect on democracy. Our second major result is that both IV strategies show no evidence of a causal effect of income on democracy. We recognize that neither instrument is perfect, since there are reasonable scenarios in which our exclusion restrictions could be violated (e.g., saving rates might be correlated with future anticipated regime changes; or democracy scores of a country’s trading partners, which are correlated with their income levels,

⁴ It remains true that over time there is a general tendency toward greater incomes and greater democracy throughout the world. In our regressions, time effects capture these general (world-level) tendencies. Our estimates suggest that these world-level movements in democracy are unlikely to be driven by the causal effect of income on democracy.

⁵ A recent creative attempt is by Edward Miguel, Shankar Satyanath, and Ernest Sergenti (2004), who use weather conditions as an instrument for income in Africa to investigate the impact of income on civil wars. Unfortunately, weather conditions are a good instrument only for relatively short-run changes in income, thus not ideal to study the relationship between income and democracy.




FIGURE 2. CHANGE IN DEMOCRACY AND INCOME, 1970–1995

Notes: See Appendix Table A1 for data definitions and sources. Changes are total difference between 1970 and 1995. Countries are included if they were independent by 1970. Start and end dates are chosen to maximize the number of countries in the cross section. The regression represented by the fitted line yields a coefficient of 0.032 (standard error = 0.058), $N = 102$, $R^2 = 0.00$. The “G” prefix corresponds to the average for groups of countries. G01 is FJI and KEN; G02 is COL and IND; G03 is IRN, JAM, and SLV; G04 is CHL and DOM; G05 is CIV and RWA; G06 is CHE, CRI, and NZL; G07 is DZA and SWE; G08 is AUS, DNK, MAR, and NLD; G09 is BEL, CAN, FRA, and GBR; G10 is AUT, EGY, ISL, ITA, PRY, and USA; G11 is BRB, NOR, and TUN; G12 is IRL and SYR; G13 is BDI and TZA; G14 is GAB, MEX, and TTO; G15 is PER and SEN; G16 is HTI and JOR; G17 is LSO and NPL; G18 is BRA and COG; G19 is ARG and HND; G20 is BEN and MLI; G21 is GRC, MWI, and PAN; and G22 is ECU and HUN.




FIGURE 3. CHANGE IN DEMOCRACY AND INCOME, 1970–1995

Notes: See notes to Figure 2. The regression represented by the fitted line yields a coefficient of -0.024 (standard error = 0.063), $N = 98$, $R^2 = 0.00$. G01 is CHE, CRI, and NZL; G02 is AUS, DNK, and NLD; G03 is BEL, CAN, FIN, GBR, and TUR; G04 is AUT, COL, IND, ISL, ISR, ITA, and USA; G05 is IRL and SYR; G06 is KEN, MAR, and URY; G07 is BOL and MLI; G08 is MWI and PAN; G09 is GRC and LSO; and G10 is BRA and ESP.




FIGURE 4. CHANGE IN DEMOCRACY AND INCOME, 1900–2000

Notes: Log GDP per capita is from Angus Maddison (2003). See Appendix Table A1 for data definitions and sources. Changes are total difference between 1900 and 2000. Countries are included if they are in the 1900–2000 balanced 50-year panel discussed in Section V of the text. The regression represented by the fitted line yields a coefficient of 0.035 (standard error = 0.049), $N = 37$, $R^2 = 0.00$.

might have a direct effect on its democracy). To alleviate these concerns, we show that the most likely sources of correlation between our instruments and the error term in the second stage are not present.

We also look at the relationship between income and democracy over the past 100 years using fixed effects regressions and again find no evidence of a positive impact of income on democracy. These results are depicted in Figure 4, which plots the change in Polity score for each country between 1900 and 2000 against the change in GDP per capita over the same period (see Section V for data details). This figure confirms that there is no relationship between income and democracy conditional on fixed effects.

These results naturally raise the following important question: why is there a cross-sectional correlation between income and democracy? In other words, why are rich countries democratic today? At a statistical level, the answer is clear: even though there is no relationship between changes in income and democracy in the postwar era or over the past 100 years or so, there is a positive association over the past 500 years. Most societies were nondemocratic 500 years ago and had broadly similar income levels. The positive cross-sectional relationship reflects the fact that those that have become more democratic over this time span are also those that have grown faster. One possible explanation for the positive cross-sectional correlation is, therefore, that there is a causal effect of income on democracy, but it works at *much* longer horizons than the existing literature has posited. Although the lack of a relationship over 50 or 100 years sheds some doubt on this explanation, this is a logical possibility.

We favor another explanation for this pattern. Even in the absence of a simple causal link from income to democracy, political and economic development paths are interlinked and are jointly affected by various factors. Societies may embark on *divergent political-economic development paths*, some leading to relative prosperity and democracy, others to relative poverty and dictatorship. Our hypothesis is that the positive cross-sectional relationship and the 500-year correlation

between changes in income and democracy are caused by the fact that countries have embarked on divergent development paths at some *critical junctures* during the past 500 years.⁶

We provide support for this hypothesis by documenting that the positive association between changes in income and democracy over the past 500 years is largely accounted for by a range of historical variables. In particular, for the whole world sample, the positive association is considerably weakened when we control for date of independence, early constraints on the executive, and religion.⁷ We then turn to the sample of former European colonies, where we have better proxies for factors that have influenced the development paths of nations. Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2001, 2002) and Engerman and Sokoloff (1997) argue that differences in European colonization strategies have been a major determinant of the divergent development paths of colonial societies. This reasoning suggests that in this sample, the critical juncture for most societies corresponds to their experience under European colonization. Furthermore, Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2002) show that the density of indigenous populations at the time of colonization has been a particularly important variable in shaping colonization strategies, and provide estimates of population densities in the year 1500 (before the advent of colonization). When we use information on population density, as well as on independence year and early constraints on the executive, the 500-year relationship between changes in income and democracy in the former colonies sample disappears. This pattern is consistent with the hypothesis that the positive cross-sectional relationship between income and democracy today is the result of societies embarking on divergent development paths at certain critical junctures during the past 500 years (although other hypotheses might account for these patterns).

A related question is whether income has a separate causal effect on transitions to, and away from, democracy. Space restrictions preclude us from investigating this question here; the results of such an investigation are presented in our follow-up paper, Acemoglu et al. (2007). Using both linear regression models and double-hazard models that simultaneously estimate the process of entry into, and exit from, democracy, we find no evidence that income has a causal effect on the transitions either to or from democracy. The IV strategies and the focus on the long-run relationship are unique to the current paper.

The paper proceeds as follows. In Section I we describe the data. Section II presents our econometric model. Section III presents the fixed effects results for the postwar sample. Section IV contains our IV results for the postwar sample, while the fixed effects results for the 100-year sample are presented in Section V. Section VI discusses the sources of the cross-country relationship between income and democracy we observe today. Section VII concludes. The Appendix contains further information on the construction of the instruments used in Section IV.

I. Data and Descriptive Statistics

Our first and main measure of democracy is the Freedom House Political Rights Index. A country receives the highest score if political rights come closest to the ideals suggested by a checklist of questions, beginning with whether there are free and fair elections, whether those who are elected rule, whether there are competitive parties or other political groupings, whether the opposition plays an important role and has actual power, and whether minority groups have reasonable

⁶ See, among others, Douglass C. North and Robert P. Thomas (1973), North (1981), Eric L. Jones (1981), Stanley L. Engerman and Kenneth L. Sokoloff (1997), and Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2001, 2002) for theories that emphasize the impact of certain historical factors on development processes during critical junctures, such as the collapse of feudalism, the age of industrialization, or the process of colonization.

⁷ See Max Weber (1930), Huntington (1991), and Steven M. Fish (2002) for the hypothesis that religion might have an important effect on economic and political development.

self-government or can participate in the government through informal consensus.⁸ Following Barro (1999), we supplement this index with the related variable from Kenneth A. Bollen (1990, 2001) for 1950, 1955, 1960, and 1965. As in Barro (1999), we transform both indices so that they lie between zero and one, with one corresponding to the most democratic set of institutions.

The Freedom House index, even when augmented with Bollen's data, enables us to look only at the postwar era. The Polity IV dataset, on the other hand, provides information for all independent countries starting in 1800. Both for pre-1950 events and as a check on our main measure, we also look at the other widely used measure of democracy, the composite Polity index, which is the difference between Polity's Democracy and Autocracy indices (see Monty G. Marshall and Keith Jagers 2004). The Polity Democracy Index ranges from zero to ten and is derived from coding the competitiveness of political participation, the openness and competitiveness of executive recruitment, and constraints on the chief executive. The Polity Autocracy Index also ranges from zero to ten and is constructed in a similar way to the democracy score based on competitiveness of political participation, the regulation of participation, the openness and competitiveness of executive recruitment, and constraints on the chief executive. To facilitate comparison with the Freedom House score, we normalize the composite Polity index to lie between zero and one.

Using the Freedom House and the Polity data, we construct five-year, ten-year, twenty-year, and annual panels. For the five-year panels, we take the observation every fifth year. We prefer this procedure to averaging the five-year data, since averaging introduces additional serial correlation, making inference and estimation more difficult (see footnote 12). Similarly, for the ten-year and twenty-year panels, we use the observations from every tenth and twentieth year. For the Freedom House data, which begin in 1972, we follow Barro (1999) and assign the 1972 score to 1970 for the purpose of the five-year and ten-year regressions.

The GDP per capita (in PPP) and savings rate data for the postwar period are from Alan Heston, Robert Summers, and Bettina Atten (2002), and GDP per capita (in constant 1990 dollars) for the longer sample are from Maddison (2003). The trade-weighted world income instrument is built using data from the International Monetary Fund Direction of Trade Statistics (2005). Other variables we use in the analysis are discussed later (see also Appendix Table A1 for detailed data definitions and sources).

Table 1 contains descriptive statistics for the main variables. The sample period is 1960–2000 and each observation corresponds to five-year intervals. The table shows these statistics for all countries and also for high- and low-income countries, split according to median income. The first panel refers to the baseline sample we use in Table 2, while the other panels are for samples used in other tables. In each case, we report means, standard deviations, and also the total number of countries for which we have data and the total number of observations. The comparison of high- and low-income countries in columns 2 and 3 confirms the pattern in Figure 1 that richer countries tend to be more democratic.

II. Econometric Model

Consider the following simple econometric model, which will be the basis of our work both for the postwar period and in the 100-year samples:

$$(1) \quad d_{it} = \alpha d_{it-1} + \gamma y_{it-1} + \mathbf{x}'_{it-1} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mu_i + \delta_i + u_{it},$$

⁸ The main checklist includes three questions on the electoral process, four questions on the extent of political pluralism and participation, and three questions on the functioning of government. For each checklist question, zero to four points are added, depending on the comparative rights and liberties present (zero represents the least, four represents the most) and these scores are combined to form the index. See Freedom House (2004), <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2003/methodology.htm>.

TABLE 1—DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

	All countries	High-income countries	Low-income countries
	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Panel A</i>			
Freedom House measure of democracy	0.57 (0.36)	0.78 (0.30)	0.36 (0.30)
Log GDP per capita _{<i>t</i>-1} (chain weighted 1996 prices)	8.16 (1.02)	9.02 (0.56)	7.30 (0.53)
Observations	945	473	472
Countries	150	93	98
<i>Panel B</i>			
Polity measure of democracy _{<i>t</i>}	0.57 (0.38)	0.79 (0.31)	0.36 (0.31)
Observations	854	427	427
Countries	136	81	88
<i>Panel C</i>			
Log population _{<i>t</i>-1}	9.10 (1.54)	9.13 (1.56)	9.07 (1.52)
Education _{<i>t</i>-1}	4.57 (2.86)	6.62 (2.36)	2.52 (1.53)
Observations	676	338	338
Countries	95	57	65
<i>Panel D</i>			
Savings rate _{<i>t</i>-2}	0.17 (0.13)	0.22 (0.10)	0.11 (0.14)
Observations	891	446	445
Countries	134	82	84
<i>Panel E</i>			
Trade-weighted log GDP _{<i>t</i>-1}	11.61 (8.43)	12.98 (9.74)	10.24 (6.62)
Observations	895	448	447
Countries	124	75	85

Notes: Values are averages during sample period, with standard deviations in parentheses. Panel A refers to the sample in Table 2, column 1; Panel B refers to the sample in Table 3, column 1; Panel C refers to the sample in Table 4, column 7; Panel D refers to the sample in Table 5, column 5; Panel E refers to the sample in Table 6, column 5. Column 1 in each panel refers to the full sample, and columns 2 and 3 split the sample in column 1 by the median income (from Penn World Tables 6.1) in the sample of column 1. The number of observations refers to the total number of observations in the unbalanced panel. The number of countries refers to the number of countries for which we use observations. Freedom House measure of democracy is the Political Rights Index, augmented following Barro (1999). Polity measure of democracy is Democracy Index minus Autocracy Index from Polity IV. GDP per capita in 1996 prices with PPP adjustment is from the Penn World Tables 6.1. Population is from the World Bank (2002). Education is average total years of schooling in the population age 25 and over and is from Barro and Jong-Wha Lee (2000). Nominal savings rate is from Penn World Tables 6.1 and is defined as nominal income minus consumption minus government expenditure divided by nominal income (not PPP). Trade-weighted log GDP is constructed as in equation (5) using data from IMF Direction of Trade Statistics (2005) and Penn World Tables 6.1. For detailed definitions and sources, see Appendix Table A1.

where d_{it} is the democracy score of country i in period t . The lagged value of this variable on the right-hand side is included to capture persistence in democracy and also potentially mean-reverting dynamics (i.e., the tendency of the democracy score to return to some equilibrium value for the country). The main variable of interest is y_{it-1} , the lagged value of log income per capita. The parameter γ therefore measures the causal effect of income per capita on democracy. All

TABLE 2—FIXED EFFECTS RESULTS USING FREEDOM HOUSE MEASURE OF DEMOCRACY

	Base sample, 1960–2000								
	Five-year data				Annual data	Ten-year data		Twenty-year data	
	Pooled OLS (1)	Fixed effects OLS (2)	Anderson-Hsiao IV (3)	Arellano-Bond GMM (4)	Fixed effects OLS (5)	Fixed effects OLS (6)	Fixed effects OLS (7)	Arellano-Bond GMM (8)	Fixed effects OLS (9)
	Dependent variable is democracy								
Democracy _{<i>t</i>-1}	0.706 (0.035)	0.379 (0.051)	0.469 (0.100)	0.489 (0.085)		[0.00]	-0.025 (0.088)	0.226 (0.123)	-0.581 (0.198)
Log GDP per capita _{<i>t</i>-1}	0.072 (0.010)	0.010 (0.035)	-0.104 (0.107)	-0.129 (0.076)	0.054 (0.046)	[0.33]	0.053 (0.066)	-0.318 (0.180)	-0.030 (0.156)
Hansen <i>J</i> test				[0.26]				[0.07]	
AR(2) test				[0.45]				[0.96]	
Implied cumulative effect of income	0.245 [0.00]	0.016 [0.76]	-0.196 [0.33]	-0.252 [0.09]				-0.411 [0.09]	-0.019 [0.85]
Observations	945	945	838	838	958	2895	457	338	192
Countries	150	150	127	127	150	148	127	118	118
<i>R</i> -squared	0.73	0.80			0.76	0.93	0.77		0.89

Notes: Pooled cross-sectional OLS regression in column 1, with robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. Fixed effects OLS regressions in columns 2, 5, 6, 7, and 9, with country dummies and robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. Implied cumulative effect of income represents the coefficient estimate of log GDP per capita_{*t*-1}/(1–democracy_{*t*-1}), and the *p*-value from a nonlinear test of the significance of this coefficient is in brackets. Column 3 uses the instrumental variables method of Theodore W. Anderson and Cheng Hsiao (1982), with clustered standard errors, and columns 4 and 8 use the GMM of Manuel Arellano and Stephen R. Bond (1991), with robust standard errors; in both methods we instrument for income using a double lag. Year dummies are included in all regressions. Dependent variable is Freedom House measure of democracy. Base sample is an unbalanced panel, 1960–2000, with data at five-year intervals, where the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1960$, so $t - 1 = 1955$); column 6 uses annual data from the same sample; a country must be independent for five years before it enters the panel. Columns 7 and 8 use ten-year data from the same sample, where, as before, the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1960$, so $t - 1 = 1950$); a country must be independent for ten years before it enters the panel. Column 9 uses twenty-year data from the same sample, where, as before, the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1980$, so $t - 1 = 1960$); a country must be independent for twenty years before it enters the panel. In column 6, each right-hand-side variable has five annual lags; we report the *p*-value from an *F*-test for the joint significance of all five lags. For detailed data definitions and sources, see Table 1 and Appendix Table A1.

other potential covariates are included in the vector \mathbf{x}_{it-1} . In addition, the δ_i 's denote a full set of country dummies and the μ_t 's denote a full set of time effects that capture common shocks to (common trends in) the democracy score of all countries; u_{it} is an error term, capturing all other omitted factors, with $E(u_{it}) = 0$ for all i and t .⁹

The standard regression in the literature, for example, Barro (1999), is pooled OLS, which is identical to (1) except for the omission of the fixed effects, δ_i 's. In our framework, these country dummies capture any time-invariant country characteristics that affect the level of democracy. As is well known, when the true model is given by (1) and the δ_i 's are correlated with y_{it-1} or \mathbf{x}_{it-1} , then pooled OLS estimates are biased and inconsistent. More specifically, let x_{it-1}^j denote the j th component of the vector \mathbf{x}_{it-1} and let Cov denote population covariances. Then, if either $\text{Cov}(y_{it-1}, \delta_i + u_{it}) \neq 0$ or $\text{Cov}(x_{it-1}^j, \delta_i + u_{it}) \neq 0$ for some j , the OLS estimator will be inconsistent. In contrast, even when these covariances are nonzero, the fixed effects estimator will be consistent if $\text{Cov}(y_{it-1}, u_{it}) = \text{Cov}(x_{it-1}^j, u_{it}) = 0$ for all j (as $T \rightarrow \infty$). This structure of correlation

⁹ More generally, equation (1) can be combined with another equation that captures the effect of democracy on income. The simultaneous equation bias resulting from the endogeneity of democracy is addressed in Section IV. The estimation of the effect of democracy on income is beyond the scope of the current paper.

is particularly relevant in the context of the relationship between income and democracy because of the possibility of underlying political and social forces shaping both equilibrium political institutions and the potential for economic growth.

Nevertheless, there should be no presumption that fixed effects regressions necessarily estimate the causal effect of income on democracy. First, the regressor d_{it-1} is mechanically correlated with u_{is} for $s < t$ so the standard fixed effect estimator is biased (e.g., Jeffrey M. Wooldridge 2002, chap. 11). It can be shown, however, that the fixed effects OLS estimator becomes consistent as the number of time periods in the sample increases (i.e., as $T \rightarrow \infty$). We discuss and implement a number of strategies to deal with this problem in Section III.

Second, even if we ignore this technical issue, it is possible that $\text{Cov}(y_{it-1}, u_{it}) \neq 0$ because of the reverse effect of democracy on income, because both changes in income and changes in democracy are caused by a third, time-varying factor, or because the correct model is one with fixed growth effects rather than fixed level effects (see the extended model in Section VIA). In Section IV, we implement an instrumental variable strategy to account for these problems. It is worth noting, however, that almost all theories in political science, sociology, and economics suggest that we should have $\text{Cov}(y_{it-1}, u_{it}) \geq 0$. Therefore, when it fails to be consistent, the fixed effects estimator of the relationship between income and democracy will be biased upward. Our fixed effects results can thus be viewed as upper bounds on the causal effect of income on democracy. Consistent with this, instrumental-variables regressions in Section IV lead to more negative estimates than the fixed effects results.

III. Fixed Effects Estimates

A. Main Results

We begin by estimating (1) in the postwar sample. Table 2 uses the Freedom House data and Table 3 uses the Polity data, in both cases for the period 1960–2000. All standard errors in the paper are fully robust against arbitrary heteroskedasticity and serial correlation at the county level (i.e., they are clustered at the country level; see Wooldridge 2002).

The first columns of Table 2 and Table 3 replicate the standard pooled OLS regressions previously used in the literature using the five-year sample. These regressions include the (five-year) lag of democracy and log income per capita as the country variables, as well as a full set of time dummies. Lagged democracy is highly significant and indicates that there is a considerable degree of persistence in democracy. Log income per capita is also significant and illustrates the well-documented positive relationship between income and democracy. Though statistically significant, the effect of income is quantitatively small. For example, the coefficient of 0.072 (standard error = 0.010) in column 1 of Table 2 implies that a 10 percent increase in GDP per capita is associated with an increase in the Freedom House score of less than 0.007, which is very small (for comparison, the gap between the United States and Colombia today is 0.5). If this pooled cross-section regression identified the causal effect of income on democracy, then the long-run effect would be larger than this, because the lag of democracy on the right-hand side would be increasing over time, causing a further increase in the democracy score. The implied cumulative effect of log GDP per capita on democracy is shown in the fifth row. Since lagged democracy has a coefficient of 0.706, the cumulative effect of a 10 percent increase in GDP per capita is $0.007/(1-0.706) \approx 0.024$, which is still quantitatively small.

The remaining columns of Table 2 and Table 3 present our basic results with fixed effects. Column 2 shows that the relationship between income and democracy disappears once fixed effects are included. For example, in Table 2 with Freedom House data, the estimate of γ is 0.010 with a standard error of 0.035, which makes it highly insignificant. With the Polity data in

TABLE 3—FIXED EFFECTS RESULTS USING POLITY MEASURE OF DEMOCRACY

	Base sample, 1960–2000								
	Five-year data				Annual data	Ten-year data		Twenty-year data	
	Pooled OLS (1)	Fixed effects OLS (2)	Anderson-Hsiao IV (3)	Arellano-Bond GMM (4)	Fixed effects OLS (5)	Fixed effects OLS (6)	Fixed effects OLS (7)	Arellano-Bond GMM (8)	Fixed effects OLS (9)
	Dependent variable is democracy								
Democracy _{<i>t</i>-1}	0.749 (0.034)	0.449 (0.063)	0.582 (0.127)	0.590 (0.106)		[0.00]	0.060 (0.091)	0.309 (0.134)	-0.516 (0.165)
Log GDP per capita _{<i>t</i>-1}	0.053 (0.010)	-0.006 (0.039)	-0.413 (0.127)	-0.351 (0.127)	-0.011 (0.055)	[0.53]	0.007 (0.070)	-0.368 (0.190)	-0.1260 (0.164)
Hansen <i>J</i> test			[0.03]	[0.03]				[0.01]	
AR(2) test			[0.39]	[0.39]				[0.38]	
Implied cumulative effect of income	0.211 [0.00]	-0.011 [0.89]	-0.856 [0.00]	-0.856 [0.00]			0.007 [0.92]	-0.533 [0.04]	-0.083 [0.45]
Observations	854	854	747	747	880	3701	419	302	168
Countries	136	136	114	114	136	134	114	107	100
<i>R</i> -squared	0.77	0.82			0.77	0.96	0.77		0.87

Notes: Pooled cross-sectional OLS regression in column 1, with robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. Fixed effects OLS regressions in columns 2, 5, 6, 7, and 9, with country dummies and robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. Implied cumulative effect of income represents the coefficient estimate of log GDP per capita $_{t-1}/(1 - \text{democracy}_{t-1})$ and the *p*-value from a nonlinear test of the significance of this coefficient is in brackets. Column 3 uses the instrumental variables method of Anderson and Hsiao (1982), with clustered standard errors, and columns 4 and 8 use the GMM of Arellano and Bond (1991), with robust standard errors; in both methods we instrument for income using a double lag. Year dummies are included in all regressions. Dependent variable is Polity measure of democracy. Base sample is an unbalanced panel, 1960–2000, with data at five-year intervals, where the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1960$, so $t - 1 = 1955$); column 6 uses annual data from the same sample; a country must be independent for five years before it enters the panel. Columns 7 and 8 use ten-year data from the same sample, where, as before, the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1960$, so $t - 1 = 1950$); a country must be independent for ten years before it enters the panel. Column 9 uses twenty-year data from the same sample, where, as before, the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1980$, so $t - 1 = 1960$); a country must be independent for twenty years before it enters the panel. In column 6, each right-hand-side variable has five annual lags; we report the *p*-value from an *F*-test for the joint significance of all five lags. For detailed data definitions and sources, see Table 1 and Appendix Table A1.

Table 3, the estimate of γ has the “wrong” (negative) sign, -0.006 (standard error = 0.039). The bottom rows in both tables again show the implied cumulative effects of income on democracy, which are small or negative.

