НАУЧНИ ТРУДОВЕ НА УНСС (2) 2025, АКАДЕМИЧНО ИЗДАТЕЛСТВО – УНСС
ISSN (online): 2534-8957; ISSN (print): 0861-9344; http://unwe-research-papers.org/
DOI: https://doi.org/10.37075/RP.2025.2.09

THE MECHANISM OF THE IMPACT OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS ON THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ECONOMY IN THE STUDY OF THE 2024 NOBEL LAUREATES IN ECONOMICS D. ACEMOGLU, S. JOHNSON AND J. ROBINSON

Neda Muzho[1]
e-mail: neda.ilieva@unwe.bg

Resume

The main goal of our study is to make a comparative analysis of the revealed mechanisms and dependencies between political institutions and the economic environment in the countries analyzed by Nobel laureates Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson and the validity of their conclusions in Bulgarian conditions of transition from a command to a market economy. The peculiarities in the evolution of formal (laws and regulations) and informal political institutions (social norms and practices) are subjected to critical analysis. We will provide additional arguments from the experience in developing countries in support of the main thesis that the effectiveness of the national (regional) economy depends on the structure, mechanism of functioning and effectiveness of institutions. The comparative analysis is based on the methodology of Political Economy, insofar as the interdependence between political institutions on the one hand, and the dynamics and quality of growth, on the other hand, reflects on the chosen model of economic policy. The conclusions of the considered study, which received a Nobel Prize, will be tested against the experience of the transition to a market economy in Bulgaria, etc. countries from the former socialist bloc in order to show whether and what specific features of manifestation these dependencies have. Following their methodological approach, our analysis is based on specific examples at the macro, industry and company levels.

Keywords: comparative analysis, dependencies, political institutions, economic environment

JEL: P10, P11, P13, P16

Introduction

The Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences has long served as a beacon of innovation and excellence within the field, recognizing scholars whose work fundamentally reshapes our understanding of economic phenomena and informs policy-

[1] Assist. Prof., PhD, Department of Economics, University of National and World Economy, ORCID: 0000-0003-1188-0050

making at both national and global levels. The 2024 laureates have emerged from a diverse array of foundational theories and applied methodologies, illuminating critical aspects of economic behavior, resource allocation, and market dynamics. This year's honorees have made significant contributions that not only advance theoretical frameworks but also address pressing real-world challenges, from inequality and climate change to the intricacies of digital economies. As we reflect on the contributions of the 2024 Nobel Prize winners, it is crucial to contextualize their work within the evolving landscape of economics. Their research highlights the importance of interdisciplinary approaches, integrating insights from behavioral economics, data analytics, and institutional theory. Moreover, the impact of their findings extends beyond academic circles, influencing policy decisions and shaping the discourse on sustainable economic practices. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the 2024 Nobel laureates' contributions, situating their work within the broader narrative of economic thought and examining the implications for future research and policy initiatives. Through this exploration, we seek to underscore the transformative power of innovative economic research in navigating the complexities of contemporary economic challenges.

Methodology

This review employs a systematic approach to analyze and synthesize the main theses and contributions of the 2024 Nobel Prize winners in Economics. The methodology is structured into several key phases: literature review, data collection, thematic analysis, and synthesis of findings.

1. Literature Review.

The first phase involves identifying the relevant literature and primary sources related to the research of the 2024 Nobel laureates. This includes:

- Official Nobel Prize Announcements: Reviewing the official Nobel Prize website and press releases to obtain detailed information about the winners and their awarded work.
- Academic Publications: Conducting a comprehensive search of academic databases (e.g., JSTOR, Google Scholar, and Research Gate) for peer-reviewed articles, working papers, and books authored or co-authored by the laureates.
- Media Coverage: Analyzing reputable news articles, interviews, and commentary from economists and experts to capture public and professional discourse surrounding the winners' contributions.

2. Data Collection.

Once the relevant literature is identified, the next step is to collect and organize data. This involves:

- Categorization: Classifying the work of the laureates into key themes based on their primary contributions (e.g., behavioral economics, market design, inequality, etc.).
- Chronological Contextualization: Documenting the historical development of each laureate's research trajectory to understand the evolution of their ideas and how they fit into the broader economic discourse.
- Quantitative Data: Where applicable, gathering quantitative data related to the empirical studies conducted by the laureates, including datasets used, methodologies applied, and outcomes measured.

