The quality of governance plays a significant role in the management of any country. In March 2000, the Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) launched the National Capacity Building Program for Good Governance in Zambia. Through this program, the GRZ aimed to enhance good governance in Zambia by strengthening institutional linkages and building institutional capacity, and also to identify clear policy guidelines to promote good governance. To coordinate the National Capacity Building Program for Good Governance in Zambia, the GRZ established the Governance Development Unit (GDU) in the Ministry of Justice. The GDU is responsible for coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating the Governance Program in Zambia.

Transparency and accountability are two of the key strategic objectives of the National Capacity Building Program for Good Governance in Zambia. Under these joint objectives, the GRZ has acknowledged that corruption and poor public service delivery are governance problems affecting economic and social development in Zambia. In January 2001, the GRZ requested the World Bank to provide assistance in the development of a comprehensive governance and anti-corruption strategy.

Upon assuming office and noticing the high levels of corruption in the country, His Excellency, the President Mr. Levy Patrick Mwanawasa, SC, declared zero tolerance for corruption. This gave a big boost to the fight against corruption. At the launch of the
National Movement Against Corruption in March 2002, the President announced that his
government was going to conduct a National Governance Baseline Survey (NGBS) based
on three country-wide surveys as a way to address the issue of corruption. The surveys
would be used to collect data from the nation on corruption and public service delivery
with a view to developing a comprehensive strategy to combat corruption and enhance
public service delivery. The Minister of Justice and Attorney General, Honorable George
Kunda, SC, MP, officially launched the NGBS in September 2002.

The NGBS is based on three country-wide surveys and their findings, which are reflected
in the NGBS report, summarise the Zambian population’s views on corruption as
perceived by three distinct populations: users of public services (households), public
officials, and business enterprises. The use of the experience of these three populations
permits triangulation of the results and greater objectivity. The NGBS report provides a
firm empirical basis for developing action plans and sharing responsibilities among
coalition partners, as well as implementing and monitoring an integrated national anti-
corruption program. The survey results are particularly useful in describing the
experiences of the Zambian population, as these experiences relate to their views on
corruption as well as service delivery and the efficiency of public institutions. The survey
results will also provide benchmark indicators so that elements of governance and the
extent of corruption practices may be reviewed through another survey in two to three
years.
The information collected from the NGBS offers a set of key messages that complements and reinforces the government’s stand on the fight against corruption. Furthermore, the findings of the surveys confirm that the crusade against corruption—which His Excellency, the President Mr. Levy Patrick Mwanawasa, SC, is spearheading—is not a personal or political issue, but a matter of national concern as exhibited by the views of the Zambian population.

The NGBS has been coordinated by the Ministry of Justice through the Governance Development Unit, which chairs the steering committee that is overseeing the NGBS. The steering committee, called the Governance Baseline Survey Team (GBST) oversees all the affairs of the NGBS. The GBST comprises the following institutional members: Anti-Corruption Commission, Central Statistical Office, Ministry of Finance and National Planning, Cabinet Office, Integrity Foundation of Zambia (Civil Society Organization), and the Ministry of Justice.

The GBST was responsible for all the general discussions regarding the surveys’ technical parameters such as survey design, sample frame, and so on. The GBST was responsible for preparing and revising the survey instruments of the NGBS. Furthermore, the GBST was responsible for all tender procedures and selection of the Consultant, which was in this case the Department of Political and Administrative Studies of the University of Zambia, who undertook the survey. The GBST, in collaboration with the World Bank, provided technical backstopping to the Consultant and ensured that high standards of quality were observed as the survey was being undertaken. Such quality control measures
are evident from the scrutiny to which the GBST subjected the pilot survey report, the draft final survey report, and the final survey report. The comments from the GBST and the World Bank have culminated in the NGBS report that is now available.

The survey was financed by the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom through the World Bank, while the GRZ met the administrative costs of the survey.

The rationale for a survey-oriented diagnostic approach is that voicing the experiences of the people who interact with the state and implement state policies is essential for the development of a well-informed and effective anti-corruption strategy. The rich survey data collected facilitated the process of unbundling the many faces of corruption, from administrative corruption to state capture, as well as the process of assessing their presence across Zambian governmental agencies and regions. Such detailed analysis allows us to link different forms of corruption to specific institutional and regional weaknesses in the country.

