Corruption and marginalisation

Author: Jessie Bullock and Matthew Jenkins, tihelpdesk@transparency.org
Reviewers: Isabelle Büchner, Jessica Ebrard and Marie Chêne, Transparency International
Ellie McDonald, Equal Rights Trust
Date: 26 June 2020

This literature review examines common experiences of corruption among marginalised groups. It finds that, while corruption's role in exacerbating the effects of marginalisation is increasingly well-documented for some disadvantaged groups, notably women and girls, it remains generally understudied and further research is needed. The evidence indicates that corruption makes it even more difficult for marginalised groups to access justice and public services or to participate meaningfully in politics and business. As such, corruption can serve as a vehicle for discrimination; it is often the means by which certain groups and individuals are granted or denied access to goods, services and opportunities on the basis of their identity.

The paper considers the different ways corruption disproportionately affects groups exposed to discrimination, among them women and girls, youth and children, ethnic minorities, Indigenous peoples, LGBTI communities and people with disabilities. While the relationship between corruption and discrimination varies widely by group, depending on the forms of marginalisation that characterise the various communities, what they have in common is an above-average risk of falling victim to corruption due to ingrained power asymmetries.

Some marginalised groups are more likely to encounter coercive attempts to extract bribes and other rent-seeking behaviour due to their restricted access to justice. Other marginalised groups may inhabit regions that expose them to particular risks, such as land grabbing. Yet others may find themselves exposed to corruption on the basis of their identity in a manner that either scapegoats them for poor governance or sows division as a smokescreen for political corruption.

Finally, some people's experiences of corruption may be aggravated by their compound identities, particularly where such individuals are exposed to multidimensional forms of marginalisation, such as being a non-cisgender member of an ethnic minority group. In addition, historic and current patterns of discrimination that mean marginalised groups typically have lower socio-economic status can further exacerbate the effects of corruption. Those especially exposed to corruption include individuals who experience discrimination on the basis of their identity, status or beliefs, and who also display other characteristics of precarity, such as poverty, occupation in the informal sector or lack of legal identity.

What is the relationship between corruption and marginalisation, and how do marginalised groups experience corruption?

Contents

Definitions and terminology

Corruption

Transparency International (2020a) defines corruption as "the abuse of entrusted power for private gain".

Here, "abuse" refers to misuse or mistreatment, "entrusted power" refers to authority granted to duty bearers and decision makers on the premise that they act with integrity to advance the public good, and "private gain" refers to the self-serving benefits (financial, material, political or social) that accrue to individuals or specific interest groups at the expense of society at large.

Collusive corruption

According to the World Bank (2019), a collusive practice is "an arrangement between two or more parties designed to achieve an improper purpose, including to influence improperly the actions of another party". When it comes to corruption, collusive practices typically involve coordination between "insiders" and their clients to obtain an undue advantage or to avoid an obligation.

Examples include bid rigging during procurement processes, in which a favoured firm wins the tender in return for paying kickbacks to the procuring entity, or backroom deals between firms and legislators or regulators to secure sweetheart deals.

Main points

— Marginalisation can exacerbate the effects of corruption, making it even more difficult for groups exposed to discrimination to access justice and public services or to participate meaningfully in politics and business.
— The costs of corruption are particularly onerous for marginalised communities. Yet while corruption typically affects all disadvantaged groups disproportionately, it does so in unique ways, depending on contextual legal, socio-economic and institutional factors, as well as how group identity is politicised.
— The costs of corruption can be cumulative: if an individual is a member of multiple marginalised groups, they may be even more exposed to extortive forms of corruption.

While collusive corruption can doubtless be profitable for those party to the arrangement, it invariably entails a wider negative cost to others. As the phenomenon of corrupt land grabbing in regions inhabited by Indigenous peoples clearly demonstrates, marginalised groups are less likely to be the beneficiaries of collusive corruption and more likely to bear the cost.

Coercive corruption

The World Bank (2019) defines coercive practices as "impairing or harming, or threatening to impair

or harm, directly or indirectly, any party or the property of the party to influence improperly the actions of a party".

Corruption is often coercive in nature, whereby corrupt actors leverage power asymmetries through the use of implicit or explicit threats and intimidation to extort goods, money, services or even sexual favours from their selected victims in return for access to entitlements such as healthcare, education or identification papers.