A natural concern is that the lack of relationship in the fixed effects regressions may result from large standard errors. This does not seem to be the case. On the contrary, the relationship between income and democracy is estimated relatively precisely. Although the pooled OLS estimate of γ is quantitatively small, the two standard error bands of the fixed effects estimates almost exclude it. More specifically, with the Freedom House estimate, two standard error bands exclude short-run effects greater than 0.008.

That these results are not driven by some unusual feature of the data is further shown by Figures 2 and 3, which plot the change in the Freedom House and Polity scores for each country between 1970 and 1995 against the change in GDP per capita over the same period.¹⁰ They show

¹⁰ These scatterplots correspond to the estimation of equation (long-run relationship specification) in Section VIA with a start date at 1970 and end date at 1995. These two dates are chosen to maximize sample size. The regression of the change in Freedom House score between 1970 and 1995 on change in log income per capita between 1970 and 1995 yields a coefficient of 0.032, with a standard error of 0.058, while the same regression with Polity data gives a coefficient estimate of -0.024 , with a standard error of 0.063.

clearly that there is no strong relationship between income growth and changes in democracy over this period.

These initial results show that once we allow for fixed effects, per capita income is *not* a major determinant of democracy. The remaining columns of the tables consider alternative estimation strategies to deal with the potential biases introduced by the presence of the lagged dependent variable discussed in Section II.

Our first strategy, adopted in column 3, is to use the methodology proposed by Anderson and Hsiao (1982), which is to time difference equation (1), to obtain

$$(2) \quad \Delta d_{it} = \alpha \Delta d_{it-1} + \gamma \Delta y_{it-1} + \Delta \mathbf{x}'_{it-1} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \Delta \mu_t + \Delta u_{it},$$

where the fixed country effects are removed by time differencing. Although equation (2) cannot be estimated consistently by OLS, in the absence of serial correlation in the original residual, u_{it} (i.e., no second-order serial correlation in Δu_{it}), d_{it-2} is uncorrelated with Δu_{it} , so can be used as an instrument for Δd_{it-1} to obtain consistent estimates, and, similarly, y_{it-2} is used as an instrument for Δy_{it-1} . We find that this procedure leads to negative estimates (e.g., -0.104 , standard error = 0.107 , with the Freedom House data), and shows no evidence of a positive effect of income on democracy.

Although the instrumental variable estimator of Anderson and Hsiao (1982) leads to consistent estimates, it is not efficient, since, under the assumption of no further serial correlation in u_{it} , not only d_{it-2} , but all further lags of d_{it} are uncorrelated with Δu_{it} , and can also be used as additional instruments. Arellano and Bond (1991) develop a generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator using all of these moment conditions. When these conditions are valid, this GMM estimator is more efficient than the Anderson and Hsiao (1982) estimator. We use this GMM estimator in column 4. The coefficients are now even more negative and more precisely estimated, for example -0.129 (standard error = 0.076) in Table 2.¹¹ In this case, the two standard error bands comfortably exclude the corresponding OLS estimate of γ (which, recall, was 0.072). In addition, the presence of multiple instruments in the GMM procedure allows us to investigate whether the assumption of no serial correlation in u_{it} can be rejected, and also allows us to test for overidentifying restrictions. With the Freedom House data, the AR(2) test and the Hansen J test indicate that there is no further serial correlation, and the overidentifying restrictions are not rejected.¹²

With the Polity data, both the Anderson and Hsiao and GMM procedures lead to more negative (and statistically significant) estimates. In this case, however, although there continues to be no serial correlation in u_{it} , the overidentification test is rejected, so we need to be more cautious in interpreting the results with the Polity data.

Column 5 shows a simpler specification in which lagged democracy is dropped. With either the Freedom House or Polity measure of democracy, there is again no evidence of a significant effect of income on democracy, and in this case, the two standard error bands comfortably

¹¹ In addition, Arellano and Olympia Bover (1995) also use time-differenced instruments for the level equation, (1). Nevertheless, these instruments would be valid only if the time-differenced instruments are orthogonal to the fixed effect. Since this is not appealing in this context (e.g., five-year income growth is unlikely to be orthogonal to the democracy country fixed effect), we do not include these additional instruments.

¹² We also checked the results with five-year averaged data rather than with our dataset, which uses only the democracy information every fifth year. The estimates in all columns are very similar, but in this case, the AR(2) test shows evidence for additional serial correlation, which is not surprising, given the serial correlation that averaging introduces. This motivates our reliance on the five-year or annual datasets. Our analysis with annual data in column 6 of Tables 2 and 3 makes use of all of the available data.

exclude the corresponding OLS coefficient (the OLS estimate without lagged democracy, which is shown in the first column of Table 5 and Table 6, is 0.233 with a standard error of 0.013).

Column 6 estimates (1) with OLS using annual observations. This is useful since the fixed effect OLS estimator becomes consistent as the number of observations becomes large. With annual observations, we have a reasonably large time dimension. Estimating the same model on annual data with a single lag would, however, induce significant serial correlation (since our results so far indicate that five-year lags of democracy predict changes in democracy). For this reason, we now include five lags of both democracy and log GDP per capita in these annual regressions. Column 6 in both tables reports the p -value of an F-test for the joint significance of these variables. There is no evidence of a significant positive effect of income on democracy either with the Freedom House or the Polity data (while democracy continues to be strongly predicted by its lags).

Columns 7 and 8 investigate the relationship between income and democracy at lower frequencies by estimating similar regressions using a dataset of ten-year observations. The results are similar to those with five-year observations and to the patterns in Figures 2 and 3, which show no evidence of a positive association between changes in income and democracy between 1970 and 1995. Finally, column 9 in both tables presents a fixed effect regression using a smaller dataset consisting of twenty-year observations. Once again, there is no evidence of a positive effect of income on democracy.

Overall, the inclusion of fixed effects proxying for time-invariant country specific characteristics removes the cross-country correlation between income and democracy. These results shed considerable doubt on the conventional wisdom that income has a strong causal effect on democracy.

B. Robustness

Table 4 investigates the robustness of these results. To save space, we report the robustness checks for the Freedom House data only (the results with Polity are similar and are available upon request). Columns 1–4 examine alternative samples. Columns 1 and 2 show the regressions corresponding to columns 2 and 4 of Table 2 for a balanced sample of countries from 1970 to 2000. This is useful to check whether entry and exit of countries from the base sample of Tables 2 and 3 might be affecting the results. Both columns provide very similar results. For example, using the balanced sample of Freedom House data and the fixed effects OLS specification, the estimate of γ is -0.031 (standard error = 0.049). Columns 3 and 4 exclude former socialist countries, again with very similar results.

Columns 5–8 investigate the influence of various covariates on the relationship between income and democracy. Columns 5 and 6 include log population and age structure, and columns 7 and 8 add education.¹³ In each case, we present both fixed effects and GMM estimates. The results show that these covariates do not affect the (lack of) relationship between income and democracy when fixed effects are included. Age structure variables are significant in the specification that excludes education, but not when education is included. Education is itself insignificant with a negative coefficient. The causal effect of education on democracy, which is another basic tenet of the modernization hypothesis, is therefore also not robust to controlling for country fixed effects. This finding is consistent with the results reported in Acemoglu et al.

¹³ Age structure variables are from United Nations Population Division (2003) and include median age and variables corresponding to the fraction of the population in the following four age groups: 0–15, 15–30, 30–45, and 45–60. Total population data are from the World Bank (2002). We measure education as total years of schooling in the population age 25 and above. For detailed definitions and sources, see Appendix Table A1.

TABLE 4—FIXED EFFECTS RESULTS USING FREEDOM HOUSE MEASURE OF DEMOCRACY: ROBUSTNESS CHECKS

	<i>Five-year data</i>							
	Balanced panel, 1970–2000		Base sample, 1960–2000, without former socialist countries				Base sample, 1960–2000	
	Fixed effects OLS (1)	Arellano- Bond GMM (2)	Fixed effects OLS (3)	Arellano- Bond GMM (4)	Fixed effects OLS (5)	Arellano-Bond GMM (6)	Fixed effects OLS (7)	Arellano- Bond GMM (8)
	<i>Dependent variable is democracy</i>							
Democracy $t-1$	0.283 (0.058)	0.472 (0.092)	0.362 (0.052)	0.436 (0.085)	0.353 (0.053)	0.480 (0.087)	0.351 (0.055)	0.499 (0.097)
Log GDP per capita $t-1$	-0.031 (0.049)	-0.262 (0.128)	0.005 (0.035)	-0.151 (0.078)	0.015 (0.041)	-0.008 (0.139)	-0.001 (0.049)	-0.121 (0.182)
Log population $t-1$					-0.109 (0.100)	-0.001 (0.113)	-0.042 (0.108)	0.049 (0.143)
Education $t-1$							-0.007 (0.020)	-0.020 (0.026)
Age structure $t-1$					[0.05]	[0.63]	[0.19]	[0.27]
Hansen J test		[0.40]		[0.34]		[0.08]		[0.15]
AR(2) test		[0.73]		[0.49]		[0.43]		[0.88]
Implied cumulative effect of income	-0.043 [0.53]	-0.496 [0.03]	0.008 [0.89]	-0.268 [0.05]	0.023 [0.72]	-0.015 [0.96]	-0.002 [0.98]	-0.242 [0.50]
Observations	630	567	908	823	863	731	676	589
Countries	90	81	128	124	142	120	95	92
R -squared	0.80		0.79		0.80		0.77	

Notes: Fixed effects OLS regressions in columns 1, 3, 5, and 7 with country dummies and robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. In columns 2, 4, 6, and 8, we use the GMM of Arellano and Bond (1991), with robust standard errors; in this method we instrument for income using a double lag. Year dummies are included in all regressions. Implied cumulative effect of income represents the coefficient estimate of $\log \text{GDP per capita}_{t-1} / (1 - \text{democracy}_{t-1})$, and the p -value from a nonlinear test of the significance of this coefficient is in brackets. Dependent variable is the Freedom House measure of democracy. Base sample is an unbalanced panel, 1960–2000, with data at five-year intervals in levels where the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1960$, so $t - 1 = 1955$); a country must be independent for five years before it enters the panel. Columns 1 and 2 use a balanced panel from 1970 to 2000. Columns 3 and 4 exclude Soviet bloc countries. Education is average years of total schooling in the population. Columns 5–8 include but do not display the median age of the population at $t - 1$ and four covariates corresponding to the percent of the population at $t - 1$ in the following age groups: 0–15, 15–30, 30–45, and 45–60. The age structure F -test gives the p -value for the joint significance of these variables. For detailed data definitions and sources, see Table 1 and Appendix Table A1.

(2005). In regressions not included here, we find that our results remain unchanged if we include the full set of covariates from Barro's (1999) baseline specification.¹⁴

In addition, in regressions not reported here, we checked for nonlinear and nonmonotonic effects of income on democracy and for potential nonlinear interactions between income and other variables, and found no evidence of such relationships. We also checked and found no evidence of an effect of the volatility in the growth rate of income per capita on democracy.¹⁵

¹⁴ These results are included in the working paper version and are very similar to the results in columns 7 and 8 of Table 4.

¹⁵ We also investigated the effect of growth accelerations using a definition similar to that in the recent paper by Ricardo Hausmann, Lant Pritchett, and Dani Rodrik (2005) and found no effect of growth accelerations on democracy. Interestingly, however, the incidence of crises is correlated with democracy once fixed effects are taken into account.

The only subsample where we find a positive association between income per capita and democracy conditional on fixed effects is the postwar sample with 18 West European countries. This relationship holds only with the Freedom

IV. Instrumental Variable Estimates

As discussed in Section II, fixed effects estimators do not necessarily identify the causal effect of income on democracy. The estimation of causal effects requires exogenous sources of variation. While we do not have an ideal source of exogenous variation, there are two promising potential instruments and we now present IV results using these.

A. Savings Rate Instrument

The first instrument is the savings rate in the previous five-year period, denoted by s_{it} . The corresponding first stage for log income per capita, y_{it-1} , in regression (1) is

$$(3) \quad y_{it-1} = \pi^F s_{it-2} + \alpha^F d_{it-1} + \mathbf{x}'_{it-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}^F + \mu^F_{it-1} + \delta_i^F + u^F_{it-1},$$

where all the variables are defined in Section II and the only excluded instrument is s_{it-2} . The identification restriction is that $\text{Cov}(s_{it-s}, u_{it} | \mathbf{x}_{it-1}, \mu_t, \delta_i) = 0$, where u_{it} is the residual error term in the second-stage regression, (1).

We naturally expect the savings rate to influence income in the future. What about excludability? While we do not have a precise theory for why the savings rate should have no direct effect on democracy, it seems plausible to expect that changes in the savings rate over periods of five to ten years should have no direct effect on the culture of democracy, the structure of political institutions, or the nature of political conflict within society.

Nevertheless, there are a number of channels through which savings rates could be correlated with the error term in the second-stage equation, u_{it} . First, the savings rate itself might be influenced by the current political regime, for example d_{it-2} , and could be correlated with u_{it} if all the necessary lags of democracy are not included in the system. Second, the savings rate could be correlated with changes in the distribution of income or composition of assets, which might have direct effects on political equilibria. Below, we provide evidence that these concerns are unlikely to be important in practice.

With these caveats in mind, Table 5 looks at the effect of GDP per capita on democracy in IV regressions using past savings rates as instruments and using the Freedom House data (results using Polity data are similar and available upon request). The savings rate is defined as nominal income minus consumption minus government expenditure divided by nominal income.

We report a number of different specifications, with or without lagged democracy on the right-hand side, and with or without GMM. The first three columns show the OLS estimates in the pooled cross section, the fixed effects estimates without lagged democracy on the right-hand side, and the fixed effects estimates with lagged democracy on the right-hand side. Without fixed effects, there is a strong association between income per capita and democracy (the relationship in column 1 is stronger than before because it does not include lagged democracy on the right-hand side). With fixed effects, this relationship is no longer present. The remaining columns look at IV specifications and the bottom panel shows the corresponding first stages.

Column 4 shows a strong first-stage relationship between income and the savings rate, with a t-statistic of almost 5. The 2SLS estimate of the effect of income per capita on democracy is -0.035 (standard error = 0.094). The two standard error bands comfortably exclude the OLS estimate from column 1. Column 5 adds lagged democracy to the right-hand side. The first stage

House data, however, and not with the Polity data, and also disappears when we look at a longer sample than the post-war period alone. Details are available upon request.

TABLE 5—FIXED EFFECTS RESULTS USING FREEDOM HOUSE MEASURE OF DEMOCRACY: TWO-STAGE LEAST SQUARES WITH SAVINGS RATE INSTRUMENT

Base sample, 1960–2000									
All countries									
	Pooled OLS	Fixed effects OLS	Fixed effects OLS	Fixed effects 2SLS	Fixed effects 2SLS	Arellano-Bond GMM	Fixed effects 2SLS	Fixed effects 2SLS	Fixed effects 2SLS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>Panel A</i>									
<i>Dependent variable is democracy</i>									
Democracy $t-1$			0.359 (0.054)		0.363 (0.056)	0.427 (0.100)		[0.00]	
Log GDP per capita $t-1$	0.233 (0.013)	0.044 (0.051)	0.009 (0.038)	-0.035 (0.094)	-0.020 (0.081)	-0.228 (0.102)	-0.036 (0.191)	-0.074 (0.113)	0.016 (0.095)
Labor share $t-1$							0.250 (0.199)		
<i>Panel B</i>									
<i>First stage for log GDP per capita $t-1$</i>									
Democracy $t-1$					0.144 (0.066)			[0.24]	
Labor share $t-1$							0.329 (0.187)		
Savings rate $t-2$				1.356 (0.277)	1.343 (0.270)		1.202 (0.315)	1.173 (0.254)	1.022 (0.218)
Savings rate $t-3$									0.720 (0.182)
Hansen <i>J</i> test									[0.34]
AR(2) test									[0.72]
Implied cumulative effect of income			0.014 [0.82]		-0.031 [0.80]	-0.398 [0.01]			
Observations	900	900	891	900	891	764	471	733	796
Countries	134	134	134	134	134	124	98	124	125
<i>R</i> -squared in first stage				0.96	0.96		0.98	0.97	0.97

Notes: Pooled cross-sectional OLS regression in column 1, with robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. Fixed effects OLS regressions in columns 2 and 3 with country dummies and robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. Fixed effects 2SLS regressions in columns 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 with country dummies and robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses; first-stage regressions are displayed in panel B and include all second-stage covariates (apart from income) on the right-hand side with robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. GMM of Arellano-Bond in column 6 with robust standard errors; in this method we instrument for income in the first differenced equation with the first difference of the instrument. Year dummies are included in all regressions. Implied cumulative effect of income represents the coefficient estimate of $\log \text{GDP per capita}_{t-1}/(1 - \text{democracy}_{t-1})$, and the *p*-value from a nonlinear test of the significance of this coefficient is in brackets. Dependent variable is Freedom House measure of democracy. Base sample is an unbalanced panel, 1960–2000, with data at five-year intervals, where the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1960$, so $t - 1 = 1955$); a country must be independent for five years before it enters the panel. Columns 4–9 include instrument for $\log \text{GDP per capita}_{t-1}$ with savings rate $t-2$. Column 9 includes savings rate $t-3$ as an additional instrument. Column 8 includes but does not display democracy_{t-1} , democracy_{t-2} , and democracy_{t-3} ; we report the *p*-value from an *F*-test for the joint significance of all three lags. For detailed data definitions and sources, see Table 1 and Appendix Table A1.

is very similar and the estimate of γ is now -0.020 (standard error = 0.081). Column 6 uses the GMM procedure, again with the savings rate as the excluded instrument for income. Now the estimate of γ is again negative, relatively large, and significant at 5 percent. These IV results, therefore, show no evidence of a positive causal effect of income on democracy.

The remaining columns investigate the robustness of this finding and the plausibility of our exclusion restriction. Column 7 adds labor share as an additional regressor, to check whether

a potential correlation between the savings rate and inequality might be responsible for our results.¹⁶ The first stage shows no significant effect of labor share on income per capita, and the 2SLS estimate of γ is similar to the estimate without the labor share. Column 8 includes further lags of democracy to check whether systematic differences in savings rates between democracies and dictatorships might have an effect on the results. The estimate of γ is similar to before and, if anything, a little more negative in this case. Finally, column 9 adds a further lag of the savings rate as an instrument. This is useful since it enables a test of the overidentifying restriction (namely, a test of whether the savings rate at $t - 3$ is a valid instrument conditional on the savings rate at $t - 2$ being a valid instrument). The 2SLS estimate of γ is again similar and the overidentification restriction that the instruments are valid is accepted comfortably (at the p -value of 1.00).

B. Trade-Weighted World Income Instrument

Our second instrument exploits trade linkages across countries. To develop this instrument, let $\Omega = [\omega_{ij}]_{i,j}$ denote the $N \times N$ matrix of (time-invariant) trade shares between countries in our sample, where N is the total number of countries. More precisely, ω_{ij} is the share of trade between country i and country j in the GDP of country i which measure using trade shares between 1980 and 1989 (which is chosen to maximize coverage).¹⁷

The transmission of business cycles from one country to another through trade (e.g., Marianne Baxter 1995; Aart Kraay and Jaume Ventura 2001) implies that we can think of a statistical model for income of a country as follows:

$$(4) \quad Y_{it-1} = \zeta \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \omega_{ij} Y_{jt-1} + \varepsilon_{it-1},$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, where Y_{it-1} denotes log total income, so $y_{it-1} = Y_{it-1} - P_{it-1}$, where P_{it-1} is the log population of i at $t - 1$. The parameter ζ measures the effect of the trade-weighted world income on the income of each country.

Given equation (4), the identification problem in the estimation of (1) can be restated as follows: the error term ε_{it-1} in (4) is potentially correlated with u_{it} in equation (1) and, if so, the estimates of the effect of income on democracy, γ , will be inconsistent. The idea of the approach in this section is to purge Y_{it-1} , and hence y_{it-1} , from ε_{it-1} to achieve consistent estimation of γ . For this purpose, we construct

$$(5) \quad \hat{Y}_{it-1} = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \omega_{ij} Y_{jt-1},$$

to use as an instrument for y_{it-1} . Here, \hat{Y}_{it-1} is a weighted sum of world income for each country, with weights varying across countries depending on their trade pattern. Given \hat{Y}_{it-1} , we can consider a model for income per capita of the form: $y_{it-1} = \tilde{\pi}^F \hat{Y}_{it-1} + \alpha^F d_{it-1} + \mathbf{x}'_{it-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}^F + \mu_{t-1}^F + \delta_i^F + u_{it-1}^F$. Substituting for (5), we obtain our first-stage relationship,

$$(6) \quad y_{it-1} = \tilde{\pi}^F \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \omega_{ij} Y_{jt-1} + \alpha^F d_{it-1} + \mathbf{x}'_{it-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}^F + \mu_{t-1}^F + \delta_i^F + u_{it-1}^F,$$

¹⁶ This is the labor share of gross value added from Rodrik (1999). We use these data, rather than the standard Gini indices, because they are available for a larger sample of countries. The results with Gini coefficients are very similar and are available upon request.

¹⁷ We obtain similar results if we use predicted average trade shares from a standard gravity equation, as in Jeffrey A. Frankel and David Romer (1999). See the previous version of the paper for details.

where the parameter π^F corresponds to $\zeta\tilde{\pi}^F$ (we do not need separate estimates of ζ and $\tilde{\pi}^F$). The identification assumption for this strategy is that \hat{Y}_{it-1} is orthogonal to u_{it} . A sufficient condition for this is for Y_{jt-1} to be orthogonal to u_{it} for all $j \neq i$.

There may be reasons for this identification assumption to be violated. For example, Y_{jt-1} may be correlated with democracy in country j at time t , d_{jt} , which may influence d_{it} through other political, social, or cultural channels.¹⁸ Although we have no way of ruling out these channels of influence a priori, below we control for the direct effect of the democracy of trading partners and find no evidence to support such a channel.¹⁹

The main results using the Freedom House data are presented in Table 6 (results using Polity data are similar and available upon request). In the bottom panel we report the first-stage relationships. The first three columns again report OLS regressions with and without fixed effects; the basic patterns are similar to those presented before. Column 4 shows our basic 2SLS estimate with the trade-weighted instrument. The instrument is constructed as in (5) using the average trade shares between 1980 and 1989. The bottom panel shows a strong first-stage relationship with a t-statistic of almost 5. The 2SLS estimate of γ is -0.213 (standard error = 0.150). When we add lag democracy in column 5, the estimate is slightly less negative and more precise, -0.120 (standard error = 0.105), and becomes a little more precise with GMM in column 6, -0.133 (standard error = 0.077).

Column 7 investigates whether the democracy of trading partners of country j might have a direct effect on d_{jt} . We construct a world democracy index, \tilde{d}_{it} , using the same trade shares as in equation (5), and include this both in the first and second stages. This democracy index, \tilde{d}_{it} , also varies across countries because of the differences in weights. We find that \tilde{d}_{it} has no effect either in the first or the second stages, consistent with our identification assumption that \hat{Y}_{it-1} should have no effect on democracy in country i except through its influence on y_{it-1} . Column 8 uses Y_{jt-2} instead of Y_{jt-1} on the right-hand side of (5) as an alternative strategy. Finally, column 9 performs an overidentification test similar to that in column 9 of Table 5 by including both the instrument constructed using Y_{jt-2} and the instrument constructed using Y_{jt-1} . The estimate of γ is similar to the baseline estimate in column 4 and the overidentifying restriction that the twice-lagged instrument is valid conditional on the first instrument being valid is again accepted comfortably (at the p -value of 1.00).

Overall, our two IV strategies give results consistent with the fixed effects estimates and indicate that there is no evidence for a strong causal effect of income on democracy.²⁰

V. Fixed Effects Estimates over 100 Years

Thus far, we have followed much of the existing literature in focusing on the postwar period, where the democracy and income data are of higher quality. Nevertheless, it is important to investigate whether there may be an effect of income on democracy at longer horizons.

Although historical data are typically less reliable, the Polity IV dataset extends back to the beginning of the nineteenth century for all independent countries, and Maddison (2003) gives

¹⁸ Because ω_{ij} is time-invariant, it does not capture *changes* in trade patterns and in trade agreements, which could possibly have a direct effect on democracy.

¹⁹ There is an econometric problem arising from the general equilibrium nature of equation (4). Since this equation also applies for country j , the disturbance term ε_{it-1} , which determines Y_{it-1} , will be correlated with Y_{jt-1} , inducing a correlation between Y_{jt-1} and ε_{it-1} , and thus between \hat{Y}_{it-1} and ε_{it-1} . However, under some regularity conditions, the problem disappears as $N \rightarrow \infty$. In exercises included in the previous version of our paper, we have estimated ζ adjusting for potential bias and found no change in our results. Details available upon request.