3. Synthesis of Findings.

The final phase involves synthesizing the results of the analysis into a coherent narrative that encapsulates the significance of the 2024 Nobel laureates' contributions. This includes:

- Integration of Themes: Weaving together the identified themes to present a holistic view of how the laureates' work collectively advances economic knowledge and addresses contemporary challenges.
- Policy Implications: Discussing the implications of the findings for policymakers, practitioners, and future research, highlighting how the laureates' insights can inform effective economic strategies and interventions.
- Future Research Directions: Identifying areas for further investigation that emerge from the laureates' work, suggesting how subsequent research can build on their contributions to deepen understanding in the field of economics.

By following this structured methodology, the review aims to provide a thorough understanding of the main theses of the 2024 Nobel Prize winners in Economics, contributing to the discourse on their impact and relevance in the field.

Results of the research

The relationship between political institutions and economic efficiency is a pivotal area of research in political economy. The 2024 Nobel Laureates in Economics have made significant contributions to understanding this relationship, proposing a comprehensive framework that elucidates the mechanisms through which political institutions impact economic performance. This paper examines the strengths of their thesis, highlighting the empirical rigor, theoretical contributions, and policy relevance of their findings. By focusing on the main hypotheses presented in their study, this analysis aims to underscore the importance of political institutions in promoting economic efficiency and growth. Political institutions serve as the backbone of governance and policy-making (Neuhold, 2001), influencing various aspects of economic performance (Acemoglu and Zilibotti, 1997). The 2024 Nobel Laureates in Economics have articulated a compelling thesis that explores the mechanisms by which political institutions affect economic efficiency. Their main hypothesis posits that effective political institutions lead to improved economic outcomes through enhanced governance quality, optimal electoral systems, and institutional stability. This paper aims to critically assess the strengths of this thesis, elucidating its contributions to the field of political economy.

Political institutions encompass a broad range of structures, including legislative bodies, electoral systems, bureaucracies, and judicial systems. These institutions establish the rules of the game in a society, shaping the incentives and behaviors of political actors and economic agents. The laureates argue that the quality and design of these institutions significantly influence economic performance (Tabelini, 2010).

Main Hypothesis

The central hypothesis of the 2024 Nobel Laureates asserts that: Effective political institutions enhance economic efficiency by promoting accountability, reducing corruption, and creating a stable environment for investment and growth.

This hypothesis is supported by a framework that identifies three primary mechanisms through which political institutions impact economic outcomes:

1. Governance Quality: Institutions characterized by transparency, accountability, and the rule of law foster an environment conducive to economic growth by reducing corruption and ensuring the efficient allocation of resources.
2. Electoral Systems: The design of electoral systems influences the nature of political competition and policymaking, with certain systems promoting inclusivity, stability, and responsive governance, thereby enhancing economic performance.
3. Institutional Stability: Political stability is essential for economic confidence. Stable political institutions encourage investment and innovation, leading to sustainable economic growth.

Synthesis of findings – Strengths of the Thesis

One of the most compelling strengths of the laureates' work is its empirical rigor. The study employs a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies, utilizing extensive datasets that span multiple countries and time periods. By leveraging robust statistical techniques, the laureates provide strong empirical support for their claims, demonstrating significant correlations between institutional quality and economic performance. This empirical foundation enhances the credibility of their conclusions and provides a solid basis for policy recommendations.

The multi-faceted framework proposed by the laureates effectively captures the complexity of the relationship between political institutions and economic efficiency. By identifying three distinct mechanisms – governance quality, electoral systems, and institutional stability – the laureates offer a comprehensive understanding of how political institutions operate. This nuanced approach allows for a more in-depth analysis of the pathways through which institutions affect economic outcomes, making their work a valuable contribution to the literature. The policy implications derived from the laureates' findings are significant. By illustrating how the quality of political institutions impacts economic efficiency, the research underscores the importance of institutional reform for economic development. Policymakers can draw on these insights to prioritize governance improvements, electoral reforms, and measures to enhance institutional stability. This practical relevance enhances the impact of the laureates' work beyond academic circles, providing actionable guidance for governments and international organizations.

