

Notes

Chapter I

1. Dreze and Sen 2002; Sen 1997a; Sen 1997b; Sen 1999.
2. Rajivan 2007b.
3. This distinguishes corruption from other crimes or undesirable phenomenon that may also need regulation – murder, break-in, littering, etc.
4. An example of differences in norms within the same country relates to punctuality. In the UK, for example, while people are expected to come to a meeting on time, in social situations if the guests arrive on the dot they may find the hosts still in the process of getting dressed.
In the context of corruption, bribing a police constable for a traffic violation is corruption, but when the same constable leaves a roadside café after a snack without paying, it may be seen as perfectly natural. In fact if the constable insists on paying, that may be considered odd, even suspicious – perhaps a raid is being planned?
5. For example, in rural India the poor may think it is perfectly legitimate to draw water from pipelines that take water to the city (making unauthorized holes in the pipes with the knowledge of field staff of the water board – even paying them a ‘fee’) when the pipes pass through wayside villages without serving them. But the city dwellers, and even the water board, would consider such local collusion a form of corruption - field staff collecting bribes in return for turning a blind eye to the water theft and damage caused to the infrastructure.
6. Kaufmann and Vicente 2005.
7. Gampat 2007a.
8. La Porta et al. 1997; Lipset and Lenz 2000; Paldam 2002; Triesman 2000.
9. Kautilya, The Arthashastra. Edited, rearranged, translated and introduced by L.N. Rangarajan in 1992.
10. Numerator – The count of the number of articles or pages containing the words ‘corruption’ and ‘fraud’ (and their variants, such as ‘corrupt’ or ‘fraudulent’).
Denominator – The deflator used is ‘Political’, i.e. the number of articles (or pages) containing the word ‘political’ (and its variants) which standardizes the numerator count and accounts for the amount of space given in the newspapers to stories about corruption and fraud. The series are expressed as three-year centered moving averages.
Data sources – The information is from two sources: (a) The NY Times, regarded as a national newspaper of record, distributed internationally, and (b) Ancestry.com a website which has records of scanned newspapers from small towns and cities across the USA, beginning in the late 1700s to the present, providing data from a cluster of newspapers.
11. Tran 2007.
12. The Standard 2006.
13. UNDP 2007b.
14. See Technical note 1 for a summary of various measures of corruption.
15. Lederman et al. 2001; Linz 1978; Panizza 2001.
16. Gerring and Thacker 2004; Kunikova 2005.
17. Fisman and Gatti 2002; Root 1999; Treisman 1999.
18. Fisman and Gatti 2002; Huther and Shah 1998; Knack and Azfar 2003.
19. Durlauf et al. 2005; Mauro 1995.
20. Bardhan 1997.
21. Kaufman and Wei 1999; Svensson 2003; Seligson 2002.
22. Lui 1985.
23. Acemoglu and Verdier 1998; Murphy et al. 1993.
24. Sarte 2000.
25. Barro 1990.
26. Murphy et al. 1993.
27. Li, et al. 2000.
28. Gyimah-Brempong and Gyimah-Brempong 2006.
29. Knack and Keefer 1995; Mauro 1995.
30. Mo 2001.
31. Rock and Bonnett 2004.
32. Shleifer and Vishny 1993.

33. Campos, Lien and Pradhan 1999.
34. Rock and Bonnett 2004.
35. Bardhan 1997.
36. Johnson and Mitton 2001.
37. Gampat, Sarangi and Wickramarathne 2007.
38. LankaNewspapers.com 2006. At the time of publication SLR110 = \$1.
39. Keen and Smith 2007.
40. For a survey of the empirical evidence that corruption reduces overall tax revenues, see Abed and Gupta 2002.
41. Sanyal et al. 2000.
42. Mauro 1997; Shleifer and Vishny 1993.
43. Delavallade (n.d.)
44. Akcay 2006.
45. Gupta et al. 1998.
46. Kaufmann et al. 1999.
47. Gupta et al. 2002.
48. Hunt and Laszlo 2006; Kaufmann et al. 2005.