The literature indicates that marginalised groups suffer from an above-average chance of being the victims of coercive corruption, in which corrupt actors intentionally target them for exploitation. Growing attention to the phenomenon of sextortion shows how pernicious this can be, with enormous hidden costs for individuals and communities subject to these practices.

Marginalisation

At an individual level, the Oxford English Dictionary (2020) defines marginalisation as "the process or result of making somebody feel as if they are not important and cannot influence decisions or events; the fact of putting somebody in a position in which they have no power".

Such processes can also be systemic when they are linked to broader historic and current patterns of prejudice and discrimination against certain types of people. Entire communities and groups may be "marginalised" in the sense that they are relegated to the fringes of society through the (systematic) denial of full access to the rights, opportunities and resources available to members of a different group (Inoi, Nishiwaki and Doi 2017: 4220; UN 2016: 17-20).

Marginalisation can ultimately result in "social exclusion", described by the World Health Organisation (2019) as a series of "dynamic, multi-dimensional processes driven by unequal power relationships interacting across four main

dimensions – economic, political, social and cultural – and at different levels including individual, household, group, community, country and global levels. It results in a continuum of inclusion/exclusion characterised by unequal access to resources, capabilities and rights".

Discrimination

As set out in the Equal Rights Trust's Declaration of Principles on Equality, the right to non-discrimination protects people from unfavourable treatment or disproportionate impacts on the basis of their identity, status or beliefs. International law requires states to provide protection from discrimination on a range of characteristics, including age, disability, ethnicity, gender identity, health status, political opinion, religious belief, sex and sexual orientation. The list of characteristics is not fixed; discrimination should also be prohibited where it occurs because of a combination of these characteristics (Equal Rights Trust 2008).

Discrimination can be direct – where a person is subjected to a disadvantage because of their protected characteristic – or indirect – where the application of a uniform standard results in a particular disadvantage for persons sharing a particular characteristic (Equal Rights Trust 2008).

Discrimination also includes harassment – unwanted conduct which creates an environment which is hostile, degrading or humiliating to those with a particular characteristic – and the failure to make reasonable accommodation for persons with different capabilities (Equal Rights Trust 2008).

Introduction

Corruption is bad for society in general, but it typically hits already marginalised groups harder than most. Corruption severely affects these communities by undermining economic development, exacerbating inequality and skewing resource distribution to the advantage of the powerful (Transparency International 2017).

As such, the costs of corruption are primarily borne by people with restricted access to political, economic or social rights (United Nations Development Fund for Women 2010; World Bank Group 2015). Marginalised groups include those who are exposed to discrimination on the basis of their identity, status or beliefs, including on the ground of their sex, ethnicity, religion or belief, nationality, gender identity, age, or disability.

The crosscutting nature of discrimination means that corruption penalises these marginalised groups twice. Not only do individuals from these communities struggle with forms of corruption that result in the particularistic allocation of resources but discrimination against these groups can create additional opportunities for corrupt officials to exploit them. On the basis of the literature surveyed, it appears that exposure to extortive forms of corruption further increases these communities' alienation, especially from the organs of the state.

This marginalisation is compounded by the lack of political, economic and social representation of all of the marginalised groups covered in this paper. Exclusion from decision-making processes at all levels renders them less able to demand equal access to goods, services and opportunities.

At the end of 2019, for instance, around the world women only made up 24.5 per cent of national parliaments and 36 per cent of senior private sector leadership roles, while in the NGO sector only 30 per cent of leadership positions are filled by women, despite the fact that 70 per cent of NGO staff are reportedly female (Inter-Parliamentary Union 2019; World Economic Forum 2020; Fair Share 2020).

Other marginalised groups have even fewer voices in positions of power. A 2010 survey of global parliamentarians on Indigenous and minority representation showed that while 40 per cent of countries have some sort of parliamentary quota or special electoral measure in place to increase representation, there are severe financial, educational and professional barriers to minority ethnic and Indigenous groups to compete in elections in the first place (Protsyk, Inter-Parliamentary Union, and United Nations Development Programme 2010).

Aggregate data on global political representation of people with disabilities is scarce, but data from the United Kingdom and United States show that fewer than 1 per cent of elected officials have a disability (Candidates with Disabilities Running for Elected Office 2018; Dénes and Republikon Institute 2019).