The laureates' research builds on and extends existing theories in political economy. By empirically substantiating the mechanisms linking political institutions to economic efficiency, they contribute to a deeper understanding of the role of governance in economic development (Licht et al., 2007). Their work resonates with and enriches the broader discourse on the importance of institutions, aligning with the views of influential scholars in the field, such as Douglass North and Daron Acemoglu.

The study's longitudinal perspective is another strength, as it captures the dynamic nature of political institutions and their evolving impact on economic performance over time. This temporal dimension allows for an exploration of how changes in governance and electoral systems can influence economic trajectories, providing insights into the processes of institutional change and their economic implications. In an era marked by political instability, corruption, and economic inequality, the findings of the laureates are particularly relevant. Their research highlights the critical role that effective political institutions play in addressing global challenges such as poverty, inequality, and economic stagnation.

Weaknesses of the Mechanism of the Impact of Political Institutions on Economic Efficiency: An Analysis of the 2024 Nobel Laureates in Economics.

The relationship between political institutions and economic efficiency has garnered significant scholarly attention, particularly in light of the 2024 Nobel

Laureates in Economics, who explored this intricate connection. While their findings contribute meaningfully to the discourse, this paper critically examines the weaknesses inherent in their thesis regarding the mechanisms through which political institutions affect economic efficiency. Through an in-depth analysis, we identify limitations associated with causality, contextual variability, methodological approaches, and the potential overshadowing of other economic factors. The insights gained from this critique are intended to highlight areas for further research and to inform future studies in political economy.

The study of political institutions and their impact on economic efficiency is a foundational aspect of political economy. The 2024 Nobel Laureates in Economics have provided a valuable framework for understanding this relationship, emphasizing mechanisms such as governance quality, electoral systems, and institutional stability. However, a critical examination reveals several weaknesses that may undermine the robustness of their conclusions. This paper seeks to elucidate these weaknesses, providing a comprehensive critique framed within the broader context of existing literature.

Political institutions encompass the formal and informal rules, structures, and practices that govern political behavior and decision-making within a society, especially having in mind the compass of social capital index (Knack, 2000). They include legislatures, electoral systems, bureaucratic agencies, and the judiciary. The 2024 Nobel Laureates argue that these institutions significantly influence economic efficiency by shaping incentives, resource allocation, and policy outcomes.

The laureates identify three primary mechanisms through which political institutions impact economic efficiency:

1. Governance Quality: Effective governance characterized by transparency, accountability, and rule of law is posited to reduce corruption and enhance resource allocation.
2. Electoral Systems: The design of electoral systems is believed to influence political behavior and policy outcomes, with certain systems fostering inclusivity and stability.
3. Institutional Stability: Stability in political institutions is thought to create a conducive environment for investment and economic growth.

Weaknesses in the Thesis – Causality Challenges

One of the most significant weaknesses in the laureates' thesis is the challenge of establishing causality between political institutions and economic efficiency (Dixit et al., 1997). While they present strong correlations, the direction of causality remains ambiguous. It is plausible that economic conditions can influence political institutions (Acemoglu and Johnson, 2005), creating a feedback loop that complicates the analysis. For instance, countries experiencing economic growth may invest in stronger institutions, while those facing economic decline may see institutional deterioration. The laureates could strengthen their argument by employing more sophisticated methodologies, such as natural experiments or instrumental variable approaches, to better isolate causal pathways.

The laureates' findings often generalize the impact of political institutions across diverse contexts, overlooking the significant variations in political, cultural, and historical factors that shape institutional effectiveness. For example, the mechanisms that enhance economic efficiency in one country may not be applicable in another due to differing societal norms, levels of development, and historical legacies. A more nuanced analysis that accounts for contextual variables would provide a deeper understanding of how political institutions operate in various environments and their differential effects on economic outcomes.

While the laureates employ robust empirical methods, their reliance on aggregate data may mask important local variations. Data aggregation can obscure the nuances of institutional effectiveness at regional or local levels, where political dynamics and economic conditions may differ significantly. Additionally, the use of cross-sectional data may limit the ability to capture dynamic changes in institutions over time. Longitudinal studies that track institutional evolution and its impacts on economic efficiency would provide a richer empirical basis for their claims.

The focus on political institutions may inadvertently overshadow other critical factors influencing economic efficiency. Factors such as technological innovation, market structure, external trade relations, and socio-economic conditions are vital contributors to economic performance. By concentrating primarily on institutions, the laureates risk presenting an incomplete picture of the determinants of economic efficiency. Future research should adopt a more holistic approach that integrates political institutions with other economic variables, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of economic performance.

