CORRUPTION IN THE PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS OF PAKISTAN: PERCEPTUAL VIEWS OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Fiaz Hussain¹ Adnan Riaz²

Abstract

Corruption is such a variable that is hard to measure and it is equally difficult to quantify. Therefore, a worldwide practice is to assess the perception of corruption among people. Applying the same approach, this study analyzes the extent, location and seriousness of corruption in Pakistan and finds out causes of corruption and lastlu assesses appropriateness of different anticorruption strategies. The study is based on descriptivesurvey type research. It assesses the level of perception of corruption among university students. The students perceive that the incumbents of political government are not exhibiting any political will to combat from corruption public organizations. Majority of the students have close experience of corruption. They perceive the weak accountability mechanism is the major cause of corruption in government departments and consider that education curriculum should place more emphasis on moral values to bring behavioural change against corruption.

Key words: Corruption, Corruption Perception, Anti-Corruption, Corruption Survey, Pakistan

INTRODUCTION

Corruption is as old as human civilization and is worldwide. But this issue has got huge attraction among both academics and policy makers particularly over the last decade. Now the menace of corruption is considered a pervasive and universal phenomenon. It exists in both advanced as well as in poor countries, in public and private sectors, and even in the non-profit and charitable organisations (Myint, 2000). Similarly, corruption scandals across the globe have also highlighted the gravity of the issue. Governments have been charged with massive corruption and sometimes toppled; politicians and bureaucrats have been accused of their

involvement in corruption scandals. The public sector corruption is also considered to be the major obstacle in the process of economic development process of a country especially developing countries.

Corruption represents a major hurdle on the road to good governance. There are several manifestations of the corruption facing the government circles in Pakistan viz bribery, embezzlement, fraud, extortion, favouritism, and nepotism. Over the years, governance indicators paint the same gloomy picture of Pakistan and corruption is one of them which is perceived to be pervasive and ingrained both at society and government levels. Not a single tier of government (local, provincial and federal) is exempted from this menace of corruption. Pakistan has consistently been grouped with the corrupt countries of world. According to the World Bank estimates of 1998, corruption in Pakistan was close to 10% of GDP (Khan et al, 2004). The Corruption Perception Index (CPI) of Transparency International consistently positions Pakistan among the lowest strata (Table 1).

In Pakistan, various legal and institutional mechanisms are in place to check the growth of corruption. Parliament is empowered to check each and every penny being spent on any areas mentioned in the budget. Public Accounts Committee of the National Assembly, lower house of Parliament, in particular and the standing committees are also robust organs of public accountability. Besides parliamentary oversight, there are many legal anti-corruption instruments on the statute book for example: Pakistan Penal Code, 1860, Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947, Public Representatives (Disgualification) Act, 1949, Elected Bodies (Disqualification) Ordinance, 1959, Anti-Corruption Establishment Act, Investigation Agency Act, Ehtesab Act and the National Accountability Ordinance 1999. To enforce these legislative measures, a number of Anti Corruption Agencies were raised from time to time. Pakistan inherited the Special Police Establishment, replaced later on by the Federal Agency. Anti-Corruption Investigation Establishments exist in each province. At the federal level, Federal Investigation Agency came into existence in 1975. Ehtesab Commission was established in 1996. The Ehtesab Bureau

¹ Commonwealth MPA Programme Scholar, Allama Iqbal Open University Islamabad. E-mail: fiazkazmi@yahoo.com.

² Lecturer for COL MBA/MPA Programme, Allama Iqbal Open University Islamabad. E-mail: adnan_riaz@aiou.edu.pk

supplemented its functions as the former was entrusted with the task of investigation whereas the latter undertook prosecutions. National Accountability Bureau (NAB) came into being in 1999 and first time an anti-corruption agency was empowered to combat corruption through a holistic approach of encompassing awareness, prevention and enforcement tools. In addition to these anti-corruption agencies, accountability bodies also exist to check the menace of corruption. These bodies, Public Accounts Committee (PAC) as mentioned earlier, Auditor General's (AG) Department, and the office of Ombudsman have also been tasked eliminating corruption at macro level and perform a crucial role in ensuring environment of robust public accountability by addressing the concerns of the public.

