

# Contents

---

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>1 The role of local institutions in the decentralization process</b>	<b>1</b>
1 Introduction . . . . .	1
2 Decentralization in fragile states . . . . .	3
3 Decentralization and inter-jurisdictional coordination . . . . .	5
<b>2 From rebellion to electoral violence: evidence from Burundi</b>	<b>9</b>
1 Decentralization as a tool for post-war reconstruction in Burundi . . .	11
2 Conceptual framework . . . . .	14
3 Identification strategy . . . . .	16
3.1 Data . . . . .	16
3.2 Estimation method . . . . .	20
3.3 Causal chain and bad controls . . . . .	23
4 Results . . . . .	23
4.1 Benchmark results . . . . .	24
4.2 Heterogenous effects . . . . .	29
5 Discussion . . . . .	31
5.1 Reconciling theoretical and empirical evidence . . . . .	31
5.2 Is electoral violence different from other types of violence? . .	32
5.3 Are the results robust? . . . . .	34
6 Concluding remarks . . . . .	34
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>3 Interjurisdictional coordination and access to sanitation in Brazil</b>	<b>51</b>
1 Introduction . . . . .	51
2 Decentralization and coordinated provision of sanitation services in Brazil . . . . .	53
3 Conceptual framework . . . . .	54
4 Data . . . . .	58
4.1 Dependent and independent variables . . . . .	58
4.2 Definition of “neighboring municipalities” and sample selection	60
5 Empirical analysis . . . . .	63
5.1 Identifying assumption . . . . .	63
5.2 Estimation of the treatment effect . . . . .	66
6 Results . . . . .	70

7	Robustness test . . . . .	72
8	Conclusion . . . . .	74
<b>Appendix</b>		<b>77</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Decentralization, accountability and crime prevention</b>	<b>79</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	79
2	Institutional framework: mayors and police management in Belgium . . . . .	82
2.1	Background: local institutions and politics in Belgium . . . . .	83
2.2	The 2005 reform introducing direct election of mayors in Wal- lonia . . . . .	84
2.3	The governance of local police . . . . .	87
3	Conceptual framework . . . . .	89
3.1	The effect of the reform on crime incidence in police districts with one municipality and chief of police . . . . .	89
3.2	The effect of the reform on crime incidence in police districts with more than one municipality and chief of police . . . . .	93
4	Data sources and descriptive statistics . . . . .	93
5	Empirical strategy . . . . .	98
5.1	Identification strategy . . . . .	98
6	Results and robustness tests . . . . .	101
6.1	Benchmark results . . . . .	102
6.2	Robustness tests . . . . .	103
7	Discussion . . . . .	107
7.1	Reconciling the results with the first hypothesis in the concep- tual framework . . . . .	107
7.2	Reconciling the results with the second hypothesis in the con- ceptual framework . . . . .	109
7.3	Benchmark results by type of crime . . . . .	112
8	Conclusion and external validity . . . . .	113
<b>Appendix</b>		<b>117</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Final remarks</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>		<b>129</b>

