

Diagnostic Survey Instruments

Three anti-corruption diagnostic survey instruments follow. They focus in: Public Officials, Households and Enterprises. These instruments represent an example of the worked being carried out in different regions by the World Bank Institute. They have been carefully tailored to different particular situations and interest in the field. A brief introduction to these instruments follows. A detailed description for the public officials survey is also included in this binder.

Survey Focus	Study Objectives
Public Officials Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of this survey will be to identify different practices inside the public sector related to the management of personnel, budget, and the delivery of public services. In particular, the study will investigate corrupt and improper practices in (i) personnel management, (ii) budgeting, (iii) project planning, (iv) information management, and (v) performance of the public sector. It will also investigate (i) public officials' opinions about state reforms, (ii) the performance of the public sector, and (iii) the capacity of official institutions for undertaking the battle against corruption.
Enterprise Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of the survey is to gain a better understanding of the obstructions and limitations to business development. In particular, the study will examine (i) the perceived obstacles to business development, (ii) analysis of the corruption problem, (iii) the different faces of corruption, (iv) transparency in public services and in the judicial system, (v) bureaucratic costs, and (vi) tax evasion and the informal sector. The study will provide a basis for recommendations that will optimize private enterprise and help develop new projects and programs to strengthen enterprise growth.
Household Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of this survey will be to find out how households in perceive the services they receive in their homes and ways to improve them. The survey will focus on, among other things, (i) perceived dishonesty in various public institutions (judicial system, educational system, health system, etc) as well as in public service providers (customs office, tax payment offices, water works, police, transit authorities, licensing, public registry, schools, telecommunication providers, post office, power companies, public hospitals. Social security, trash collection, etc.) and (ii) the efficiency of anti-corruption agencies.

Governance Survey of Public Officials: Main Objectives and Characteristics

Objective: Understanding of institution-specific determinants of:

- 1) Corruption** (detailed mapping, including bribery, nepotism, political interference, embezzlement/misappropriation of public, etc.),
- 2) Discretion and Informality in Public Sector – Actual behavior vs. de Jure policies and regulations** (including in politicized vs. meritocratic recruitment, etc)
- 3) Public Sector Performance and Governance – Bureaucratic Efficiency and Service Delivery**
- 4) Link between Governance and i) Poverty Alleviation; ii) Social Sector Outcomes, and iii) Political Factors**
- 5) Insights to effects of Values/Cultural Differences.**

1. Governance, Unofficialdom and Corruption

Measures of Corruption

Bribery:

- Unofficial payments as a percentage of official salary
- Perceptions on buying process (speed), service, or resources (decisions)
- Purchasing positions in public service

Embezzlement/misuse of public funds (agency specific perceptions)

- Agency specific perceptions of frequency of embezzlement/misuse of public funds

Political interference

- In promotions/recruitment
- In allocation of public funds
- Share in bribes

Nepotism/Patronage/Clientelism (agency specific perceptions)

- Promotion/recruitment based on political/family/religion or grounds other than professionalism
- Diversion of public funds due to political/family/religion or grounds other than public interest/need
- Purchase of decisions

Determinants of Corruption, Unofficialdom and Misgovernance:

Cost Side: Original 'Private Investment' in Obtaining Job + Probability X Penalty of Detection/Indictment/Enforcement for corrupt practice while on the job

Benefit Side: Extent of Unofficial Incomes; Structure of Bribe Fee List for different services

- Organizational structure (wider organizations are harder to control/monitor):
- Number of subordinates/supervisors
- Extent and quality of internal/external monitoring/enforcement mechanisms for performance/quality of service delivery
- Extent and quality of internal/external audits (with and without warning)

Quality of corruption reporting mechanisms
 Satisfaction level: salary/benefits/work schedule/flexibility/job security/learning/personal satisfaction/opportunity outside the public sector
 Satisfaction with resources available to work with
 Identification with the goals/strategy of the organization (clarity of goals/strategy of organization)
 Opportunity and quality of training
 Turnover: perceived horizon
 Meritocracy: professional based recruitment/promotion (personnel management)
 Extent of support for public sector reforms (including Anti-Corruption campaign)
 Work load: extra hours
 Work in unofficial/informal sector

2. Discretionary Behavior and Informality in the Public Sector

Mapping of Discretionary Behavior and Informality in the Public Sector

Agency-specific perceptions of extent of discretionary behavior in:

- 1) Personnel Management (including contracting out);
- 2) Budget Management;
- 3) Service Delivery,
- 4) Performance,
- 5) Use of procedural guidelines/manuals

Determinants of Discretionary Behavior and Informality in the Public Sector

Agency-specific responses/reporting on extent, quality, clarity and stability of procedures/guidelines/regulations in:

- 1) Personnel Management (including contracting out);
- 2) Budget Management;
- 3) Service Delivery,
- 4) Performance, 5)

Use of procedural/manuals

Agency-specific perceptions of extent and quality of enforcement and monitoring mechanism of procedures/guidelines/regulations in:

- 1) Personnel Management (including contracting out);
- 2) Budget Management;
- 3) Service Delivery,
- 4) Performance,
- 5) Use of procedural/manuals

Transparency, Quality of Information; Internal communications, Voice, and Accountability

3. Performance Measures

Agency-specific perceptions of performance standards, frequency etc
 Differential Impact on Lower Income Strata/Social Programs
 Public Service Delivery

4. Link between Governance and i) *Poverty Alleviation*; ii) *Social Sector Outcomes*, and iii) *Political Factors*

5. Insights to effects of *Values/Cultural Differences*.