The motivation of this study derives from the widespread factors witnessed during the recent course of history. For example the factors like impasse on proposed 'Holders of Public Offices (Accountability) bill', 34th position Corruption Perception Index (CPI) 2010 released by the Transparency International, donor fatigue witnessed during recent devastated water floods in Pakistan on the pretext of alleged corruption during aids for earthquake affecttees 2005, much maligned National Reconciliation Ordinance (NRO) and its beneficiaries and the concern shown by the judiciary and the civil society on the issue of corruption, 'corruption' the most problematic factor for doing business in Pakistan as declared by the Competitiveness Report 2010-11 released by World Economic Forum, Switzerland are some of the motivating factors behind conducting this study. The issue is exceedingly important and relevant to the current socio-political environ, so it was considered appropriate to measure the perception of the students, the knowledgeable strata of the society, about various facets of corruption and efficacy of various anticorruption strategies. Likewise, corruption being a white-collar crime exerts difficulty in its measuring and it is equally difficult to quantify it. Therefore, a worldwide practice is to assess the perception of corruption among the public and in this way, level of prevailing corruption in the government departments is gauged.

An attempt has been made to collect primary data on corruption perception among university students pursuing their academic degrees in capital territory of Islamabad. The underlying objectives of the study are to analyze the extent, location and seriousness of corruption in Pakistan; to find out causes of corruption; and lastly to evaluate different anticorruption strategies. This study will, hopefully, urge the government and policy makers to revisit and redesign their governmental priorities. It will also counsel them to focus on the areas where reforms are necessary to curb the corruption in the government circles.

This research work is planned as: Section II reviews the relevant literature, Section III presents the research methodology, Section IV consists of the findings, and lastly Section V gives conclusion and policy implications.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining corruption is important because without having deep insight of the topic, it may not be possible to develop anti-corruption strategies. Keeping in view different aspects of corruption including moral, social, political and economic, writers, scholars, intellectuals and different organizations have produced definitions of corruption. But the most widely used definition is that corruption is the abuse of public power for private or personal benefits or gains (Melgar et al, 2009, Haarhuis & Leeuw, Virtually all corruption 2004, NACS, 2002). perception indices like Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index published for its Global Competitiveness Reports, International Country Risk Group (ICRG) index by Political Risk Services Group, and World Governance Indicators prepared by the World Bank use the same definition an abuse of public office for private benefit. These all indices reveal the behaviour of all public office holders including government officials and politicians. Though these indices theoretically define corruption in a similar way, yet there is no guarantee that the rankings they produce are consistent (Ahmed, 2001). Similarly, Khan (1996) defines corruption as behavioural deviation from the formal rules of conduct that governs the actions of public office holders.

Andvig *et al* (2001) explain some major forms of corruption which are bribery, embezzlement, extortion and fraud. Though these concepts might have common characteristics still they can make clear the varieties of corruption. 'Bribery' is some kind of payment given to public officials in the form of money or kind in exchange of some favour. 'Embezzlement' is some kind of theft of resources committed

by public officials while administering the institutional resources. 'Fraud' is considered an economic crime committed by usually middle man like public officials working between state politicians and citizens. 'Extortion' is defined as when money or other precious items are taken with the sheer use of coercion, violence or the threats to use force. Both blackmailing and extortion are labeled as corrupt transactions where money is extracted with the use of power. 'Favouritism' is the biased use of state resources. The distribution of resources is carried out illegally favouring friends, family and other trusted ones. Some people get preferential treatment from public officials who violate the rules, regulations or standard procedures. 'Nepotism' is a kind of favouritism in which a government official gives preference to his family members or kinfolk over others. The literature also classifies corruption as grand corruption and petty corruption (Lambsdorff, 2004). The corruption related to export and import permits, public utilities, annual tax payments, public contracts, loan applications, laws and policies, and judicial decisions is labeled as "Petty corruption". While corruption connected with legal political donations, public trust in politicians and bureaucratic red tape is named as "Grand corruption".

There are multiple causes of corruption and some of them are more dominant than the others. The major causes of corruption specific to Pakistan as highlighted by National Accountability Bureau (NAB) in its Annual Report 2007 are systematic, governance, political, corporate and need & greed based causes. Besides these causes, National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2002, a governance reform project approved by the Federal Cabinet and the Transparency International's National Corruption Perception Survey 2006 pinpoint some main causes of corruption in Pakistan viz weak internal accountability mechanism; discretionary powers of public office holders and their blatant abuse; poor oversight mechanism; absence of suitable moral and business standards for both public and private sectors; incompetent, self-interested and untrustworthy political leaders; transparency in the government's decision making processes; lengthy and cumbersome administrative procedures; weaknesses in the judicial system; illiterate, indifferent masses

with inadequate judgment of political choices; power of powerful people; and low wages/compensation.