²⁰ We also tested the overidentifying restriction that the savings rate instrument is valid conditional on the trade-weighted income instrument being valid, and vice versa. Both hypotheses are accepted comfortably (at the p -values of 0.99 and 1.00, respectively).

TABLE 6—FIXED EFFECTS RESULTS USING FREEDOM HOUSE MEASURE OF DEMOCRACY: TWO-STAGE LEAST SQUARES WITH TRADE-WEIGHTED WORLD INCOME INSTRUMENT

Base sample, 1960–2000									
<i>All countries</i>									
	Pooled OLS	Fixed effects OLS	Fixed effects OLS	Fixed effects 2SLS	Fixed effects 2SLS	Arellano-Bond GMM	Fixed effects 2SLS	Fixed effects 2SLS	Fixed effects 2SLS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>Panel A</i>									
<i>Dependent variable is democracy</i>									
Democracy $t-1$			0.376 (0.051)		0.393 (0.057)	0.478 (0.094)			
Log GDP per capita $t-1$	0.233 (0.013)	0.038 (0.045)	0.001 (0.034)	-0.213 (0.150)	-0.120 (0.105)	-0.133 (0.077)	-0.202 (0.130)	-0.198 (0.160)	-0.217 (0.149)
Trade-weighted democracy $_t$							-0.137 (0.635)		
<i>Panel B</i>									
<i>First stage for log GDP per capita $t-1$</i>									
Democracy $t-1$					0.169 (0.063)				
Trade-weighted democracy $t-1$							-1.195 (0.959)		
Trade-weighted log GDP $t-1$				0.402 (0.083)	0.421 (0.082)		0.441 (0.070)		0.529 (0.180)
Trade-weighted log GDP $t-2$								0.341 (0.090)	-0.127 (0.206)
Hansen <i>J</i> test						[0.19]			
AR(2) test						[0.50]			
Implied cumulative effect of income			0.002 [0.98]		-0.198 [0.28]	-0.255 [0.07]			
Observations	906	906	895	906	895	812	906	906	906
Countries	124	124	124	124	124	122	124	124	124
<i>R</i> -squared in first stage				0.95	0.96		0.95	0.95	0.95

Notes: Pooled cross-sectional OLS regression in column 1, with robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. Fixed effects OLS regressions in columns 2 and 3 with country dummies and robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. Fixed effects 2SLS regressions in columns 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 with country dummies and robust standard errors clustered by country in parentheses. GMM of Arellano-Bond in column 6 with robust standard errors; in this method we instrument for income in the first differenced equation with the first difference of the instrument. Year dummies are included in all regressions. Implied cumulative effect of income represents the coefficient estimate of $\log \text{GDP per capita}_{t-1} / (1 - \text{democracy}_{t-1})$, and the *p*-value from a nonlinear test of the significance of this coefficient is in brackets. Dependent variable is Freedom House measure of democracy. Base sample is an unbalanced panel, 1960–2000, with data at five-year intervals, where the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1960$, so $t - 1 = 1955$); a country must be independent for five years before it enters the panel. Columns 4–8 instrument for $\log \text{GDP per capita}_{t-1}$ with trade-weighted world $\log \text{GDP}_{t-1}$. Column 9 uses trade-weighted world $\log \text{GDP}_{t-2}$ as an additional instrument. For detailed data definitions and sources, see Table 1 and Appendix Table A1.

estimates of income per capita for many countries during this period. To investigate longer-term relationships between income and democracy, we construct a 25-year dataset starting in 1875.²¹ This dataset contains a balanced panel of 25 countries for which democracy, lagged democracy

²¹ Since Maddison reports income estimates for 1820, 1870, and 1929, we assign income per capita from 1820 to 1850, income per capita from 1870 to 1875, and income per capita from 1929 to 1925. All of our results are robust to dropping the 1875 observation so as not to use the 1850 estimate of income per capita as the value of log income. If income per capita is not available for a particular country-year pair, it is estimated at the lowest aggregation level at which Maddison's data are available (e.g., Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Honduras are assigned the same income per capita in 1850) and the standard errors are computed by clustering at the highest aggregation level assigned to a particular country.

(calculated 25 years earlier), and lagged income (calculated 25 years earlier) are available for every twenty-fifth year between 1875 and 2000.²² We also construct a larger dataset with 50-year observations that starts in 1900. This dataset contains a larger sample of 37 independent countries.²³

Table 7 presents the basic fixed effects results with these two samples. The specifications of columns 1–4 of the top panel in Table 7 are identical to the specifications of columns 1, 2, 4, and 5 of Table 2, but we use the 25-year valid sample over 1875–2000 with the Polity index as the dependent variable. These results are very similar to those from the postwar panel presented in Tables 2–4. For example, without fixed effects, the coefficient on income per capita is positive and significant at 0.116 (standard error = 0.034), and with fixed effects the coefficient has the wrong sign and is insignificant at –0.020 (0.093). Column 5 reports the baseline regression on a smaller sample, excluding all countries with imputed income estimates (see footnote 21). The results are very similar to those of column 2. The bottom panel repeats the same regressions using the data in 50-year intervals from 1900 to 2000, again with similar results. Once fixed effects are included, the coefficient on income is small and insignificant. Figure 4 depicts these results graphically and shows that there is little relationship between changes in democracy and income in this 100-year sample.

As emphasized in Section II, these results do not necessarily correspond to the causal effect of income on democracy, since there may be omitted time-varying covariates.²⁴ Nevertheless, most plausible omitted variables (as well as potential reverse causality) would bias these estimates upward, so it is safe to conclude that there is no evidence of causal effect of income on democracy over the past 100 years.

VI. Sources of Income-Democracy Correlations

The results presented so far show no evidence of a causal effect of income on democracy. Nevertheless, there is a strong positive association between income and democracy today, as shown in Figure 1. Since 500 years ago most (or all) societies were nondemocratic and exhibited relatively small differences in income, this current-day correlation suggests that over the past 500 years societies that have grown faster have also become democratic. We now investigate why this may have been, and how to reconcile this 500-year pattern with our econometric results. We start with a variation on the econometric model presented in Section II to motivate our theoretical approach and empirical work.

A. Divergent Development Paths

We first extend the econometric model introduced in Section II and use it to clarify the notions of *divergent development paths* and *critical junctures*. Consider a simplified version of (1), without the lagged dependent variable and the other covariates and with contemporaneous income per capita on the right-hand side:

$$(7) \quad d_{it} = \gamma y_{it} + \delta_i^d + u_{it}^d.$$

²² The countries included in this dataset are Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

²³ In addition to the countries in the 25-year sample, this sample includes Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Haiti, Iran, Liberia, Nepal, Oman, Paraguay, Portugal, and Spain.

²⁴ We also looked at IV regressions on this sample using a version of trade-weighted income constructed as in Section IV. In this smaller sample of countries, however, the first-stage relationship was not strong enough to allow the estimation of meaningful second-stage regressions.

TABLE 7—FIXED EFFECTS RESULTS USING POLITY MEASURE OF DEMOCRACY IN THE LONG RUN

<i>Balanced panel, 1875–2000</i>					
	Pooled OLS	Fixed Effects	Arellano-Bond	Fixed Effects	Fixed Effects
	(1)	OLS	GMM	OLS	OLS
		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<i>Panel A</i>					
<i>Dependent variable is democracy</i>					
Democracy $t-1$	0.487 (0.085)	0.192 (0.119)	0.439 (0.143)		0.212 (0.140)
Log GDP per capita $t-1$	0.116 (0.034)	-0.020 (0.093)	-0.495 (0.266)	0.003 (0.092)	0.074 (0.118)
Hansen J test			[0.27]		
AR(2) test			[0.42]		
Implied cumulative effect of income	0.226 [0.00]	-0.025 [0.84]	-0.882 [0.02]		0.094 [0.53]
Observations	150	150	125	150	78
Countries	25	25	25	25	13
R-squared	0.55	0.65		0.63	0.72
<i>Panel B</i>					
<i>Dependent variable is democracy</i>					
Democracy $t-1$	0.233 (0.070)	-0.248 (0.124)	0.319 (0.148)		-0.266 (0.188)
Log GDP per capita $t-1$	0.191 (0.043)	0.039 (0.110)	-0.411 (0.194)	-0.004 (0.092)	0.028 (0.222)
Hansen J test			[0.87]		
Implied cumulative effect of income	0.249 [0.00]	0.031 [0.72]	-0.604 [0.04]		0.031 [0.90]
Observations	111	111	74	111	48
Countries	37	37	37	37	16
R-squared	0.49	0.72		0.70	0.69

Notes: Pooled cross-sectional OLS regression is in column 1, with robust standard errors clustered by highest level of aggregation for income data in parentheses. Fixed-effects OLS regressions are in columns 2, 4, and 5, with country dummies and robust standard errors clustered by highest level of aggregation for income data in parentheses. Column 3 uses GMM of Arellano and Bond (1991), with robust standard errors; we instrument for income using a double lag. Year dummies are included in all regressions. Implied cumulative effect of income represents the coefficient estimate of $\log \text{GDP per capita}_{t-1}/(1-\text{democracy}_{t-1})$, and the p -value from a nonlinear test of the significance of this coefficient is in brackets. Dependent variable is Polity measure of democracy. Base sample is a balanced panel 1875–2000. Panel A uses 25-year data where the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1875$, so $t-1 = 1850$), and panel B uses 50-year data where the start date of the panel refers to the dependent variable (i.e., $t = 1900$, so $t-1 = 1850$), where the sample begins in 1900. In column 5, we drop countries for which the level of aggregation for income data changes across the sample period. The AR (2) test is not possible in column 3 of panel B, since there are two observation years. GDP per capita is from Maddison (2003). For detailed data definitions and sources, see Table 1 and Appendix Table A1.

Moreover, suppose that the statistical process for income per capita is

$$(8) \quad y_{it} = \delta_i^y + u_{it}^y.$$

The parameter γ again represents the causal effect of income on democracy, while δ_i^d and δ_i^y correspond to fixed differences in levels of democracy and income across countries. These fixed differences have so far been taken out by country fixed effects.²⁵

²⁵ Allowing democracy to influence income in equation (8) does not change the conclusions, as long as the effect is nonnegative.

Imagine we have data for two time periods, $t = T - S$ and $t = T$. In time-differencing equations (7) and (8), we obtain

$$(9) \quad d_{iT} - d_{iT-S} = \gamma(y_{iT} - y_{iT-S}) = u_{iT}^d - u_{iT-S}^d,$$

and

$$y_{iT} - y_{iT-S} + u_{iT}^y - u_{iT-S}^y.$$

Consider the fixed effects estimator $\hat{\gamma}_S^{FE}$ using only these two data points, where the time span is given by S . Standard arguments imply that the probability limit of this estimator using these two data points is

$$(10) \quad \text{plim } \hat{\gamma}_S^{FE} = \gamma + \frac{\text{Cov}(u_{iT}^d - u_{iT-S}^d, u_{iT}^y - u_{iT-S}^y)}{\text{Var}(u_{iT}^y - u_{iT-S}^y)}.$$

Therefore, estimation of (9) would yield a consistent estimate of the effect of income on democracy only if $\text{Cov}(u_{iT}^d - u_{iT-S}^d, u_{iT}^y - u_{iT-S}^y) = 0$, that is, only if changes in income over the relevant time horizon are not correlated with changes in democracy through a third common factor.

The condition $\text{Cov}(u_{iT}^d - u_{iT-S}^d, u_{iT}^y - u_{iT-S}^y) = 0$ is restrictive, especially over long horizons. The presence of divergent political-economic development paths across countries implies that this covariance is likely to be positive. Intuitively, divergent development paths refer to processes of development whereby political and economic outcomes evolve jointly. This joint evolution implies that u_{it}^d and u_{it}^y are not orthogonal and that $\text{Cov}(u_{iT}^d - u_{iT-S}^d, u_{iT}^y - u_{iT-S}^y) \neq 0$.

As an example, let us contrast the development experience of the United States with those of Peru and Bolivia. The United States grew rapidly during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and became gradually more democratic, while these Andean societies stagnated and did not show a tendency to become democratic. Nondemocracy and stagnation in the Andes cannot be separated; the hacienda system, based on labor repression and the control of the indigenous Indian communities, was not conducive to industrialization and rapid growth during the nineteenth century. This system and its continuation, even after the abolition of formal systems of Indian tribute and forced labor, were not consistent with democratic institutions and a relatively equal distribution of political power within the society. This contrasts with the small-holder society in the United States, which resulted from the process of European colonization based on settlements in relatively empty and healthy lands. This social structure dominated by small-holders was much more consistent with democratic representation,²⁶ which in turn was conducive to an environment where new industries and new entrepreneurs could flourish with relatively little resistance from established interests.²⁷ This description suggests that beyond the impact of income on democracy or the impact of democracy on income, we may want to think of political and economic development taking place jointly.²⁸ These ideas in general, and the contrast

²⁶ See David W. Galenson (1996) and Alexander Keysser (2000) on the development of the northeastern United States as a settler colony, with relatively democratic and open institutions. See James Lockhart (1968) and Nils Jacobsen (1993) for the creation and persistence of colonial practices in Peru, and see Herbert S. Klein (1992) on Bolivia. For a contrast of these development paths, see, among others, Engerman and Sokoloff (1997) and Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2001, 2002).

²⁷ Sokoloff and B. Zorina Khan (1990) and Khan and Sokoloff (1993) show that many of the major US inventors in the nineteenth century were not members of the already established economic elite, but newcomers with diverse backgrounds.

²⁸ Examples of models in which democracy and economic outcomes are jointly determined include Acemoglu and Robinson (2000, 2007), Acemoglu (2007), Matteo Cervellati, Piergiuseppe Fortunato, and Uwe Sunde (2005), and Humberto Llavador and Robert J. Oxoby (2005).

between the northeast United States and the Andes in particular, are captured by our notion of divergent development paths.

This description naturally leads to the question of what determines whether a country embarks upon a specific development path and brings us to the notion of *critical juncture*. The colonization strategies brought about by the Europeans, ranging from the settler societies of northeast United States to the repressive economies of the Andes, were clearly important for the kind of development paths these societies embarked upon. In this sense, we can think of the early stages of the colonization process as the critical juncture for these development paths.

In summary, the simple conceptual framework proposed here is one in which income and democracy evolve jointly. The development path a society embarks upon is partly influenced by its experience during certain critical junctures, which might include the early stages of colonization for former colonies, the aftermath of independence or the founding of a nation, the epoch of the collapse of feudalism for Western European nations, the age of industrialization (i.e., the nineteenth century), and the periods of significant ideological shocks such as the Reformation, the Enlightenment, or the rise of Islam.

These ideas can be incorporated into the econometric model above in a simple way. Suppose that the critical juncture (for example, the early dates of European colonization) is denoted by T^* , and for notational simplicity, suppose that this is a single common date for all countries. Suppose, moreover, that each of the stochastic terms in (7) and (8), u_{it}^d and u_{it}^y , admits a unit-root representation:

$$u_{it}^d = \eta_{it}^d + \xi_{it}^d \text{ and } u_{it}^y = \eta_{it}^y + \xi_{it}^y, \quad \text{where} \quad \eta_{it}^d = \eta_{it-1}^d + v_{it}^d \text{ and } \eta_{it}^y = \eta_{it-1}^y + v_{it}^y,$$

with $E(\xi_{it}^d) = E(\xi_{it}^y) = E(v_{it}^d) = E(v_{it}^y) = 0$. Let the variances of v_{it}^y and ξ_{it}^y be denoted by $\sigma_{v^y}^2$ and $\sigma_{\xi^y}^2$, and assume that the ξ 's are independent of the v 's. Moreover, let $\text{Cov}(\xi_{it}^d, \xi_{it+k}^y) = 0$, $\text{Cov}(v_{it}^y, v_{it+k}^y) = 0$, and $\text{Cov}(v_{it}^d, v_{it+k}^d) = 0$ for all i and $k \neq 0$. Given this formulation, our emphasis on political and economic development paths diverging at some critical juncture corresponds to large and correlated shocks v_{it}^d and v_{it}^y at some $t = T^*$, which will then have a persistent effect on democracy and prosperity because of the unit root in η_{it}^d and η_{it}^y . To capture this, let $\text{Cov}(v_{it^*}^d, v_{it^*}^y) = \sigma_{T^*}^2$ be positive and large (i.e., $\sigma_{T^*}^2 \gg 0$), corresponding to the importance of a major event affecting both economic and political outcomes at this critical juncture. In contrast with the pattern during critical junctures, we have that $\text{Cov}(v_{it}^d, v_{it}^y) = \sigma_{T^*}^2$ for $t \neq T^*$, which we presume to be positive but small (i.e., $\sigma_{T^*}^2 \geq 0$ but $\sigma_{T^*}^2 \approx 0$). Suppose also that $\text{Cov}(v_{it}^d, v_{it+k}^y) = 0$ for all i and $k \neq 0$. With this additional structure, equation (10) implies the following probability limit for the fixed effect estimator $\hat{\gamma}_S^{FE}$:

$$(11) \quad \text{plim } \hat{\gamma}_S^{FE} = \begin{cases} \gamma + \frac{\sigma_{T^*}^2}{\sigma_{v^y}^2 + 2\sigma_{w^y}^2/S} & \text{if } T^* \notin [T - S, T] \\ \gamma + \frac{(\sigma_{T^*}^2 - \sigma_{T^*}^2)/S + \sigma_{T^*}^2}{\sigma_{v^y}^2 + 2\sigma_{w^y}^2/S} & \text{if } T^* \in [T - S, T] \end{cases},$$

where the second equality exploits the fact that v_i 's and u_i 's are serially uncorrelated.

Equation (11) emphasizes that the bias of $\hat{\gamma}_S^{FE}$ will crucially depend on whether the critical juncture T^* takes place between the dates $T - S$ and T . If it does not do so, the first term applies, and to the extent that $\sigma_{T^*}^2 \approx 0$, the estimator will be “approximately” consistent. Note, however,

that as S increases, the denominator falls, so the potential bias in this estimator may increase when $\sigma_{T^*}^2 > 0$. Nevertheless, by and large, the fixed effects estimator will be approximately consistent when the critical juncture does not take place during the sample period. This is the reason we have some confidence in the results obtained using the fixed effects regressions in the postwar and twentieth-century samples.

As the second line in (11) illustrates, however, when the critical juncture T^* is in our sample, the estimate of γ will be more severely inconsistent, since $\sigma_{T^*}^2 \gg 0$. This observation may be relevant in interpreting why we may see a positive relationship between these two variables during the past 500 years, where many major events affecting the ultimate development path of various societies have taken place, but not during the postwar era or the entire twentieth century.

Equation (11) also suggests an empirical methodology for checking whether events during the critical junctures might indeed be responsible for the cross-country correlation between income and democracy that we observe today. If we can control for variables correlated with the common component in $v_{IT^*}^d$ and $v_{IT^*}^y$ (in practice, historical determinants of divergent development paths) while estimating (9), the positive association between changes in income and democracy should weaken significantly or disappear. We investigate this issue in the next subsection.

B. *Income and Democracy over the Past 500 Years*

As discussed above, the current cross-country correlation between income and democracy likely reflects the changes in income and democracy over the past 500 years. We now investigate this relationship and interpret it in light of the econometric framework introduced in the previous subsection. The major hurdle in an analysis of the relationship between income and democracy over long horizons is the availability of data. Nevertheless, there exist rough estimates of income per capita for almost all areas of the world in 1500. Moreover, we also have information about the variation in political institutions around the turn of the sixteenth century. While no country was fully “democratic” according to current definitions, there were certain notable differences in the political institutions of countries around the world even at this date. In particular, most countries outside Europe were ruled by absolutist regimes, while some European countries had developed certain constraints on the behavior of their monarchs.

Acemoglu et al. (2005) provide a coding of constraint on the executive for European countries going back to 1500 (based on the Polity definition). Constraint on the executive is a key input to the Polity democracy score for European countries. In addition, it seems reasonable that constraint on the executive for non-European countries and the other components of the Polity index (competitiveness of executive recruitment, openness of executive recruitment, and competitiveness of political participation) both for European and non-European countries should take the lowest score in 1500. Based on this information, we construct estimates for the Polity composite index for 1500 (details available upon request). We combine these data with Maddison’s (2003) estimates of income per capita in 1500 and 2000 and Polity’s democracy score for 2000.²⁹

We first check whether the current income–democracy correlation is indeed caused by changes over the past 500 years by estimating (9) over this sample period. Table 8A, column 1, provides estimates for our entire world sample, and Table 8B, column 1, focuses on

²⁹ Countries that have become independent in the 1990s are excluded from the sample. If the Polity score for 2000 is missing, we assign the 1995 score to the observation.




FIGURE 5. CHANGE IN DEMOCRACY AND CHANGE IN INCOME, 1500–2000

Notes: See Appendix Table A1 for data definitions and sources. Changes are total differences between 1500 and 2000. GDP per capita is from Maddison (2003). Democracy is calculated using the Polity measure of democracy, which comprises in part constraint on the executive; data for 1500 from Acemoglu et al. (2005). The regression represented by the fitted line yields a coefficient of 0.134 (standard error = 0.021), $N = 135$, $R^2 = 0.20$, and corresponds to the specification of Table 8A, column 1. The “G” prefix corresponds to the average for groups of countries. G01 is QAT and SAU; G02 is IRQ and PRK; G03 is AFG and SLE; G04 is MMR and SDN; G05 is HTI and TGO; G06 is BDI, COM, and GIN; G07 is CAF and GNB; G08 is BEN and MOZ; G09 is RUS and TUR; G10 is DOM, GTM, and ROM; G11 is ARG, BRA, HUN, and POL; G12 is GBR and KOR; G13 is DNK and SWE; G14 is PAN and ZAF; G15 is BWA and THA; G16 is CHL and ITA; G17 is ESP, PRT, and TTO; G18 is AUT, DEU, GRC, ISR, and MUS; G19 is CYP and ISL; G20 is FIN, JPN, and NZL; and G21 is AUS and CAN.

the sample of former European colonies, which will allow us to better control for potential determinants of divergent development paths. As conjectured above, in both samples, the coefficient on income is large and significant. For example, in this 500-year sample, the coefficient on change in income in the entire world sample is 0.134 (standard error = 0.021) and for the former colonies sample, it is 0.136 (standard error = 0.019). Figure 5 depicts the association between the changes in democracy and changes in income over the past 500 years for the entire world sample. These results suggest that the current cross-country correlation between income and democracy is indeed accounted for by developments over the past 500 years.

We next investigate how the inclusion of proxies for the divergent development paths affects this relationship. For the entire world sample, we use two sets of proxies. The first set of variables includes a measure of early political institutions, constraint on the executive at independence from Polity IV, and the independence year. Since the date of independence is a possible critical juncture for most countries, a direct measure of institutions immediately after the end of the colonial period (for former colonies) or at the date of national independence (for noncolonies) is a useful proxy for the nature of the development paths that these societies have embarked upon. This variable is constructed as the average score of constraint on the executive from Polity IV during the first ten years after independence. We again normalize this score to a zero-to-one scale like democracy, with one representing the highest constraint on the executive. It is useful to control for date of independence as well, since this is also related to the development paths that societies may have embarked upon (with early independence more indicative of a pro-growth and pro-democracy development path). Moreover, constraint on the executive at the

TABLE 8A—DEMOCRACY IN THE VERY LONG RUN

	Base sample, 1500–2000			
	OLS (1)	OLS (2)	OLS (3)	OLS (4)
	Dependent variable is change in democracy over sample period			
Change in log GDP per capita over sample period	0.134 (0.021)	0.061 (0.023)	0.088 (0.020)	0.047 (0.023)
Constraint on the executive at independence		0.260 (0.120)		0.164 (0.064)
Independence year/100		–0.206 (0.063)		–0.133 (0.036)
Fraction Muslim			–0.299 (0.097)	–0.233 (0.083)
Fraction Protestant			0.191 (0.112)	0.180 (0.091)
Fraction Catholic			0.155 (0.073)	0.117 (0.069)
Historical factors F-test		[0.02]	[0.00]	[0.01]
Observations	135	135	131	131
R-squared	0.20	0.34	0.40	0.45

Notes: Cross-section OLS regression in all columns, with robust standard errors clustered by level of aggregation for 1500 income data in parentheses. Countries are included if independent prior to 1990, as determined by CIA *World Factbook* (2004). Changes are total differences between 1500 and 2000. GDP per capita is from Maddison (2003), and democracy is calculated using the Polity measure of democracy, which comprises in part constraint on the executive. All columns assume some values of democracy in 1500 in a few European countries, following Acemoglu et al. (2005) and assign the lowest value of democracy for all other countries. The historical factors *F*-test reports the *p*-value for all variables other than change in income. For detailed data definitions and sources see Table 1 and Appendix Table A1.

date of independence would not be comparable across countries if we did not control for date of independence, since the meaning of this constraint likely varies over time.³⁰

Column 2 of Table 8A includes constraint on the executive at independence and independence year in the regression for our entire world sample. The coefficient on income is reduced from 0.134 (standard error = 0.021) to 0.061 (standard error = 0.023), and higher values of constraint on the executive at independence and earlier dates of independence significantly predict greater changes in democracy over the past 500 years (conditional on the change in income). The coefficient on the change in income is still significant in this regression, perhaps in part because constraint on the executive at independence and independence year are very crude proxies for the divergent development paths of nations.

