

The effect of participation on economic development emphasizing social cohesion

Pegah mahdavi¹

Ph.D Economics
Student, University of
Mazandaran
pegahmahdavi74@gmail.com
ail.com

Saeid rasekhi

professor of
Economic and
Administrative
Sciences,
Mazandaran
University
srasekhi@umz.ac.ir

Ali karimi maleh

professor of Law and Political Science,
Mazandaran University

akm10@umz.ac.ir

Abstract:

In political and social institutions, in developed countries, participation is a great of importance. According to, institutional contexts and the level of socio-political cohesion, political participation indicates different results in developing countries. However, political participation is the most general form of democracy and political develop of a country, it leads to development in developing countries when is subject to socio-political cohesion. The present article, using panel data, aims to find the effect of political participation on economic development, emphasizing the effect of socio-political cohesion over a period of time 2006- 2016 for 123

developing countries. Research results show that participation increase, causes

economic development subject to socio-political cohesion. Therefore, based on the facts of present study, economic development needs to be endogenous and based on internal capabilities that it is provided by creating useful contexts in order to more relationship and correlation between society and politicians.

Keywords: political participation, socio-political cohesion, economy development, developing countries, political development.

1- Introduction

One of the most important factors which has helped continuity of human life, is participation and cooperation among people. From sociology perspective, participation is considered as a multifaceted interactive process that includes intervention, people's observation, and socio-political capability of the system to achieve development, along with social justice. Participation emphasis three fundamental values in process of empowerment of people of the society, which are: sharing people in power, allow people to control their own destination and reopening the opportunity of development to people (Toosi, 1990). However, the word of "theoretical agreement" has not achieved with respect to lexical meaning, overall, its main essence can be considered as conflict, activity and influence (Alavi tabar, 1999). People participation means their volunteer

¹ Corresponding Author

and autonomic cooperation in the process of development. People's participation in the development process is so credible that considers development equal with participation (Ebrahimzadeh, 1998). Participation is one of the key factors of development in developing societies, that largely manifested itself after the failure of development strategies and programs in the 1950s and 1960s, which had entered the countries from the west. Lack of public participation has been evaluated as a major factor in the failure of development programs. Therefore, in development strategies, the people's participation approach has been emphasized as one of the main human needs (Vahid and Niazi, 2004). The largest and most sociological explanations for explaining political participation originates from theories of modernization. So far, many international research has been done on the sociological determinants of political participation, and they have often found that the level of development of a country is positively and significantly correlated with the participation of citizens and the promotion of their presence in their political destination. (Almond and Verba, 1963). The study of social cohesion also has a long history in social sciences. Whenever a relation and connection of social cohesion arises with other social actions and processes such as participation in social, economy, and political forms, all sociological theorists agree on the means of paying attention to the existence of this connection, despite disagreements over how to communicate and influence at the group level, middle-group and collective, and emphasize the importance of connection between participation and cohesion (Azkia and Ghaffari, 2001). Researchers such as North (2005), Easterly (2006), and North et al, (2009) consider social cohesion and the lack of appropriate institutional contexts as the most important reasons of underdevelopment in these countries. Coherence is sometimes taken into account equal with words such as consensus, unity, and so on. Consensus implies the emergence of a clear consensus and agreement in a group. Consensus and

cohesion leads to a conscious integration of a group and its greater correlations, subject to, first, established and common laws, rules, and norms are generally accepted by social and active socio-political groups; second, the institutions that execute those laws and norms are acceptable by the same groups; third, the sense of identity and unity among these mentioned groups should be extended in terms of accepting those rules and institutions. (Bashriyeh, 2001). However, studies which are fully connected to effect of participation on economic development have not been conducted, especially, that this effect has subjected to coherence, there are several experimental studies with respect to research that are presented in the following. Tavares and wacziarg (2001) state that the effect of competitive elections in developing countries is such a like a double-edged sword. Elections might create two situations: In the first case, voters force the government to perform well and promote democracy. In a way, the election encourages good political motivation. Elections force politicians to answer that has direct economic and social effects. In the latter situation, the election may provoke differences and specifically, disrupts policy in general. Collier & Chauvet (2009) investigate to what extent elections in developing countries improve governance and economic development policies and to what extent the election has forced governments to improve their performance. Elections that are not free and fair will not lead to accountability of the government. As a result, frequency and electoral behaviors are important. Elections are an effective tool for accountability and accountability leads to good policies adoption and ultimately, economic development.

