In recent years, there has been increased interest in corruption—the abuse of public power or the public trust for private gain. Building on existing theoretical foundations, progress has been made in analyzing its causes and its political, social, and economic effects. A major impetus for the recent explosion of empirical work is the increasing availability (and acceptability) of various cross-national quantitative measures of corruption. Economists, political scientists, and policy analysts have examined corruption empirically in analyses that attempt to sort out systematically its underlying causes, its global distribution, and its consequences for growth, investment, government expenditure, income distribution, and regime support. These studies are complemented by other empirical work that relies on different sorts of evidence to investigate the scope, severity, and variety of forms of corruption. All this is combined with greater post-Cold War agreement among governments, multinational corporations, and international lending agencies that corruption is a practical problem with a generally detrimental impact on outcomes of policies, investments, and projects. At the same time, anticorruption activism has grown at the grassroots: in an increasing number of countries, nongovernmental watchdog organizations have emerged to pressure governments toward greater transparency and accountability.

What are the prospects for success in anticorruption reform and prescriptions, if any, for hurrying good governance along? This is an important generic research question and a formidable practical policy problem. It is the focus of this seminar. We begin with questions about definition and measurement and then examine perspectives on causes and consequences of corruption. Much of the seminar, however, has a policy orientation: it considers our cumulative knowledge about corruption as a policy issue that demands action both within countries and globally by a wide range of players.

**Reading Materials**


Johnston's view on this in a 1 January 2014 e-mail to me is as follows: "If you and/or your students find the material useful from that source, please use it with my blessing." With the exception of this book and readings linked to the Internet below, required readings are available at the Learn@UW course website.
For most topics, I also list supplementary readings. You can find these on your own, in hard copy at the library or electronically. The supplementary readings may be useful for your research report; they include a few classics, even studies that reflect now outmoded perspectives.

**Expectations and Evaluation**

Your grade is based on the quality of your performance on four dimensions, described below:

- **Participation.** (1) Before 5:00 a.m. each Tuesday, submit a discussion comment or question (or, ideally, both) to the Learn@UW course website discussion board, taking into account required readings for the week. You may also respond to questions and comments already posted on the discussion board. (2) Before seminar, read contributions of your fellow students. (3) Not least of all, participate, with informed and thoughtful contributions, in exposition and discussion during seminar. Online comments and questions 10 percent, in-seminar participation 10 percent

- **Review report.** Write a descriptive and analytical review of 2,000–2,400 words, focusing on one week’s readings. Dates are assigned by random draw on 20 January; you may exchange your assigned date with a fellow student, to accommodate tastes and schedules. For the week’s readings on which you write a review report, expect me to call on you as a novice expert on the topic. 20 percent

- **Examination.** Demonstrate what you have learned in a cumulative examination, consisting of both in-class short answer and take-home essay components. 30 percent, with 15 percent for each component

- **Research report.** On your own or (even better!) in collaboration with fellow students, research, write, and present an original empirical report that analyzes a corruption problem, evaluates an anticorruption reform, or carries out a qualitative or quantitative study of some other aspect of corruption or reform. See details on the last page of this syllabus. 30 percent

Graded assignments, due dates, and delivery modes are summarized below. Unless otherwise specified, work is due at 5:00 a.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Assignment Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 January–14 April</td>
<td>online participation, by dropbox submission and active seminar participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random draw of one Tuesday</td>
<td>review report, by dropbox submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 March</td>
<td>research proposal, by dropbox submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 April</td>
<td>cumulative examination, take-home and in seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 April</td>
<td>research report, by dropbox submission and hard copy in seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random draw of 21 or 28 April</td>
<td>oral presentation of research report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written style guidelines. For the review report, exam essay, research proposal, and research

---

1. For persuasive evidence on the benefits of test taking, see “Retrieval Practice Produces More Learning"
report, follow Style Guidelines for PA 857 Written Work, posted on the Learn@UW course website. Observe appropriate guidelines on what is considered plagiarism, when and how to cite, et cetera. If you are not sure, consult Acknowledging, Paraphrasing, and Quoting Sources from the University of Wisconsin–Madison Writer’s Handbook, also posted on the Learn@UW course website.