The GBST would therefore like to put forward the NGBS, which is expected to contribute to enhancing good governance in Zambia by reducing corruption and improving public service delivery, thereby contributing to economic and social development in Zambia.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This summary covers the findings of the three in-depth baseline surveys conducted in 2003 by the Department of Political and Administrative Studies of the University of Zambia. The main objective of this exercise was to obtain information that would assist the Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) in designing a comprehensive governance and anti-corruption strategy. In particular, the surveys aimed to assess the extent and costs of corruption across public agencies and the quality of the services delivered to citizens. Three thousand Zambian citizens, comprising 1,500 household heads, 1,000 public officials, and 500 managers of enterprises from all the nine provinces participated in this effort and expressed their views and concerns about the quality of governance in the country.

The rationale for a survey-oriented approach is that voicing the experiences of the people who interact with the state and implement state policies is essential for the development of a well-informed and effective anti-corruption strategy and for improving service delivery. The rich survey data collected facilitate the process of unbundling the many faces of corruption, from administrative corruption and state capture\(^1\) to an assessment of their presence across Zambian governmental agencies and regions. Such detailed analysis makes it possible to link different forms of corruption to specific institutional and regional weaknesses.

The information collected by the surveys offers the following set of key messages:

---

\(^1\) Administrative corruption refers to corruption relative to the implementation of rules and regulations; state capture describes corruption that affects the actual design of the laws and regulations.
Zambia faces serious governance challenges at this stage. Corruption in Zambia takes many forms and is quite common, especially in the areas of public service delivery, permits and licences, and public procurement (Figure E.1).

Urban and rural areas face significantly different challenges. Households and managers report that the biggest challenges in service delivery are in the rural areas (Figures A.1 and A.2). Bribes, however, are more frequently asked for in urban areas than in rural ones (Figure A.3).

Corruption increases inequality and impedes access to basic public services. Low-income citizens (households) are disproportionately penalised by paying bribes that represent a greater share of their income (their gross monthly revenues) than their counterparts in the middle- and high-income brackets (Figure A.12). Bribery does not translate into better quality of services (Figure A.16). Corruption also reduces access to basic services and to courts.

Need for public administration improvements. Based on public officials’ responses, nepotism and corruption in the budget process are the greatest challenges within the public administration. It is necessary to improve recruiting and establish a merit-based promotion system, to guarantee insulation of the civil service from changes in political administrations, and to promote transparency and accountability in the budget management process.

Figures with the prefix “E” before their number refer to those figures that appear here in the Executive Summary; figures with the prefix “A” are those in the appendix; those with no prefix before the number refer to the figure number of the main report.
Figure E.1 Corruption in Zambia: A Summary

- % of users who were asked for a bribe to obtain public services: 38%
- % of users who were asked for a bribe to obtain licenses and permits: 39%
- % of managers who were asked for a bribe to obtain contracts with public institutions: 33%
- % of managers who were asked for a bribe to obtain licenses and permits: 36%
- Public funds misappropriation (% of public officials reporting it is very frequent): 19%
- % of cases in which bribes were necessary to obtain public services (% of public officials reporting it is very frequent): 20%
- % of cases in which bribes were necessary along the contracting process (% of public officials reporting it is very frequent): 26%
- Purchasing of positions (% of public officials reporting it is very frequent): 27%

- Citizens’ voice is still ineffective. Citizens often do not know how or where to report corruption (Figure 3.26 in the main report). Public officials suggest that the complaint and consultation mechanisms in place in their organisations are not effective (Figure 4.35 in the main report).

- The business environment is adversely affected by corruption, government inefficiency, and shortage of funds. The high frequency of bribery, bureaucratic red tape, and the problems of accessing information and funds make it difficult to start a business and operate.
In sum, the country is at a cross-roads and it is crucial to implement a series of institutional reforms in key areas to improve transparency and accountability of public agencies. Only in this way will governance significantly improve. In this regard, it remains to be seen if implementation of the Public Service Reform Programme (PSRP), once completed, will have a positive impact on public institutions.