Without political, economic and social visibility, marginalised communities are less able to challenge coercive corrupt practices that deprive them of their needs and entitlements on the basis of their identity or seek recourse when they bear the cost of collusive corrupt arrangements to which they are not party.

For example, the Kenya Human Rights Commission (2011) has documented routine police coercion and demands for bribes from the LGBTI community. The double penalisation of these groups is illustrated by the fact that the victims of this coercive corruption were reportedly reluctant to raise official complaints given their underlying vulnerability due to the criminalisation of same-sex practices (Kenya Human Rights Commission 2011).

In Indonesia, village councils and lumber companies are alleged to have made collusive illegal logging contracts that excluded Indigenous communities that lived on the land (Alesina, Gennaioli and Lovo 2019). The issuance of these illicit logging "permits" is argued to threaten Indigenous peoples' economic and physical livelihoods, which is compounded by the lack of representation on village councils (Alesina, Gennaioli, and Lovo 2019).

This literature review therefore considers how various marginalised communities experience corruption, and how marginalisation and the lack of representation reproduce forms of exclusion that facilitate corrupt practices. Broadly speaking, it finds that limited scholarly or policy attention has so far been paid to the interplay between corruption and marginalisation, let alone the implications of these dynamics on groups exposed to discrimination.

Corruption and marginalised groups

Marginalised groups typically bear a disproportionately large share of the costs of corruption. Yet the different ways in which marginalised groups experience corruption can vary significantly according to the features that characterise each group's relationships with state institutions, businesses and dominant groups more generally.

This section explores the distinct and nuanced links between marginalisation and corruption for several groups exposed to discrimination: ethnic minorities, women and girls, youth and children, Indigenous peoples, LGBTI, and people with disabilities. The paper aims primarily to be illustrative and is necessarily selective. It makes no claims to a comprehensive study of how corruption affects all marginalised groups, nor of the full range of ways in which corruption affects and is experienced by the groups covered below.

Ethnic minorities

At the time of writing, events following the killing of George Floyd and the protests by the Black Lives Matter movement have brought systemic discrimination of ethnic minorities to the forefront of public debate. The killing has also brought the role of law enforcement in reproducing forms of discrimination intimately connected to corruption into sharp relief.

Unsurprisingly, this is mirrored by citizen perceptions; the 2017 US Corruption Barometer found that nearly one in three African Americans view the police as highly corrupt, compared to a fifth of the total population (Transparency International 2017a). Revealingly, while 19 per cent of white Americans believed no members of the police force are involved in corruption, this view was shared by only three per cent of African Americans (Transparency International 2017a). It appears increasingly clear that the effects of corruption on ethnic minorities are exacerbated by their marginalisation, which is commonly associated with higher inequality, a lack of political representation and limited access to resources.

Ethnicity-based corruption

Isaksson (2015) suggests that members of the dominant ethnic group are more likely to experience corruption than ethnic minorities, though it is important to note that this type of corruption is usually collusive, such as where ethnic favouritism and ethnicity-based clientelism are widespread among the majority group. Entrenched social networks and higher baseline levels of trust within an ethnic group may make it easier for bureaucrats to ask members of the same ethnic group to grease their palms and for politicians to distribute handouts, in the expectation that a vote from a member of their own ethnic group will follow.

Despite this evidence that ethnic majorities may be the targets of collusive corruption, ethnicity-based corruption typically entails negative costs for ethnic minorities. Any type of ethnicity-based clientelism or intragroup handouts by dominant ethnic groups will be by definition exclusionary of ethnic minorities. Furthermore, ethnicity-based corruption is a form of particularism that implicitly damages the trust that minorities hold in the impartiality and quality of the government (Dahlberg and Holmberg 2014; Ramasamy 2020).

In turn, despite the lower resources that ethnic minorities typically possess vis-à-vis majority groups, this alienation from the state may foster intragroup corruption on the part of ethnic minorities. A paper by Giannoccolo and Lisciandra (2019) suggests that minorities confronted by a lack of political representation may resort to corruption to redress power imbalances. Another study in the Western Balkans found that discrimination and neglect on the part of the state in decentralised areas predominantly inhabited by minority groups has resulted in the proliferation of informal practices like bribery and clientelism as a means to access basic services (Skendaj 2016).