Chapter 2

1. UNODC 2005.
2. Azfar and Gurgur 2005.
3. World Bank 2000.
4. Centre for Policy Alternatives 2007.
5. Asian Human Rights Commission 2005.
6. Olken and Barron 2007.
7. Hasan 2006.
8. Nissen 2005.
9. Bhowmik 2005.
10. At the time of publication INR 38 = \$1.
11. National Human Rights Commission n.d.
12. Jha 2003.
13. Centre for Policy Alternatives 2007.
14. Daily Times 2007.
15. Amnesty International Malaysia 2007; International Herald Tribune 2007.
16. Masud 2002.
17. Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative 2003.
18. Transparency International 2007.
19. Supreme Court of Pakistan 2007.
20. UNDP and Center for Policy and Human Development 2007.
21. The Sunday Times 2000.
22. Rajivan 2007a.
23. Khan and Khan 2003.
24. Transparency International Bangladesh 2005b.
25. Ahmad et al. n.d.

26. http://www.unodc.org/pdf/corruption/corruption_judicial_res_e.pdf
27. Jayawickrama 2007.
28. Netto 2007.
29. A television channel in India has used its media power through a sting operation to demonstrate how the legal system may have been subverted in cases concerning the rich. See Aggarwal 2007.
30. Rajivan 2007a.
31. World Bank 2001.
32. Bharuka 2005.
33. Xie 2007.

Chapter 3

1. Prevenslik-Takeda 2006.
2. Lewis 2006.
3. Ibid.
4. Lewis 2007.
5. Prevenslik-Takeda 2006.
6. Lewis 2006.
7. Azfar and Gurgur 2001; Azfar et al. 2001.
8. Azfar and Gurgur 2001.
9. Gupta et al. 2000.
10. Lewis 2006.
11. Barber, Bonnet, and Bekedam 2004.
12. BBC News 2005.
13. Campos and Pradhan 2007.
14. Wei 2007.
15. UNESCO and IIEP 2007.
16. Bennet 2000.
17. Community Information and Epidemiological Technologies 1999.
18. U4 Anti-Corruption Centre n.d.
19. Chaudhury et al. 2006.
20. Luo and Ye 2005.
21. Knack and Sanyal 2000; Mauro 1998.
22. Gupta et al. 2000.
23. Johnston 2007.
24. Banerjee and Duflo 2006.
25. Chapman 2002.
26. UNICEF Islamabad (Pakistan) 2007.
27. UNICEF Islamabad (Pakistan) 2007.
28. UNESCAP et al. 2007.
29. DFID 2002.
30. Sohail and Cavill 2007.
31. Stålgren 2006.
32. Gulati and Rao 2007.

33. The Economic Times 2007.
34. ADB 2005.
35. Sohail and Cavill 2007.
36. Wax, Emily 2007.
37. Transparency International India 2005.
38. Gulati and Rao 2007.
39. Ibid.
40. Stålgren 2006.
41. Gulati and Rao 2007.
42. Lovei and Whittington 1993.
43. Marketplace 2007.
44. Barse et al. 2000.
45. Costin 2006.
46. Sohail and Cavill 2007.
47. Steele et al. 2007.
48. ADB 2006a.
49. Davis 2004.

Chapter 4

1. Escaleras et al. 2006.
2. Le Billion 2005.
3. Le Billion 2005.
4. Le Billion 2005.
5. OECD 2005.
6. Schultz and Soreide 2006.
7. Olken 2007b.
8. Rajivan 2007c; Burra 2007.
9. Larmour and Barcham 2005.
10. UNESCAP 2001.
11. Burra 2007.
12. UNESCAP 2001.
13. Olken 2007a.
14. Burra 2007.