[[B]] Challenges Facing the Nation: Overview

- **Corruption as a top socioeconomic challenge for the country.** All respondents regard the high cost of living and inflation as the top serious problems for Zambia. However, corruption appears among the top three serious problems for most of citizens (Figure E.2). Over 80 per cent of households and public officials rated corruption in the public sector as a very serious challenge to the country, and about 67 per cent of managers rated it as the most burdensome obstacle to business development. Food availability is also a challenge, especially for households in the eastern and southern provinces.

**Figure E.2: Key Problems in Zambia, 2003** (as reported by households, public officials, and managers)
- **Frequency and forms of corruption.** Corruption has many faces in Zambia, from administrative corruption (to obtain permits or a basic service) to nepotism and procurement mismanagement (Table E.1). Some of these forms of corruption are more widespread than others. Almost 40 per cent of respondents report that they have been asked for a bribe to obtain a public service or licenses and permits. The police, the National Registration Office, the courts, and the Lands Department are agencies where unofficial payments are more frequently requested.

- **Moderate integrity of some key public organisations.** Over all, public institutions are considered to be only moderately honest. The organisations rated the most honest are the Ministries of Health and Education, the postal services, and church and religious organisations.
• **Poor ratings for the political system and the police.** All three groups of respondents rate political parties as well as core public security institutions (such as the police) among the most corrupt state agencies. More than 70 per cent of households and managers complain about the lack of honesty of these agencies. Public officials also state that political party executives have a significant influence on government authorities (Figure 3.18). About 10 per cent of managers report that they contributed to a political party during the last elections to obtain favourable treatment.

Table E.1. Governance and Corruption Indicators by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator*</th>
<th>Whole Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall corruption</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative corruption</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State capture</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption in budget</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption in public contracts</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption in personnel (1)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption in personnel (2)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for poor</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit mechanisms</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of rules</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicisation</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of rules</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen voice</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meritocracy</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: The indicators above take values between 0 and 100. To interpret them please keep in mind that (1) the higher the value of the corruption index, the more severe the problem; and (2) the higher the value of the governance indicator, the better the quality of that dimension.

• **Delivery of some public services is perceived to be poor and uneven across the**
country. Households and managers report that pension offices, local councils, health services, and the police provide the worst services (Figure E.3). Moreover, the quality of many basic services from providers such as pension offices, Social Security, and the Housing Authority is higher in urban areas than in rural ones (Figures A.1 and A.2). Service delivery, however, varies not only between rural and urban areas but also among provinces. The Eastern and Luapula Provinces appear to face the greatest challenge with regard to Traffic Police services and Zambia Postal Services, respectively (Figure A.15).

- **The role of incentives.** A preliminary analysis indicates that there is a positive correlation between lower levels of corruption and better governance institutions such as functioning audit and complaint mechanisms, effective enforcement of rules, and lower political interference in personnel and budget management. (Figures A.4, A.5, A.6, and A.7).

[[B]]A closer look

- **The role of incentives.** A preliminary analysis indicates that there is a positive correlation between lower levels of corruption and better governance institutions such as functioning audit and complaint mechanisms, effective enforcement of rules, and lower political interference in personnel and budget management. (Figures A.4, A.5, A.6, and A.7).
• **Firms and public procurement.** Unofficial payments to get government contracts are also quite widespread, and managers report forfeiting, on average, 6.4 per cent of the invoice value to public officials in order to expedite contract payments from the government (see Figure 3.12).

• **Adverse effects of poor governance on business environment.** Corruption and poor services are not the only challenges faced by firms. Bureaucratic red tape also places a burden on the private sector. Managers report spending about eight weeks on average to register a new business and about 3.2 per cent of their time weekly dealing with public officials. Some managers hire facilitators to deal with the government bureaucracy. The top five institutions where managers reported
spending the greatest amount of time each week were, in order of ranking, the Zambian Revenue Authority (ZRA), the Zambia Electricity Supply Corporation (ZESCO), local authorities, the public health services, and the police (Figure A.10).

**Figure E.4. Bribes by Type of Activity: Comparing Domestic and Foreign Firms**

- **Households are less likely to be asked for a bribe.** The police, the National Registration Office, and the courts are the offices where private citizens are most likely to be asked for a bribe. However, the frequency of these requests is lower for households than for managers by about a third (Figure A.11).