For this reason, we look for additional potential determinants of development paths. An important candidate suggested in the literature is religion. Citing the experience of England as the primary example, Weber (1930) argued that the Protestant ethic was responsible for the development of an institutional structure conducive to the rise of democracy and capitalism. Other arguments pointing to religion as an important determinant of political and economic development

³⁰ Data on date of independence are from the CIA *World Factbook* (2004). For detailed data definitions and sources, see Appendix Table A1. The data on constraint on the executive from Polity begin in 1800 or at the date of independence. Countries independent prior to 1800 are coded as being independent in 1800.

TABLE 8B—DEMOCRACY IN THE VERY LONG RUN (CONTINUED)

	Former colonies sample, 1500–2000						
	OLS (1)	OLS (2)	OLS (3)	OLS (4)	OLS (5)	OLS (6)	OLS (7)
	Dependent variable is change in democracy over sample period						
Change in log GDP per capita over sample period	0.136 (0.019)	0.067 (0.012)	0.099 (0.012)	0.057 (0.013)	0.081 (0.027)	0.025 (0.024)	0.029 (0.026)
Constraint on the executive at independence		0.189 (0.072)		0.189 (0.075)		0.166 (0.089)	0.167 (0.087)
Independence year/100		–0.190 (0.032)		–0.105 (0.075)		–0.179 (0.023)	–0.128 (0.074)
Fraction Muslim			0.023 (0.101)	0.059 (0.105)			0.038 (0.088)
Fraction Protestant			0.508 (0.258)	0.491 (0.154)			0.411 (0.196)
Fraction Catholic			0.306 (0.130)	0.277 (0.229)			0.200 (0.221)
Log population density, 1500					–0.059 (0.021)	–0.049 (0.022)	–0.031 (0.027)
Historical factors <i>F</i> -test		[0.05]	[0.00]	[0.00]	[0.02]	[0.00]	[0.00]
Observations	87	87	87	87	83	83	83
<i>R</i> -squared	0.20	0.30	0.33	0.37	0.25	0.34	0.38

Notes: Cross-section OLS regression in all columns, with robust standard errors clustered by level of aggregation for 1500 income data in parentheses. Countries are included if they are independent prior to 1990, as determined by CIA (2006), and if they are former European colonies. Changes are total differences between 1500 and 2000. GDP per capita is from Maddison (2003), and democracy is calculated using the Polity measure of democracy, which comprises, in part, constraint on the executive. All columns assign the lowest value of democracy for all countries in 1500. The historical factors *F*-test reports the *p*-value for all variables other than change in income. For detailed data definitions and sources, see Table 1 and Appendix Table A1.

have been articulated by Huntington (1991) and Fish (2002), who emphasize the importance of Islam as an institutional barrier to economic and political development.

In column 3 of Table 8A we present estimates that include the fractions of different religions (in particular, fractions of Protestants, Catholics, and Muslims in the population).³¹ The coefficient on income is again reduced, now to 0.088 (standard error = 0.020), and religious fractions are individually significant at the 10 percent level with the fraction Muslim being most significant and negative at –0.299 (standard error = 0.097). Column 4 combines the religion variables with the proxies of early institutions and date of independence. Now there is a more substantial drop in the estimate of the effect of change in income on the change in democracy, to 0.047 (standard error = 0.023), which is just significant at 5 percent. Figure 6 illustrates the significant weakening in the relationship between changes in income and democracy once we control for historical factors affecting divergent development paths. It depicts the residual plot of the regression in Table 8A, column 4. It shows that the inclusion of historical factors significantly reduces the upward sloping relationship apparent in Figure 5. Recall also that this estimate is likely to be an upper bound on the effect of changes in income on changes in democracy over

³¹ Data from Rafael La Porta et al. (1999).




FIGURE 6. CHANGE IN DEMOCRACY AND CHANGE IN INCOME, 1500–2000, CONDITIONAL ON HISTORICAL FACTORS

Notes: See Appendix Table A1 for data definitions and sources. Changes are total differences between 1500 and 2000 (see Figure 5 for the construction of these differences) which are not predicted in a linear regression by historical factors: fraction Muslim, fraction Protestant, fraction Catholic, constraint on the executive at independence, and independence year. This corresponds to the residual plot of the regression in Table 8A, column 4, and it yields a coefficient of 0.047 (standard error = 0.023), $N = 131$, $R^2 = 0.45$. The “G” prefix corresponds to the average for groups of countries. G01 is CMR and SDN; G02 is CHE and LBY; G03 is MAR and USA; G04 is SLV and ZMB; G05 is BFA and COL; G06 is FJI and PRY; G07 is MEX and SWE; G08 is BEL and VEN; G09 is DOM and GTM; G10 is ARG, JOR, and POL; G11 is FIN and NLD; G12 is CHL and MYS; G13 is GIN and NGA; G14 is DEU, ESP, ITA, and PRT; G15 is PHL and ROM; G16 is BGR and BWA; and G17 is ISR and MUS.

the past 500 years, since our historical measures are only crude proxies for the determinants of divergent development paths.

Although the change in income continues to be significant in this regression, the magnitude of the effect is very small. If the coefficient of 0.047 represented the causal effect of income on democracy, it would imply that an “average” dictatorship in 1500 with income per capita of \$566 (average of world income in 1500 in 1990 dollars) would need to reach a per capita income of \$984 billion to become democratic!³²

Table 8B turns to the former colonies sample. The advantage of this sample is that we have a better understanding of the factors that have shaped the divergent development path during critical junctures. In particular, Acemoglu et al. (2002) document that former colonies with high rates of indigenous population density in 1500 have experienced greater extraction of resources and repression by Europeans, and consequently have been more likely to embark on a development path leading to relative stagnation and nondemocracy. They also provide estimates for population density of the indigenous population in 1500.³³ Motivated by this reasoning, we use the estimates of the size of the indigenous population in 1500 (population density

³² This follows since, given the estimates in column 4, a change from a score of democracy of 0 to 1 would require an increase in log GDP per capita of $1/0.047$. This translates into an $\exp(1/0.047)$ -fold (i.e., ≈ 1.7 -billion-fold!) increase in GDP per capita starting from \$566, which leads to an income per capita of \$984 billion. In contrast, the coefficient of 0.134 in column 1 implies that a substantially smaller (though still large) 1,742-fold increase in income per capita is necessary for a society to move from a democracy score of 0 to 1.

³³ Population density in 1500 is calculated by dividing the historical measures of population from Colin McEvedy and Richard Jones (1975) by the area of arable land (see Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson 2002).

in 1500, for short) as an additional proxy for factors determining the divergent development paths of nations.

Columns 2–4 of Table 8B are similar to columns 2–4 of Table 8A, but refer to the former colonies. They show that the inclusion of constraint on the executive, independence year, and religion variables weakens the 500-year correlation between changes in democracy and income, but a significant relationship still remains (and is in fact stronger than was the case for the entire-world sample). Column 5 turns to the effect of population density in 1500 by including the log of the population density of the indigenous population. This variable is significant and has the expected sign. Moreover, its inclusion reduces the coefficient on the change in income per capita substantially. Column 6 shows that the inclusion of this variable, together with constraint on the executive and date of independence, is sufficient to remove the significant association between changes in income and democracy over the past 500 years entirely. Now the coefficient on the change in income per capita, which was originally equal to 0.136 (standard error = 0.019), is reduced to 0.025 (standard error = 0.024), which is highly insignificant. Moreover, constraint on the executive, independence year, and population density in 1500 are each individually significant. For example, the coefficient on population density in 1500 is -0.049 (0.022). Therefore, in this sample, there is no evidence that changes in income cause changes in democracy once we condition on certain proxies for divergent development paths of former colonies. Finally, column 7 includes the religion variables as well and, again, the coefficient on income is low and insignificant at 0.029 (standard error = 0.026)

Overall, these results are encouraging for our hypothesis, since they indicate that, once reasonable proxies for the divergent development paths are included, the 500-year correlation between changes in income and democracy disappears and the cross-country correlation between income and democracy can be largely accounted for by these divergent development paths.

VII. Conclusion

The conventional wisdom in the political economy literature is that income per capita has a causal effect on democracy. In this paper, we argue that, although income and democracy are positively correlated, there is no evidence of a causal effect. Instead, omitted—most probably historical—factors appear to have shaped the divergent political and economic development paths of various societies, leading to the positive association between democracy and economic performance. Consequently, regressions that include country fixed effects and/or instrumental variable regressions show no evidence of a causal effect of income on democracy over the post-war era or the past 100 years. These results shed considerable doubt on the conventional wisdom both in the academic literature and in the popular press that income per capita is a key determinant of democracy and that a general increase in income per capita will bring improvements in institutions.

These results raise the question of why there is a positive cross-country correlation between income and democracy today. We provided evidence that this is likely to be because the political and economic development paths are interwoven. Some countries appear to have embarked upon a development path associated with democracy and economic growth, while others pursued a path based on dictatorship, repression, and more limited growth. Consistent with this, we have showed that historical sources of variation in development paths are responsible for much of the statistical association between long-run economic and political changes.

Nevertheless, some caution is necessary in interpreting our results. First, even though our results do not provide evidence for a causal effect of income on democracy, such an effect might be present but working at much lower frequencies (for example, over horizons of 100 years or longer), or this causal effect might be conditional on some other characteristics

(though we have not found any evidence for this type of interaction effects using the available cross-country data). Second, our results do not imply that democracy has no effect on economic growth (see, e.g., Torsten Persson and Guido Tabellini 2007). Finally, while we have emphasized the importance of historical development paths, we do not want to suggest that there is a historical determinism in political or economic institutions; the fixed effects in the regressions and the presence of divergent development paths create a tendency, but many other factors influence equilibrium political institutions.³⁴ The potential effects of democracy and political institutions on economic growth, the possible conditional relationship between income and democracy, and the impact of various time-varying and human factors on the evolution of equilibrium political institutions appear to be important areas for future theoretical and empirical research.

APPENDIX

This Appendix addresses the construction of trade-weighted instrument used in Section IV. We first measure the matrix $\Omega = [\omega_{ij}]_{i,j}$ using actual trade shares between 1980 and 1989. These dates are chosen to maximize coverage. Bilateral trade data are from the International Monetary Fund Direction of Trade Statistics (DOTS) (2005) CD-ROM. Let X_{ijs} denote the total trade flow between i and j in year s , meaning the sum of exports from i to j and exports from j to i in year s . We calculate X_{ijs} for all country pairs in year s for which both flows from i to j and from j to i are available. These flows can be measured using either FOB (free on board) exports from i to j or CIF (cost, insurance, and freight) imports by j from i . When both are available, we take the average, and otherwise we use whichever measure is available. All trade data are deflated into 1983 US dollars using the US CPI from International Financial Statistics (2004).

Let Y_{is}^* denote the total GDP of country i in year s in 1983 US dollars obtained from Heston, Summers, and Aten (2002), and \mathcal{I}_{ij} be the number of years between 1980 and 1989 for which bilateral data between i and j are available. Our main measure of $\Omega = [\omega_{ij}]_{i,j}$ is

$$\omega_{ij} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_{ij}} \sum_{s=1980}^{1989} \left(\frac{X_{ijs}}{Y_{is}^*} \right),$$

where $X_{iis} = 0$ by definition.

Since we have an unbalanced panel, we construct our instrument defined in (5) as follows. Define $I_{jt-1} = \{0, 1\}$ as an indicator for Y_{jt-1} being available in the dataset. Then,

$$(12) \quad \hat{Y}_{it-1} = \zeta \left(\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \omega_{ij} I_{jt-1} Y_{jt-1} \right) \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \omega_{ij}}{\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N I_{jt-1} \omega_{ij}} \right),$$

where Y_{jt-1} is log income as before. The third term in (12) ensures that the sum of the weights ω_{ij} are the same across time for a given country i , and this adjustment term is equal to one in a balanced panel. We measure trade-weighted democracy, \tilde{d}_{it} , in an analogous fashion using (12), where we substitute d_{jt} for Y_{jt-1} and let I_{jt-1} now represent an indicator referring to the availability of the variable d_{jt} .

³⁴ Various current factors could, and in fact do, appear to influence democracy. In the previous versions of our paper, we showed how severe economic crises lead to the collapse of dictatorships, making democracy more likely. Benjamin Jones and Benjamin Olken (2006) show how deaths of autocratic leaders make subsequent democracy more likely.

APPENDIX TABLE A1—DATA AND SOURCES

Variable	Description	Source
Freedom House Political Rights Index, also referred to here as Freedom House measure of democracy	Data for 1972–2000 in Freedom House Political Rights Index, original range 1, 2, 3, ..., 7 normalized 0–1. Data for 1972 used for 1970. Data for 1950, 1955, 1960, and 1965, in Bollen, original range 0.00, 0.01, ..., 0.99, 1.	http://www.freedomhouse.org/ratings/ , and Bollen (2001), “Cross National Indicators of Liberal Democracy 1950–1990” available on ICPSR
Polity Composite Democracy Index, also referred to here as the Polity measure of democracy	Data for 1850–2000 in Polity IV. The composite index is the democracy score minus the autocracy score. Original range –10, –9, ..., 10, normalized 0–1. For the purposes of the historical regressions, countries for which data are not available in 2000 are assigned the data for 1995.	http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/polity/
Polity Composite Democracy Index in 1500	Constructed using constraint on the executive score from Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2004b) for the sample of European countries. Components of the index other than constraint on the executive are assigned a value of zero for all countries.	Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2004)
GDP per capita (chain weighted 1996 prices)	Data for 1950–2000 measured as log real GDP per capita (chain method in 1996 prices) from Penn World Tables 6.1.	http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/
GDP per capita (1990 dollars)	Data for 1500–2000 measured as log real GDP per capita (1990 Geary-Khamis dollars) from Maddison (2003). Countries are assigned values at the lowest possible aggregation. Data in 1820 are used for 1850. Data in 1870 are used for 1875. Data in 1929 are used for 1925.	http://www.eco.rug.nl/~Maddison/
Population	Total population in thousands.	World Bank (2002)
Education	Average total years of schooling in the population age 25 and over. Data for 1960, 1965, ..., 1995 from Barro and Lee. We include average years of primary schooling in the population age 25 and over in specifications that include the same covariates as Barro (1999).	Barro and Lee (2000), available at http://www.cid.harvard.edu/ciddata/ciddata.html
Age structure	Data for 1950, 1955, ..., 2000 from United Nations Population Division (2002). These variables are median age of the population and fraction of the population in five different age ranges: 0 to 15, 15 to 30, 30 to 45, 45 to 60, and 60 and above.	United Nations Population Division (2003)
Savings rate	Data for 1950–2000 measured as $(Y-G-C)/Y$ from Penn World Tables 6.1, where Y is nominal income, C is nominal consumption, and G is nominal government spending.	http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/
Labor share	Labor share of value added from Rodrik (1999), 0–1 scale.	Rodrik (1999)
Trade-weighted log GDP	Constructed using GDP per capita from Penn World Tables 6.1 and average trade shares between 1980 and 1989 from International Monetary Fund Direction of Trade Statistics (2005), according to procedures described in Appendix.	http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/ and IMF DoTS CD-ROM (2005)
Trade-weighted democracy	Constructed using Freedom House Political Rights Index, GDP per capita from Penn World Tables 6.1, and average trade shares between 1980 and 1989 from International Monetary Fund Direction of Trade Statistics (2005), according to procedures described in Appendix.	http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/ , IMF DoTS CD-ROM (2005), and http://www.freedomhouse.org/ratings/ , and Bollen (2001), “Cross National Indicators of Liberal Democracy 1950–1990” available on ICPSR

APPENDIX TABLE A1 (CONTINUED)

Variable	Description	Source
Constraint on the executive at independence	Data in Polity IV, original range 1,2,3...7, normalized 0–1. Calculated as the average of constraint on the executive in a country during the first ten years after its independence (ignoring missing data). If data for the first ten years after independence are missing, we find the first year these data are available in Polity, then average over the following ten years (ignoring missing data).	http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/polity/
Independence year	Year when country became independent, with any year before 1800 coded as 1800. We coded Taiwan's independence year as 1948 and changed Zimbabwe's independence year to 1964. Classification of countries follows Polity.	CIA World Factbook (2004), available at http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/
Population density in 1500	Indigenous population divided by arable land in 1500.	Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robison (2002)
Religion	Percent of population in 1980 which is (1) Catholic, (2) Protestant, or (3) Muslim.	La Porta et al. (1999)

APPENDIX TABLE A2— CODES USED TO REPRESENT COUNTRIES

Country	Code	Country	Code	Country	Code
Andorra	ADO	Ghana	GHA	Netherlands	NLD
Afghanistan	AFG	Guinea	GIN	Norway	NOR
Angola	AGO	Gambia, The	GMB	Nepal	NPL
Albania	ALB	Guinea-Bissau	GNB	New Zealand	NZL
United Arab Emirates	ARE	Equatorial Guinea	GNQ	Oman	OMN
Argentina	ARG	Greece	GRC	Pakistan	PAK
Armenia	ARM	Grenada	GRD	Panama	PAN
Antigua	ATG	Guatemala	GTM	Peru	PER
Australia	AUS	Guyana	GUY	Philippines	PHL
Austria	AUT	Honduras	HND	Papua New Guinea	PNG
Azerbaijan	AZE	Croatia	HRV	Poland	POL
Burundi	BDI	Haiti	HTI	Korea, Dem. Rep.	PRK
Belgium	BEL	Hungary	HUN	Portugal	PRT
Benin	BEN	Indonesia	IDN	Paraguay	PRY
Burkina Faso	BFA	India	IND	Qatar	QAT
Bangladesh	BGD	Ireland	IRL	Romania	ROM
Bulgaria	BGR	Iran	IRN	Russia	RUS
Bahrain	BHR	Iraq	IRQ	Rwanda	RWA
Bahamas	BHS	Iceland	ISL	Saudi Arabia	SAU
Bosnia and Herzegovina	BIH	Israel	ISR	Sudan	SDN
Belarus	BLR	Italy	ITA	Senegal	SEN
Belize	BLZ	Jamaica	JAM	Singapore	SGP
Bolivia	BOL	Jordan	JOR	Solomon Islands	SLB
Brazil	BRA	Japan	JPN	Sierra Leone	SLE
Barbados	BRB	Kazakhstan	KAZ	El Salvador	SLV
Brunei	BRN	Kenya	KEN	Somalia	SOM
Bhutan	BTN	Kyrgyz Republic	KGZ	Sao Tome and Principe	STP
Botswana	BWA	Cambodia	KHM	Suriname	SUR
Central African Republic	CAF	Kiribati	KIR	Slovakia	SVK
Canada	CAN	St. Kitts and Nevis	KNA	Slovenia	SVN
Switzerland	CHE	Korea, Rep.	KOR	Sweden	SWE
Chile	CHL	Kuwait	KWT	Swaziland	SWZ
China	CHN	Lao PDR	LAO	Seychelles	SYC
Cote d'Ivoire	CIV	Lebanon	LBN	Syrian Arab Republic	SYR
Cameroon	CMR	Liberia	LBR	Chad	TCD
Congo, Rep.	COG	Libya	LYB	Togo	TGO
Colombia	COL	St. Lucia	LCA	Thailand	THA
Comoros	COM	Liechtenstein	LIE	Tajikistan	TJK
Cape Verde	CPV	Sri Lanka	LKA	Turkmenistan	TKM
Costa Rica	CRI	Lesotho	LSO	Tonga	TON
Cuba	CUB	Lithuania	LTU	Trinidad and Tobago	TTO
Cyprus	CYP	Luxembourg	LUX	Tunisia	TUN
Czech Republic	CZE	Latvia	LVA	Turkey	TUR
Germany	DEU	Morocco	MAR	Taiwan	TWN
Djibouti	DJI	Moldova	MDA	Tanzania	TZA
Dominica	DMA	Madagascar	MDG	Uganda	UGA
Denmark	DNK	Maldives	MDV	Ukraine	UKR
Dominican Republic	DOM	Mexico	MEX	Uruguay	URY
Algeria	DZA	Macedonia, FYR	MKD	United States	USA
Ecuador	ECU	Mali	MLI	Uzbekistan	UZB
Egypt, Arab Rep.	EGY	Malta	MLT	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	VCT
Eritrea	ERI	Myanmar	MMR	Venezuela, RB	VEN
Spain	ESP	Mongolia	MNG	Vietnam	VNM
Estonia	EST	Mozambique	MOZ	Vanuatu	VUT
Ethiopia	ETH	Mauritania	MRT	Western Samoa	WSM
East Timor	ETM	Mauritius	MUS	Yemen	YEM
Finland	FIN	Malawi	MWI	Yugoslavia - post 1991	YUG
Fiji	FJI	Malaysia	MYS	South Africa	ZAF
France	FRA	Namibia	NAM	Congo, Dem. Rep.	ZAR
Gabon	GAB	Niger	NER	Zambia	ZMB
United Kingdom	GBR	Nigeria	NGA	Zimbabwe	ZWE
Georgia	GEO	Nicaragua	NIC		

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, Daron.** Forthcoming. "Oligarchic Versus Democratic Societies." *Journal of the European Economic Association*.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, and James A. Robinson.** 2001. "The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation." *American Economic Review*, 91(5): 1369–1401.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, and James A. Robinson.** 2002. "Reversal of Fortune: Geography and Institutions in the Making of the Modern World Income Distribution." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(4): 1231–94.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, and James A. Robinson.** 2005. "The Rise of Europe: Atlantic Trade, Institutional Change, and Economic Growth." *American Economic Review*, 95(3): 546–79.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, James A. Robinson, and Pierre Yared.** 2005. "From Education to Democracy?" *American Economic Review*, 95(2): 44–49.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, James A. Robinson, and Pierre Yared.** 2007. "Reevaluating the Modernization Hypothesis." Unpublished.
- Acemoglu, Daron, and James A. Robinson.** 2000. "Why Did the West Extend the Franchise? Democracy, Inequality, and Growth in Historical Perspective." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(4): 1167–99.
- Acemoglu, Daron, and James A. Robinson.** 2006. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Acemoglu, Daron, and James A. Robinson.** 2008. Persistence of Power, Elites, and Institutions. *American Economic Review*, 98(1): 267–93.
- Anderson, Theodore W., and Cheng Hsiao.** 1982. "Formulation and Estimation of Dynamic Models Using Panel Data." *Journal of Econometrics*, 18(1): 47–82.
- Arellano, Manuel, and Stephen R. Bond.** 1991. "Some Tests of Specification for Panel Data: Monte Carlo Evidence and an Application to Employment Equations." *Review of Economic Studies*, 58(2): 277–97.
- Arellano, Manuel, and Olympia Bover.** 1995. "Another Look at the Instrumental Variable Estimation of Error-Components Models." *Journal of Econometrics*, 68(1): 29–51.
- Barro, Robert J.** 1997. *Determinants of Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Empirical Study*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Barro, Robert J.** 1999. "Determinants of Democracy." *Journal of Political Economy*, 107(6): S158–83.
- Barro, Robert J., and Jong-Wha Lee.** 2000. "International Data on Educational Attainment: Updates and Implications." Center for International Development Working Paper 42–2000.
- Baxter, Marianne.** 1995. "International Trade and Business Cycles." In *Handbook of International Economics*. Vol. 3. ed. Gene M. Grossman and Kenneth Rogoff, 1801–64. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, North-Holland.
- Bollen, Kenneth A.** 1990. "Political Democracy: Conceptual and Measurement Traps." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 25(1): 7–24.
- Bollen, Kenneth A.** "Cross-National Indicators of Liberal Democracy, 1950–1990." 2nd ICPSR version. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 1998. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, 2001.
- Central Intelligence Agency.** 2004. *World Factbook*. <http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/> (accessed March 2004.)
- Cervellati, Matteo, Piergiuseppe Fortunato, and Uwe Sunde.** 2005. "Consensual and Conflictual Democratization." Unpublished.
- Dahl, Robert A.** 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Engerman, Stanley L., and Kenneth L. Sokoloff.** 1997. "Factor Endowments, Institutions, and Differential Paths of Growth among New World Economies: A View from Economic Historians of the United States." In *How Latin America Fell Behind: Essays on the Economic Histories of Brazil and Mexico, 1800–1914*, ed. Stephen Haber, 60–304. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fish, Steven M.** 2002. "Islam and Authoritarianism." *World Politics*, 55(1): 4–37.
- Frankel, Jeffrey A., and David Romer.** 1999. "Does Trade Cause Growth?" *American Economic Review*, 89(3): 379–99.
- Freedom House.** 2004. *Freedom in the World*. <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=15> (accessed March 2004.)
- Galenson, David W.** 1996. "The Settlement and Growth of the Colonies: Population, Labor, and Economic Development." In *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States*. Vol. 1, ed. Stanley L. Engerman and Robert E. Gallman, 135–207. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hausman, Jerry A.** 1978. "Specification Tests in Econometrics." *Econometrica*, 46(6): 1251–71.
- Hausmann, Ricardo, Lant Pritchett, and Dani Rodrik.** 2005. "Growth Accelerations." *Journal of Economic Growth*, 10(4): 303–29.
- Heston, Alan, Robert Summers, and Bettina Aten.** 2002. *Penn World Tables Version 6.1*. Philadelphia: Center for International Comparisons at the University of Pennsylvania.