Voters have little information about costly economic policies and because of the problem of free ride, voters have a small motivation to get it. As a result, voters may not be able to monitor government performance. Ethnic prejudices may also cause outcomes that do not pay attention to politicians performance (Bossuroy, 2007),

Wantchechon (2003) in a field experiment, shows that ethnic election promises are more effective than election promises of public goods. Ethnic diversity encourages this issue in most of developing countries.

The issue of fraud and bribery in elections can also be addressed. An accidental experiment from Vicente (2007) shows that bribery has been effective in elections. It is even possible that this illegal strategy will affect the election more than the promise and performance of good economic policies. As mentioned, the effect of the election has an ambiguous result in the specific circumstances of many developing countries and it is not easy to assume that we will have the victory of accountability and ultimately development. Acket et al. (2011) examined the correlation of the cohesion index with some macroeconomic variables in 39 selected European countries in 2009. The cohesion index is created based on survey from citizens in the fields of behavioral and social variables (trust in institutions, sense of belonging and solidarity, political participation, cultural and social participation), in 2008. The results show that countries with higher levels of social cohesion perform better in macroeconomic indicators. Schatz (2013) examines how social accountability reduces corruption in offices. Corruption in government offices is largely driven by economic motivations, along with a lack of systematic control and rule that it can be reduced through political accountability. The accountability mechanism is a tool and the way it is used affects corruption. This mechanism is effective when it puts pressure on public opinion to strengthen horizontal accountability or power sanction (public mobilization) through the electoral accountability mechanism. Accountability is a power and government officials are more accountable when citizens have more power to demand that this demand is rooted in their participation. Among the domestic studies, the only study related to the subject of the present study is the research of Karimi Moghari et al. (2014) who examined the effect of social cohesion on economic development with data from 85

selected countries. Other researchers such as Golshiri Esfahani et al. (2009), Zare and Rohandeh (2015), Pourgotabi and Mousavi (2016), Manzoor and Yadipour (2008) and Shahram Nia et al. (2014) have investigated social capital, social cohesion and political participation, separately. In general, none of the domestic and foreign experimental studies have examined the effect of participation on economic development and the impact of socio-political cohesion in this regard. Also, the present study is different from other studies in terms of research methodology. The organization of the article is such that after introduction in the first part, the theoretical foundations are presented, in the second part. In the third section, the effect of participation on development is estimated under the condition of socio-political cohesion by the method of panel data with constant effects and at the end of the article, a summary is provided.

2- Theoretical foundations and fundamental concepts

The goal of economic development in the simplest way is to create wealth for a nation. Before 1970, a rapid growth was evaluating a serious variable for development (Todaro & Smith, 2009). To compare the wealth of different countries, GNP (Gross National Product) is measured by the common currency, usually the US dollar, in terms of population of a country (Jaffee, 1998). The World Bank is currently using gross national income (GNI) to compare countries' wealth. Experience in the years 1950 and 1960 has shown that increasing GDP growth is an obligation for improving people's lives (Todaro & Smith, 2003).

Contemporary growth theorists (Romer 1988, Lucas 1988 Aghion & Howitt 1992) consider technological changes as the result of knowledge production. They emphasize that increasing productivity is achieved through work and capital rather than knowledge. This theory argues that much of the investment should go toward human capital (education), infrastructure, and R&D (Meier, 2000).