Corruption is a variable that is considered difficult to be measured directly. However, some kind of measurement or standard is required when making appropriate comparison corruption across countries. However, in the recent past, numerous organizations and researchers have constructed perception-based corruption indices. Such perceived indices are based on the subjective evaluations of experts or survey respondents of how widespread or costly corruption is in particular countries. These indices have been used frequently in many econometric studies. The major and famous indices are: Business International Corporation's corruption index, CPI of Transparency International; Global Competitiveness Index published World Economic Forum in its Global Competitiveness Reports, ICRG corruption index, and World Bank's World Governance Indicators.

Lambsdorff (1999) view that the data available on corruption in various countries is largely perception-based which is subjective in assessment and considers this perception-based data a useful indicator to measure the actual level of corruption. It helps researchers to apply statistical tools with other macroeconomic, political or social data. Similarly, Mocan (2008) justifies the perception-based measurement of corruption because the real level of corruption in a country is difficult to examine. He develops an aggregate (country level) corruption index based on the information supplied by more than 90,000 individuals in the data-set comprised of 49 countries. By doing so, he constructed a direct measure of corruption, which reveals the extent of bribery as exposed by individuals who reside in those countries. This measure is proven to be highly correlated with other commonly used corruption perception indices. Ahmed (2001) examines four different corruption indices (WCR 1990, 92, 94, 96, TI 95-98, ICRG 82-95 and WB 96) and opines that these corruption indices produce similar results and their results also show consistency over time. He used Rank Co-efficient Correlation for categorizing countries and then subsequently regress their indices on the same set of in different variables taken from known sources for a common set of countries. The results reveal that these indices are correlated among each other and exhibit stability over time.

Melgar et al (2009) view that both individual characteristics (age, gender, marital status, number of children, religion & religiosity) and country characteristics (Income Inequality, GDP per capita) shape corruption perception. Perception of corruption at public sector is highly correlated with that of private sector. Their data set comprised of 78 countries with more than 57,000 observations. Similarly, Davis and Ruhe (2003) examine the association between perception of a country's perceived corruption and its cultural characteristics. They argue that individual's, organizational and governmental perceptions of a country corruption are linked with their perceptions of that country's cultural characteristics. Cabelkova (2001) examines the incentives to take corrupt actions and he considers that this phenomenon is affected by the level of corruption as perceived by the individual and the level of tolerance as exhibited by the concerned authority.

These perception-based indices have some limitations and may not be appropriate and suitable for many research projects. First, they are ill-equipped to quantify the corruption and with this shortcoming they make it difficult to work out the relation between perceptions and specific cardinal dimensions of corruption. Second, perceptions and actual level of corruption are two different things. This perception may be driven by factors such as racial or religious prejudices, pre-conceived concepts or past events. In order to fix these limitations, alternative data collection methods have been constructed by individual researchers information that record about phenomenon of corrupt practices in addition to perceptions (Foster et al, 2009). Besides this, these perception based indices have been facing many challenges and their significance for developing countries is also being questioned. There is seldom consensus on the meaning of the term corruption as the case with CPI, ratio between the different scores has no significance and is not constant, individual perception about hidden activities is biased, and public generally misinterpret the rankings (Soreide, 2006).

Besides, perception-based measurements on the pervasiveness of corruption, several researchers have put their hands on the actual measurement of the level of corruption. Dreher *et al* (2004) develop the index of measuring corruption and economic loss because of corruption. Their index is cardinal in nature as opposed to many other indices worldly used to assess the pervasiveness

of corruption which are ordinal in nature. They constructed a cardinal index of corruption comprising of data-set of approximately 100 countries. With the help of this they measure the economic losses due to corruption as percentage of GDP per capita. Foster *et al* (2009) use axiomatic measurement approach, primarily developed for measuring poverty and inequality, applied to the measurement of corruption. With this approach, they empirically estimate several aggregate corruption measures during the year of 2000 with a sample size of 25 countries. Empirical results show that there is difference between perception indices and actual corrupt acts.