- Huntington, Samuel P.** 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- International Monetary Fund.** 2005. *Direction of Trade Statistics*. Database and Browser CD-ROM. Washington, DC.
- International Monetary Fund.** 2004. *International Financial Statistics*. Database and Browser CD-ROM. Washington, DC.
- Jacobsen, Nils.** 1993. *Mirages of Transition: the Peruvian Altiplano, 1780-1930*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jones, Benjamin F., and Benjamin A. Olken.** 2005. "Do Leaders Matter? National Leadership and Growth since World War II." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(3): 835–64.
- Jones, Eric L.** 1981. *The European Miracle: Environments, Economies, and Geopolitics in the History of Europe and Asia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Khan, B. Zorina, and Kenneth L. Sokoloff.** 1993. "'Schemes of Practical Utility': Entrepreneurship and Innovation Among 'Great Inventors' in the United States, 1790–1865." *Journal of Economic History*, 53(2): 289–307.
- Keysser, Alexander.** 2000. *The Right to Vote: The Contested History of Democracy in the United States*. New York: Basic Books.
- Klein, Herbert S.** 1992. *Bolivia: The Evolution of a Multi-ethnic Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kraay, Aart, and Jaume Ventura.** 2001. "Comparative Advantage and the Cross-Section of Business Cycles." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 8104.
- La Porta, Rafael, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, Andrei Shleifer, and Robert W. Vishny.** 1999. "The Quality of Government." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 15(1): 222–79.
- Lipset, Seymour M.** 1959. "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy." *American Political Science Review*, 53(1): 69–105.
- Llavador, Humberto, and Robert J. Oxoby.** 2005. "Partisan Competition, Growth, and the Franchise." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(3): 1155–89.
- Lockhart, James.** 1968. *Spanish Peru, 1532–1560: A Colonial Society*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Londregan, John B. and Keith T. Poole.** 1996. "Does High Income Promote Democracy?" *World Politics*, 49(1): 1–30.
- Maddison, Angus.** 2003. *The World Economy: Historical Statistics*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Marshall, Monty G. and Keith Jagers.** 2004. "Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800–2002." College Park, MD: Polity IV Project, University of Maryland.
- McEvedy, Colin and Richard Jones.** 1975. *Atlas of World Population History*. New York: Facts on File.
- Miguel, Edward, Shanker Satyanath, and Ernest Sergenti.** 2004. "Economic Shocks and Civil Conflict: An Instrumental Variables Approach." *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(4): 725–53.
- North, Douglass C.** 1981. *Structure and Change in Economic History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- North, Douglass C., and Robert P. Thomas.** 1973. *The Rise of the Western World: A New Economic History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Papaioannou, Elias, and Gregorios Siourounis.** 2006. "Economic and Social Factors Driving the Third Wave of Democratization." Unpublished.
- Persson, Torsten, and Guido Tabellini.** 2007. "The Growth Effect of Democracy: Is It Heterogenous and How Can It Be Estimated?" National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 13150.
- Przeworski, Adam, Michael Alvarez, José A. Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi.** 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Material Well-being in the World, 1950–1990*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam and Fernando Limongi.** 1997. "Modernization: Theory and Facts." *World Politics*, 49(2): 155–83.
- Rodrik, Dani.** 1999. "Democracies Pay Higher Wages." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114(3): 707–38.
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Evelyn Huber Stephens, and John D. Stephens.** 1992. *Capitalist Development and Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sokoloff, Kenneth L., and B. Zorina Khan.** 1990. "The Democratization of Invention During Early Industrialization: Evidence from the United States, 1790–1846." *Journal of Economic History*, 50(2): 363–78.
- United Nations Population Division.** 2003. *World Population Prospects: The 2002 Revision*. Disc. New York.
- Weber, Max.** 1930. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Wooldridge, Jeffrey M.** 2002. *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- World Bank.** 2002. *World Development Indicators*. CD-ROM and Book. Washington, DC.

This article has been cited by:

1. Blaise Gnimassoun, John C. Anyanwu. 2019. The Diaspora and economic development in Africa. *Review of World Economics* **155**:4, 785-817. [[Crossref](#)]
2. MEHDI SHADMEHR. 2019. Investment in the Shadow of Conflict: Globalization, Capital Control, and State Repression. *American Political Science Review* **113**:4, 997-1011. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Espen Geelmuyden Rød, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Håvard Hegre. 2019. The determinants of democracy: a sensitivity analysis. *Public Choice* **95**. . [[Crossref](#)]
4. Li-Chen Chou, Wan-Hao Zhang, Meng-Ying Wang, Fu-Ming Yang. 2019. The influence of democracy on emissions and energy efficiency in America: New evidence from quantile regression analysis. *Energy & Environment* **39**, 0958305X1988238. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Onur ÖZDEMİR. 2019. THE NEW INSIGHTS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND INCOME: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM ADVANCED ECONOMIES. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 1776-1796. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Christian Gunadi. 2019. The legacy of slavery on hate crime in the United States. *Research in Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
7. Fadillah Putra. 2019. Examining the link between democracy, social policy, and inclusive development in South-East Asia. *Asian Social Work and Policy Review* **13**:3, 226-241. [[Crossref](#)]
8. George A. Krause, Matthew Zarit. 2019. Understanding political-economic development in the American South. *Economics & Politics* **98**. . [[Crossref](#)]
9. Martin Roessler. 2019. Political regimes and publicly provided goods: why democracy needs development. *Public Choice* **180**:3-4, 301-331. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Mingbo Zheng, Gen-Fu Feng, Suling Feng, Xuemei Yuan. 2019. The road to innovation vs. the role of globalization: A dynamic quantile investigation. *Economic Modelling* . [[Crossref](#)]
11. Ali Pirannejad, Marijn Janssen, Jafar Rezaei. 2019. Towards a balanced E-Participation Index: Integrating government and society perspectives. *Government Information Quarterly* 101404. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Thomas Barnebeck Andersen, Peter Sandholt Jensen. 2019. Preaching democracy: The second Vatican council and the third wave. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **47**:3, 525-540. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Chandan Kumar Jha, Oasis Kodila-Tedika. 2019. Does social media promote democracy? Some empirical evidence. *Journal of Policy Modeling* . [[Crossref](#)]
14. Jaeho Kim, Le Wang. 2019. Hidden group patterns in democracy developments: Bayesian inference for grouped heterogeneity. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **34**:6, 1016-1028. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Dramane Coulibaly, Luc Désiré Omgba. 2019. Why are some African countries succeeding in their democratic transitions while others are failing?. *Oxford Economic Papers* **91**. . [[Crossref](#)]
16. Shaun P. Hargreaves Heap, Kei Tsutsui, Daniel J. Zizzo. 2019. Vote and voice: an experiment on the effects of inclusive governance rules. *Social Choice and Welfare* **98**. . [[Crossref](#)]
17. Gang Huang, Ho-Chuan Huang, Xiaojian Liu, Jiangang Zhang. 2019. Endogeneity in Okun's law. *Applied Economics Letters* 1-5. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Tarek Ben Ali, Bandar Ben Abdul Aziz Al Yahya. 2019. The effect of governance on public debt: an empirical investigation for the Arabian Gulf countries. *Journal of Economic Studies* **46**:4, 812-841. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Sima Siami-Namini, Darren Hudson. 2019. The impacts of sector growth and monetary policy on income inequality in developing countries. *Journal of Economic Studies* **46**:3, 591-610. [[Crossref](#)]

20. Ngoc Thi Minh Tran, Michael P. Cameron, Jacques Poot. 2019. Local Institutional Quality and Return Migration: Evidence from Viet Nam. *International Migration* 57:4, 75-90. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Fubing Su, Xi Lu, Xi Zhao, Ran Tao. 2019. Land Taking and Electoral Rule Setting: Evidence from Chinese Rural Democracy. *Political Studies* 67:3, 752-774. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Doug J. Chung, Byungyeon Kim, Byoung G. Park. 2019. How Do Sales Efforts Pay Off? Dynamic Panel Data Analysis in the Nerlove–Arrow Framework. *Management Science* . [[Crossref](#)]
23. Christopher Claassen. 2019. Does Public Support Help Democracy Survive?. *American Journal of Political Science* 150. . [[Crossref](#)]
24. Laura E. Arney, Robert M. McNab. 2019. What Goes Up Must Come Down: Military Expenditure and Civil Wars. *Defence and Peace Economics* 30:5, 570-591. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Abdulkareem Alhassan, Abdulkhakeem Abdullahi Kilishi. 2019. Weak economic institutions in Africa: a destiny or design?. *International Journal of Social Economics* 46:7, 904-919. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Rostislav I. Kapeliushnikov. 2019. Contra pan-institutionalism. Part I. *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :7, 119-146. [[Crossref](#)]
27. K. Kıvanç Karaman, Şevket Pamuk, Seçil Yıldırım-Karaman. 2019. Money and monetary stability in Europe, 1300–1914. *Journal of Monetary Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
28. Stephanie M. Rizio, Ahmed Skali. 2019. How often do dictators have positive economic effects? Global evidence, 1858–2010. *The Leadership Quarterly* . [[Crossref](#)]
29. Andrew Musau. 2019. A Replication Study of “Openness, Country Size, and Government Size” (Journal of Public Economics 2009). *Public Finance Review* 47:4, 775-792. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Luis Rene Caceres. 2019. Determinants of trust in government in Latin America. *Revista Mexicana de Economía y Finanzas* 14:3, 329-351. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Nam Kyu Kim. 2019. Reassessing the relationship between elections and democratization. *International Political Science Review* 019251211984614. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Martin Paldam. 2019. A study of triggering events: When do political regimes change?. *Public Choice* 98. . [[Crossref](#)]
33. SAIMA NAWAZ, M. IDREES KHAWAJA. 2019. FISCAL POLICY, INSTITUTIONS AND GROWTH: NEW INSIGHTS. *The Singapore Economic Review* 86, 1650029. [[Crossref](#)]
34. James Cust, Torfinn Harding. 2019. Institutions and the Location of Oil Exploration. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 127. . [[Crossref](#)]
35. Ignacio Sánchez-Cuenca. The Historical Roots of Political Violence 25, . [[Crossref](#)]
36. Carolyn Chisadza, Manoel Bittencourt. 2019. Economic development and democracy: The modernization hypothesis in sub-Saharan Africa. *The Social Science Journal* 56:2, 243-254. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Jørgen Møller. 2019. Bringing the Church Back In: Ecclesiastical Influences on the Rise of Europe. *Politics and Religion* 12:02, 213-226. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Michael Jetter, Sabine Laudage, David Stadelmann. 2019. The Intimate Link Between Income Levels and Life Expectancy: Global Evidence from 213 Years*. *Social Science Quarterly* 100:4, 1387-1403. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Nouha Bougharriou, Walid Benayed, Foued Badr Gabsi. 2019. Education and democracy in the Arab world. *Economic Change and Restructuring* 52:2, 139-155. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Wei Zheng, Patrick Paul Walsh. 2019. Economic growth, urbanization and energy consumption — A provincial level analysis of China. *Energy Economics* 80, 153-162. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Kevin Williams. 2019. Do political institutions improve the diminishing effect of financial deepening on growth? Evidence from developing countries. *Journal of Economics and Business* 103, 13-24. [[Crossref](#)]

42. Saqib Amin. 2019. The endless nexus between ethnic diversity, social exclusion and institutional quality of Pakistan. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 39:3/4, 182-200. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Rajius Idzalika, Thomas Kneib, Inmaculada Martinez-Zarzoso. 2019. The effect of income on democracy revisited a flexible distributional approach. *Empirical Economics* 56:4, 1207-1230. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Adrián Lucardi. 2019. Strength in Expectation: Elections, Economic Performance, and Authoritarian Breakdown. *The Journal of Politics* 81:2, 552-570. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Philippe Aghion, Xavier Jaravel, Torsten Persson, Dorothée Rouzet. 2019. Education and Military Rivalry. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 17:2, 376-412. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Joyce Hsieh, Ting-Cih Chen, Shu-Chin Lin. 2019. Credit constraints and growth gains from governance. *Applied Economics* 51:11, 1199-1211. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Andrew Farrant, Vlad Tarko. 2019. James M. Buchanan's 1981 visit to Chile: Knightian democrat or defender of the 'Devil's fix'?. *The Review of Austrian Economics* 32:1, 1-20. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Boris Begović, Dušan Popović. 2019. Merger Control and Economic Growth of LDCs: Some Observations and Recommendations. *Review of Industrial Organization* 54:2, 381-408. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Antonis Adam, Kostas Karanatsis. 2019. Sovereign Defaults and Democracy. *Comparative Economic Studies* 61:1, 36-62. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Frédéric Gaspard, Pierre Pecher. 2019. Ethnic Inclusiveness of the Central State Government and Economic Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of African Economies* 28:2, 176-201. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Katarzyna Iwińska, Athanasios Kampas, Kerry Longhurst. 2019. Interactions between Democracy and Environmental Quality: Toward a More Nuanced Understanding. *Sustainability* 11:6, 1728. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Ángeles Gallego, M. Ángeles Rodríguez-Serrano, Cristóbal Casanueva. 2019. Dynamic panel data models in tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism* 22:4, 379-399. [[Crossref](#)]
53. CARL HENRIK KNUTSEN, JOHN GERRING, SVEND-ERIK SKAANING, JAN TEORELL, MATTHEW MAGUIRE, MICHAEL COPPEDGE, STAFFAN I. LINDBERG. 2019. Economic development and democracy: An electoral connection. *European Journal of Political Research* 58:1, 292-314. [[Crossref](#)]
54. Jeanet Sinding Bentzen, Jacob Gerner Hariri, James A Robinson. 2019. Power and Persistence: The Indigenous Roots of Representative Democracy. *The Economic Journal* 129:618, 678-714. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Saibal Ghosh. 2019. RETRACTED ARTICLE: Financial inclusion, economic growth and mobile telephony in India: analysing the nexus. *Innovation and Development* 14, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Ivar Kolstad. 2019. Too big to fault? Effects of the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize on Norwegian exports to China and foreign policy. *International Political Science Review* 69, 019251211880861. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Michael Coppedge, David Kuehn. 2019. Introduction: absorbing the four methodological disruptions in democratization research?. *Democratization* 26:1, 1-20. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Jason Seawright. 2019. Statistical analysis of democratization: a constructive critique. *Democratization* 26:1, 21-39. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Carolyn Chisadza, Elsabé Loots. Economic Growth and Quality of Life in Africa 131-147. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Thomas Denk, Sarah Lehtinen. The Legacy of Initial Regimes and Democratization in New States 109-138. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Marta Guerriero. Democracy and the Labor Share of Income: A Cross-Country Analysis 151-176. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Izaskun Zuazu. 2019. The growth effect of democracy and technology: An industry disaggregated approach. *European Journal of Political Economy* 56, 115-131. [[Crossref](#)]

63. Diogo Baerlocher, Stephen L. Parente, Eduardo Rios-Neto. 2019. Economic effects of demographic dividend in Brazilian regions. *The Journal of the Economics of Ageing* 14, 100198. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Thomas Plümper, Vera E. Troeger. 2019. Not so Harmless After All: The Fixed-Effects Model. *Political Analysis* 27:1, 21-45. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Daniel de Kadt, Stephen B. Wittels. 2019. Democratization and Economic Output in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Political Science Research and Methods* 7:1, 63-84. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Elliott Green. 2019. Elliott Green: Public goods and national identification. *Nations and Nationalism* 25:1, 90-96. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Nikolaos Antonakakis, Mina Dragouni, Bruno Eeckels, George Filis. 2019. The Tourism and Economic Growth Enigma: Examining an Ambiguous Relationship through Multiple Prisms. *Journal of Travel Research* 58:1, 3-24. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Alexandre Padilla, Nicolas Cachanosky. 2019. The Grecian Horse II: Do Immigrants Import Their Home Country's Institutions Into Their Host Countries? The Case of the American States. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
69. Marta Guerriero. 2019. Democracy and the Labor Share of Income: A Cross-Country Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
70. Yassine Bakkar, Ali Recayi Ogcem. 2019. Democracy and Economic Development: Disentangling the Effect of Elections and Rule of Law. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
71. Alexandre Padilla, Nicolas Cachanosky, Jonathan Beck. 2019. Immigration and Economic Freedom: Does Immigrants' Education Level Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
72. Sam van Noort. 2019. The Structural Economic Roots of Liberal Democracy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
73. Robert K. Fleck, F. Andrew Hanssen. 2018. Path dependence and transitions from tyranny to democracy: evidence from ancient Greece. *Constitutional Political Economy* 29:4, 371-388. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Julia Debski, Michael Jetter, Saskia Möhle, David Stadelmann. 2018. Gender and corruption: The neglected role of culture. *European Journal of Political Economy* 55, 526-537. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Kevin Williams. 2018. Is the Relationship Between Remittances and Political Institutions Monotonic? Evidence from Developing Countries. *South African Journal of Economics* 86:4, 449-467. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Alberto Chong, Mark Gradstein. 2018. On the Preferences for Strong Leadership*. *Social Science Quarterly* 99:4, 1267-1282. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Sébastien Mary. 2018. How Much Does Economic Growth Contribute to Child Stunting Reductions?. *Economies* 6:4, 55. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Carlos Gervasoni. Hybrid Regimes within Democracies 5, . [[Crossref](#)]
79. Adaner Usmani. 2018. Democracy and the Class Struggle. *American Journal of Sociology* 124:3, 664-704. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Saibal Ghosh. 2018. RETRACTED ARTICLE: Biometric identification, financial inclusion and economic growth in India: does mobile penetration matter?. *Information Technology for Development* 14, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Scott J. Cook, Jude C. Hays, Robert J. Franzese. 2018. Fixed effects in rare events data: a penalized maximum likelihood solution. *Political Science Research and Methods* 50, 1-14. [[Crossref](#)]
82. Theodora Bermpei, Antonios Kalyvas, Thanh Cong Nguyen. 2018. Does institutional quality condition the effect of bank regulations and supervision on bank stability? Evidence from emerging and developing economies. *International Review of Financial Analysis* 59, 255-275. [[Crossref](#)]
83. Timm Betz, Scott J. Cook, Florian M. Hollenbach. 2018. On the Use and Abuse of Spatial Instruments. *Political Analysis* 26:4, 474-479. [[Crossref](#)]

84. Tobias Erhardt. 2018. Does International Trade Cause Overfishing?. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 5:4, 695-711. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Michael Jetter, Christopher F. Parmeter. 2018. Does Urbanization Mean Bigger Governments?. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 120:4, 1202-1228. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Wuyi Wang, Peter C. B. Phillips, Liangjun Su. 2018. Homogeneity pursuit in panel data models: Theory and application. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 33:6, 797-815. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Nedra Baklouti, Younes Boujelbene. 2018. The Nexus Between Democracy and Economic Growth: Evidence from Dynamic Simultaneous-Equations Models. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy* 9:3, 980-998. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Jerg Gutmann, Stefan Voigt. 2018. The rule of law: Measurement and deep roots. *European Journal of Political Economy* 54, 68-82. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Chun-Yu Ho, Shaoqing Huang, Hao Shi, Jun Wu. 2018. Financial deepening and innovation: The role of political institutions. *World Development* 109, 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Michael Jetter, Christopher F. Parmeter. 2018. Sorting through global corruption determinants: Institutions and education matter – Not culture. *World Development* 109, 279-294. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Wilson Prichard, Paola Salardi, Paul Segal. 2018. Taxation, non-tax revenue and democracy: New evidence using new cross-country data. *World Development* 109, 295-312. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Ivar Kolstad, Arne Wiig. 2018. Diversification and democracy. *International Political Science Review* 39:4, 551-569. [[Crossref](#)]
93. José Pereira Coutinho. 2018. Restrição à Liberdade Religiosa no Mundo: Caracterização de Clusters e Definição de Modelos Explicativos. *Dados* 61:3, 617-657. [[Crossref](#)]
94. . Bibliography 285-295. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Rohan Best, Paul J. Burke. 2018. Electricity availability: A precondition for faster economic growth?. *Energy Economics* 74, 321-329. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Tiago Neves Sequeira, Marcelo Serra Santos. 2018. Renewable energy and politics: A systematic review and new evidence. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 192, 553-568. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Kelsey J. O'Connor, Luisa R. Blanco, Jeffrey B. Nugent. 2018. Does oil really curse democracy? A long-run time-series analysis of 127 countries. *Resources Policy* 57, 264-277. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Dramane Coulibaly, Blaise Gnimassoun, Valérie Mignon. 2018. Growth-enhancing Effect of Openness to Trade and Migrations: What is the Effective Transmission Channel for Africa?. *Journal of African Economies* 27:4, 369-404. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Martin Paldam, Erich Gundlach. 2018. Jumps into Democracy: Integrating the Short and Long Run in the Democratic Transition. *Kyklos* 71:3, 456-481. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Kevin Williams. 2018. Workers' remittances and government size. *Review of Development Economics* 22:3, e115-e134. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Seok Eun Kim, You Hyun Kim. 2018. Democracy and Nonprofit Growth: A Cross-National Panel Study. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 47:4, 702-722. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Esmeralda A. Ramalho, Tiago Neves Sequeira, Marcelo Serra Santos. 2018. The effect of income on the energy mix: Are democracies more sustainable?. *Global Environmental Change* 51, 10-21. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Chandan Kumar Jha, Sudipta Sarangi. 2018. Women and corruption: What positions must they hold to make a difference?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 151, 219-233. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Jon Danielsson, Marcela Valenzuela, Ilknur Zer. 2018. Learning from History: Volatility and Financial Crises. *The Review of Financial Studies* 31:7, 2774-2805. [[Crossref](#)]