- **Households are more likely not to use a public service they need because of corruption and official costs.** Households pay on average 4.8 per cent of their (weighted) monthly income in bribes to obtain public services. This figure can be misleading, since low-income households pay about 18 per cent of their monthly income in bribes, while high-income households pay less than 1 per cent. About a
third of the respondents report that they did not seek to obtain a service from the ZRA, the police, or the water agency, though needed, because they could not afford the unofficial payments (Figure E.5). Thus, low-income citizens are the ones penalised the most, as they pay a substantially higher proportion of their income in bribes than high-income ones (Figure A.12). Users of public education services are discouraged from accessing the services more by official costs than bribes, while the opposite is the case for users of public health services (Figure 4.31).

- **Corruption and delays as obstacles to accessing courts in Zambia.** Corruption and delayed justice are the main barriers against households’ and firms’ access to courts (Figure A.13). Households identify the influence of corruption in court decisions as the leading obstacle to accessing courts in Zambia, while managers suggest that the length of the court process is the most serious obstacle to using courts (Figures 4.25, 4.26, and 4.28).

- **The performance of the judiciary.** About 40 per cent of households and 25 per cent of managers report that bribes are paid to speed up legal proceedings. More than 50 per cent of managers believe that the judiciary is independent neither from the government nor from economic pressures, nor do they report that justice is administered in a fair, just, or transparent manner (Figure E.6).
The mechanisms of corruption. How is corruption perpetrated? According to public officials, the initiative to pay is more likely to come not from the officials themselves but from the clientele (Figure 3.14). In contrast, households and managers report that public officials ask for a payment in most of the cases (Figure 3.15).

State capture. Some key ‘institutions’ outside of the public sector appear to fuel bad
governance by exercising undue influence over the state. In particular, political parties, multinational companies, and economic groups are perceived as wielding great influence in shaping policies and regulations. Further, both enterprises and public officials report that bribes are used to avoid taxes and regulations, ensure patronage, and influence high court authorities.

• **Bribes are also linked to political funding.** About 10 per cent of firms report having made political contributions during the last elections to receive favourable treatment (Figure A.14). This is true especially for medium- and small-size firms. Both public officials and managers believe that these contributions have great negative influence on the business environment (Figure 3.16).

• **Reporting corruption.** Awareness of the corruption reporting process is very low among households. Almost 80 per cent reported not knowing the process (Figure 3.25). Lack of information about the reporting mechanisms, which is the main obstacle, is particularly pronounced in Northern, Northwestern, and Eastern Provinces (Figure 3.27). Although public officials claim to know the corruption reporting process better than households do, they admit to not reporting all the cases of corruption they witnessed, thus suggesting that many such cases go unreported. For public officials, the main obstacles to reporting corruption are the fear of harassment and the difficulty of proving cases of corruption in courts.
Figure E.6. Performance of the Judiciary (as reported by managers)

- **Willingness to contribute to eliminating corruption.** Managers state that they would be willing to pay about 4 per cent of their business’ monthly revenue to eliminate corruption completely (Figure E.7). Medium-size firms are especially willing to eliminate corruption. However, citing poverty as their main reason, the majority of household respondents are not willing to contribute part of their income towards eliminating corruption (Figures 3.28 and 3.29).

- **Quality of services and corruption.** In some cases, households not only have to pay extra to obtain a public service, they also receive a fairly poor quality of service, as illustrated in Figure E.3. We can observe significant differences across provinces and areas, with Luapula and the Eastern provinces rated the worst (Figures A.1, A.2, A.15). Paying extra, however, does not translate to a better quality of services received (Figure A.16).
• **Quality of services: The public officials’ point of view.** Public officials, on average, consider the services provided by their institutions to be of high quality. Moreover, they suggest that the services provided by their institutions are fully satisfactory to the users and accessible to poor citizens. However, only about a third of public officials indicated that the consultative and complaints mechanisms exist and work effectively; thus suggesting the need for a more comprehensive feedback mechanism system (Figures 4.34 and 4.35).

**Figure E.7. Willingness to Pay to Eliminate Corruption** (per cent of monthly revenues that firms are willing to pay to eliminate corruption)

![Graph showing willingness to pay by firm size](image)

[[B]]Measures for Improving the Quality of Services

• **Education services.** Low salaries and inadequate infrastructure are the principal cause of poor education (Figure 4.12), according to households. The cost of
accessing education is another factor responsible for the poor quality of education.