Naturally, perceptions of and experiences with corruption are not dictated solely by one's ethnicity. In a study of corruption and ethnicity in Sri Lanka in the aftermath of the civil war rooted in tensions between the island's ethnic communities, Orjuela et al. (2016: 171) observed that citizens frequently interpreted corrupt practices "as instances of ethnic discrimination". The authors posited, however, that this reflected an overarching narrative in which "problems related to a general weakness of the state were … incorporated into discourse of complaint about unfair treatment on the basis of ethnicity".

Indeed, one of the few quantitative studies on ethnicity and corruption found some indication of a "persistent, if weak correlation between racial fractionalisation [ethnic diversity] and *perceived* corruption"[1] across the US, but identified no such evidence of a link between ethnic diversity and the number of federal convictions for corruption (White 2016: 1661).

Nonetheless, as Orjuela et al. (2016: 171) are at pains to point out, perceptions matter and "repeated experiences of being cheated and marginalised, and perceptions that others receive undue benefits

or embezzle money are intertwined with other grievances and feed into a sense of injustice".

Of course, ethnic groupings are by no means monolithic, and evidence from the field underscores the fact that citizens are not blind to or tolerant of corruption on the part of leaders from their own ethnic group (Orjuela et al. 2016). This leads some scholars to posit that ethnic grievances around corruption should be primarily understood as a function of relations between the state and minority groups, rather than about relations between people from different ethnic groups (Thiranagama 2013).

"Ethnic" inequality

On average, individuals from ethnic minority groups have lower socio-economic status than their counterparts from ethnic majorities (Darden 1988; Massey and Eggers 1990; Grassroots Policy Project 2000). A publication by the Equal Rights Trust (2012) documents how disparities in amenities, infrastructure and access to services between different ethnic groups translate into inequalities in terms of participation in all areas of civil, political, economic, social and cultural life.

One cross-country study of "ethnic" inequality, understood as the income inequality between ethnic groups, has illustrated the impact of discrimination towards ethnic minorities in reproducing relative wealth (dis)advantages and consolidating the economic power of ethnic majorities relative to other groups (Alesina, Michalopoulos and Papaioannou 2016).

Such power imbalances are known to facilitate corruption (Chêne 2010; Fried, Lagunes and Venkataramani 2010; Lyons 2017), and indeed Alesina et al. (2016) find that high ethnic inequality is positively correlated with higher levels of corruption. The literature on inequality indicates

---

[1] Emphasis added. Note that the measure of perceived corruption draws on a survey of political journalists, not members of the public.

that corruption often skews income distribution in favour of powerful groups (see Transparency International 2017b; You and Khagram 2005; Hunt 2007; Nielsen 2003) and can thereby exacerbate existing underlying income disparities between different ethnic groups. Orjuela et al. (2016: 171) point to the intersectional dynamics often present as "class often overlaps with ethnicity to position people in relation to the (corrupt) state".

A final important point is that high levels of inequality are believed to contribute to lower levels of social trust in "other people" and government institutions, thereby decreasing the constraints on corruption (Rothstein and Uslaner 2005). In turn, some scholars contend that corruption decreases intergroup trust while increasing intragroup trust (Rothstein 2011; Uslaner 2008), which has clear implications for ethnic discrimination.

Lack of political representation

Inequality is linked to a lack of political representation of ethnic minority groups. Several studies in the US have shown that the political system is less accessible to people with a lower socio-economic status and non-white ethnicities (Kotch 2015; McElwee 2016; Koerth 2018; Kotch and Shaw 2019; Kromm 2020).

The same discriminatory practices that limit political representation may also serve to exacerbate the impact of corruption on ethnic minorities. An analysis of the relationship between the proportion of reserved seats in a legislature and levels of corruption found that, on average, those countries that reserve up to 25 per cent of seats for ethnic minorities enjoy higher aggregate citizen trust in government and lower perceptions of corruption while also maintaining democratic and competitive elections (Stendahl 2016). Unfortunately, this group of countries is small: most ethnic minorities do not have reserved seats in their national legislatures and their political representation is low (Protsyk, Inter-Parliamentary

Union and United Nations Development Programme 2010; Stendahl 2016).