105. Jong-Han Yoon. 2018. Information equality and democracy in the information age. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics* 49, 205789111878309. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Suzanna- Maria Paleologou. 2018. Income and democracy: dynamic misspecification due to the presence of serial correlation. *Applied Economics Letters* 25:10, 698-701. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Matteo Cervellati, Alireza Naghavi, Farid Toubal. 2018. Trade liberalization, democratization, and technology adoption. *Journal of Economic Growth* 23:2, 145-173. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Markus Brueckner, Era Dabla-Norris, Mark Gradstein, Daniel Lederman. 2018. The rise of the middle class and economic growth in ASEAN. *Journal of Asian Economics* 56, 48-58. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Hans Degryse, Thomas Lambert, Armin Schwienbacher. 2018. The Political Economy of Financial Systems: Evidence from Suffrage Reforms in the Last Two Centuries. *The Economic Journal* 128:611, 1433-1475. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Deepraj Mukherjee. 2018. Corruption in International Business: Does Economic Globalization Help?. *Global Business Review* 19:3, 623-634. [[Crossref](#)]
111. Serhan Cevik. 2018. Unlocking Pakistan's Revenue Potential. *South Asian Journal of Macroeconomics and Public Finance* 7:1, 17-36. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Mark Dincecco, Yuhua Wang. 2018. Violent Conflict and Political Development Over the Long Run: China Versus Europe. *Annual Review of Political Science* 21:1, 341-358. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Pierre Pecher. 2018. Ethnic divisions and the effect of appropriative competition intensity on economic performance. *Economics of Governance* 19:2, 165-193. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Doris A. Oberdabernig, Stefan Humer, Jesus Crespo Cuaresma. 2018. Democracy, Geography and Model Uncertainty. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 65:2, 154-185. [[Crossref](#)]
115. ALAN GREEN. 2018. Democracy and institutions in postcolonial Africa. *Journal of Institutional Economics* 14:2, 207-231. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Roland Hodler. 2018. THE POLITICAL ECONOMICS OF THE ARAB SPRING. *Economic Inquiry* 56:2, 821-836. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Clara Weinhardt, Anke Moerland. 2018. (Mis)Perceptions in Two- and Three-Level Games: Detachment in Economic Partnership Agreement Negotiations. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 56:3, 576-593. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Antonis Adam, Sofia Tsarsitalidou. 2018. Do democracies have higher current account deficits?. *Constitutional Political Economy* 29:1, 40-68. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Alexandre Padilla, Nicolás Cachanosky. 2018. The Grecian horse: does immigration lead to the deterioration of American institutions?. *Public Choice* 174:3-4, 351-405. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Maricruz Lacalle-Calderon, Manuel Perez-Trujillo, Isabel Neira. 2018. Does Microfinance Reduce Poverty among the Poorest? A Macro Quantile Regression Approach. *The Developing Economies* 56:1, 51-65. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Allan Dafoe. 2018. Nonparametric Identification of Causal Effects under Temporal Dependence. *Sociological Methods & Research* 47:2, 136-168. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Troy Saghaug Broderstad. 2018. A meta-analysis of income and democracy. *Democratization* 25:2, 293-311. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Peter Lloyd, Cassey Lee. 2018. A REVIEW OF THE RECENT LITERATURE ON THE INSTITUTIONAL ECONOMICS ANALYSIS OF THE LONG-RUN PERFORMANCE OF NATIONS. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 32:1, 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Jianhua Liu, Zhaohua Jiang. Introduction 1-56. [[Crossref](#)]

125. NIKOLA ALTIPARMAKOV, MILAN NEDELJKOVIĆ. 2018. Does pension privatization increase economic growth? Evidence from Latin America and Eastern Europe. *Journal of Pension Economics and Finance* 17:1, 46-84. [[Crossref](#)]
126. Jørgen Møller. 2018. Medieval Roots of the Modern State: The Conditional Effects of Geopolitical Pressure on Early Modern State Building. *Social Science History* 42:2, 295-316. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Faqin Lin. 2018. Cross-country diffusion of ideology via FDI. *Economics of Transition* 26:1, 3-34. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Christopher Gelpi, Nazli Avdan. 2018. Democracies at risk? A forecasting analysis of regime type and the risk of terrorist attack. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 35:1, 18-42. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Matteo Bellitto, Mario Coccia. 2018. Human Progress and the Inconsistency of the Equation Economic Growth=Progress in the Late Capitalism. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
130. Bruce E. Hansen, Seojeong Lee. 2018. Inference for Iterated GMM Under Misspecification and Clustering. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
131. Jaeho Kim, Wang Le. 2018. Hidden Group Patterns in Democracy Developments: Bayesian Inference for Grouped Heterogeneity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
132. Xun Lei, Tomasz Piotr Wisniewski. 2018. Democracy and Stock Market Returns. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
133. Rohan Best, Paul J. Burke. 2018. Electricity Availability: A Precondition for Faster Economic Growth?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
134. Jin Hyung Kim, Shon R. Hiatt. 2018. Where Are You From? Perceived Country Homophily and Its Effect on the Implementation of Corporate Political Strategy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
135. Haakon Gjerløw, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Tore Wig, Matthew Charles Wilson. 2018. Stairways to Denmark: Does the Sequence of State-Building and Democratization Matter for Economic Development?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
136. Chandan Kumar Jha, Oasis Kodila-Tedika. 2018. Does Social Media Promote Democracy? Some Empirical Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
137. Peter Kunzel, Phil De Imus, Edward Gemayel, Risto Herrala, Alexei Kireyev, Farid Talishli. 2018. Opening Up in the Caucasus and Central Asia: Policy Frameworks to Support Regional and Global Integration. *Departmental Papers / Policy Papers* 18:07, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Helena Helfer. 2017. Prosperity-Enhancing Institutions: Towards a Comprehensive Composite Index. *Social Indicators Research* 134:3, 805-845. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Zied Ftiti, Abdelkader Aguir, Mounir Smida. 2017. Time-inconsistency and expansionary business cycle theories: What does matter for the central bank independence–inflation relationship?. *Economic Modelling* 67, 215-227. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Raymundo M. Campos-Vazquez, Emmanuel Chavez, Gerardo Esquivel. 2017. Growth is (really) good for the (really) rich. *The World Economy* 40:12, 2639-2675. [[Crossref](#)]
141. Collin Constantine. 2017. Economic structures, institutions and economic performance. *Journal of Economic Structures* 6:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
142. Shengmin Sun, Rigoberto Lopez, Xiaou Liu. 2017. Property rights, labor mobility and collectivization: The impact of institutional changes on China's agriculture in 1950–1978. *International Review of Economics & Finance* 52, 345-351. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Zhao Rong, Xiaokai Wu, Philipp Boeing. 2017. The effect of institutional ownership on firm innovation: Evidence from Chinese listed firms. *Research Policy* 46:9, 1533-1551. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Xun Lu, Liangjun Su. 2017. Determining the number of groups in latent panel structures with an application to income and democracy. *Quantitative Economics* 8:3, 729-760. [[Crossref](#)]

145. Mark Dincecco. State Capacity and Economic Development 11, . [[Crossref](#)]
146. Alan Green. 2017. Contracts Do Matter: Robust Evidence of an Optimal Level of Legal Formalism in Developing Countries. *The Journal of Development Studies* 53:10, 1663-1678. [[Crossref](#)]
147. Jørgen Møller. 2017. Medieval Origins of the Rule of Law: The Gregorian Reforms as Critical Juncture?. *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law* 9:2, 265-282. [[Crossref](#)]
148. Mahmoud Arayssi, Ali Fakh. 2017. Finance–growth nexus in a changing political region: How important was the Arab Spring?. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 55, 106-123. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Nikolaos Antonakakis, Juncal Cunado, George Filis, Fernando Perez de Gracia. 2017. Oil dependence, quality of political institutions and economic growth: A panel VAR approach. *Resources Policy* 53, 147-163. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Yanyan Gao, Leizhen Zang, Antoine Roth, Puqu Wang. 2017. Does democracy cause innovation? An empirical test of the popper hypothesis. *Research Policy* 46:7, 1272-1283. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Wade M. Cole. 2017. Too much of a good thing? Economic growth and human rights, 1960 to 2010. *Social Science Research* 67, 72-90. [[Crossref](#)]
152. Colin O'Reilly, Ryan H. Murphy. 2017. Exogenous Resource Shocks and Economic Freedom. *Comparative Economic Studies* 59:3, 243-260. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Minh Tam Schlosky, Andrew Young. 2017. Can foreign aid motivate institutional reform? An evaluation of the HIPC Initiative. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy* 6:2, 242-258. [[Crossref](#)]
154. Saibal Ghosh. 2017. Broadband penetration and economic growth: Do policies matter?. *Telematics and Informatics* 34:5, 676-693. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Mausumi Kar, Saibal Kar. 2017. Multi Fibre Arrangement and Wage Inequality: Firm and State-level Evidence from India and a Theoretical Model. *The World Economy* 40:7, 1473-1493. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Tiago Neves Sequeira. 2017. Democracy and income: taking parameter heterogeneity and cross-country dependency into account. *The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics* 17:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
157. Ben Wilson, Tim Dyson. 2017. Democracy and the demographic transition. *Democratization* 24:4, 594-612. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Faqin Lin, Ermias O. Weldemicael, Xiaosong Wang. 2017. Export sophistication increases income in sub-Saharan Africa: evidence from 1981–2000. *Empirical Economics* 52:4, 1627-1649. [[Crossref](#)]
159. Dmitry Ryvkin, Anastasia Semykina. 2017. An experimental study of democracy breakdown, income and inequality. *Experimental Economics* 20:2, 420-447. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Maxim L. Pinkovskiy. 2017. Growth discontinuities at borders. *Journal of Economic Growth* 22:2, 145-192. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Shrabani Saha, Zhaoyong Zhang. 2017. Democracy-growth nexus and its interaction effect on human development: A cross-national analysis. *Economic Modelling* 63, 304-310. [[Crossref](#)]
162. K.M. Vu. 2017. Structural change and economic growth: Empirical evidence and policy insights from Asian economies. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 41, 64-77. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Zhao Rong, Sheng Xiao. 2017. Innovation-Related Diversification and Firm Value. *European Financial Management* 23:3, 475-518. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Frank Wiengarten, Di Fan, Chris K.Y. Lo, Mark Pagell. 2017. The differing impacts of operational and financial slack on occupational safety in varying market conditions. *Journal of Operations Management* 52:1, 30-45. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Alexander L. Lundberg, Kim P. Huynh, David T. Jacho-Chávez. 2017. Income and Democracy: A Smooth Varying Coefficient Redux. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 32:3, 719-724. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Ray Galvin. 2017. Humans and stuff: Interweaving social and physical science in energy policy research. *Energy Research & Social Science* 26, 98-102. [[Crossref](#)]

167. Sirianne Dahlum, Carl Henrik Knutsen. 2017. Democracy by Demand? Reinvestigating the Effect of Self-expression Values on Political Regime Type. *British Journal of Political Science* 47:2, 437-461. [[Crossref](#)]
168. Toke S. Aidt, Peter S. Jensen. 2017. From Open to Secret Ballot. *Comparative Political Studies* 50:5, 555-593. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Kevin Williams. 2017. Does democracy dampen the effect of finance on economic growth?. *Empirical Economics* 52:2, 635-658. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Giovanna d'Adda, Guido de Blasio. 2017. HISTORICAL LEGACY AND POLICY EFFECTIVENESS: THE LONG-TERM INFLUENCE OF PREUNIFICATION BORDERS IN ITALY. *Journal of Regional Science* 57:2, 319-341. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Nam Kyu Kim. 2017. Anti-regime Uprisings and the Emergence of Electoral Authoritarianism. *Political Research Quarterly* 70:1, 111-126. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Wen-Chin Wu, Yu-Tzung Chang, Hsin-Hsin Pan. 2017. Does China's middle class prefer (liberal) democracy?. *Democratization* 24:2, 347-366. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Kevin Williams. 2017. Do remittances improve political institutions? Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Economic Modelling* 61, 65-75. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Ghulam Mustafa, Marian Rizov, David Kernohan. 2017. Growth, human development, and trade: The Asian experience. *Economic Modelling* 61, 93-101. [[Crossref](#)]
175. Regan Deonanan, Kevin Williams. 2017. The effect of remittances on democratic institutions. *Applied Economics* 49:5, 403-416. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Muhammad Habibur Rahman, Nejat Anbarci, Prasad Sankar Bhattacharya, Mehmet Ali Ulubaşoğlu. 2017. The Shocking Origins of Political Transitions: Evidence from Earthquakes. *Southern Economic Journal* 83:3, 796-823. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Nadia Fiorino, Roberto Ricciuti, Fulvio Venturino. Measuring Direct Democracy 143-158. [[Crossref](#)]
178. Taisya Pogodaeva, Nadezhda Senchenko. Institutions and Economic Growth in the Resources Intensive Use Economies 105-123. [[Crossref](#)]
179. Thomas Apolte, Helena Helfer. The Role of Democracy in a Social Market Economy 65-81. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Alessandra Ricciardelli. Theoretical Studies on Content Analysis and Empirical Research 13-66. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Rainer Kotschy, Uwe Sunde. 2017. Democracy, inequality, and institutional quality. *European Economic Review* 91, 209-228. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Faiz Ur Rehman, Paolo Vanin. 2017. Terrorism risk and democratic preferences in Pakistan. *Journal of Development Economics* 124, 95-106. [[Crossref](#)]
183. Min Tang, Narisong Huhe, Qiang Zhou. 2017. Contingent Democratization: When Do Economic Crises Matter?. *British Journal of Political Science* 47:1, 71-90. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Stephen Chaudoin, Zachary Peskowitz, Christopher Stanton. 2017. Beyond Zeroes and Ones. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61:1, 56-83. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Kunal Sen, Lant Pritchett, Sabyasachi Kar, Selim Raihan. 2017. Democracy Versus Dictatorship? The Political Determinants of Growth Episodes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
186. Anibal PPrez-Liinin. 2017. Explaining the Erosion of Democracy: Can Economic Growth Hinder Democracy?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
187. Mario Coccia. 2017. General Causes of Terrorism: High Population Growth in Problematic Society. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

188. Robert K. Fleck. 2017. Engineering the Rule of Law in Ancient Athens. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
189. Mehdi Shadmehr. 2017. Capitalists in Revolution. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
190. Gregory P. Casey, Marc Klemp. 2017. Instrumental Variables in the Long Run. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
191. Mark Dincecco, Yuhua Wang. 2017. Violent Conflict and Political Development Over the Long Run: China versus Europe. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
192. Christopher Claassen. 2017. Does Democracy Require Public Support?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
193. Jonathan Kropko, Robert Kubinec. 2017. Analyzing Variation in the Cross-Section and Over Time: A Reassessment of Fixed Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
194. Giacomo Magistretti, Marco Tabellini. 2017. Economic Integration and Democracy: An Empirical Investigation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
195. Christian Houle. 2016. Inequality, Economic Development, and Democratization. *Studies in Comparative International Development* 51:4, 503-529. [[Crossref](#)]
196. Michael Effah Asamoah, Charles K.D. Adjasi, Abdul Latif Alhassan. 2016. Macroeconomic uncertainty, foreign direct investment and institutional quality: Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Economic Systems* 40:4, 612-621. [[Crossref](#)]
197. Klaus Gründler, Tommy Krieger. 2016. Democracy and growth: Evidence from a machine learning indicator. *European Journal of Political Economy* 45, 85-107. [[Crossref](#)]
198. Daniel L. Bennett, Boris Nikolaev, Toke S. Aidt. 2016. Institutions and well-being. *European Journal of Political Economy* 45, 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
199. Irina Ervits, Małgorzata Żmuda. 2016. Comparative Study of the Role of Institutions in Shaping Inventive Activity in Mid-Range Emerging Economies. *Comparative Economic Research* 19:4, 85-105. [[Crossref](#)]
200. Federico Traversa. 2016. ¿Por qué quiebran las democracias? Educación y conflicto de clase revisitados. *Revista de Sociología e Política* 24:60, 69-89. [[Crossref](#)]
201. A. Alesina, P. Giuliano. 2016. Culture and institutions. Part II. *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :11, 24-56. [[Crossref](#)]
202. Nikolaos Antonakakis, Mina Dragouni, Bruno Eeckels, George Filis. 2016. Tourism and economic growth: Does democracy matter?. *Annals of Tourism Research* 61, 258-264. [[Crossref](#)]
203. Nabamita Dutta, Sanjukta Roy. 2016. The interactive impact of press freedom and media reach on corruption. *Economic Modelling* 58, 227-236. [[Crossref](#)]
204. Rok Spruk. 2016. Institutional transformation and the origins of world income distribution. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 44:4, 936-960. [[Crossref](#)]
205. Jørgen Møller. 2016. Composite and Loose Concepts, Historical Analogies, and the Logic of Control in Comparative Historical Analysis. *Sociological Methods & Research* 45:4, 651-677. [[Crossref](#)]
206. Arusha Cooray, Nabamita Dutta, Sushanta Mallick. 2016. Does female human capital formation matter for the income effect of remittances? Evidence from developing countries. *Oxford Development Studies* 44:4, 458-478. [[Crossref](#)]
207. Michael Connolly, Cheng Li. 2016. Government spending and economic growth in the OECD countries. *Journal of Economic Policy Reform* 19:4, 386-395. [[Crossref](#)]
208. Isma'il al-Shatti. 2016. The state of democracy and human rights in the Arab ummah (nation) 1. *Contemporary Arab Affairs* 9:4, 523-535. [[Crossref](#)]

209. Timothy Besley, Torsten Persson, Marta Reynal-Querol. 2016. Resilient Leaders and Institutional Reform: Theory and Evidence. *Economica* **83**:332, 584-623. [[Crossref](#)]
210. Tay-Cheng Ma, Lishu Ouyang. 2016. DEMOCRACY AND GROWTH: A PERSPECTIVE FROM DEMOCRATIC EXPERIENCE. *Economic Inquiry* **54**:4, 1790-1804. [[Crossref](#)]
211. Alberto Alesina. 2016. Review of Political Order and Inequality: Their Foundations and Their Consequences by Carles Boix. *Journal of Economic Literature* **54**:3, 935-941. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
212. Ichiro Iwasaki, Taku Suzuki. 2016. RADICALISM VERSUS GRADUALISM: AN ANALYTICAL SURVEY OF THE TRANSITION STRATEGY DEBATE. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **30**:4, 807-834. [[Crossref](#)]
213. Rodolphe Desbordes, Gary Koop. 2016. Should we care about the uncertainty around measures of political-economic development?. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **44**:3, 752-763. [[Crossref](#)]
214. Francesco Caselli, Andrea Tesei. 2016. Resource Windfalls, Political Regimes, and Political Stability. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **98**:3, 573-590. [[Crossref](#)]
215. Panagiotis Artelaris, George Petrakos. 2016. Intraregional Spatial Inequalities and Regional Income Level in the European Union. *International Regional Science Review* **39**:3, 291-317. [[Crossref](#)]
216. Nabamita Dutta, Russell Sobel. 2016. Does corruption ever help entrepreneurship?. *Small Business Economics* **47**:1, 179-199. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Nils-Petter Lagerlöf. 2016. Statehood, democracy and preindustrial development. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **67**, 58-72. [[Crossref](#)]
218. Nadezhda V. Baryshnikova, Ngoc T.A. Pham, Maria M. Wihardja. 2016. Does Political and Economic Inequality Affect Institutional Quality?. *Economic Record* **92**:297, 190-208. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Christos Kollias, Suzanna Maria Paleologou. 2016. Globalization and Democracy: A Disaggregated Analysis by Income Group. *Global Economy Journal* **16**:2, 213-228. [[Crossref](#)]
220. Lukáš Martinák. 2016. Substantivní teorie vojenského převratu: příčinné faktory. *Středoevropské politické studie Central European Political Studies Review* **17**:3-4, 276. [[Crossref](#)]
221. David Stasavage. 2016. Representation and Consent: Why They Arose in Europe and Not Elsewhere. *Annual Review of Political Science* **19**:1, 145-162. [[Crossref](#)]
222. Saibal Ghosh. 2016. How important is mobile telephony for economic growth? Evidence from MENA countries. *info* **18**:3, 58-79. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Frédéric Docquier, Elisabetta Lodigiani, Hillel Rapoport, Maurice Schiff. 2016. Emigration and democracy. *Journal of Development Economics* **120**, 209-223. [[Crossref](#)]
224. Raphaël Franck. 2016. The Political Consequences of Income Shocks: Explaining the Consolidation of Democracy in France. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **98**:1, 57-82. [[Crossref](#)]
225. Mark Dincecco, Gabriel Katz. 2016. State Capacity and Long-Run Economic Performance. *The Economic Journal* **126**:590, 189-218. [[Crossref](#)]
226. Jörg Faust. Entwicklungstheorien in der Vergleichenden Politikwissenschaft 197-207. [[Crossref](#)]
227. Daron Acemoğlu, James A. Robinson. Paths to Inclusive Political Institutions 3-50. [[Crossref](#)]
228. Sarah Blodgett Bermeo. 2016. Aid Is Not Oil: Donor Utility, Heterogeneous Aid, and the Aid-Democratization Relationship. *International Organization* **70**:1, 1-32. [[Crossref](#)]
229. Christian Houle, Mark A. Kayser, Jun Xiang. 2016. Diffusion or Confusion? Clustered Shocks and the Conditional Diffusion of Democracy. *International Organization* **70**:4, 687-726. [[Crossref](#)]
230. Samir Makdisi. The Unravelling of Arab Autocracy: Socioeconomic Factors in Context 51-73. [[Crossref](#)]

231. Willa Friedman, Michael Kremer, Edward Miguel, Rebecca Thornton. 2016. Education as Liberation?. *Economica* **83**:329, 1-30. [[Crossref](#)]
232. Astrid Krenz. 2016. Do Political Institutions Influence International Trade? Measurement of Institutions and the Long-Run Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
233. Pal Czeglédi. 2016. Classical Liberalism, Democracy, and Economic Growth: A Hypothesis About the Lipset Hypothesis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
234. Arno Tausch. 2016. Smart Developmentt. An Essay on a New Political Economy of the Environment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
235. Lee J. Alston, Carlos Pereira. 2016. A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Critical Transitions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
236. Adewole Musiliu Adeolu. 2016. Middle Class and Economic Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Micro Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
237. Jonathan F Schulz. 2016. The Churches' Bans on Consanguineous Marriages, Kin-Networks and Democracy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
238. Wuyi Wang, Peter C. B. Phillips, Liangjun Su. 2016. Homogeneity Pursuit in Panel Data Models: Theory and Applications. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
239. Houda Haffoudhi, Racem Mehdi, Gam Abdelkader. 2016. Understanding Democratic Transition Using Self-Organizing Maps: A Special Focus on Arab Spring Countries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
240. Serhan Cevik. 2016. Unlocking Pakistan's Revenue Potential. *IMF Working Papers* **16**:182, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
241. Alberto Alesina, Paola Giuliano. 2015. Culture and Institutions. *Journal of Economic Literature* **53**:4, 898-944. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
242. Piergiuseppe Fortunato, Ugo Panizza. 2015. Democracy, education and the quality of government. *Journal of Economic Growth* **20**:4, 333-363. [[Crossref](#)]
243. Heikki Lehkonen, Kari Heimonen. 2015. Democracy, political risks and stock market performance. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **59**, 77-99. [[Crossref](#)]
244. Markus Brueckner, Daniel Lederman. 2015. Trade Openness and Economic Growth: Panel Data Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Economica* **82**, 1302-1323. [[Crossref](#)]
245. Markus Brueckner, Hannes Schwandt. 2015. Income and Population Growth. *The Economic Journal* **125**:589, 1653-1676. [[Crossref](#)]
246. Randall Akee, Miriam Jorgensen, Uwe Sunde. 2015. Critical junctures and economic development – Evidence from the adoption of constitutions among American Indian Nations. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **43**:4, 844-861. [[Crossref](#)]
247. Alberto Posso, Simon Feeny. 2015. Income, democracy and European colonization. *Applied Economics Letters* **22**:15, 1257-1261. [[Crossref](#)]
248. Daniel Treisman. 2015. Income, Democracy, and Leader Turnover. *American Journal of Political Science* **59**:4, 927-942. [[Crossref](#)]
249. Andreas Assiotis, Kevin Sylwester. 2015. Does Law and Order Attenuate the Benefits of Democracy on Economic Growth?. *Economica* **82**:328, 644-670. [[Crossref](#)]
250. Gang Wang, Liyun Wu, Rongbin Han. 2015. College education and attitudes toward democracy in China: an empirical study. *Asia Pacific Education Review* **16**:3, 399-412. [[Crossref](#)]
251. Pablo Jimenez-Ayora, Mehmet Ali Ulubaşoğlu. 2015. What underlies weak states? The role of terrain ruggedness. *European Journal of Political Economy* **39**, 167-183. [[Crossref](#)]

