

**University of Washington**  
**Daniel J. Evans School of Public Policy and Governance**

**Diagnosing and Reforming Corrupt Systems**  
PUBPOL537A Topics in International Affairs, Winter 2017  
Tuesdays: 9:30am-12:20pm

Professor Scott Fritzen  
322 Parrington  
(206) 348-3356 (mobile)  
sfritzen@uw.edu  
Office hours: Wednesdays 2-4 pm\* and by appointment  
\* Please use google doc signup sheet

*“No matter which syndrome of corruption reformers confront, at some point they must assess the scope and trends of corruption problems and estimate the effects of their reforms. As a practical matter, they must show political backers, officials, citizens, business people, and potential wrongdoers that reform is for real. They also need sound evidence to decide which problems to attack, in what specific parts of government, using what tactics. Further, if corruption control is to be sustained by citizens defending their own interests, the links between reform and the problems of daily life must become more than an abstraction. If those connections are not clear, collective-action problems and low levels of trust will likely inhibit reform. For all of those reasons, those seeking to check corruption need valid and reliable measures of corruption vulnerabilities and the effects of reform.”*

*Johnston, Michael. Corruption, Contention, and Reform: The Power of Deep Democratization  
Cambridge University Press.*

**Overview:**

Corruption – one of the greatest obstacles to social, economic, and political development around the world – has become a focal point for efforts to improve public sector performance. This course explores strategies for the effective prevention and mitigation of corruption across a range of organizational, sector-wide, city, and national contexts. It takes an action-oriented approach, drawing lessons from successful cases of corruption control and focusing on what approaches might be undertaken under different circumstances. It aims to meld analytical and managerial dimensions of the problem into effective diagnosis and action.

**Learning objectives:**

Through the course, students will develop their ability to:

- Break down the concept and practice of ‘corruption’ into various meaningful types and categories;
- Diagnose corruption risks and pathologies using a variety of conceptual tools, including economic, institutional and political analysis;
- Identify and assess possibilities for combating corruption using a variety of approaches, including enforcement, prevention, and public education and involvement; and

- Develop action-oriented strategies for successfully implementing anti-corruption strategies in specific organizational, sectoral or national contexts.

**Assessment:**

The assignments are directly targeted on the learning objectives of the course, and comprise the following:

- Discussion forum posts (45% of grade): Weekly short posts to the discussion forum, each about one page in length (about 500 words), responding to discussion question(s) posted for the week in question. You should ensure you post at least 6 of these 10 weeks. The posts are always due on the Monday before class, 12 noon (so I have time to read and incorporate them into our class discussion). Late work is not accepted. See “guidelines on discussion forum posts”, to be posted as a page in Canvas.
- Research project (40% of grade): The class will be divided into small groups that will write and present an analysis on the anti-corruption performance of one of several case study countries in the course: probable countries include Brazil, Russia, China, India, Nigeria and Indonesia. Of the 40% of the overall grade represented by the research project, 20% will be assessed based on the quality of each student’s 1,500-2,000-word individual written contribution to the group report, and 20% on the group’s overall report and presentation. See “guidelines on research paper”, to be posted as a page in Canvas.
- Class participation (15% of grade): Active participation in class is a significant contributor to your learning, and has implications for the learning of everyone else in the class too. While at a minimum I expect everyone to come to class prepared to share their perspectives on the course materials, I recognize that different students will have different ways of sharing their insights and engaging with the course material, and thus participation will here be assessed in several ways:
  - Assessment of your participation by the instructor;
  - Questionnaires distributed at the end of the quarter allowing you to identify fellow students who particularly contributed to your own learning, separately for your research teams and for the class as a whole.
  - Class attendance, which is mandatory in both class and section discussions, unless by previous arrangement.
  - Your brief written responses on 3x5 index cards to a question I pose at the end of some classes (which will require a reflective response rather than testing specific factual knowledge). These will be collected but not graded separately, in a formal way; rather, they will form part of your class participation record for assessment at the end of the quarter.

**GRADING CRITERIA**

This statement, taken from the student handbook, describes the guidelines for numerical grades for courses taken in the Evans School.