Politicians may also seek to use corruption to mobilise ethnic groups for political gain, or indeed weaponise ethnicity in an attempt to obscure their own corrupt dealings. Mattingly and Obala (2013) write that, after forced evictions in a slum in Nairobi, various communities scrambled to claim their new parcel of land. During the reallocation process, politicians reportedly sought to mobilise different ethnic groups in exchange for bribes and favours, and Mattingly and Obala (2013) claim that the result was that certain ethnic minorities were terrorised off their lands, sold fraudulent land parcels and excluded from land markets.

Lack of resources

Given that ethnic minority groups tend to have fewer economic resources (Alesina, Michalopoulos and Papaioannou 2016), they can expect greater challenges meeting their basic economic needs and accessing resources in systems with a high incidence of corruption due to the particularistic distribution of goods and services (Johnston 1989 in: Fried et al. 2010).

Certain ethnic minorities may live in more remote areas, with difficult terrain and poor infrastructure that further hinders access to fundamental resources and services (Brockerhoff and Hewett 2000; Van De Walle and Gunewardena 2000; Epprecht et al. 2011). Corruption can serve to widen the gulf between urban nodes and rural areas inhabited primarily by ethnic minorities (Konadu-Agyemang and Shabaya 2005). For example, in the district of West Lombok in Indonesia, local bureaucrats allegedly allocated more than 3.3 billion rupiah (approximately US$350,000) for the purchase of luxury cars and motorbikes for district officials, while villages inhabited predominantly by ethnic minorities were starved of development funds (Mawardi et al. 2002: 11, as cited in: Duncan 2007).

Law enforcement

Another way in which ethnic minorities may be affected by corruption is through forms of discrimination embedded in the criminal justice system (Roberts and Ford 2015; Jones 1978). Skendaj (2016) shows that ethnic minorities in the Western Balkans are more likely to be asked for or forced to pay a bribe by state officials, while Musgrove (2012) concludes in his 40-year study of US politics from the 1970s onwards that African American politicians have been disproportionately targeted by law enforcement bodies on charges of misconduct and corruption.

A study by Fried et al. (2010) found that police officers in Mexico were more likely to demand bribes from individuals perceived to belong to lower socio-economic groups. They suggest that these individuals could be more vulnerable to police corruption because they are less likely to be in a position to demand redress or file charges against corrupt police officers. Given the well-documented phenomenon of "ethnic" inequality mentioned above, this finding suggests that any aggregate gulf in socio-economic status between different ethnic groups will likely mean that ethnic minorities are more exposed to extortive forms of corruption.

Women and girls

In many societies, corruption disproportionately deprives women and girls of opportunities to participate fully in social, economic and political life, particularly in the public sphere.

Of all the groups covered in this paper, the impact of corruption on women and girls is the most extensively documented. However, most of the literature adopts a relatively narrow focus in studying the impact of corruption in public service delivery on women and girls. This lack of access to basic services such as health and education is often founded on exclusionary practices and forms

of marginalisation that can follow a woman for her entire life – or worse, end it.

Justice

Women and girls are often at a greater risk than men of experiencing corruption when trying to access justice, and in particular during proceedings related to property (Transparency International 2018). Discrimination against women may make it more difficult for them to access the justice system through formal channels for redress, including to report incidences of corruption (United Nations Development Fund for Women 2010). While women and girls clearly have diverse experiences of access to justice, in many settings women can struggle to realise their formal rights even where they technically have the same legal rights as men, and their autonomy may be further constrained by social norms (Transparency International 2019a).

In fact, women that most urgently need access to justice may be the ones least able to report corruption and demand accountability due to a combination of factors that collectively serve to weaken their voices. These include the fact that women typically have fewer resources as well as more limited awareness of their legal entitlements as a result of discriminatory practices in schooling (Hossain et al 2010: 8) and, critically, the dearth of gender-sensitive reporting mechanisms available to them (Transparency International 2016: 10).

Troublingly, women seeking security and protection from violence are particularly exposed to police or judicial corruption, especially those women that live in poverty (United Nations Development Fund for Women 2010). A case study from Uganda found that women had little trust in the police to properly investigate cases of rape and domestic violence due to corrupt practices, such as the perpetrators paying off the police (Transparency International 2016: 10). This reportedly led affected women to avoid contacting authorities and seek informal dispute settlement channels.

Corruption and women's (often limited) access to justice can affect how women realise their rights to education, healthcare and other social entitlements. Bribes, predatory pricing or lending schemes and intimidation make it more difficult for women to have their voices heard in already challenging gendered environments (Transparency International 2019b; Chêne 2009; United Nations Development Fund for Women 2010).