- **Public health services.** Provision of adequate drugs is identified as the main measure for improving health services. The majority of household respondents indicated that making adequate drugs available could lead to the improvement of the public health system (Figure 4.13). About 70 per cent of households report that the availability of more hospitals, clinics, and rural health centers and the availability of trained staff are key factors in improving the public health system.

[[B]]\textbf{Performance of the Public Administration}

- **Efficiency of public organisations.** Public officials report that a few agencies, such as the Ministry of Education, Zambia Postal Services, and ZESCO, are efficient, while several others, such as Traffic Police, local authorities, the Passport and Citizenship Office, the Ministry of Works and Supply, and the Road Traffic Commission, are considered to be quite inefficient. Among judicial organisations, local courts received the most negative evaluation. This suggests that the reported poor performance is due either to inefficiency or lack of adequate capacity to dispose of cases expeditiously.

- **Performance standards.** About 45 per cent of public officials report that their organisations did not have any written standards of performance. In the cases where these standards existed, only half of the cases were met. Leading organisations in meeting performance standards were identified are the Ministry of Community
Development and Social Services, the Bursaries Committee, the Public Service Commission, the Teaching Service Commission, the Judicial Service Commission, and the Ministries of Communications and Transport, Foreign Affairs, and Information and Broadcasting Services.

- **Inadequate resources.** Financial and physical resources are inadequate. Public officials indicate that the amounts of budgetary allocations their organisations receive are not enough to carry out their activities.

[[B]] Management of Public Resources

- **Managing personnel.** More than two-thirds of public officials report an extremely low level of involvement in personnel decisions, except in the case of disciplinary actions. Personnel management is hampered by red tape and lack of transparency. About 20 per cent of public officials state that rules and regulations about personnel decisions are never or rarely are applied, and almost 50 per cent reveal that personnel decisions require excessive administrative steps (Tables A112 and A113 in Appendix 1 of the main report). The indices of meritocracy and corruption in personnel (Table E.1) are especially low for the Traffic Police, the Housing Authority, and the Director of Public Prosecution.

- **Recruitment process and information.** Responses by public officials on survey questions about recruitment procedures confirmed that transparency and merit criteria are seldom followed in personnel decisions. Almost half of respondents
stated that they heard about the first job opening in the government through an advertisement, while about 20 per cent received a personal notification from a public official, indicating the potential extent of patronage.

• **Public sector compensation.** Salary dissatisfaction among public workers is very widespread, with about 90 per cent reporting that salary and benefits are not satisfactory (Figure 6.3). In addition, salaries are paid late. Of the public officials interviewed, 98.3 per cent indicated that they experienced delays in receiving salaries. Notwithstanding this problem, there is a general perception of job security among the respondents, 70.6 per cent of whom ‘completely agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that their jobs and positions were secure, while 43.6 per cent reported that working in the public sector was better than working in the private sector.

• **Performance evaluation and disciplinary actions.** About one-third of the respondents reported never being subject to evaluation. The majority of the public officials subject to evaluation reported that their performance is assessed once a year. Such an unsatisfactory evaluating system does not allow the rewarding of excellent professional achievement, as most respondents indicate (Figure 6.4). Nor does it permit applying disciplinary actions impartially, thereby jeopardising the effectiveness of the personnel management system (Figure 6.5).

• **Illicit payments to secure public administration positions.** About 34 per cent of public officials report that this practice exists for higher-level jobs, while this number
declines to about 25 per cent for lower-level positions. The evidence suggests that some of these positions may be purchased as a ‘private investment’ since a significant number of public officials indicate that bribes are a significant part of total revenues (and are more significant for higher-level positions; see Table A73 in Appendix 1 of the main report). The Traffic Police, ZAMPOST, the Judiciary, and the Public Service Management Division are the agencies where this practice is most frequent (Figure A.17).

**Figure E.8. The Practice of Purchasing Jobs Among Public Officials**

(as reported by public officials)

- **Budget management.** Poor management of budget resources is a serious challenge. More than one-third of public officials report abuse. There are a variety of possible reasons for such a poor rating. Public officials’ responses reveal that the levels of participation in the budget process—preparing, implementing, and monitoring—are very low. Moreover, public officials, while reporting that budget-monitoring
mechanisms are fairly effective (Figure 6.10), also suggest that the quality of budget rules is quite poor. Most public officials also see the degree of political influence on budget decisions as an obstacle to effective budget management.