Chapter 5

1. World Resources Institute in collaboration with United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, and World Bank 2005.
2. Seneviratne 2007.
3. Greenpeace International 1997.
4. USAID 2005.
5. Robbins 2000.
6. Transparency International 2002.
7. Transparency International 2004.
8. Transparency International Bangladesh 2005a.
9. Viet Nam Net 2005.
10. UNDP 2004.

11. OECD 2007.
12. Shah 2004.
13. World Bank 2002.
14. OECD 2007.
15. UNDP 2006.
16. Hussain 2005.
17. FAO 2006.
18. OECD 2007.
19. Tidwell n.d.
20. Lowe 2002.
21. FAO 2003.
22. OECD 2007.
23. World Bank 2006c.
24. USAID 2004.
25. UNEP 2007.
26. Environmental Investigation Agency 2005.
27. Kinshor and Damania 2007.
28. UNEP 2003.
29. Jarvie et al. 2004.
30. Kinshor and Damania 2007.
31. OECD 2007.
32. Lin 2005.
33. WWF/TRAFFIC 2002.
34. World Bank 2005.
35. World Bank 2005.
36. World Resources Institute in collaboration with United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, and World Bank 2003.
37. World Resources Institute in collaboration with United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, and World Bank 2003.
38. Transparency International 2006c.
39. Environmental Investigation Agency/Telapak 2002.
40. Goodman and Finn 2007.
41. ADB 2006b.
42. ADB 2006b.
43. WWF n.d.
44. Goodman and Finn 2007.
45. People's Daily 2005.
46. Wade 1982.
47. UNDP 2007.
48. Briscoe 2005.
49. Kachin Development Network Group 2007.
50. Environmental Investigation Agency/Telapak 2007.
51. UNDP 2007.
52. Renner 2002.

53. Ngamcharoen 2001.
54. World Resources Institute in collaboration with United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, and World Bank 2003.
55. Dogra 2007.
56. World Bank 2006a.
57. OECD 2007.
58. Global Witness 2005.
59. Hawley 2003.
60. Harris and Rajora 2006.
61. Lin 2005.
62. TRAFFIC 2004.
63. World Bank 2007a.
25. UNDP 2005.
26. UNDP 2005.
27. UNDP 2005.
28. ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and the Pacific 2004.
29. Independent Commission Against Corruption (2004; 2007).
30. Quah 2007a.
31. Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau 2006.
32. Tan 1999.
33. Quah 2007b.
34. Dhiravegin 1978; Gonzalez and Mendoza 2004.
35. Partnership for Governance Reform 2001.
36. Transparency International 2002.
37. Stanway 2007.
38. Warwick 1987.
39. Republic of Korea 1998.
40. Government of India 2006.
41. Naidu 2006.
42. End-use exemptions are a major source of corruption for taxes on many commodities and services.
43. Hines 2005.
44. Asher 2001.
45. Aggarwal 1991.
46. These criteria were: ownership of a credit card, ownership of a house, ownership of a car, payment of an electricity bill of more than Rs. 50,000 per month, leaving the country during the year and membership of a club. The scheme was eliminated in 2006-07 (Aggarwal 1991).
47. International Tax Dialogue 2005; Keen and Smith 2007.
48. Kpundeh 1998.
49. Chan 2007.
50. Estache et al. 2000.
51. Banisar 2006.
52. International Press Institute 2006.
53. No. 22 of the 2005 Indian Right to Information Act. Cited in Mendel 2007.
54. Articles 9-12. Cited in Mendel 2007.
55. Mendel 2007.
56. Section 4 (3) and (4) of the 2005 Indian Right to Information Act. Cited in Mendel 2007.
57. Article 9 under the 2002 Federal Transparency and Access to Public Government Information Law. Cited in Mendel 2007.
58. The Freedom of Information Act 2000, section 19. Cited in Mendel 2007.