4.0	Excellent and exceptional work for a graduate student. Work at this level is unusually thorough, methodologically sophisticated, and well-written. Work is of good professional
-----	---

	quality, shows an incisive understanding of the major policy and management issues, and demonstrates a clear recognition and mastery of the appropriate analytical approaches to address the problems and questions.
3.7	Strong work for a graduate student. Work at this level shows signs of creativity and is thorough and well reasoned. It indicates a strong understanding of appropriate methodological or analytical approaches, and demonstrates a clear recognition and good understanding of the salient policy and management issues and problems.
3.4	Competent and sound graduate student work. Work is well reasoned and thorough and methodologically and analytically sound, but is not especially creative or insightful, nor technologically or analytically sophisticated. It shows adequate understanding of the policy and management issues and problems, although that understanding may be somewhat incomplete. This grade indicates neither unusual strengths nor exceptional weaknesses.
3.2	Adequate graduate student work. Basically competent performance, although the work shows some weaknesses. Work is moderately thorough and well reasoned, but there is some indication that the understanding of important policy or management issues is less than complete. It may also be inadequate in other ways, such as quality of reasoning, writing, or incomplete analysis. Methodological or analytical approaches are generally adequate but have one or more weaknesses or limitations.
3.0	Borderline graduate student work. This work barely meets the minimal expectations for a graduate student in the course. The understanding of basic policy or management issues is incomplete and the methodological or analytical work performed is minimally adequate. The writing and reasoning barely qualify for professional quality work. Overall performance, if consistent in graduate courses, would barely suffice to sustain graduate status in good standing and does not reflect long-term professional quality work.
2.6	Deficient graduate work. This work does not meet the minimal expectations for a graduate student in the course. Work is inadequately developed and flawed by numerous errors and misunderstandings of important issues. Methodological work or analysis is weak and fails to demonstrate knowledge or basic skills competence expected of graduate student work. May also reflect unprofessional level of writing, organization, or reasoning skills. This grade means the course will not count towards graduation.

**Key texts:**

The course has two required texts, which we will cover in detail and which will be available in the University bookstore:

- Rose-Ackerman, S. and B. Palifka (2016) *Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences and Reform*, Cambridge University Press (note: this is the second edition, the 2016 one – substantially changed from the first. It is available both as a hardcopy for purchase in the U-Store as well as in Kindle version on amazon.com.) [https://www.amazon.com/Corruption-Government-Causes-Consequences-Reform/dp/1107441099/ref=dp\\_ob\\_title\\_bk](https://www.amazon.com/Corruption-Government-Causes-Consequences-Reform/dp/1107441099/ref=dp_ob_title_bk)

- Johnston, Michael (2014). *Corruption, contention and reform: the power of deep democratization*. Cambridge University Press.

Case study coursepacks and other readings to purchase:

- <http://cb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cbmp/access/56830705> contains four of our case studies.
- <http://case.hks.harvard.edu/battling-for-rule-of-law-in-mexico-city-crime-corruption-and-criminal-justice/> (This case study is only available through the Harvard Kennedy School website.)
- All other readings will be made available through Canvas.

### **Class policies:**

- Mandatory attendance: absences for legitimate reasons only must be excused in advance.
- No electronics: during all class discussions in plenary, we will commit to not using computers or phones, for the simple reason that research shows it to be highly distracting to others and detrimental to the quality of discussion. You are encouraged to bring hard copies of the readings and your assignments for easy reference.
- Honor code guidelines of course fully apply: all writing must be original and properly cited, and you are encouraged to flag any questions or doubts about anything.

## **Week 1 (Jan 3). Introduction**

*Required reading:*

- *Corruption and Government*: Chapter 1 “What is corruption and why does it matter?”
- *Corruption, Contention and Reform*: Chapter 1 “Reform in an imperfect world”
- Klitgaard, R. 2000. Subverting corruption. *Finance & Development* 37(2): <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2000/06/klitgaar.htm>
- Get a head start on the voluminous readings for week 2 if possible.

*Discussion forum:*

Have you had any personal encounters with corruption? Describe the scenario, how you responded, and what you make of the whole experience now.

Or

What motivates your interest in studying corruption? Share an article from a newspaper or other source that encapsulates your interest. What questions does it raise in your mind?

## **Week 2 (Jan 10). Contrasting approaches to corruption: an overview**

*Case study: “Corruption in La Paz: A Mayor Fights City Hall” (In HBS coursepack). For preparation (not written, for discussion in class):*

How would each of the approaches covered this week – economic, institutional and political – inform advice that you would give to the Mayor of La Paz, Ronnie MacLean, about how to proceed to reduce corruption in the city?