252. Zsuzsanna Csereklyei, David I. Stern. 2015. Global energy use: Decoupling or convergence?. *Energy Economics* **51**, 633-641. [[Crossref](#)]
253. Leonid Grigoryev. 2015. The elites' demand for law: "Overcrowded streetcar (tram) effect". *Russian Journal of Economics* **1**:3, 313-327. [[Crossref](#)]
254. Piergiuseppe Fortunato. 2015. Democratic Government and Development: A Survey. *Asian Development Review* **32**:2, 153-177. [[Crossref](#)]
255. Jakob B. Madsen, Paul A. Raschky, Ahmed Skali. 2015. Does democracy drive income in the world, 1500–2000?. *European Economic Review* **78**, 175-195. [[Crossref](#)]
256. Markus Brückner, Mark Gradstein. 2015. Income growth, ethnic polarization, and political risk: Evidence from international oil price shocks. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **43**:3, 575-594. [[Crossref](#)]
257. Robert Mattes. 2015. South Africa's Emerging Black Middle Class: A Harbinger of Political Change?. *Journal of International Development* **27**:5, 665-692. [[Crossref](#)]
258. Kevin Sylwester. 2015. Does Democracy Increase Growth More in New Countries?. *Economics & Politics* **27**:2, 266-289. [[Crossref](#)]
259. Federico Traversa. 2015. Income and the stability of democracy: Pushing beyond the borders of logic to explain a strong correlation?. *Constitutional Political Economy* **26**:2, 121-136. [[Crossref](#)]
260. Markus Brueckner, Era Dabla Norris, Mark Gradstein. 2015. National income and its distribution. *Journal of Economic Growth* **20**:2, 149-175. [[Crossref](#)]
261. Zohid Askarov, Hristos Doucouliagos. 2015. Aid and institutions in transition economies. *European Journal of Political Economy* **38**, 55-70. [[Crossref](#)]
262. Robert J. Barro. 2015. Convergence and Modernisation. *The Economic Journal* **125**:585, 911-942. [[Crossref](#)]
263. Carl Henrik Knutsen, Tore Wig. 2015. Government Turnover and the Effects of Regime Type. *Comparative Political Studies* **48**:7, 882-914. [[Crossref](#)]
264. Thiago Henrique Carneiro Rios Lopes, Cleiton Silva de Jesus. 2015. Financial liberalization and economic growth. *Journal of Economic Studies* **42**:2, 207-223. [[Crossref](#)]
265. Stéphane Bonhomme, Elena Manresa. 2015. Grouped Patterns of Heterogeneity in Panel Data. *Econometrica* **83**:3, 1147-1184. [[Crossref](#)]
266. Laura E. Armev, Robert M. McNab. 2015. Democratization and civil war. *Applied Economics* **47**:18, 1863-1882. [[Crossref](#)]
267. Norbert Berthold, Klaus Gründler. 2015. The Growth Crisis of Germany: A Blueprint of the Developed Economies. *International Economic Journal* **29**:2, 195-229. [[Crossref](#)]
268. T. Janus, D. Riera-Crichton. 2015. The output effect of gross foreign investment reversals. *Oxford Economic Papers* **67**:2, 356-379. [[Crossref](#)]
269. Suzanna-Maria Paleologou. 2015. Income and democracy: the modernization hypothesis re-visited via alternative non-linear models. *Empirical Economics* **48**:2, 909-921. [[Crossref](#)]
270. Tolga Bilgicer, Kamel Jedidi, Donald R. Lehmann, Scott A. Neslin. 2015. The Long-Term Effect of Multichannel Usage on Sales. *Customer Needs and Solutions* **2**:1, 41-56. [[Crossref](#)]
271. Joannes Jacobsen. 2015. Revisiting the Modernization Hypothesis: Longevity and Democracy. *World Development* **67**, 174-185. [[Crossref](#)]
272. Saima Nawaz. 2015. Growth effects of institutions: A disaggregated analysis. *Economic Modelling* **45**, 118-126. [[Crossref](#)]

273. Maricruz Lacalle-Calderón, Coro Chasco, Javier Alfonso-Gil, Isabel Neira. 2015. A comparative analysis of the effect of aid and microfinance on growth. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement* 36:1, 72-88. [[Crossref](#)]
274. Jörg Faust. Entwicklungstheorien aus politikwissenschaftlicher Perspektive 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
275. Gerardo L. Munck. Democratic Transitions 97-100. [[Crossref](#)]
276. Daron Acemoglu, Suresh Naidu, Pascual Restrepo, James A. Robinson. Democracy, Redistribution, and Inequality 1885-1966. [[Crossref](#)]
277. Ben Zissimos. 2015. World Price Shocks, Income, and Democratization: Figure 1. *The World Bank Economic Review* 29:suppl 1, S145-S154. [[Crossref](#)]
278. Adam Przeworski. 2015. Acquiring the Habit of Changing Governments Through Elections. *Comparative Political Studies* 48:1, 101-129. [[Crossref](#)]
279. Pal Czeglédi. 2015. The Lipset Hypothesis in a Property Rights Perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
280. Mario Coccia. 2015. Religious Culture, Democratisation and Patterns Of Technological Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
281. Yanyan Gao. 2015. Political Systems, Urban Bias and Urban-Rural Income Gap: An Empirical Study on the World Panel Data, 1990-2010. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
282. Ana Abeliantsky, Astrid Krenz. 2015. Democracy and International Trade: Differential Effects from a Panel Quantile Regression Framework. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
283. Shaun P. Hargreaves Heap, Kei Tsutsui, Daniel John Zizzo. 2015. An Experiment on Democratic Versus Dictatorial Collective Decision Making. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
284. Jan Fredrick Cruz, Ronald U. Mendoza. 2015. Does Dynastic Prohibition Improve Democracy?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
285. Yi-ting Wang, Patrik Lindenfors, Aksel Sundström, Fredrik Jansson, Staffan I. Lindberg. 2015. No Democratic Transition Without Women's Rights: A Global Sequence Analysis 1900-2012. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
286. Frédéric Docquier, Elisabetta Lodigiani, Hillel Rapoport, Maurice Schiff. 2015. Emigration and Democracy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
287. William R. Cline. 2015. Further Statistical Debate on 'Too Much Finance'. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
288. Carl Henrik Knutsen, John Gerring, Svend-Erik Skaaning, Jan Teorell, Matthew Maguire, Michael Coppedge, Staffan I. Lindberg. 2015. Economic Development and Democracy: An Electoral Connection. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
289. Toke S. Aidt, Peter S. Jensen. 2014. Workers of the world, unite! Franchise extensions and the threat of revolution in Europe, 1820-1938. *European Economic Review* 72, 52-75. [[Crossref](#)]
290. Jean-Claude Cosset, Charles Martineau, Anis Samet. 2014. Do political institutions affect the choice of the U.S. cross-listing venue?. *Journal of Multinational Financial Management* 27, 22-48. [[Crossref](#)]
291. Florian Jung, Uwe Sunde. 2014. Income, inequality, and the stability of democracy — Another look at the Lipset hypothesis. *European Journal of Political Economy* 35, 52-74. [[Crossref](#)]
292. Jana Friedrichsen, Philipp Zahn. 2014. Political support in hard times: Do people care about national welfare?. *European Journal of Political Economy* 35, 23-37. [[Crossref](#)]
293. Rabah Arezki, Markus Brueckner. 2014. Effects of International Food Price Shocks on Political Institutions in Low-Income Countries: Evidence from an International Food Net-Export Price Index. *World Development* 61, 142-153. [[Crossref](#)]

294. JAVIER ALFONSO-GIL, MARICRUZ LACALLE-CALDERÓN, ROCÍO SÁNCHEZ-MANGAS. 2014. Civil liberty and economic growth in the world: a long-run perspective, 1850–2010. *Journal of Institutional Economics* 10:3, 427-449. [[Crossref](#)]
295. David Fielding. 2014. The Dynamics of Aid and Political Rights. *The World Economy* 37:9, 1197-1218. [[Crossref](#)]
296. Graziella Bertocchi, Arcangelo Dimico. 2014. Slavery, education, and inequality. *European Economic Review* 70, 197-209. [[Crossref](#)]
297. Filipe R. Campante, Davin Chor. 2014. “The people want the fall of the regime”: Schooling, political protest, and the economy. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 42:3, 495-517. [[Crossref](#)]
298. Ariel BenYishay, Roger Betancourt. 2014. Unbundling democracy: Political rights and civil liberties. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 42:3, 552-568. [[Crossref](#)]
299. Narjess Boubakri, Sadok El Ghouli, Walid Saffar. 2014. Political rights and equity pricing. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 27, 326-344. [[Crossref](#)]
300. Manthos D. Delis, Iftexhar Hasan, Pantelis Kazakis. 2014. Bank Regulations and Income Inequality: Empirical Evidence*. *Review of Finance* 18:5, 1811-1846. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Andreas Assiotis, Kevin Sylwester. 2014. Do the Effects of Corruption upon Growth Differ Between Democracies and Autocracies?. *Review of Development Economics* 18:3, 581-594. [[Crossref](#)]
302. Daron Acemoglu, Francisco A. Gallego, James A. Robinson. 2014. Institutions, Human Capital, and Development. *Annual Review of Economics* 6:1, 875-912. [[Crossref](#)]
303. Anar K. Ahmadov. 2014. Oil, Democracy, and Context. *Comparative Political Studies* 47:9, 1238-1267. [[Crossref](#)]
304. Annette N. Brown, Drew B. Cameron, Benjamin D. K. Wood. 2014. Quality evidence for policymaking: I'll believe it when I see the replication. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* 6:3, 215-235. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Cecilia García-Peñalosa, Maty Konte. 2014. Why Are Women Less Democratic Than Men? Evidence from Sub-Saharan African Countries. *World Development* 59, 104-119. [[Crossref](#)]
306. Uwe Sunde, Matteo Cervellati. 2014. Democratizing for peace? The effect of democratization on civil conflicts. *Oxford Economic Papers* 66:3, 774-797. [[Crossref](#)]
307. Dalibor S. Eterovic, Cassandra M. Sweet. 2014. Democracy and Education in twentieth-century Latin America. *Economics & Politics* 26:2, 237-262. [[Crossref](#)]
308. Fabrice Murtin, Romain Wacziarg. 2014. The democratic transition. *Journal of Economic Growth* 19:2, 141-181. [[Crossref](#)]
309. Gabriel Leon. 2014. Loyalty for sale? Military spending and coups d'état. *Public Choice* 159:3-4, 363-383. [[Crossref](#)]
310. Thomas D. Jeitschko, Susan J. Linz, Jose Noguera, Anastasia Semykina. 2014. Economic security and democratic capital: Why do some democracies survive and others fail?. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 50, 13-28. [[Crossref](#)]
311. Christopher J. Ellis, John Fender. 2014. Public Sector Capital and the Transition from Dictatorship to Democracy. *The Manchester School* 82:3, 322-346. [[Crossref](#)]
312. Jørgen J. Andersen, Michael L. Ross. 2014. The Big Oil Change. *Comparative Political Studies* 47:7, 993-1021. [[Crossref](#)]
313. Arnt J. M. Verriest. 2014. Auditor Governance, Institutions and Analyst Forecast Properties: International Evidence. *Journal of International Accounting Research* 13:1, 1-32. [[Crossref](#)]
314. Min Tang, Dwayne Woods. 2014. Conditional effect of economic development on democracy – the relevance of the state. *Democratization* 21:3, 411-433. [[Crossref](#)]

315. Xuepeng Liu, Emanuel Ornelas. 2014. Free Trade Agreements and the Consolidation of Democracy. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 6:2, 29-70. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
316. Sebastian Vollmer, Kenneth Harttgen, Malavika A Subramanyam, Jocelyn Finlay, Stephan Klasen, S V Subramanian. 2014. Association between economic growth and early childhood undernutrition: evidence from 121 Demographic and Health Surveys from 36 low-income and middle-income countries. *The Lancet Global Health* 2:4, e225-e234. [[Crossref](#)]
317. Thushyanthan Baskaran. 2014. Taxation and Democratization. *World Development* 56, 287-301. [[Crossref](#)]
318. Manuel Barron, Edward Miguel, Shanker Satyanath. 2014. Economic Shocks and Democratization in Africa. *Political Science Research and Methods* 2:1, 33-47. [[Crossref](#)]
319. Andreas Assiotis, Kevin Sylwester. 2014. Does democratization spur growth?. *Economics of Transition* 22:2, 211-246. [[Crossref](#)]
320. Matteo Cervellati, Uwe Sunde. 2014. Civil Conflict, Democratization, and Growth: Violent Democratization as Critical Juncture. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 116:2, 482-505. [[Crossref](#)]
321. Feiqiong Chen, Yangmin Xu. 2014. Democratization in the host country and institutional risk of cross-border M&A: an empirical study on Chinese listed enterprises. *Quality & Quantity* 48:2, 1013-1025. [[Crossref](#)]
322. Daniel Greenfield. 2014. Competition and service quality: New evidence from the airline industry. *Economics of Transportation* 3:1, 80-89. [[Crossref](#)]
323. Peter Sandholt Jensen, Mogens K. Justesen. 2014. Poverty and vote buying: Survey-based evidence from Africa. *Electoral Studies* 33, 220-232. [[Crossref](#)]
324. Jeff D. Colgan. 2014. Oil, Domestic Politics, and International Conflict. *Energy Research & Social Science* 1, 198-205. [[Crossref](#)]
325. John C. Anyanwu, Andrew E. O. Erhijakpor. 2014. Does Oil Wealth Affect Democracy in Africa?. *African Development Review* 26:1, 15-37. [[Crossref](#)]
326. Matteo Cervellati, Florian Jung, Uwe Sunde, Thomas Vischer. 2014. Income and Democracy: Comment. *American Economic Review* 104:2, 707-719. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
327. Matteo Cervellati, Piergiuseppe Fortunato, Uwe Sunde. 2014. Violence during democratization and the quality of democratic institutions. *European Economic Review* 66, 226-247. [[Crossref](#)]
328. Faqin Lin, Nicholas C.S. Sim. 2014. Baltic Dry Index and the democratic window of opportunity. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 42:1, 143-159. [[Crossref](#)]
329. Mario Coccia. 2014. Socio-cultural origins of the patterns of technological innovation: What is the likely interaction among religious culture, religious plurality and innovation? Towards a theory of socio-cultural drivers of the patterns of technological innovation. *Technology in Society* 36, 13-25. [[Crossref](#)]
330. Miongsei Kang. 2014. Democracy and the Welfare State: Government form, partisanship, and labor market institutions. *National Strategy* 20:1, 95-127. [[Crossref](#)]
331. Guanghua Yu. Explaining the Persistence of Authoritarianism 125-144. [[Crossref](#)]
332. Elliott D. Green. 2014. The Political Economy of Urbanization in Modern Botswana. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
333. Maxim L. Pinkovskiy, Xavier Sala-i-Martin. 2014. Lights, Camera,...Income! Estimating Poverty Using National Accounts, Survey Means, and Lights. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

334. Sarmistha Pal, Jaideep Roy. 2014. Fiscal Decentralization, Grass-Root Democracy and Local Development in Indonesia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
335. Chandan Kumar Jha, Sudipta Sarangi. 2014. Women and Corruption: What Positions Must They Hold to Make a Difference?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
336. Huw Edwards, Todd Landman, David Kernohan, Azizun Nessa. 2014. Economic Geography and Human Rights. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
337. Caroline L. Freund, Melise Jaud. 2014. Regime Change, Democracy, and Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
338. Wilson Prichard, Paola Salardi, Paul Segal. 2014. Taxation, Non-Tax Revenue and Democracy: New Evidence Using New Cross-Country Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
339. Benjamin A. T. Graham, Michael K. Miller, Kaare Strom. 2014. Powersharing and Democratic Development. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
340. Johan P. Mackenbach, Caspar W. N. Looman. 2013. Changing patterns of mortality in 25 European countries and their economic and political correlates, 1955–1989. *International Journal of Public Health* **58**:6, 811–823. [[Crossref](#)]
341. Toke S. Aidt, Christian Bjørnskov, Peter Kurrild-Klitgaard, Gert Tinggaard Svendsen. 2013. Public choice, political economy and development: an introduction to the life, times and themes of Martin Paldam. *Public Choice* **157**:3–4, 357–365. [[Crossref](#)]
342. Mogens K. Justesen, Peter Kurrild-Klitgaard. 2013. Institutional interactions and economic growth: the joint effects of property rights, veto players and democratic capital. *Public Choice* **157**:3–4, 449–474. [[Crossref](#)]
343. Alan Green. 2013. Estimating the effects of democratization in African countries: A simultaneous equations approach. *Economic Systems* **37**:4, 555–571. [[Crossref](#)]
344. Khuong M. Vu. 2013. Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and Singapore's economic growth. *Information Economics and Policy* **25**:4, 284–300. [[Crossref](#)]
345. Janice Boucher Breuer, John McDermott. 2013. Economic depression in the world. *Journal of Macroeconomics* **38**, 227–242. [[Crossref](#)]
346. Paula Wyndow, Jianghong Li, Eugen Mattes. 2013. Female Empowerment as a Core Driver of Democratic Development: A Dynamic Panel Model from 1980 to 2005. *World Development* **52**, 34–54. [[Crossref](#)]
347. Anna Larsson Seim, Stephen L. Parente. 2013. Democracy as a middle ground: A unified theory of development and political regimes. *European Economic Review* **64**, 35–56. [[Crossref](#)]
348. James B. Ang. 2013. Institutions and the long-run impact of early development. *Journal of Development Economics* **105**, 1–18. [[Crossref](#)]
349. Markus Brückner, Mark Gradstein. 2013. Exogenous volatility and the size of government in developing countries. *Journal of Development Economics* **105**, 254–266. [[Crossref](#)]
350. Johannes Fedderke, Robert Klitgaard. 2013. How Much Do Rights Matter?. *World Development* **51**, 187–206. [[Crossref](#)]
351. Enrique Moral-Benito. 2013. Likelihood-Based Estimation of Dynamic Panels With Predetermined Regressors. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **31**:4, 451–472. [[Crossref](#)]
352. Robert K. Fleck, F. Andrew Hanssen. 2013. When voice fails: Potential exit as a constraint on government quality. *International Review of Law and Economics* **35**, 26–41. [[Crossref](#)]
353. Christian Bachelder Holkeboer, James Raymond Vreeland. 2013. Calling Democracies and Dictatorships: The Effect of Political Regime on International Long-Distance Rates. *Kyklos* **66**:3, 417–437. [[Crossref](#)]

354. George E. Halkos, Epameinondas A. Paizanos. 2013. The effect of government expenditure on the environment: An empirical investigation. *Ecological Economics* **91**, 48-56. [[Crossref](#)]
355. Kunal Sen. 2013. The Political Dynamics of Economic Growth. *World Development* **47**, 71-86. [[Crossref](#)]
356. Elvira Pupović. 2013. Corruption's Effect on Foreign Direct Investment. *International Journal of Sustainable Economies Management* **2**:3, 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
357. Verena Mertins. 2013. Soziale Marktwirtschaft: Auslauf- oder Zukunftsmodell?. *List Forum für Wirtschafts- und Finanzpolitik* **39**:2, 137-162. [[Crossref](#)]
358. Toke S. Aidt, Raphaël Franck. 2013. How to get the snowball rolling and extend the franchise: voting on the Great Reform Act of 1832. *Public Choice* **155**:3-4, 229-250. [[Crossref](#)]
359. Leonid A. Krasnozhon. 2013. Institutional stickiness of democracy in post-communist states: Can prevailing culture explain it?. *The Review of Austrian Economics* **26**:2, 221-237. [[Crossref](#)]
360. Arvind Magesan. 2013. Human Rights Treaty Ratification of Aid Receiving Countries. *World Development* **45**, 175-188. [[Crossref](#)]
361. Kjetil Bjorvatn, Mohammad Reza Farzanegan. 2013. Demographic Transition in Resource Rich Countries: A Blessing or a Curse?. *World Development* **45**, 337-351. [[Crossref](#)]
362. Robert K. Fleck, F. Andrew Hanssen. 2013. How Tyranny Paved the Way to Democracy: The Democratic Transition in Ancient Greece. *The Journal of Law and Economics* **56**:2, 389-416. [[Crossref](#)]
363. Nabamita Dutta, Peter T. Leeson, Claudia R. Williamson. 2013. The Amplification Effect: Foreign Aid's Impact on Political Institutions. *Kyklos* **66**:2, 208-228. [[Crossref](#)]
364. Kim Hyung Ryeol. 2013. Rethinking the Civic Mission of Schools: A Comparative Study of Family Socioeconomic Status and Student Civic Outcomes in 15 Countries. *Journal of Ethics* **1**:89, 75-120. [[Crossref](#)]
365. Bongkoo Kang, Sang Joon Lee, ###. 2013. Democracy and Economic Growth in Post-Communist Transition Countries. ##### **23**:1, 259-278. [[Crossref](#)]
366. Faqin Lin, Nicholas C.S. Sim. 2013. Trade, income and the Baltic Dry Index. *European Economic Review* **59**, 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
367. Martin Gassebner, Michael J. Lamla, James Raymond Vreeland. 2013. Extreme Bounds of Democracy. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* **57**:2, 171-197. [[Crossref](#)]
368. Jess Benhabib, Alejandro Corvalan, Mark M. Spiegel. 2013. Income and democracy: Evidence from nonlinear estimations. *Economics Letters* **118**:3, 489-492. [[Crossref](#)]
369. Ari Aisen, Francisco José Veiga. 2013. How does political instability affect economic growth?. *European Journal of Political Economy* **29**, 151-167. [[Crossref](#)]
370. Harry H. Kelejian, Peter Murrell, Oleksandr Shepotylo. 2013. Spatial spillovers in the development of institutions. *Journal of Development Economics* **101**, 297-315. [[Crossref](#)]
371. Margaret Levi. 2013. Can Nations Succeed?. *Perspectives on Politics* **11**:1, 187-192. [[Crossref](#)]
372. Walter W. McMahon, Moses Oketch. 2013. Education's Effects on Individual Life Chances and On Development: An Overview. *British Journal of Educational Studies* **61**:1, 79-107. [[Crossref](#)]
373. M. Balamoune-Lutz, S. H. Boko. 2013. Trade, Institutions, Income and Human Development in African Countries. *Journal of African Economies* **22**:2, 323-345. [[Crossref](#)]
374. Allan Dafoe, John R. Oneal, Bruce Russett. 2013. The Democratic Peace: Weighing the Evidence and Cautious Inference. *International Studies Quarterly* **57**:1, 201-214. [[Crossref](#)]
375. Alessandro Olper, Valentina Raimondi. 2013. Electoral rules, forms of government and redistributive policy: Evidence from agriculture and food policies. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **41**:1, 141-158. [[Crossref](#)]

376. Yi Che, Yi Lu, Zhigang Tao, Peng Wang. 2013. The impact of income on democracy revisited. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 41:1, 159-169. [[Crossref](#)]
377. Daniel Berger, Alejandro Corvalan, William Easterly, Shanker Satyanath. 2013. Do superpower interventions have short and long term consequences for democracy?. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 41:1, 22-34. [[Crossref](#)]
378. Tim Dyson. 2013. On Demographic and Democratic Transitions. *Population and Development Review* 38, 83-102. [[Crossref](#)]
379. Anca M. Cotet, Kevin K. Tsui. 2013. Oil and Conflict: What Does the Cross Country Evidence Really Show?. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 5:1, 49-80. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
380. Yaliu Pan. Study on the Effect of Government Spending on GDP Growth 303-311. [[Crossref](#)]
381. Evan Schnidman, Norman Schofield. Gridlock or Leadership in U.S. Electoral Politics 187-227. [[Crossref](#)]
382. Maxim L. Pinkovskiy. 2013. World welfare is rising: Estimation using nonparametric bounds on welfare measures. *Journal of Public Economics* 97, 176-195. [[Crossref](#)]
383. F. H. Buckley. 2013. American Exceptionalism. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
384. Daniel de Kadt, Stephen B. Wittels. 2013. Democratization and Economic Prosperity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
385. Dmitriy Veselov. 2013. Redistribution and the Political Support of Free Entry Policy in the Schumpeterian Model with Heterogenous Agents. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
386. Ariel BenYishay, Roger R. Betancourt. 2013. Unbundling Democracy: Tilly Trumps Schumpeter. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
387. Francesco Caselli, Andrea Tesei. 2013. Resource Windfalls, Political Regimes, and Political Stability. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
388. Thushyanthan Baskaran. 2013. Taxation and Democratization. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
389. Hans Degryse, Thomas Lambert, Armin Schwienbacher. 2013. The Political Economy of Financial Systems: Evidence from Suffrage Reforms in the Last Two Centuries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
390. Diogo Costa, Adriano Gianturco Gulisano. 2013. Of the People, by the People, for the People's Development?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
391. Jean-Jacques Rosa, Xavier de Vanssay. 2012. Information, organization, and freedom: Explaining the great reversal. *The Review of Austrian Economics* 25:4, 329-350. [[Crossref](#)]
392. Enrique Moral-Benito, Cristian Bartolucci. 2012. Income and democracy: Revisiting the evidence. *Economics Letters* 117:3, 844-847. [[Crossref](#)]
393. George Tridimas. 2012. How democracy was achieved. *European Journal of Political Economy* 28:4, 651-658. [[Crossref](#)]
394. Tilman Brück, Guo Xu. 2012. Who gives aid to whom and when? Aid accelerations, shocks and policies. *European Journal of Political Economy* 28:4, 593-606. [[Crossref](#)]
395. Robert Andersen. 2012. Support for democracy in cross-national perspective: The detrimental effect of economic inequality. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 30:4, 389-402. [[Crossref](#)]
396. MARIO GILLI. 2012. A SIMPLE MODEL OF REPRESSION AND REVOLT IN AUTOCRACIES APPLIED TO THE ARAB SPRING. *International Game Theory Review* 14:04, 1240005. [[Crossref](#)]
397. Carl Henrik Knutsen. 2012. Democracy and economic growth: A survey of arguments and results. *International Area Studies Review* 15:4, 393-415. [[Crossref](#)]