With the limitations, these perception-based indices are being used worldwide and reveal the level of corruption. To curb governmental corruption in countries, International regimes like the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), ADB/ OECD Anticorruption Initiatives for Asia and the Pacific organizations and international International Association of Anti Corruption Authorities (IAACA), OIC Anti-corruption & Enhancing Integrity Forum, World Bank Institute and UNODC all have designed anticorruption strategies. Ades and Di Tella (1997) explains three types of policy approaches aimed at fighting corruption viz the lawyer's approach recommends new tougher laws and tougher enforcement of existing laws; the businessman's approach advocates paying higher wages and other compensations to bureaucrats, economists propose increasing the level of competition in the economy, both among firms and bureaucrats.

Haarhuis & Leeuw (2004) analyze the effectiveness of World Bank's anticorruption programme. The programme integrates both top-down and bottom-up approaches. The former devise administrative and judicial reforms, while the latter deal with the process of awareness. He concludes that indicators need to be developed to assess the relevance of national anti-corruption policies to country specific governance and anti-corruption conditions. National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2002 of Pakistan also emphasized the comprehensive approach to combat corruption through a threepronged strategy; enforcement, prevention and awareness. But the strong theoretical framework and actionable points do not have the statistical support to validate their efficacy.

This study has presented the perception of

university students on various facets of corruption. The novelty of this research is that it has included a direct question about personal experience of corruption and students' opinion on various anti-corruption strategies was also elicited.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was based on a descriptive-survey type research. The population was consisted of the entire university student community that is pursuing their academic degrees in various disciplines in the universities located in the Islamabad capital territory. Sample size was 125 university students. The simple random sampling technique was applied in the study to select the universities from the capital territory Islamabad and subsequently respondents from the universities. A structured questionnaire having close ended questions was used as data collection instrument. LIKERT scale was employed where-ever applicable. Structured and close ended questionnaires are cost-effective and less time consuming. Therefore, the same were used for data collection.3

The majority of the respondents, 110 out of 125, returned the filled questionnaires. Therefore, the response rate was 88%. Among the returned questionnaires, 10 were not properly filled and therefore rejected for further processing of data analysis. While the remaining 100 questionnaires were analyzed this became 80% of the total sample size. Detailed data profile of the respondents is at Table 2.

For analysis of the collected data, electronic data processing tools like MS Excel was employed. The simple percentages, means and frequencies were calculated to get the results. While the effectiveness of anti-corruption strategies was studied using the students' perception on Likert scale with 1 being effective and 4 being least effective. Using the weighted

$$\text{mean} \quad \overline{X}_w = \sum_{i=1}^4 w_i X_i \, / \sum_{i=1}^4 w_i \quad \text{,} \quad \text{the} \quad \text{anti-}$$

corruption strategies were ranked, where w_i is the ith weight (1 to 4) and X_i is the number of respondents giving ith weight to a strategy. The median of the weighted mean value 30.30 was also calculated while considering the most

preferred anti-corruption strategy "Education curriculum placing more emphasis on moral values" with the weighted mean 30.50 as the standard. There is very small variance among the anti-corruption strategies as the strategy at the bottom of the list received 84.2% value (Table 3).

FINDINGS

The findings of the survey reveal that more than half of the respondents (52%) had the personal experience of corruption. For that matter, students were asked if they had personally faced corruption during the past years or has any government official asked you or your relative or your friend to pay a bribe for his service?

In terms of the seriousness of the problem as interpreted by the students, the majority opinion (52%) was that corruption is one of the serious problems confronting Pakistan and 41% respondents consider corruption as the most serious problem. The results reveal that there is broad consensus and acknowledgment from the student community that corruption is a serious Almost two-third problem. respondents considered the civilian governments as the most compared corrupt as to the military governments. The 67% respondents believed that the current government is more corrupt than the previous one. The students recognize that corruption is the sole purview of the public sector. That's why the focus of national and international endeavours to eradicate it is on the public sector. Majority of respondents, 73%, believed corruption was more prominent in governmental circles and 24% believed that the level of corruption in both sectors (public & private) was the same. According to 36% respondents' perception, police is the most corrupt sector of government. Whereas 29% perceived Parliament, 12% Defence, 10% Judiciary, 9% Taxation and very small portion 4% and 1% Railway and Public Works respectively as the most corrupt sectors of the Government.