# List of Figures

---

2.1	Distribution of electoral violence . . . . .	17
2.2	Goodness of fit of Negative Binomial and Poisson models . . . . .	21
2.3	Predicted number of events in function of projected number of groups of the same size . . . . .	28
2.4	Correlation matrix between variables of interest . . . . .	46
2.5	Interactions: demob. rebels' polarization and Hutu share . . . . .	47
2.6	Interactions: Political competition and Hutu share . . . . .	48
2.7	Interactions: demob. rebels' polarization and political competition . .	49
2.8	Interactions: number of demobilized rebels and political competition .	50
3.1	A schematic representation of the conceptual framework . . . . .	56
3.2	Map of access to sewerage network, municipality level . . . . .	59
3.3	Outcomes of the 2008 elections, municipality level . . . . .	60
3.4	Schematic representation of an average cluster of neighbors within 100 km from the core . . . . .	61
3.5	Examples of clusters by "treatment status" . . . . .	64
3.6	Local mean estimates with different quantile-spaced bins . . . . .	67
3.7	The RD effect around the cutoff, for $h = 0.05$ . . . . .	71
4.1	Direct election of mayors had been discussed since 2002, was approved in 2005 and implemented during the 2006 municipal elections . . . . .	85
4.2	Police districts have their own governance framework which requires mayors to interact when several municipalities are involved . . . . .	88
4.3	The positive effect of direct election on crime incidence (hypothesis 1 can be explained through two mechanisms, both of which draw from the principal-agent framework . . . . .	90
4.4	Trend of average crime incidence before and after the reform and between treatment and control groups . . . . .	100
4.5	Treatment effect by year (2000-2012) . . . . .	103
4.6	Marginal effects of the interaction between treatment effects and the size of police districts . . . . .	111
B4.1	Spatial distribution of crime incidence by municipality, average 2000- 2012 . . . . .	124
B4.2	Evolution of the local proportion of non-Belgian residents (2000- 2012), by region . . . . .	124
B4.3	Evolution of covariates (2000-2012), by treatment and control groups	125



# List of Tables

---

2.1	Parties and ex-rebel groups in post-war Burundi . . . . .	13
2.2	Summary Statistics . . . . .	18
2.3	Testing hypotheses separately and simultaneously . . . . .	25
2.4	Benchmark regressions - comparison of different sets of controls and different sorts of geographic fixed effects . . . . .	27
2.5	Heterogenous effects . . . . .	30
2.6	Falsification tests . . . . .	33
2.7	The results of Table 2.4 with demobilized rebels' variables constructed using the municipality of origin of demobilized rebels . . . . .	41
2.8	Testing hypotheses separately and simultaneously - OLS estimates . . . . .	42
2.9	The results of Table 2.4 using OLS estimation . . . . .	43
2.10	Balancing test - regressions of variables of interest on controls, with and without geographic fixed effects . . . . .	44
2.11	Balancing test - regressions of variables of interest on controls, with and without geographic fixed effects (Cont'd) . . . . .	45
3.1	Difference in means of control variables, all samples . . . . .	65
3.2	Parametric fit (local linear regressions) of access to sanitation limited to close elections . . . . .	70
3.3	The RD effect by region . . . . .	72
3.4	Descriptive statistics, means difference and RD estimates for covari- ates in restricted sample ( $h = 0.05$ ) . . . . .	73
A3.1	Testing the exogeneity of the reform . . . . .	77
A3.2	Non-parametric fit (local linear regressions) of access to sanitation . . . . .	77
4.1	Average crime incidence between 2000 and 2012 by region and type of crime, municipal level . . . . .	95
4.2	Average social and economic characteristics and public expenditure between 2000 and 2012, municipal level . . . . .	96
4.3	Share of mayors that ran for re-election in 2006 and 2012, and that served for 1 or 2 legislatures. . . . .	97
4.4	Testing pre-treatment parallel assumption - interaction $WAL_i \times year$ <i>dummy</i> . . . . .	101
4.5	Benchmark results . . . . .	102
4.6	Robustness test - Benchmarking results with restricted sample . . . . .	105
4.7	Interaction between treatment and size of the local police force . . . . .	109
4.8	Interaction between treatment and local expenditure in safety and crime prevention . . . . .	109
4.9	Interaction of the treatment effect with the size of police districts . . . . .	110
4.10	Interaction of the treatment effect with indexes of political diversity . . . . .	112

4.11 Benchmark results by type of crime . . . . .	113
A4.1 Benchmark results, all coefficients . . . . .	117
A4.2 Robustness test - Balancing test for subsamples . . . . .	118
A4.3 Robustness test - Clustering standard errors at different administrative levels . . . . .	119
A4.4 Robustness test - Spatially clustered standard errors . . . . .	120
A4.5 Robustness test - Municipal trend (linear and quadratic) . . . . .	121
A4.6 Robustness test - Police district trend (linear and quadratic) . . . . .	122
A4.7 Robustness test - Regional trend (linear and quadratic) . . . . .	123