Education

Corruption in the education sector disproportionately affects women, especially poor women, because of their greater reliance on the state and on public services (Rheinbay and Chêne 2016; World Bank Group 2015). This has a deleterious effect on poor women's educational quality and their future opportunities.

Where education officials or schools divert funds from the school into their own pockets, the literature suggests that women and girls suffer unduly from lower quality educational services (UN Women 2009; UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education 2010).

The World Bank Group (2018) points to a "poverty penalty" that disproportionately affects girls and women up the age of 30, and results in around 5 million more women than men living in extreme poverty around the world. These women are unlikely to be able to afford private schools, tutoring or other options if the school quality is low, and if asked for a bribe by corrupt school officials, a woman may be forced to drop out or withdraw her child from school (Bray 2003).

Alternatively, she may cut corners financially to be able to afford the bribe, putting other areas of her life in jeopardy, such as healthcare or her rent payments. When parents are faced with the choice of putting more than one child through school and they cannot afford the bribes for both children, there is evidence that they pull the girl out of

school at a younger age to be able to help with household chores (Gandhi 2002). The cumulative effect of these education-related inequities is sometimes enough to curtail women's financial and political independence for a lifetime.

Health

Corruption in the health sector disproportionately affects women, which is partially due to the reasons related to economic vulnerability, lack of voice vis-à-vis corrupt state officials and lower bargaining power, as mentioned above (see Transparency International 2016). In addition, however, there are specific concerns related to women's health, especially in their reproductive years, which render them more dependent on the health system (Nawaz and Chêne 2009; Sen, Östlin and George 2007).

Corruption in healthcare means that women may be exposed to corruption due to similar factors that affect them in the education sector. Women are particularly reliant on public health services; one study in Nicaragua found that women constitute nearly two-thirds of all patients in the public health facilities (see Transparency International 2014). This is hardly surprising, as public clinics or hospitals are generally the only facilities to which poor women have access and, as noted above with reference to the "poverty penalty", women of childbearing age are disproportionately affected by extreme poverty (World Bank Group 2018). Corruption in primary healthcare can lead to long waiting times, poor quality of service, insufficient access to medicine, and other problems that could mean life or death to women in need (Sen, Östlin and George 2007; World Bank Group 2015).

The specialised care that women need (paired with their lower bargaining power) means that they are at particular risk of losing out when corruption becomes pervasive in healthcare systems. There is some indication that women who are hospitalised or in a precarious physical state struggle more than men to object to predatory

corrupt practices such as over-invoicing (Sen, Östlin and George 2007). For instance, there is evidence of women that have just given birth being forced to pay a bribe to see their baby or that bribes are extorted to ensure that a physician was present for the whole duration of the childbirth (Nawaz and Chêne 2009; Rheinbay and Chêne 2016; Sen, Östlin, and George 2007).

Finally, the amount of money in the healthcare sector is vast and there is often a high risk of corruption during contracting, invoicing and large-scale public procurement, as well as the construction of hospitals and other health infrastructure. Women's health supplies and pharmaceuticals are reportedly more likely to be over-invoiced or "lost" due to corruption in procurement; Goetz and Jenkins (2004) posit this is because women as a collective bargaining group are thought by those in power to lack the political clout to object to corrupt practices. Such neglect can have life-threatening consequences for women in desperate need of this medicine and equipment, especially during childbirth (Sen, Östlin and George 2007; United Nations Development Fund for Women 2010).

Where large-scale corruption scandals plague health projects, women may again be disproportionately affected. This is because, where corruption reduces the available health budget, the provision of women's health services may be especially vulnerable because of the high cost and particular needs of women's health. Women who need more specialised care and have fewer outlets for legal recourse may therefore act as "shock absorbers" for public officials' corruption (Nawaz and Chêne 2009; Sen, Östlin and George 2007; World Bank Group 2002).

Water and sanitation

Corruption in the water and sanitation sector has a particularly damaging impact on the wellbeing of women and girls by exacerbating existing service failures and reinforcing gender inequality

(Transparency International 2017c; UNDP 2012). In Kiribati, for instance, a study found that girls had a significantly higher likelihood of suffering from diarrhoea and dysentery than boys (Asian Development Bank 2014: ix).