The respondents were asked which factor is the most responsible for corruption in the government departments. According to their perception "weak accountability mechanism" is the most responsible factor (31%) of corruption in government departments. Whereas 20% and 13% of the respondents considered the "low wages" and "political interference" respectively as the major causes of corruption. The National Corruption Perception Survey 2010 conducted

³ The Survey was carried out in the last two months previous year (Nov.-Dec 2010).

by TI, Pakistan also found the "weak accountability mechanism" as the most important cause of corruption in government departments.

Considering the corruption as most serious problem, students were asked how they rate the performance of current government in dealing with the matter of corruption. Similarly, the students were also asked how committed they thought the government was to fight corruption. More than a half (58%) of the students believed that the current government was handling the fight against corruption not at all well. Only 5% showed their satisfaction about the government handling the matter of corruption. More than three-fourth (85%) of the respondents perceived that the current government was not at all or not very committed to fighting corruption. Only 9% of the respondents felt that the government was committed or very committed to fight corruption. These results abundantly cleared the level of political will in fighting corruption

Only 7% respondents show their satisfaction on the performance of National Accountability Bureau, the apex federal anti-corruption agency of Pakistan, in curbing the corruption in Pakistan while 41% respondents are partially satisfactory with the performance of NAB. Almost three-fourth of the respondents (72%) believes that the accountability should be across the board with no exemption for any institution. While the effectiveness of anti-corruption strategies has been studied using the students' perception in the matter. Students considered the most preferred anti-corruption strategy to "Education curriculum placing more emphasis on moral values" with the weighted mean 30.50 other anticorruption strategies got weightage as "Corruption Free-service - a fundamental guaranteed right Constitution" (32.90), "Greater internal financial controls and internal audits of government spending" (31.50),"Religious community placing greater emphasis on promoting moral values in everyday life" (31.40), "A holistic approach encompassing awareness, prevention and enforcement in fighting corruption" (31.00), "Special accountability courts" (31.00),"Disclosure by civil servants and politicians of their income and assets" (31.00), "Greater access to government information" (30.90), "More to resources investigate and prosecute corruption cases" (30.80), "Increase salaries of government employees" (30.80),"Greater transparency of political party finances" (30.40), "Investigative journalism" (30.30), "A national anti-corruption hotline" (30.20), "Increased commitment by political leadership to fight corruption" (30.10), "Greater transparency of tendering/procurement government procedures" (30.00), "Harsher sentences for corruption (29.80), Bar corrupt officials from holding public office" (29.70), "Blacklisting businesses /NGOs proved to be involved in corruption" (29.70), "A public awareness campaign to sensitize the general public about the evils of corruption" (29.60), "Rationalization discretionary powers" (29.20), "Legal protection for whistleblowers" (29.10), "Codes of conduct to promote professional ethics in government" (28.70), "A single independent anti-corruption agency" (28.20).

Since there was very small variance among the anti-corruption strategies as they are viewed by the students. Therefore, they were not grouped separately into effective and not effective strategies. Rather they were all considered as effective anti-corruption strategies which can be used to fight corruption.

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

While addressing the Constituent Assembly on August, 1947, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the Father of Nation, categorically called bribery and corruption a poison which must be put down with an iron hand. Since then many legal instruments, institutional mechanisms, specialized anticorruption organizations are tried, but the establishment of a corruption free society is still a dream. Many reasons may be attributed to such state of affairs, but of prime concern is weak accountability mechanism prone to political interferences, shallow political will, un-sustainability of anticorruption drives, unpredictability of the institutions, cumbersome procedures, lack of capacity of the anti-corruption agencies and inappropriate anticorruption strategies.

The university students' perception of corruption prevailing in the government circles is considerably high and majority has personal experience of corruption. This high level of perception about widespread corruption in the government departments now cannot be attributed to the result of excessive cynicism. This perception merits consideration for the policy makers to bring the issue on national agenda for reforms.