Respect for others. Please respect others in seminar. Be at the seminar and seated by 1:20 so that you do not disturb others, including me, with a late arrival. If you use a laptop to take notes, stay on task so that your laptop screen content does not distract those seated near you.

Special accommodation. If you require special accommodation to enable full participation in this seminar, let me know in the first few weeks of the semester. Information will remain confidential. You also may wish to contact the McBurney Disability Resource Center at 608.263.2741 regarding campus policies and services.

Absence due to illness. Students with influenza-like illness (fever of 100 degrees F or higher, with a cough or sore throat) should not come to class (or to my office hours!) until fever-free for 24 hours without the aid of fever-reducing medications. If you experience symptoms of influenza-like illness, send me an e-mail explaining your absence. We can work something out.

Schedule

20 January: Organizational Meeting
No required reading, supplementary reading below

Overviews:


Riveting accounts:

27 January: Defining and Measuring Corruption


Supplementary:

- Quality of Governance Institute, University of Gothenburg, Sweden, European Quality of Governance Index at [http://qog.pol.gu.se/data/datadownloads/qogeuregionaldata](http://qog.pol.gu.se/data/datadownloads/qogeuregionaldata).

3 February: Broad Perspectives on Corruption and Anticorruption Reform


Supplementary:

10 February: Social, Political, and Economic Effects of Corruption


Supplementary:


17 February: Survey of Causes of Corruption


In Hong Kong on 24 February, meeting to be rescheduled: The Culture of Corruption

- Philip Oldenburg, "Middlemen in Third-World Corruption: Implications of an Indian Case,"

Supplementary:


3 March: The Influences of Gender and Salaries


Supplementary:

- Ross H. McLeod, "Inadequate Budgets and Salaries as Instruments for Institutionalizing


10 March: The International Business of Corruption


Supplementary:


17 March: Third-Party Incentives and International Initiatives


Supplementary:

• Alberto Alesina and Beatrice Weder, "Do Corrupt Governments Receive Less Foreign Aid?"


24 March: Information and Transparency

Research proposal due today


Supplementary:


28 March–5 April: Spring Recess

7 April: Audits and Grassroots Monitoring


Supplementary:

- Shaazka Beyerle, Curtailing Corruption: People Power for Accountability and Justice (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 2014).

14 April: Anticorruption Agencies


Supplementary:


21 April: Cumulative Examination

28 April and 5 May: Presentations of Research Reports
Research Report

The research report accounts for 30 percent of the course grade. I welcome (indeed, encourage) you to work with one or more fellow students on a collaborative report: collaborative work receives a single grade, based on product. Your original empirical report may analyze a corruption problem, evaluate an anticorruption reform, or carry out a qualitative or quantitative study of some other aspect of corruption or reform. I will accommodate any reasonable alternatives, based on your interests and experience.

Useful Resources

- Links to articles using the Quality of Governance Institute, University of Gothenburg, Sweden Quality of Governance dataset at http://qog.pol.gu.se/data/dataextras/qog-data-articles.
- Transparency International at http://www.transparency.org/. See especially data, links, and research under "What We Do."
- Council of Europe, Group of States Against Corruption at http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/default_en.asp.

Obviously, you should also consult scholarly sources through the library's standard electronic databases (e.g., Academic Search, JSTOR, EconLit) as well as NBER working papers.

Reminder of Due Dates

24 March: dropbox submission of research proposal—consisting of (1) a 300-word abstract that introduces your research question and briefly describes your method of answering it, and (2) a preliminary list of key references or data (or both) that you have already consulted at least briefly, i.e., enough to know they will be useful.
28 April: dropbox and in-seminar submission of completed report
28 April and 5 May: oral presentation

For your presentation, you may use PowerPoint or distribute a handout or just talk. If you use PowerPoint, bring your slides on a flashdrive and one hard copy of the slide printout for me.

Style Guidelines and Evaluation

The report itself must be no longer than 5,000 words in length and may be significantly shorter. This does not include front matter, references, tables, figures, or appendices. Your grade will mainly reflect your demonstrated research and analytical effort and your success in presenting and supporting a clear argument with evidence from appropriate sources. Substantively good
papers with very significant problems of style (e.g., organization, grammar, diction, spelling, referencing, punctuation) will not be awarded a grade higher than a B, however. Follow style, referencing, and citation guidelines summarized in the two documents on the Learn@UW course website.