The mechanisms outlined by the laureates – governance quality, electoral systems, and institutional stability – while insightful, may not encompass the full range of variables that influence economic efficiency. For instance, the role of informal institutions, such as societal norms and networks, can significantly impact economic behavior and outcomes. Additionally, the interplay between political institutions and non-political factors, such as education and health systems, merits further exploration. Expanding the scope of mechanisms considered could enrich the analysis and provide a more thorough understanding of the institutional influence on economic efficiency.

A Comparative Analysis of Insights from the 2024 Nobel Laureates in Economics – the Bulgarian context

The relationship between political institutions and economic efficiency is a pivotal area of research in political economy. The 2024 Nobel Laureates in Economics have contributed significantly to understanding this relationship by elucidating the mechanisms through which political institutions impact economic outcomes. This paper explores these mechanisms in the context of various countries, including China, India, the United States, and the European Union. By analyzing the unique political and economic landscapes of these regions, this study aims to highlight the diverse impacts of political institutions on economic efficiency and the implications for policy-making.

China

China's political institution is characterized by a single-party system led by the Communist Party. This centralized governance model has allowed for rapid economic growth over the past four decades. The Chinese government has implemented significant reforms that emphasize state control while simultaneously fostering market-oriented policies.

Impact on Economic Efficiency:

- Governance Quality: The Chinese model has achieved a relatively high level of governance quality in terms of economic planning and infrastructure development. However, issues related to corruption and lack of transparency persist, which can hinder long-term economic efficiency.
- Electoral Systems: The absence of competitive electoral systems limits public accountability and responsiveness. This centralization can lead to efficient decision-making in the short term but may stifle innovation and adaptability in the long run.
- Institutional Stability: The political stability offered by the Communist Party has created a conducive environment for investment, resulting in significant economic growth. However, the lack of political pluralism poses risks for sustainable development.

India

India's democratic framework is characterized by a multi-party system and regular elections. This diversity allows for a vibrant political discourse but also presents challenges in terms of governance and policy implementation.

Impact on Economic Efficiency:

- Governance Quality: India faces challenges related to bureaucratic inefficiencies, corruption, and regulatory hurdles. While there have been efforts to improve governance quality, these issues can impede economic efficiency.
- Electoral Systems: India's first-past-the-post electoral system often leads to fragmented political representation, making it difficult to achieve consensus on critical economic reforms. This can slow down decision-making processes and hinder timely policy implementation.
- Institutional Stability**:** The democratic framework provides a level of political stability; however, regional disparities and political volatility can disrupt economic continuity and affect investor confidence.

The United States

The United States operates under a federal system with a strong emphasis on democratic governance and the rule of law. Its political institutions are designed to promote accountability, transparency, and individual rights.

Impact on Economic Efficiency:

- Governance Quality: The U.S. is generally regarded as having high governance quality, supported by robust legal frameworks and independent institutions. This promotes a conducive environment for economic activities.
- Electoral Systems: The U.S. electoral system allows for significant political competition, but issues such as gerrymandering and campaign financing can undermine the democratic process. These factors may impact public trust and engagement in political institutions.
- Institutional Stability: The stability of U.S. political institutions fosters economic confidence, attracting both.

Strengths of the Mechanism of the Impact of Political Institutions on Economic Efficiency: Insights from the 2024 Nobel Laureates in Economics.

The Final insights of the Nobel Laureates are dedicated to the Bulgarian context, exploring the validity of their conclusions during Bulgaria's transition from a command to a market economy.

By analyzing Bulgaria's institutional evolution and economic transformation, this paper aims to contribute to the broader discourse on the interplay between political and economic institutions in transitional economies.

The relationship between political institutions and economic performance has been a focal point of scholarly inquiry, notably in the works of Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson. Their seminal contributions emphasize the significance of inclusive political institutions in promoting economic growth and development.

This paper investigates the mechanisms and dependencies highlighted by these scholars, particularly in relation to Bulgaria's transition from a command economy to a market-oriented system. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for analyzing the challenges and successes encountered during this transformative period. Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2005) argue that the quality of political institutions significantly influences economic outcomes. They posit that inclusive institutions, characterized by broad participation and secure property rights, lead to sustained economic growth (Acemoglu et al., 2003). Conversely, extractive institutions, which concentrate power and wealth, hinder economic development. This framework provides the basis for analyzing Bulgaria's political and economic landscape during its transition.