Sen (1985, 1992, 1999) Provides a specific interpretation of economic development with a specific emphasis and attention to human factor and investment in human resources. According to him, development is increasing capabilities and improving competencies. In other words, the action that deepens and expands human capabilities in various dimensions are promote development factors and conversely, reduction measures and conditions of human capabilities, are taken into consideration as development inhibitory factors. Another aspect of this interpretation is the legal scope that a person uses it in its various dimensions, at different levels of life, from birth. The degree of economic development is measured by the same enjoyment or realization of competencies in a society. In fact, age increases the ultimate goal of development and considers human capabilities as freedom increase of an individual that is defined by the choice of functions. Although higher income is necessary for development, this condition is not enough. And here we have a paradigm shift in development from growth promotion to welfare promotion. And that change needs to define as a non-monetary indicator for growth that focuses on both quality and quantity aspects. The age approach through the Human Development Index (HDI), including the variables of life expectancy, education, and income, considers this immaterial aspect of development. Yet, this theory was criticized for not paying attention to social institutions. In the last two decades, the discussion of institutions and social arrangements that have been neglected for a long time and has been recalled as general assumptions or fixed conditions has been considered. Douglas North (1990) took an important step in examining economic performance with his book, "Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance". In the third millennium, a growing number of thinkers, including Aghlo et al. (2001) and North (2005), paid special attention to institutions to explain the reasons of growth and development of countries. They claim that the cause of the

weakness or shortage or corruption of institutions is the main root of underdevelopment.

Russett (1965) established a reciprocal relationship among several economic, social or cultural indicator (Per capita income, urbanization, literacy, number of radios, hospital beds, ...) and fewer political features such as; the range of participation in elections, the government's share in gross domestic product this relationship let him to provide a general picture based on five consecutive levels of economic and political development from 107 countries: Traditional primitive societies, traditional civilizations, transitional societies, societies that have passed the industrial revolution, public mass consumption societies. Such classification is, naturally, an affirmation of a developmental approach based on the interrelationship between economic efficiencies and political efficiencies. For example Rost shows, , that reaching any stage of economic development also increases the range of elections participation.

Huntington & Nelson (1976) has considered political participation as one of the main parameters of development and they make the necessary efforts to classify the systems according to this criterion, They believe that development and participation require the formation of personality and the modernist human being. According to him, traditional man always expects to be stable and not to change in nature and society. But modern man is confronted with different attitudes and approaches. He accepts the possibility of any change and adapts himself to them. Finally, the consequences of modernization lead to changes in the values between the masses and increase their participation. Huntington reminds us that a political system is efficient and credible when it has a high degree of institutionalization. That is, their organizations and infrastructures rituals are numerous and sufficiently stable and valuable from the people point of view. Based on Huntington's classification, these societies are politically advanced if they can respond to the necessity of

institutionalization otherwise, modernization is achieved at the cost of political denegration. Institutionalization criteria is to achieve a high level of complexity, independence, and coherence through the organizations and made up rituals of that system. In the context of modernization, it may lead to the birth of two political systems, in terms of whether the process of institutionalization is accompanied by the expansion of political participation: Civil society or a developed society that the reduction of social forces and their entry into the political stage is balanced by the institutions play that can organize and arrange their participation and in contrast, the Pretorin society, or degenerate society, is a direct confrontation of the force of society, each of which pursues its own particular way of achieving its goal. Therefore, political participation is associated with a low level of institutionalism and lack of irregularity (Hungtinton, 2006).

The multiplicity and expansion of local and non-governmental organizations in a society is an indicator and indicates the existence of social participation in that society; untill that civil society is defined by the expansion of social participations and civil institutions. Civil society organizations are non-governmental organizations formed in partition of the masses of people with the government and organize a part of the people to achieve a specific goal in one of the social scopes. The scope of activities of these institutions, which are formed for the organized participation of the people, is really wide. Trade unions, political parties, private economic enterprises, cooperatives, the press, etc. can be examples of civic institutions (Azkia and Ghaffari, 2004). People's participation in the development process can strengthen their commitment to development activities and their local community (Mehta, 1984). In the definition of social cohesion, it refers to a situation in which the constituent components of society are connected to each other in a way that creates a meaningful and effective whole; In other words, social cohesion is a type of social arrangement that ensures that

individuals, institutions, organizations, and various executive groups reach a common mental level at different levels, be able to work together, respect the existing rules, use the facilities of the community, and on the contrary, recognize and nurture their abilities based on multiple intelligences and abilities and provide them to the society, Because this, in turn, promotes the development of society's capacities and capabilities (Gardner, 2005).

Leighley (1990) examines the assumption that social bonds affect the likelihood of individual participation. He answers two questions about the impact of social ties on participation, in his article. He concludes that social interaction affects both the level of individual and social participation however, this participation is not always in the expected direction. Developmental sociologist Colin, considers development arised from the structure of society. He emphasizes mental readiness and personal motivation to realize participate and development. Effective participation requires personal motivations. In other words, participation is a mental phenomenon before it becomes objective that it must be sought in the thoughts, ideas, behaviors and culture of the people (Vatani, 2007).