As respondents perceived police to be the most corrupt sector of government, so it was expected,

as Police also remains the most corrupt sector in the National Corruption Perception Surveys (NCPS) 2002, 2006, 2009 and 2010 conducted by Transparency International (TI), Pakistan. This consistency in the results implies that the Police department has lost the trust of the general public. But it is also argued that those who are initially labeled "deviant", according to Social Labeling Theory, predictably act as deviant. In the beginning, this label isolates them from their groups and society, and subsequently such isolation debars them to access legitimate means of earnings. Consequently, not having access to the legitimate resources they are pushed to get resources from illegitimate means. Thus, this label compels them to step on the path of deviance and it begets a new behavioural design among them (Warren and Laufer, 2010). These results imply that government should introduce some structural reforms in police department and honestly show some political will to wash this stigma on face of this public institution.

The results also show the deficiency of strong political will in tackling the issue of corruption majority of respondents showed dissatisfaction over the current political government. If policy is about government's action or in-action on an issue, then the current government's apathy on fighting corruption could be called its policy. Anti-corruption literature emphasizes on the significance of political will as demonstrated by the political leadership for fighting corruption. Political will is considered to be the foremost thing in planning and initiating any meaningful attempt against corruption (Kpundeh 1999).

The indicators like inordinate delay in the enactment of the proposed 'the Holder of Public Office (Accountability) Act, 2009, red-tapism on recommendations of the National Commission on Government Reforms (NCGR), resource constraint anticorruption agency i.e NAB, abandoning the National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2002, mega corruption scams (e.g Hajj scam, National Insurance Corporation Ltd scam) are the tip of the iceberg. Corruption is pervasive and it has been eating up the resources of the country. Foreign investors are shy away in investing because of the pervasiveness of corruption. Government's socalled pro-investor policy will not yield results unless transparency and accountability of government departments are not ensured.

LIMITATIONS

This is a perception-based study and may not be confused with actual incidence of corruption in Pakistan. Views expressed by respondents say something about reality, but must not be confused with it. The results need to be interpreted with caution. Information gathered from students has to be seen in its proper context. Despite the limitations of the study, the information obtained may be of some use by adding to the knowledge and contributing to the picture of the corruption in Pakistan. It presents some kind of informed reflections.

References

Ades, A. and Di Tella, R. (1997). The New Economics of Corruption: a Survey and Some New Results. Political Studies, 45: 496–515. doi: 10.1111/1467-9248.00093

Andvig, Jens Chr. Fjeldstad, Odd-Helge, Amundsen, Inge, Sissener,Tone and Soreide, Tina. (2001). Corruption: A Review of Contemporary Research. Chr. Michelson Institute Development Studies and Human Rights. Retrieved from http//www.cmi. no.

Ahmed, Naved. (2001).Corruption Perception Indices: A Comparative Analysis. *The* Pakistan Development Review, 40 (4), 813-830.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. (2000). Assessing Political Will for Anticorruption Efforts: An Analytical Framework. *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 20. pp. 239-252.

Cabelkova. I. (2001). Perception of Corruption in Ukraine: Are they correct? CERGEEI, Working Paper 176.

Davis, J.H., Ruhe, J.A. (2003). Perceptions of country corruption: antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.43, pp. 275-288.

Dreher Axel & Christos Kotsogiannis & Steve McCorriston. (2004). Corruption around the World: Evidence from a Structural Model. Public Economics 0406004, EconWPA. Retrieved from http://ideas.repec.org/f/pko309.html.

James E. Foster, Andrew W. Horowitz and Fabio Méndez. (2009). An Axiomatic Approach to the Measurement of Corruption: Theory and Applications. OPHI Working Papers No. 29, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.

- Khan, Mushtaq H. (1996). A Typology of Corrupt Transactions in Developing Countries. *IDS Bulletin*, 27(2).
- Khan, M. Kakakhel, N. & Dubnick, M. (2004).

 Prosecuting Corruption: The Case of
 Pakistan. Working Paper for the Ethics
 Forum held by the American Society
 for Public Administration, Portland.
 [Online], Available from
 http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/

http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/APCITY/UNPAN019 113.pdf, [Accessed on 5 June 2010).

- Klein Haarhuis, C.M., Leeuw, F.L. (2004). Fighting government corruption: the new World Bank programme evaluated. *Journal of International Development*, pp. 547-562.
- Kpundeh, Sahr J. (1999). Political Will in Fighting Corruption. Corruption & Integrity Improvement Initiatives in Developing Countries. UNDP: New York, pp. 91- 110.
- Lambsdorff, Johann Graf. (1999). Corruption in Empirical Research - A Review. Transparency International Working Paper.