*Required reading:*

*Note: The readings for this week are a little heavy, but the intent is to give you an overview that will help you launch your research project and set the stage for more in-depth analysis in the coming weeks. So don't despair: focus on getting a good understanding of the basic approaches that are being pursued to the study of corruption.*

*Economic analysis / enforcement-oriented approaches:*

- Bardhan, P. (2006). The economist's approach to the problem of corruption. *World Development*, 34(2), 341-348.
- Bolongaita, E. P. (2010). An exception to the rule? Why Indonesia's Anti-Corruption Commission succeeds where others don't—a comparison with the Philippines' Ombudsman. *U4 Issue*, 4, 13-18. <http://www.u4.no/publications/an-exception-to-the-rule-why-indonesia-s-anti-corruption-commission-succeeds-where-others-don-t-a-comparison-with-the-philippines-ombudsman/>

*Institutional analysis / prevention-oriented approaches:*

- Rose-Ackerman, S., & Palifka, B. J. (2016). "Chapter 5: Civil service reform and bureaucratic reorganization." *Corruption and government: Causes, consequences, and reform*. Cambridge University Press
- Blanton, T. (2002). The world's right to know. *Foreign Policy*, 50-58.

*Political analysis / socio-political mobilization:*

- Johnston, M. (2014). "Chapter 2: 'Deep democratization' and the control of corruption" in *Corruption, contention and reform: the power of deep democratization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2000). Assessing political will for anti-corruption efforts: an analytic framework. *Public Administration & Development*, 20(3), 239.

*Discussion forum:*

Create a 3x3 table with economic, institutional and political analysis on the side and, on the top, "Methods" (applied to the study of corruption), "Causes of corruption" (what analysis in this tradition will focus on), and "Key solutions highlighted". Fill in the cells based on your reading of the first three categories above. Then, name one concept that you found impressive or surprising, and one question you still have, about each of three approaches.

**Week 3 (Jan 17). Economic analysis / Enforcement-oriented approaches**

*Case study: "Battling for Rule of Law in Mexico City: Crime, Corruption and Criminal Justice", for purchase at <http://case.hks.harvard.edu/battling-for-rule-of-law-in-mexico-city-crime-corruption-and-criminal-justice/> (see discussion forum question for preparation).*

*Required reading:*

- De Sousa, L. (2010). Anti-corruption agencies: between empowerment and irrelevance. *Crime, law and social change*, 53(1), 5-22.

- Raymond Fisman and Edward Miguel (2007) Corruption, Norms, and Legal Enforcement: Evidence from Diplomatic Parking Tickets, *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 115, No. 6 pp. 1020-1048
- Anechiarico, F., & Jacobs, J. B. (1996). *The pursuit of absolute integrity: How corruption control makes government ineffective*. University of Chicago Press.
- *Corruption, Contention and Reform*: chapter 4

*Discussion forum: Case analysis*

The year is 2000, and you have been invited to give a short speech on “Enforcement-led approaches to anti-corruption policy: Learning from Mexico City’s experience” to an international anti-corruption conference. What are the key points you would want to make? Be specific to the case, and work in references to as many of this week’s readings as you can as well.

### **Week 4 (Jan 24). Institutional analysis of corruption**

*Case study:* “The dirty business of sand: sand dredging in Cambodia” , available at: <http://lkyspp.nus.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/The-Dirty-Business-of-Sand-Sand-Dredging-in-Cambodia.pdf>

*Required reading:*

- *Corruption and Government*,
  - Chapter 3 “Corruption in procurement and privatization”
  - Chapter 4 “Reducing incentives and increasing costs”
  - Chapter 12 “Accountability beyond the ballot box”
- Kolstad, I., & Wiig, A. (2009). Is transparency the key to reducing corruption in resource-rich countries? *World Development*, 37(3), 521-532

*Discussion forum: Consider two questions this week (answer both – will count as one discussion forum post):*

- *How do the readings for this week help explain the causes of corruption shown in the case study?*
- *What should Global Witness do at the point the case ends, and why? (1 paragraph here is sufficient)*

### **Week 5 (Jan 31). Political analysis of corruption**

Guest speaker: Prof. Michael Johnston

*Case study: “Aruna Roy and the birth of a people’s movement in India” (in HBS coursepack)*  
*Preparation for in-class discussion (not written): What do you see as the key personal characteristics of Aruna Roy, and organizational characteristics of MKSS, that led them to be successful in their political advocacy work? Is there a corresponding figure – someone whose work reminds you of Roy / the MKSS – in a more authoritarian country? How do you compare and contrast the two figures?*

*Required reading:*

- *Corruption and Government*,
  - Chapter 8 “Politics, corruption, and clientelism”
  - Chapter 11 “Democracy: Corruption, connections and money in politics”
- *Corruption, Contention and Reform*: Chapter 5, 6

*Discussion forum:*

Let us embellish and debate Winston Churchill’s famous statement: “*Democracy is the worst form of government for fighting corruption, except for all the others.*” Argue distinctly for or against this statement. Base your argument on evidence and insights from the readings for this week.