3- Research method and data analysis

In this study, the model was estimated using panel data with fixed effects and data from 123 developing countries during the period 2016-2006. The current research model for testing the research hypothesis is as follows:

$$(1) \quad HDI_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PSI_{it} + \beta_2 PP_{it} + \beta_3 PP.PSI_{it} + \epsilon_{it}$$

Where HDI represents human development as an indicator for measuring economic development. This index is obtained from the geometric mean of per capita income, literacy level and life expectancy. The PP index indicates political participation. In order to calculate the social and political participation index, the indicators of free and fair elections, effective power for the government, parliamentary or associations rights, and speech freedom are scored from 1 to 10 and the average score is extracted

from the political participation index. Countries with more political participation scored higher. Also, PSI indicates social and political cohesion. To calculate community cohesion with politicians, the social and political cohesion index includes the weighted average of the party system, beneficiary groups, democracy, and social capital that are scored from 1 to 10 and countries with more political and social cohesion have scored higher. The World Bank's (WDi) HDI Index and the social and political cohesion index, which is collected by the Bertelsmann foundation, is then estimated, using 738 stated model observation. According to the research hypothesis that participation with cohesion

leads to economic development, relationship (2) is the implicit derivative of relation (1) toward political participation. Based on the subject literature, it is expected that the changes in human development toward the changes in political participation will be equivalent to a positive coefficient of changes in socio-political cohesion.

$$(2) \frac{\partial \text{HDI}}{\partial \text{PP}} = \beta_2 + \beta_3 \text{PSI}_{it} \quad , \quad (\beta_2 > 0, \beta_3 > 0)$$

Before estimating the pattern, it is necessary to check the variable stability of the model that in this regard, the Hadry test and the Phillips Perron test were used and the test results are presented in table (1).

Table 1 - The finding resulted from the unit-rooted variables tests of the model

Variable	Hardy test	PHILIPS_PERRON TEST
HDI	16.94 (0.000)	1301.17 (0.000)
PP	16/97 (0.000)	315.92
PSI	16.66 (0.000)	408.51 (0.000)

Source: Research Findings

- The numbers in parentheses indicate the probability value.

As can be seen from the information in the table above the results obtained from the Unified Root Test show that rejects the existence of a single root in variables of the model, including human development (HDI), political participation (PP), and social and political cohesion (PSI), and all three variables are at the static. Panel data method was used to estimate the above pattern, in where time and cross-section series are combined. The advantage of the data panel model over cross-sectional models is that in these models the researcher can have more flexibility in explaining the individual behavioral differences of the phenomena over time.

We use the F-Limer test to decide between the fixed effects method and the normal least squares method. The obtained results show that with a probability of 95%, the H0 hypothesis is rejected based on the similarity of the width from the origin. The above test only examines the acceptance or rejection of fixed effects and this test cannot be used to absolutely select fixed effects. We use the Hausman test to decide whether to use fixed effects (FE) or random effects (RE). The null hypothesis of this test is that the estimators of fixed and random effects are not fundamentally different. If the null hypothesis is rejected, the result is that the random effects are not correct and it is better to use fixed effects. According to Hassmann's statistics, the hypothesis of using constant effects at the 95% level is confirmed. The results of the F-Limer test

and the Hausman test are provided in Table (2).

Table 2. Results of boundary F test and Hassman test

Type of test	Test statistics	Value of test statistics	Probability
Boundry F	F	110.721	0.000
Hausman	H	28.850	0.000

Source: Research findings

As can be seen in Table (3), the estimation results show that the coefficients are compatible with the theory. The coefficient of political participation without the presence of cohesion has a negative sign and is statistically significant. As, one percent increase in participation without cohesion reduces human development by 0.017 percent. According to the theory of Sen (1985, 1992, 1999), human development is considered as an indicator of economic development measurment and, as expected, increasing participation without the presence of cohesion, with

respect to the institutional conditions of developing countries, will not lead to sustainable development and the coefficient has been negative in the selected countries of this study. The coefficient of socio-political cohesion without the presence of political participation is not significant despite being positive, but participation and cohesion have a positive and significant effect on the human development index, as one percent increase in the multiplication of political participation and socio-political cohesion increases human development by 0.92 percent.