Investors Prefer Grand Corruption!
Diskussionsbeitrag Nr. V-31-05,
Volkswirtschaftliche Reihe ISSN 14353520.

- Mocan, Naci. (2008). What determines corruption? International Evidence from Microdata. Economic Inquiry, 46 (4), 493–510.
- National Accountability Bureau (NAB) Annual Report 2007.
- Melgar, Natalia, & Piani, Giorgina & Rossi, Máximo. (2009), Are there differences between perception of corruption at public and private sector? A multicountry analysis. Document No. 01/09
- Myint, U. (2000) Corruption: Causes, Consequences and Cures, *Asia-Pacific Development Journal*,7(2).
- National Accountability Bureau (NAB), Annual Report 2007.
- National Anti-Corruption Strategy (2002), National Accountability Bureau, Islamabad. Government of Pakistan.
- National Corruption Perception Survey (2010).

 Transparency International (TI)
 Pakistan. Retrieved from
 http://www.transparency.org.pk..
- Soreide, Tina. (2006). Is it wrong to rank? A critical assessment of corruption indices. CMI Working Paper.
- Warren, Danielle E. and Laufer, William S. (2009). Are Corruption Indices a Self-Fulfilling Prophecy? A Social Labeling Perspective of Corruption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, pp. 88:841–849.

Table 1: Historical Trend of CPI Rating of Pakistan

Year	Score (10= highly clean and 0= highly corrupt)	Rank
1995	2.25/10	39/41
1996	1.0/10	53/54
1997	2.53/10	48/52
1998	2.7/10	71/85
1999	2.2/10	88/99
2000	NA	NA
2001	2.3/10	79/91
2002	2.6/10	77/102
2003	2.5/10	92/133
2004	2.1/10	129/145
2005	2.1/10	144/159
2006	2.1/10	142/163
2007	2.4/10	138/179
2008	2.5/10	134/180
2009	2.9/10	139/180
2010	2.3/10	143/178

Source: Transparency International

Table 2: Respondents' Profile

Description	Frequency	%age
Gender		
Male	83	83%
Female	17	17%
Marital Status		
Single	88	88%
Married	9	9%
Others	3	3%
Age Group		
Less than 20 years	2	2%
20-30	90	90%
30-40	8	8%
Education Status		
Bachelors	9	9%
Honours	3	3%
Masters	55	55%
MS/M.Phil	33	33%
Permanent Residence		
Islamabad	16	16%
Punjab	45	45%
Sindh	8	8%
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa	13	13%
Baluchistan	8	8%
Federal Administered Tribal Area	3	3%
Gilgit-Baltistan	2	2%
Azad Jammu & Kashmir	5	5%

Table 3: Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of a range of anti-corruption strategies

Sr.#	Proposals	Weighted Means	Standardized
1	Education curriculum placing more emphasis on moral values	33.50	100
2	Corruption Free-service' – a fundamental right guaranteed in the Constitution	32.90	98.20896
3	Greater internal financial controls and internal audits of government spending	31.50	94.02985
4	Religious community placing greater emphasis on promoting moral values in everyday life	31.40	93.73134

70

5	A holistic approach encompassing awareness, prevention and enforcement in fighting corruption	31.00	92.53731
6	Special accountability courts	31.00	92.53731
7	Disclosure by civil servants and politicians of their income and assets	31.00	92.53731
8	greater access to government information	30.90	92.23881
9	More resources to investigate and prosecute corruption cases	30.80	91.9403
10	Increase salaries of government employees	30.80	91.9403
11	Greater transparency of political party finances	30.40	90.74627
12	Investigative journalism	30.30	90.44776
13	a national anti-corruption hotline	30.20	90.14925
14	Increased commitment by political leadership to fight corruption	30.10	89.85075
15	Greater transparency of government tendering / procurement procedures	30.00	89.55224
16	Harsher sentences for corruption	29.80	88.95522
17	Bar corrupt officials from holding public office	29.70	88.65672
18	Blacklisting businesses / NGOs proved to be involved in corruption	29.70	88.65672
19	A public awareness campaign to sensitize the general public about the evils of corruption	29.60	88.35821
20	Rationalization of discretionary powers	29.20	87.16418
21	Legal protection for whistleblowers	29.10	86.86567
22	Codes of conduct to promote professional ethics in government	28.70	85.67164
23	A single independent anti-corruption agency	28.20	84.1791