• **Information management and communication.** The channel of communication between the government and its citizens is weak. The majority of respondents feel that people affected by broad public sector decisions are the last to know about them (Figure E.9). Public officials also report that, though there is relatively good communication among departments in the same organisation, there is poor communication across government agencies (Figure 6.17).

• **Procurement management.** Overall, public officials believe that the guidelines for procurement management at their organisation are followed. However, about 50 per cent report that public contracts are never or seldom awarded in a transparent and efficient manner (Figure 6.15).

[[A]]**LINKING CORRUPTION TO INSTITUTIONAL VULNERABILITY**

• **Exploiting institutional heterogeneity.** The evidence clearly indicates that there is an extremely varied governance performance across institutions in Zambia (Table E.1). It is therefore misleading to generalise about performance, governance, and corruption for all institutions. Such variance permits, however, a more rigorous econometric analysis to distill the key elements that influence governance. This analysis between governance structures (as rated by public officials) and the
performance and integrity of the public institutions (as rated by users, enterprises, and public officials) suggests that the following factors may be important for potentially improving governance:

1. **Audit**: The relationship between corruption and the existence of audit mechanisms within an agency is statistically significant: agencies where such mechanisms exist are less likely to display high levels of corruption (Figure A.4).

2. **Voice**: The simple correlation analyses suggest that corruption-reporting mechanisms, which are effective and which credibly protect whistleblowers, are associated with lower levels of corruption. Furthermore, complaint mechanisms that guarantee satisfactory outcome deter corrupt behaviour (Figure A.5).

3. **Enforcement of rules**: When rules and regulations relating to personnel are applied and supervised, there are fewer incentives for corruption (Figure A.6).

4. **Politicisation**: Agencies in which public officials report that decisions about contracts and financial resources are influenced by political pressures display higher levels of corruption in the procurement process.
Figure E.9. Information Management and Communication in the Public Sector

(as reported by public officials)
Figure A.1. Quality of Public Services: Urban versus Rural Areas (as reported by households)
Figure A.2. Quality of Public Services: Urban versus Rural Areas (as reported by managers)
Figure A.3. Bribes by Type of Activity: Urban versus Rural Areas (as reported by households and managers)

Figure A.4. Audit Mechanisms and Overall Corruption (based on responses of 53 agencies)
Figure A.5. Administrative Corruption and Citizen Voice
(based on responses of 53 agencies)

Figure A.6. Enforcement of Rules and Corruption in Personnel
(based on responses of 53 agencies)
Figure A.7 Politicisation and Corruption in Public Contracts

(based on responses of 53 agencies)
Figure A.8. Frequency of Bribes (as reported by managers)

Note: The frequency was calculated for those users who contacted the agency seeking attention.
Figure A.9. Frequency of Bribes by Size of Firm (as reported by managers)

Note: The frequency was calculated for those users who contacted the agency seeking attention.

Thin lines represent margins of errors (at 95 per cent confidence interval) for each value. They show the range where the true population would lie with probability 0.95 if we had drawn a random sample from this population.
Figure A.10. Institutions Where Firms Spent More Time Dealing with Bureaucracy

% of firms reporting that the greatest amount of time was spent in this institution
Figure A.11. Frequency of Bribes (as reported by households)

Note: The frequency was calculated for those users who contacted the agency seeking attention.
Figure A.12. Percentage of Household Income Paid as Bribes to Obtain Public Services, by Household Income Status (as reported by households)

Note: Figures are calculated from those users who contacted the agency, and they are weighted by income level.
Figure A.13. Corruption as an Obstacle to using Courts in Zambia (as reported by businesses and households)
Figure A.14. Requirement to Contribute to Political Parties in Order to Receive Favourable Treatment (as reported by managers)
Figure A.15: Regional Differences in Quality of Services (as perceived by households)
Figure A.16: Bribery and Quality of Public Services (as reported by households)

Note: Each point in the graph represents the combination quality-bribe for a public service

corr = -0.43
Figure A.17. The Practice of Purchasing Jobs Among Public Officials, by Institution (as reported by public officials)

Note: Only agencies with more than five responses were included.