Table 3: results of model estimation

Variable	Coefficient	Standard error	T statistics	Probability
β_0	0.576	0.018	31.771	0.000
PP	-0.017	0.003	-4.606	0.000
PSI	0.006	0.005	1.285	0.199
PP*PSI	0.920	0.033	2.711	0.006
Test value	Modified R ²		F probabilty	
	0.956		0.000	

Source: research findings

According to Equation (2), the ratio of changes in human development to socio-political cohesion can be analyzed in such a way that increasing one percent of participation combined with social cohesion, increases 0.92 percent of human development.

Based on the above results, it can be argued that in developing countries, democracy, in its broadest and most general form, is the

best guarantee for the country's protection against international crises.

In this respect, democracy and the political participation of the people is one of the most important institutions for sustainable economic development, but in developing countries, it may lead to instability and division due to the lack of appropriate institutional contexts. This result is adopted to Tavares and Vakziark (2001) and Viste

(2007) research findings and the positive effect of participation along with cohesion on development is also consistent with the results of Lightly (1990) research, which evaluated the effect of social interaction and cohesion on participation.

As referred to, in the research literature, in developing countries, political participation leads to economic development in the presence of social and political cohesion.

4- Conclusion and Recommendations

The importance of political participation as one of the most important indicators of development in social sciences and political sciences studies is constantly emphasized. In economic studies, and in particular institutional theories of development, special attention is paid to the social and political-institutional indicators that social and political participation is the most important. respect to the importance of this issue in this study, a focused has paid on social and political cohesion and the impact of combined participation on economic development in 123 selected developing and developed countries in the years 2012-2016.

Based on the results of the present study, it can be seen that in the highest state of democracy (political participation) in the shadow of ethnic and religious prejudices, etc., has led to more corruption and economic rent but participation, along with socio-political cohesion, seems to lead to economic development. The necessity of people mobilization primarily requires the preparation of ideologies and formulas for legitimacy, which means giving priority to

5- Sources and references

1. Ibrahimzadeh, Isa (1997). participation management of Islamic councils and rural management system in Iran. *Humanities Research*, 2 (32), 236-213.
2. Azkia, Mostafa and Ghaffari, Gholamreza (2004). *Rural Development with Emphasis on the*

the will of the people, Without the form of expression of this will being so important, the increase in per capita income and the level of human development are obtained by increasing the legitimacy and acceptability of the system. This legitimacy requires the realization of increased participation combined with socio-political cohesion. Huntington believes that social cohesion affects people's political participation and there is a significant relationship between participation and cohesion. According to the impact of cohesion on economic development, planning, and foundation should be done to reduce the level of social inequality and the existing conflicts among different groups and strata. As long as people are concerned about meeting their needs, they engage in antisocial behaviors to achieve rent-seeking opportunities which causes serious damage to social and political cohesion and make the wrong choices. Of course, Third World societies have a special social structure that decisively effects their developmental conditions. Some of these societies are lined racial groups but not integrated that hach has its own land, culture and institution. Under these circumstances, political participation may lead to moving the power to a particular group and this is where political development takes place selectively instead of continuity and progress. with respect to the uncertain effect of political participation in developing countries, this effect is effective and positive when it is in the shadow of social and political cohesion.

- Rural Community of Iran, Tehran: Ney Publication.
3. Bashriyeh, Hussein (2000). *Barriers to political development in Iran*. Tehran: Game no Publications.
4. Poor Gatabi, Habib, and Mousavi Khorshidi, Hamidreza (2016). *The relationship between social capital and political participation of Qom citizens*.