398. Robert H. Bates, Ghada Fayad, Anke Hoeffler. 2012. The state of democracy in Sub-Saharan Africa. *International Area Studies Review* 15:4, 323-338. [[Crossref](#)]
399. Fali Huang. 2012. THE COEVOLUTION OF ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT FROM MONARCHY TO DEMOCRACY*. *International Economic Review* 53:4, 1341-1368. [[Crossref](#)]
400. Filipe R. Campante, Davin Chor. 2012. Schooling, Political Participation, and the Economy. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 94:4, 841-859. [[Crossref](#)]
401. Michael K. Miller. 2012. Economic Development, Violent Leader Removal, and Democratization. *American Journal of Political Science* 56:4, 1002-1020. [[Crossref](#)]
402. Norman Loayza, Jamele Rigolini, Gonzalo Llorente. 2012. Do middle classes bring about institutional reforms?. *Economics Letters* 116:3, 440-444. [[Crossref](#)]
403. Luisa Blanco, Robin Grier. 2012. Natural resource dependence and the accumulation of physical and human capital in Latin America. *Resources Policy* 37:3, 281-295. [[Crossref](#)]
404. Laura K Taylor, Alexander Dukalskis. 2012. Old truths and new politics. *Journal of Peace Research* 49:5, 671-684. [[Crossref](#)]
405. Benedikt Heid, Julian Langer, Mario Larch. 2012. Income and democracy: Evidence from system GMM estimates. *Economics Letters* 116:2, 166-169. [[Crossref](#)]
406. Rodolphe Desbordes, Vincenzo Verardi. 2012. Refitting the Kuznets curve. *Economics Letters* 116:2, 258-261. [[Crossref](#)]
407. JACOB GERNER HARIRI. 2012. The Autocratic Legacy of Early Statehood. *American Political Science Review* 106:3, 471-494. [[Crossref](#)]
408. L. Grigoriev. 2012. The Demand for Law on the Part of Elites: "The Effect of the Tram". *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :6, 33-47. [[Crossref](#)]
409. Stephen Knack, F. Halsey Rogers, Jac C. Heckelman. 2012. Crossing the threshold: A positive analysis of IBRD graduation policy. *The Review of International Organizations* 7:2, 145-176. [[Crossref](#)]
410. A. Auzan, K. Kelimbetov. 2012. Socio-cultural Formula for Economic Modernization. *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :5, 37-44. [[Crossref](#)]
411. Filipe R. Campante, Davin Chor. 2012. Why was the Arab World Poised for Revolution? Schooling, Economic Opportunities, and the Arab Spring. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 26:2, 167-188. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
412. Olga Shurchkov. 2012. New elites and their influence on entrepreneurial activity in Russia. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 40:2, 240-255. [[Crossref](#)]
413. ROBERT D. WOODBERRY. 2012. The Missionary Roots of Liberal Democracy. *American Political Science Review* 106:2, 244-274. [[Crossref](#)]
414. Markus Brückner, Antonio Ciccone, Andrea Tesei. 2012. Oil Price Shocks, Income, and Democracy. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 94:2, 389-399. [[Crossref](#)]
415. Geoffrey Evans, Pauline Rose. 2012. Understanding Education's Influence on Support for Democracy in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Development Studies* 48:4, 498-515. [[Crossref](#)]
416. Fabrice Lehoucq. The Third and Fourth Waves of Democracy 273-286. [[Crossref](#)]
417. Andrew Whitford, Soo-Young Lee. 2012. Disorder, dictatorship and government effectiveness: cross-national evidence. *Journal of Public Policy* 32:1, 5-31. [[Crossref](#)]
418. Marcus Marktanner, Lana Salman, Hania Bekdash. 2012. AN EXPLORATIVE STUDY IN QUALITATIVE REGIME TRANSITIONS. *Journal of International Development* 24:2, 152-166. [[Crossref](#)]

419. Sarantis Kalyvitis, Irene Vlachaki. 2012. When does more aid imply less democracy? An empirical examination. *European Journal of Political Economy* **28**:1, 132-146. [[Crossref](#)]
420. Sambit Bhattacharyya. 2012. Trade liberalization and institutional development. *Journal of Policy Modeling* **34**:2, 253-269. [[Crossref](#)]
421. Arusha Cooray. 2012. Suffrage, Democracy and Gender Equality in Education. *Oxford Development Studies* **40**:1, 21-47. [[Crossref](#)]
422. Daniel Berkowitz, Mehmet Caner, Ying Fang. 2012. The validity of instruments revisited. *Journal of Econometrics* **166**:2, 255-266. [[Crossref](#)]
423. JOHN R. FREEMAN, DENNIS P. QUINN. 2012. The Economic Origins of Democracy Reconsidered. *American Political Science Review* **106**:1, 58-80. [[Crossref](#)]
424. Martin Paldam, Erich Gundlach. 2012. The Democratic Transition: Short-run and Long-run Causality between Income and the Gastil Index. *The European Journal of Development Research* **24**:1, 144-168. [[Crossref](#)]
425. Uwe Sunde, Thomas Vischer. Beyond balanced growth: The effect of human capital on economic growth reconsidered 11-22. [[Crossref](#)]
426. Dennis Nottebaum. A Power Through Trade? The European Union and Democracy Promotion in ACP States 237-268. [[Crossref](#)]
427. Mohammad Zulfan Tadjoeidin, Anis Chowdhury, Syed Mansoob Murshed. Routine Violence in Java, Indonesia: Neo-Malthusian and Social Justice Perspectives 633-650. [[Crossref](#)]
428. Anis Chowdhury, Mohammad Zulfan Tadjoeidin. Economic Activity and Achievements in the Muslim World 197-223. [[Crossref](#)]
429. Arne Wiig, Ivar Kolstad. 2012. If diversification is good, why don't countries diversify more? The political economy of diversification in resource-rich countries. *Energy Policy* **40**, 196-203. [[Crossref](#)]
430. Omar Al-Ubaydli. 2012. Natural resources and the tradeoff between authoritarianism and development. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **81**:1, 137-152. [[Crossref](#)]
431. Daniel Treisman. Twenty Years of Political Transition 109-133. [[Crossref](#)]
432. Derek Stimel. 2012. The Short-Run Relationship between Income and Freedom: Evidence from 128 Countries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
433. Jean-Claude Cosset, Charles Martineau, Anis Samet. 2012. Do Political Institutions Affect the Choice of the U.S. Cross-Listing Venue?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
434. Stephen H. Haber. 2012. Climate, Technology, and the Evolution of Economic and Political Institutions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
435. Mark Dincecco, Gabriel Katz. 2012. State Capacity and Long-Run Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
436. William Easterly, Claudia R. Williamson. 2012. Rhetoric versus Reality: The Best and Worst of Aid Agency Practices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
437. Mario Gilli. 2012. A Simple Model of Repression and Revolt in Autocracies Applied to the Arab Spring. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
438. Manthos D. Delis, Iftekhar Hasan, Pantelis Kazakis. 2012. Bank Regulations and Income Inequality: Empirical Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
439. Alan Green. 2012. The Household Analysis of Comparative Development: An Empirical Replication. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
440. Alan Green. 2012. The Overwhelming Case for Household Analysis of Institutions and the Rediscovered Importance of Contracts. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

441. Alan Green. 2012. Democracy and Institutions in Postcolonial Africa. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
442. Stephen Chaudoin, Zachary Peskowitz, Christopher Stanton. 2012. Beyond Zeroes and Ones: The Effect of Income on the Severity and Evolution of Civil Conflict. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
443. Gerald Schneider. 2012. Smoke with Fire: Financial Crises, Institutional Reform, and the Future of EU Democracy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
444. Mario L Chacon. 2012. A Theory of Competitive Authoritarian Elections. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
445. Anke Hoeffler, Robert H. Bates, Ghada Fayad. 2012. Income and Democracy: Lipset's Law Revisited. *IMF Working Papers* 12:295, 1. [\[Crossref\]](#)
446. Renaud EgretEAU. 2011. A passage to Burma? India, development, and democratization in Myanmar. *Contemporary Politics* 17:4, 467-486. [\[Crossref\]](#)
447. Eiji Yamamura. 2011. The Influence of Government Size on Economic Growth and Life Satisfaction. *Japanese Economy* 38:4, 28-64. [\[Crossref\]](#)
448. Sarah Blodgett Bermeo. 2011. Foreign Aid and Regime Change: A Role for Donor Intent. *World Development* 39:11, 2021-2031. [\[Crossref\]](#)
449. William Easterly, Claudia R. Williamson. 2011. Rhetoric versus Reality: The Best and Worst of Aid Agency Practices. *World Development* 39:11, 1930-1949. [\[Crossref\]](#)
450. J. D. Fearon. 2011. Self-Enforcing Democracy. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126:4, 1661-1708. [\[Crossref\]](#)
451. Carl Henrik Knutsen. 2011. Security Threats, Enemy-Contingent Policies, and Economic Development in Dictatorships. *International Interactions* 37:4, 414-440. [\[Crossref\]](#)
452. Vahe Lskavyan. 2011. Democracy levels and the income–military expenditure relationship. *Applied Economics Letters* 18:15, 1485-1489. [\[Crossref\]](#)
453. Thomas Apolte. 2011. Democracy and prosperity in two decades of transition1. *Economics of Transition* 19:4, 693-722. [\[Crossref\]](#)
454. Rohini Pande. 2011. Can Informed Voters Enforce Better Governance? Experiments in Low-Income Democracies. *Annual Review of Economics* 3:1, 215-237. [\[Crossref\]](#)
455. José Alemán, David D. Yang. 2011. A Duration Analysis of Democratic Transitions and Authoritarian Backslides. *Comparative Political Studies* 44:9, 1123-1151. [\[Crossref\]](#)
456. Mathias Koenig-Archibugi. 2011. Is global democracy possible?. *European Journal of International Relations* 17:3, 519-542. [\[Crossref\]](#)
457. Subhayu Bandyopadhyay, Javed Younas. 2011. Poverty, political freedom, and the roots of terrorism in developing countries: An empirical assessment. *Economics Letters* 112:2, 171-175. [\[Crossref\]](#)
458. Olaf J. de Groot. 2011. Spillovers of Institutional Change in Africa. *Kyklos* 64:3, 410-426. [\[Crossref\]](#)
459. Daniel Berkowitz, David N. DeJong. 2011. Growth in post-Soviet Russia: A tale of two transitions. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 79:1-2, 133-143. [\[Crossref\]](#)
460. M. J. Voors, E. H. Bulte, R. Damania. 2011. Income Shocks and Corruption in Africa: Does a Virtuous Cycle Exist?. *Journal of African Economies* 20:3, 395-418. [\[Crossref\]](#)
461. ALEX LUIZ FERREIRA. 2011. ON THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MARGINAL PRODUCT OF CAPITAL ACROSS COUNTRIES. *The Manchester School* 79:3, 455-479. [\[Crossref\]](#)
462. Arusha Cooray. 2011. The role of the government in financial sector development. *Economic Modelling* 28:3, 928-938. [\[Crossref\]](#)

463. Elizabeth Asiedu, Donald Lien. 2011. Democracy, foreign direct investment and natural resources. *Journal of International Economics* **84**:1, 99-111. [[Crossref](#)]
464. Khuong M. Vu. 2011. ICT as a source of economic growth in the information age: Empirical evidence from the 1996–2005 period. *Telecommunications Policy* **35**:4, 357-372. [[Crossref](#)]
465. Stefan Csordás, Markus Ludwig. 2011. An empirical investigation of the determinants of democracy: Trade, aid and the neighbor effect. *Economics Letters* **110**:3, 235-237. [[Crossref](#)]
466. Alan Green. 2011. Institutions Matter, but in Surprising Ways: New Evidence on Institutions in Africa. *Kyklos* **64**:1, 87-105. [[Crossref](#)]
467. Norman Schofield, Gonzalo Caballero. Introduction 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
468. Jesus Crespo Cuaresma. Sozialkapital und Wirtschaftswachstum 1-12. [[Crossref](#)]
469. Meilanie Buitenzorgy, Arthur P. J. Mol. 2011. Does Democracy Lead to a Better Environment? Deforestation and the Democratic Transition Peak. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **48**:1, 59-70. [[Crossref](#)]
470. Carl Henrik Knutsen. 2011. Democracy, Dictatorship and Protection of Property Rights. *Journal of Development Studies* **47**:1, 164-182. [[Crossref](#)]
471. Erich Weede. Does the Capitalist Peace Exist? Yes, it did! but will it Apply to China and the West? 1-29. [[Crossref](#)]
472. Sarantis C. Kalyvitis, Irene Vlachaki. 2011. When Does More Aid Imply Less Democracy? An Empirical Examination. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
473. Subhayu Bandyopadhyay, Javed Younas. 2011. Poverty, Political Freedom, and the Roots of Terrorism in Developing Countries: An Empirical Assessment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
474. Stephen H. Haber, Victor A. Menaldo. 2011. Rainfall, Human Capital, and Democracy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
475. F. Andrew Hanssen, Robert K. Fleck. 2011. How Tyranny Paved the Way to Wealth and Democracy: The Democratic Transition in Ancient Greece. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
476. Sarah Blodgett Bermeo. 2011. Foreign Aid and Regime Change: A Role for Donor Intent. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
477. Paul J. Burke. 2011. Economic Growth and Political Survival. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
478. Filipe R. Campante, Davin Chor. 2011. 'The People Want the Fall of the Regime': Schooling, Political Protest, and the Economy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
479. Tilman Brück, Guo Xu. 2011. Who Gives Aid to Whom and When? Aid Accelerations, Shocks and Policies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
480. Michael P. Murray. 2011. Avoiding the Pitfalls of Instrumental Variables Estimation with Few or Many Instruments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
481. Enrique Moral-Benito, Cristian Bartolucci. 2011. Income and Democracy: Revisiting the Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
482. Pippa Norris. 2011. Making Democratic-Governance Work: The Consequences for Prosperity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
483. Arnt Verriest. 2011. The Effect of Institutions and Big 4 Audits on Properties of Analyst Forecasts. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
484. Elaine S. Tan. 2011. Democracy, Wages and Inequality: Political Voice and Public Finance Redistribution. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
485. Niels Petersen. 2011. Antitrust Law and the Promotion of Democracy and Economic Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

486. Alan Green. 2011. Estimating the Effects of Democratization in African Countries: A Simultaneous Equations Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
487. Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, Patrick Guyer, Terra Lawson-Remer. 2011. Does Budget Transparency Lead to Stronger Human Development Outcomes and Commitments to Economic and Social Rights?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
488. Ari Aisen, Francisco José Veiga. 2011. How Does Political Instability Affect Economic Growth?. *IMF Working Papers* 11:12, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
489. Simeon Djankov, Marta Reynal-Querol. 2010. Poverty and Civil War: Revisiting the Evidence. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 92:4, 1035-1041. [[Crossref](#)]
490. Paul J. Burke,, Andrew Leigh. 2010. Do Output Contractions Trigger Democratic Change?. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 2:4, 124-157. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
491. Scott Gehlbach, Edmund J. Malesky. 2010. The Contribution of Veto Players to Economic Reform. *The Journal of Politics* 72:4, 957-975. [[Crossref](#)]
492. Guido De Blasio, Giorgio Nuzzo. 2010. HISTORICAL TRADITIONS OF CIVICNESS AND LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT*. *Journal of Regional Science* 50:4, 833-857. [[Crossref](#)]
493. Alberto F. Cavallo, Eduardo A. Cavallo. 2010. Are crises good for long-term growth? The role of political institutions. *Journal of Macroeconomics* 32:3, 838-857. [[Crossref](#)]
494. ARIEL BENYISHAY, ROGER R. BETANCOURT. 2010. Civil liberties and economic development. *Journal of Institutional Economics* 6:3, 281-304. [[Crossref](#)]
495. Erich Weede. 2010. The Rise of India: Overcoming Caste Society and Permit-License-Quota Raj, Implementing Some Economic Freedom. *Asian Journal of Political Science* 18:2, 129-153. [[Crossref](#)]
496. Silje Aslaksen. 2010. Oil and democracy: More than a cross-country correlation?. *Journal of Peace Research* 47:4, 421-431. [[Crossref](#)]
497. Duha Altindag, Naci Mocan. 2010. Joblessness and Perceptions about the Effectiveness of Democracy. *Journal of Labor Research* 31:2, 99-123. [[Crossref](#)]
498. M. Najeeb Shafiq. 2010. Do education and income affect support for democracy in Muslim countries? Evidence from the Pew Global Attitudes Project. *Economics of Education Review* 29:3, 461-469. [[Crossref](#)]
499. Xian Zhao, Jing Ma, Wang Xiao-Li. An empirical study on the effect of Chinese government's non-tax revenue spending on its GDP's growth 52-56. [[Crossref](#)]
500. Wolfgang Lutz, Jesús Crespo Cuaresma, Mohammad Jalal Abbasi-Shavazi. 2010. Demography, Education, and Democracy: Global Trends and the Case of Iran. *Population and Development Review* 36:2, 253-281. [[Crossref](#)]
501. Sambit Bhattacharyya, Roland Hodler. 2010. Natural resources, democracy and corruption. *European Economic Review* 54:4, 608-621. [[Crossref](#)]
502. Markus Brückner, Antonio Ciccone. 2010. International Commodity Prices, Growth and the Outbreak of Civil War in Sub-Saharan Africa. *The Economic Journal* 120:544, 519-534. [[Crossref](#)]
503. Lee J. Alston, Andrés A. Gallo. 2010. Electoral fraud, the rise of Peron and demise of checks and balances in Argentina. *Explorations in Economic History* 47:2, 179-197. [[Crossref](#)]
504. SARANTIS KALYVITIS, IRENE VLACHAKI. 2010. DEMOCRATIC AID AND THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF RECIPIENTS. *Contemporary Economic Policy* 28:2, 188-218. [[Crossref](#)]
505. Frederic L. Pryor. 2010. Capitalism and freedom?. *Economic Systems* 34:1, 91-104. [[Crossref](#)]
506. Sacit Hadi Akdede. 2010. Do more ethnically and religiously diverse countries have lower democratization?. *Economics Letters* 106:2, 101-104. [[Crossref](#)]

507. Yaxuan Qi, Lukas Roth, John K. Wald. 2010. Political rights and the cost of debt. *Journal of Financial Economics* **95**:2, 202-226. [[Crossref](#)]
508. Mario Coccia. 2010. Democratization is the driving force for technological and economic change. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **77**:2, 248-264. [[Crossref](#)]
509. Jean-Marie Baland, Karl Ove Moene, James A. Robinson. Governance and Development* 4597-4656. [[Crossref](#)]
510. Toke S. Aidt, Martin Gassebner. 2010. Do Autocratic States Trade Less?. *The World Bank Economic Review* **24**:1, 38-76. [[Crossref](#)]
511. Lilyan E. Fulginiti. 2010. What comes first, agricultural growth or democracy?. *Agricultural Economics* **41**:1, 15-24. [[Crossref](#)]
512. Scott Gehlbach, Edmund J. Malesky. 2010. The Contribution of Veto Players to Economic Reform. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
513. Ari Aisen, Francisco José Veiga. 2010. How Does Political Instability Affect Economic Growth?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
514. Arusha V. Cooray. 2010. Does the Size and Quality of the Government Explain the Size and Efficiency of the Financial Sector?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
515. Steven Block, Robert H. Bates. 2010. Revisiting African Agriculture: Institutional Change and Productivity Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
516. Antonio Spilimbergo, Paola Giuliano, Prachi Mishra. 2010. Democracy and Reforms: Evidence From a New Dataset. *IMF Working Papers* **10**:173, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
517. Ann L. Owen, Julio Videras, Lewis Davis. 2009. Do all countries follow the same growth process?. *Journal of Economic Growth* **14**:4, 265-286. [[Crossref](#)]
518. Jonathan H. Conning, James A. Robinson. 2009. Enclaves and Development: An Empirical Assessment. *Studies in Comparative International Development* **44**:4, 359-385. [[Crossref](#)]
519. Ola Olsson. 2009. On the democratic legacy of colonialism. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **37**:4, 534-551. [[Crossref](#)]
520. Daron Acemoglu, Simon Johnson, James A. Robinson, Pierre Yared. 2009. Reevaluating the modernization hypothesis. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **56**:8, 1043-1058. [[Crossref](#)]
521. Erich Gundlach, Martin Paldam. 2009. A farewell to critical junctures: Sorting out long-run causality of income and democracy. *European Journal of Political Economy* **25**:3, 340-354. [[Crossref](#)]
522. Arusha Cooray. 2009. Government Expenditure, Governance and Economic Growth. *Comparative Economic Studies* **51**:3, 401-418. [[Crossref](#)]
523. James E. Rauch,, Scott Kostyshak,. 2009. The Three Arab Worlds. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **23**:3, 165-188. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
524. Benjamin F. Jones,, Benjamin A. Olken. 2009. Hit or Miss? The Effect of Assassinations on Institutions and War. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* **1**:2, 55-87. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
525. Torsten Persson,, Guido Tabellini. 2009. Democratic Capital: The Nexus of Political and Economic Change. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* **1**:2, 88-126. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
526. T. S. Aidt. 2009. Corruption, institutions, and economic development. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* **25**:2, 271-291. [[Crossref](#)]
527. Paul Collier, Anke Hoeffler. 2009. Testing the neocon agenda: Democracy in resource-rich societies. *European Economic Review* **53**:3, 293-308. [[Crossref](#)]
528. Martin Paldam. An Essay on the Muslim Gap: Religiosity and the Political System 213-242. [[Crossref](#)]

529. Thomas D. Jeitschko, Susan J. Linz, Jose de Jesus Noguera, Anastasia Semykina. 2009. Economic Security and Freedom: Why Some Democracies Survive and Others Fail. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
530. M. Najeeb Shafiq. 2009. Do Education and Income Affect Support for Democracy in Muslim Countries? Evidence from the Pew Global Attitudes Project. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
531. Jean-Jacques Rosa, Xavier de Vanssay. 2009. The Global Freedom Boom: An Economic Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
532. Martin Gassebner, Michael J. Lamla, James Raymond Vreeland. 2009. Extreme Bounds of Democracy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
533. Erich Gundlach, Martin Paldam. 2009. The Agricultural and the Democratic Transitions Causality and the Roundup Model. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
534. Andreas Bergh, Niclas Berggren, Christian Bjørnskov. 2009. The Growth Effects of Institutional Instability. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
535. Mina Balamoune-Lutz. 2009. Elites, Education and Reforms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
536. Carles Boix. 2009. Development and Democratization. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
537. Kazuhiro Yuki. 2009. Government and Human Capital in a Model of Development Through Modernization and Specialization. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
538. Alessandro Olper, Jan Falkowski, Johan F. M. Swinnen. 2009. Political Reforms and Public Policies: Evidence from Agricultural Protection. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
539. Jay Ulfelder. 2009. Forecasting Democratic Transitions and Breakdowns. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
540. Simeon Djankov, Jose G. Montalvo, Marta Reynal-Querol. 2008. The curse of aid. *Journal of Economic Growth* 13:3, 169-194. [[Crossref](#)]
541. Elias Papaioannou, Gregorios Siourounis. 2008. Economic and social factors driving the third wave of democratization. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 36:3, 365-387. [[Crossref](#)]
542. Harry H. Kelejian, Peter Murrell, Oleksandr Shepotylo. 2008. Spatial Spillovers in the Development of Institutions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
543. Markus Bruckner, Antonio Ciccone. 2008. Rain and the Democratic Window of Opportunity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
544. Ramón López, Asif M. Islam. 2008. Government Spending and Economic Growth in a Context of Market Imperfections. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
545. Daniel Berkowitz, Ying Fang, Mehmet Caner. 2008. The Validity of Instruments Revisited. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
546. Martin Paldam, Erich Gundlach. 2008. Income and Democracy: A Comment on Acemoglu, Johnson, Robinson, and Yared (2008). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
547. Martin Paldam, Erich Gundlach. 2008. The Democratic Transition: A Study of the Causality Between Income and the Gastil Democracy Index. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
548. Alberto Chong, Mark Gradstein. 2008. Who Needs Strong Leaders?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
549. Mario Coccia. 2008. Democratization Is the Determinant of Technological Change. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
550. Sarantis C. Kalyvitis, Irene Vlachaki. 2008. Democratic Aid and the Democratization of Recipients. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
551. Elvira Pupović. Corruption's Effect on Foreign Direct Investment 850-865. [[Crossref](#)]