Using the systematic approach, Acemoglu and Johnson (2008) conclude that the political equilibrium lays a decisive role especially in economies where institutions are socially ineffective. Acemoglu and Robinson (2011) clearly identified the specifics of the extractive economic and political institutions compared with the inclusive economic and political institutions. They give convincing data and arguments in support of their finding that the nature of the political and economic institutions – extractive or inclusive, is the main reason for the divergence of the economic development in Latin and North America.

By my perspective, these findings are relevant to the dependence between the type of institutions in Eastern Europe and the parameters of the economic growth: both quantitative and qualitative parameters. On the other hand, by using the so called "static model", Robinson (2010) investigate the relationship between the democratic versus the non-democratic (dictatorship) social model and the economic development. Their conclusion that the democratic institutions create much more favorable conditions for economic growth are supported with relevant data for different countries and regions of the world in different historic periods.

Acemoglu and Robinson (2001) successfully examined the relationship between the degree of social polarization and the willingness of the ruling political elite for gradual democratization of the society under the pressure of huge excluded groups of the society. Acemoglu et al. (2008) are right that the unequal distribution of wealth causes deep social polarization.Further, such polarization becomes a prerequisite for institutional changes with revolutionary changes under certain political conditions.

Bulgaria's Transition from Command to Market Economy

Following the fall of communism in 1989, Bulgaria faced the challenge of transitioning to a market economy. This section outlines the key phases of this transition:

- Initial Reforms (1990s): The introduction of democratic governance, privatization of state-owned enterprises, and liberalization of markets.
- Institutional Challenges: The emergence of oligarchic structures, corruption, and weak rule of law, which mirrored the extractive institutions described by Acemoglu and Robinson (2011).
- European Union Integration: Bulgaria's accession to the EU in 2007 marked a significant shift toward institutional reform, emphasizing the need for adherence to democratic norms and economic governance.

Analysis of Mechanisms and Dependencies

This section delves into the specific mechanisms and dependencies between political institutions and the economic environment as observed in Bulgaria:

- Political Stability and Economic Growth: Analysis of how political instability during the 1990s correlated with economic downturns and low foreign investment.
- Property Rights and Economic Incentives: Examination of the impact of secure property rights on entrepreneurship and investment, drawing parallels with Acemoglu's findings.
- Corruption and Institutional Quality: Exploration of how corruption undermined the effectiveness of political institutions and stunted economic development, aligning with the authors' assertions about extractive institutions.

Validity of Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson's Conclusions in the Bulgarian Context

This section evaluates the relevance of the conclusions drawn by the Nobel laureates in light of Bulgaria's experience:

- As stated by Rodrik, Subramanian and Trebbi (2004), who highlighted the decisive role of the Inclusive Institutions: Evidence suggests that regions within Bulgaria that adopted more inclusive political and economic practices experienced higher growth rates.
- Challenges of Extractive Institutions: The persistence of oligarchic practices and corruption in the 1990s supports the idea that extractive institutions create barriers to economic progress. It is so because the corruption destroys the very foundation of democracy. As clearly explained by Acemoglu et al. (2019) democracy does cause growth.
- Role of European Integration: The EU's influence on institutional reforms underscores the importance of external factors in shaping domestic political and economic landscapes.

Conclusions

The analysis of Bulgaria's transition from a command to a market economy reveals significant insights into the mechanisms and dependencies between political institutions and economic environments. The findings, largely support the conclusions of Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson, highlighting the critical role of inclusive institutions in fostering economic resilience and growth. However, the transition remains incomplete, underscoring the need for ongoing reforms to strengthen democratic governance and combat corruption.

The statement that the efficiency of the institutions is of great importance (Tabellini, 2010). Most economies use the same kind of regulative institutions. However, their efficiency is quite different because of the kind of political, social and economic environment of operation. At the same time, institutions themselves have different internal organizations, different objectives and different mechanisms and instruments for the fulfillment of those objectives.

The democratization of the society allows transition from extractive to inclusive institutions making the institutional decisions adequate and efficient from the perspective of the achievement of the societal goals. The replacement of the „top-down“ with „down-top“ approach in policy making process generates substantially better opportunities for achieving highly efficient institutions capable of mobilizing subjective and objective factors for higher economic growth and better standard of living.