- Research-Science Journal of Social Welfare, 16 (62), 390-359.
5. Zare, Bijan and Rohandeh, Majid (2014). Investigating the factors affecting socio-political participation in a study of citizens over 18 years in Karaj. *Iranian Social Studies*, 2 (9), 87-64.
 6. Shahram Nia Seyed Amir Massoud, Sadeghi Amro Abadi Behrooz and Ebrahimi Ali (2014). Investigating the Relationship between Political Participation and Economic Welfare (Case Study of Students, Employees and Professors of Isfahan). *Journal of Social Welfare and Development Planning*, 6 (19), 202-160.
 7. Tusi, Mohammad Ali (1990). What does participation mean? Tehran: Public Management Training Center Publications.
 8. Alavi Tabar, Alireza (1999). A Study of Citizens' Participation Pattern in Urban Affairs (Global Experiences and Iran) (Vol. 1), Tehran: Municipalities Organizations.
 9. Karimi Moghari Zahra, Abu Nouri Ismail and Zubairi Hoda (2014). Phase analysis of social cohesion and its relationship with economic development. *Economic Research*, 3 (49), 645-621.
 10. Gol Shiri Isfahani Zahra, Khademi Hossein, Sedighi Reza and Tazeh Mehdi (2009). The effect of social cohesion on the level of rural participation: a case study of Gandeman district, Borujen city. *Village and Development Quarterly*, 1 (12). 137-164.
 11. Manzoor, Davood and Yadipour, Mehdi (2007). Social capital and the factor of social and economic development. *Strategy (Jasmine)*, 1 (15), 162-140.
 12. Vahid, Fereydoun and Mohsen Niazi (1383). Thinking about the relationship between family structure and social participation in Kashan. *Social Sciences Quarterly*, Volume 3 (23), 146-137.
 13. Watani, Ali (2007). Investigating the factors affecting the increase of people's motivation in social participation in Golestan province, Master's thesis in Sociology (University of Tehran).
 14. Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J.A. (2001). The colonial origins of comparative development: An empirical investigation. *American Economic Review*, 91(5), 1369-1401.
 15. Acket, S., Borsenberger, Dickes, M., P., & Sarracino, F. (2011). Measuring and Validating Social Cohesion: A Bottom-Up Approach. *Fonds National de la Recherche, CEPS/Instead Working Paper*, 08.
 16. Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1963). *The Civic Culture*: Little, Brown.
 17. Bossuroy T. (2007). Voting in an African Democracy: Does only Ethnicity Rule? :EHESS.Paris School of Economics: DIAL, mimeo.
 18. Chauvet, L., & Collier, P. (2009). Elections and economic policy in developing countries. *Economic Policy*, 24(59), 509-550.
 19. Gardner, H. (2005) ."Multiple Lenz on the Mind". Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge: MA 02138.
 20. Huntington, S. P. (2006). *Political order in changing societies*. Yale University Press.
 21. Huntington, S. P., & Nelson, J. M. (1976). *No easy choice: Political participation in developing countries* (Vol. 3). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
 22. Jaffee, D. (1998). *Levels of socio-economic development theory* (2nd ed.). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
 23. Leighley, Jan, E. (1990) ."Social Interaction and Contextual Influences on and Political Participation, *American Political Research*, 4(18).
 24. Mehta, Shirr. (1984) .*Rular development policies and programs* : London: Sage.
 25. Meier, G. M. (2000). The old generation of development economists and the new. In G. M. Meier & J. E.

- Stiglitz(Eds.), *Frontiers of development economics: The future in perspective*.
26. North, D. C (2005). *Understanding the Process of Economic Change* : Princeton University Press.
 27. Russett, B. M. (1965). *Trends in world politics*. New York: Macmillan.
 28. Schatz, F. (2013). 1. Title: *Fighting Corruption with Social Accountability: A Comparative Analysis of Social Accountability Mechanisms' Potential to Reduce Corruption in Public Administration*. *Public Administration and Development*, 33(3).
 29. Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
 30. Sen, A. (1992). *Inequality re-examined*. Oxford: Clarendon.
 31. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
 32. Tavares J. and R. Wacziarg, (2001). *How Democracy Affects Growth*. *European Economic Review*, 8(45), 1341-1378.
 33. Todaro, M, & Smith, S. (2003). *Economic development* (8th ed.). Boston: Addison Wesley.
 34. Todaro, M., & Smith, S. (2009). *Economic development* (10th ed.). Boston: Addison Wesley.
 35. Vicente P., (2007). *Is Vote-Buying Effective? Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in West Africa*. Mimeo, CSAE, Oxford.
 36. Wantcheckon L. (2003). *Clientalism and Voting Behaviour: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin*. *World Politics*, (55), 399-422.