Chapter 6

1. Stanmayer 2004.
2. Elliott 2007.
3. Anti Corruption Commission 2007.
4. World Bank 2006d.
5. A questionnaire was sent to the governance focal points of 23 UNDP country offices covering 35 countries for information on anticorruption agencies and legislation, media and access to information. More information on the survey can be accessed from www.undprcc.lk.
6. ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and the Pacific 2004.
7. Quah 2007a.
8. Republic of Singapore 1994.
9. ICAC 1989.
10. Quah 2007a.
11. http://cvc.nic.in/cvc_back.htm
12. Quah 2007a.
13. Section 8 Anti-Corruption Act of 1997. Cited in Quah 2007a.
14. <http://www.paclii.org/pg/OC/main.htm>
15. Transparency International 2003.
16. Quah 2007a.
17. Office of the Ombudsman Republic of the Philippines n.d.
18. Quah 2007a.
19. Upadhyay 2002.
20. Korea Independent Commission Against Corruption 2006.
21. Quah 2007a.
22. UNDP 2005.
23. Commission Against Corruption 2006.
24. Davidsen et al. 2006.

59. Section 24(1) of the 2005 Indian Right to Information Act. Cited in Mendel 2007.
60. The 1999 Law Concerning Access to Information Held by Administrative Organs – Article 5. Cited in Mendel 2007.
61. Section 15(2) and 15(3) of the 1997 Thai Official Information Act. Cited in Mendel 2007.
62. Section 8(2) of the 2005 Indian Right to Information Act and Article 7 of the 1999 Law Concerning Access to Information Held by Administrative Organs. Cited in Mendel 2007.
63. Section 17 of Article XI of the 1987 Constitution.
64. Section 8 of Republic Act No. 6713 on standards for public officials. Cited in Mendel 2007.
65. Bharuka 2005.
66. Central Vigilance Commission n.d.
67. Choi and Moon-Suk 2001.
68. Bhatnagar and Chawla 2001.
69. ADB/OECD 2006b.
70. Control Risks Group Limited and Simmons & Simmons 2006.
71. UNGC (United Nations Global Compact) n.d.
72. Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering n.d.
73. World Bank and UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime) 2007.
74. World Bank and UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime) 2007.
75. In 2000, two countries, Australia and the Republic of Korea, are in both the OECD and Asia Pacific. Diamond and Diamond 2002; Hines and Rice 1994; OECD n.d.(a); OECD n.d.(b).
76. Capgemini and Merrill Lynch 2006.
77. EIA 2007.
78. World Bank and UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime) 2007.
8. Coronel 2007.
9. Coronel 2007.
10. Kristof 2005.
11. Giridharadas 2007.
12. Sen 1999.
13. Coronel 2002.
14. See the 2007 case of Uma Khurana in India.
15. Perry 2002.
16. Coronel 2002.
17. Khadka 2007.
18. Keaeke 2003.
19. USAID 2006.
20. Development Gateway Foundation 2004.
21. For example, six attempts of judicial review have been submitted to the Constitutional Court challenging the authority of KPK.
22. A senior Government official once attributed the slow process of development in one region of the country to efforts to eradicate corruption.
23. Deliberation of draft laws initiated by the public, such as those concerning Freedom for Public Information and establishment of an ombudsman's office, has been delayed since 2000.
24. Slim 2002.
25. Stephens and Tazi 2006.
26. Pongsapich n.d.
27. Fox 2000; Transparency International 2000a.
28. Wilson 1973.
29. ADB/OECD 2006a.
30. Transparency International 2000b.
31. Ramkumar and Krafchik 2005.
32. Dharmaraj 2007.
33. ADB/OECD 2000.
34. Korean Educational Development Institute 2003.
35. Andersson et al. 2005.

Chapter 7

1. BBC News 2001.
2. Taylor 2005.
3. Coronel 2007.
4. Brunetti and Weder 2003.
5. Ferdinand 2003.
6. Ferdinand 2003.
7. Struck 2000.

Chapter 8

1. The idea of a 'sandwich' situation in public policy – a combination of pressure from above through political will, retained over time through public expectations from below – has been discussed earlier in the context of combating hunger and reducing malnutrition.
2. Developing countries here refer to UNDP programme countries.