## **Week 6 (Feb 7). Social and cultural analysis; social mobilization and coalition-building**

*Case study: “I Paid A Bribe (dot) Com” (in HBS coursepack)*

*Required reading:*

- *Corruption and Government*,
  - Chapter 13 “Domestic conditions for reform”
- *Corruption, Contention and Reform*: Chapter 8
- Mungiu-Pippidi. (2011). "Contextual Choices in Fighting Corruption: Lessons Learned", NORAD Evaluation Department Report (focus on pp. xx-xx)
- Bhargava, V. and Emil Bolongaita (2004) *Challenging corruption in Asia: Case studies and a framework for action*. World Bank (Chapter 2: An analytical framework for improving the effectiveness of anticorruption policies and programs)
- Khan, M. (2006). Governance and anti-corruption reforms in developing countries: Policies, evidence and ways forward (focus on pp. xx-xx)

*Discussion forum: Consider the following two questions this week:*

- How in theory can the ‘ipaidabribe’ concept and platform make a tangible contribution to fighting corruption (refer to some of the insights gleaned from the readings this week)?
- What aspects of a country’s governance context might be important to consider in deciding whether JCCD should make investments in extending IPAB beyond India?

## **Week 7 (Feb 14). The role of the international community and private sector**

*Case: “GlaxoSmithKline in China” (in HBS coursepack)*

*Required reading:*

- *Corruption and Government*,
  - Chapter 9 “Organized crime, corruption, and money laundering”

- Chapter 14 “The role of the international community”
- Chapter 15 “International Cooperation: States, Firms, Banks and Organized Crime”
- *Corruption, Contention and Reform: Chapter 7*

*Discussion forum:*

- Option 1: How do the readings for this week shed light on the causes of, and potential solutions to, the type of corruption indicated in the GSK case? What next steps would you recommend for GSK’s leadership at the point the case ends?
- Option 2: What does emerging commentary and analysis that you can find suggest about the Trump administration’s stance with respect to international anti-corruption initiatives and enforcement efforts?

**Week 8 (Feb 21). Corruption in postconflict state building**

Guest speaker: Robert Klitgaard, Claremont Graduate University

*Case: South Sudan: Promise and Reality*

- Klitgaard, R. (2013) <http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/01/07/making-a-country/>
- *The Sentry* (2016) *War crimes shouldn’t pay: Stopping the looting and destruction in South Sudan. Download full report and read the executive summary and final chapter ‘Countering violent kleptocracy in South Sudan’, and skim other sections.*

*Required reading:*

- *Corruption and Government*, Chapter 10 “Corruption in postconflict state building”
- *Corruption, Contention and Reform: Chapter 3*
- Team written case studies

*Discussion forum:*

- Which concepts or examples from the readings help you to understand why the situation in South Sudan has fallen so far short of the cautious optimism described by Klitgaard several years earlier?
- Based on everything you have learned in the course to date, assess the strategy proposed to ‘counter violent kleptocracy’ in South Sudan. How feasible is it? If you could add one idea to it, what would it be?

**Week 9 (Feb 28). Research project: Assessing national anti-corruption prospects**

Guest speaker: Prof. Susan Rose-Ackerman, Yale University Law School

*Case study: The Department of Justice’s Investigation of the Ferguson Police Department; read the report summary, and skim other sections as time allows.*

[https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/ferguson\\_police\\_department\\_report.pdf](https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/ferguson_police_department_report.pdf)

*Required reading:*

- Team written case studies

*Discussion forum:*

*Option 1: How do any of the concepts covered in the readings during this course help you understand the causes of, and potential solutions to, the Ferguson Police Department failings, as documented and analyzed by the Department of Justice? To what extent is “corruption” a useful lens through which to view this case? (Hint: What does it bring into focus, and what does it obscure?)*

*Option 2: Analyze ethical dilemmas (prominently conflict of interest concerns) facing the Trump administration in its initial months. What light do course readings or frameworks shed on these? (note: if you do option 2, you are still asked to prepare thoughts on the Ferguson report for discussion)*

**Week 10 (March 7). Research project: Lesson drawing and the road ahead**

*Required reading:*

- Team written case studies

*Discussion forum:*

- What are your most prized insights gained from this course? And what questions continue to vex you?