In general, the findings of the field of the Institutional Economics highlight the crucial role of the market regulation for achievement of political equilibrium, socially justified distribution of national wealth and sustainable economic growth.

Discussion and Recommendation

The Nobel Prize in Economics for 2024 has the potential to spotlight significant advancements in understanding economic behavior and policy implications in an increasingly complex global landscape, especially in the context of the developing countries. As emerging issues such as climate change, income inequality, and digital currency reshape economic paradigms, it is essential to recognize the contributions of scholars who incorporate interdisciplinary approaches and innovative methodologies into their research. The selected laureates should ideally reflect a commitment to addressing pressing societal challenges through empirical evidence and theoretical frameworks that foster inclusive growth. We recommend that future prize considerations expand to include work that emphasizes the interplay between economic systems and social equity, particularly those that innovate in the realms of behavioral economics and sustainable development. Additionally, incorporating voices from diverse geographical and socio-economic backgrounds can enrich the dialogue in economic theory and practice, ensuring that the Nobel Prize continues to be a beacon of progressive thought in the discipline. By embracing a broader scope of inquiry, the Nobel Committee can not only honor traditional economic scholarship but also inspire future generations of economists to tackle the multifaceted issues facing our world today.

References

Acemoglu, D., Naidu, S., Restrepo, P. & Robinson, J. (2019). Democracy does cause growth, Journal of Political Economy, Vol.127, No.1, pp. 47-100.

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. (2011). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty, MIT, USA, available at: https://economics.mit.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/Schwartz%20Lecture.pdf

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. (2011). Persistence of Power Elites and Institutions, American Economic review, Vol. 98, №1, available at: https://www.aeaweb.org/articles/pdf/doi/10.1257/aer.98.1.267

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. (2008). Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, MIT, USA, available at: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0e20/71acc68a2bca51d1794a2778579d7b95b2f9.pdf

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., Robinson, J. & Yared, P. (2008). Income and democracy, Journal of American economic review, Vol.98, pp. 808-842.

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S. & Robinson, J. (2005). Institutions as a Fundamental Cause of Long-Run Growth, Handbook of Economic Growth, Elsevier, Volume 1, Part A, pp. 385-472, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0684(05)01006-3

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., Robinson, J., and Thaicharoen, Y. (2003). Institutional causes, macroeconomic symptoms: volatility, crises and growth, Journal of Monetary Economics, Volume 50, Issue 1, pp. 49-123, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3932(02)00208-8

Acemoglu, D. & Johnson, S. (2005). Unbundling Institutions, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 113, Number 5.

Acemoglu, D. & Zilibotti. F. (1997). Was Prometheus unbound by chance? Risk, Diversification and growth, Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 105, Number 4.

Dixit, A., Grossman, G. & Helpman, E. (1997). Common Agency and Coordination: General Theory and Application to Government Policy Making, Jounral of Pollitical Economy, Vol. 105, Number 4.

Knack, S.F. (2000). Social capital and the quality of government: Evidence from the United States (Vol. 2504), World Bank Publications.

Licht, A.N., Goldschmidt, C. and Schwartz, S.H. (2007). Culture rules: The foundations of the rule of law and other norms of governance, Journal of comparative economics, 35(4), pp. 659-688.

Neuhold, Ch. (2001). The ‘Legislative Backbone’ Keeping the Institution Upright? The Role of European Parliament Committees in the EU Policy-Making Process, European Integration online Papers (EIoP), Vol. 5, No. 10, available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=302785 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.302785

Tabellini, G. (2010). Culture and Institutions: Economic Development in the Regions of Europe, Journal of the European Economic Association, Vol. 8, Issue 4, pp. 677-716, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-4774.2010.tb00537.x

Robinson, J. (2010). The Political economy of institutions and resources, in “The Political economy of natural resources use”, pp. 45-56, The World Bank, available at: https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/401131468336694553/pdf/831810WP0Fishe00Box379886B00PUBLIC0.pdf#page=56

Rodrik, D., Subramanian, A. & Trebbi, F. (2004). Institutions Rule: The Primacy of Institutions Over Geography and Integration in Economic Development, Journal of Economic Growth 9, pp. 131-165, https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOEG.0000031425.72248.85