Women are often the most exposed to corruption risks such as petty bribery or sextortion in informal water networks as they are typically expected to fetch water, cook, clean, wash and care for the sick (Cap-Net and the Gender and Water Alliance 2014).

In some settings, women are routinely excluded from making decisions on water issues, which means that their interests are not prioritised in service delivery (Water Integrity Network 2016:82). To give one example, girls' toilets in schools are frequently neglected, with the result that girls stay away from school when menstruating (Van der Gaag 2010).

In three-quarters of households without a water connection, women and girls are the ones who collect water, and studies have shown that carrying water over long distances can have a direct effect on women's health such as musculoskeletal disorders, particularly in the spine or pelvis which can result in problems during childbirth (Migiro and Mis 2014; Geere et al. 2010).

The lack of access to water and sanitation facilities also exposes women to other risks, such as sexual assault when collecting water or relieving themselves at night (Water Integrity Network 2016: 82).

There are also indirect impacts on women where corruption impedes access to safe water and sanitation services. Time spent collecting water is time that cannot be dedicated to other activities such as income generation, study, participation in community decision making or leisure (Evans et al. 2013).

Sextortion

Sextortion is a common but largely invisible form of corruption that disproportionately affects women and girls, as well as other groups such as LGBTI people. Sextortion involves an implicit or explicit request to engage in any kind of unwanted sexual activity in exchange for exercising power entrusted to someone occupying a position of authority (Transparency International 2020b).

The Global Corruption Barometer shows that in Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East and North Africa, one in five people has experienced or knows someone who has experienced sexual extortion when accessing government services such as healthcare or education (Transparency International 2019b). Another recent survey in Zimbabwe found that 57 per cent of female respondents reported that they had to offer sexual favours in exchange for jobs, medical care and even when seeking placements at schools for their children (Transparency International Zimbabwe, 2019).

Anecdotal evidence suggests that sextortion has severe psychological, physical, economic and social impacts on survivors/victims. These include dropping out of school, pregnancy, leaving a well-paid job or forgoing public services to avoid exposure to further abuse (Transparency International 2020b).

Sextortion can affect all socio-economic groups, but poorer people and those with scant legal protections such as migrants are especially vulnerable. It takes place in a variety of sectors and settings, including education, land, the judiciary and law enforcement (Transparency International 2020b). The latter is especially concerning given that it can make it harder for survivors/victims to access justice (Castro 2018). In addition, many cases are not reported due to a fear of retaliation as well as social stigma and cultural taboos (World Vision 2016). Even where cases of sextortion are reported, finding evidence

in the absence of witnesses tends to be difficult and often laws do not recognise non-physical forms of coercion (Carnegie 2019).

Human trafficking

According to an estimate by the International Labor Organisation (ILO), over 40 million people were victims of modern slavery in 2016, often as the result of human trafficking. Seventy-one per cent of those are women who frequently end up in sexual slavery, forced labour and servitude (ILO 2017). Corruption is involved at various stages in the human trafficking process; from recruitment and transportation right through to exploitation, corruption greases the wheels of trafficking networks, making human suffering a profitable business (Transparency International 2011). Corruption mostly occurs in forms of bribes to buy the silence of government bodies and public officials but also to local businesses who provide transportation or accommodation (UNIAP 2007).

Young people and children

Corruption likewise plays a part in the marginalisation of young people and children. Where corruption creates further scarcity in already strained social service or public health systems, it can prevent children from getting the essential health, education or developmental services they need.

Often, the children that suffer the most are those least prepared to advocate for themselves or whose families have limited resources. There is a clear overlap between age and income; according to the World Bank Group (2018), children account for 44 per cent of the planet's population living in extreme poverty.

While children and young people are not uniformly exposed to corruption, for many of the same reasons as women, including power asymmetries, scant resources and limited awareness of their legal entitlements, children's voices are rarely

heard, which contributes to their exclusion and even exploitation.

Essential services

In a survey commissioned by the African Union Commission in 2018, 63 per cent of young people said they had been directly affected by corruption, notably being forced to pay bribes to access healthcare or education (UReport 2018). In some instances, girls reported being asked to trade sex for access to schooling or in exchange for a good grade (UReport 2018).

Corruption typically reduces the quality or access to basic public services that are essential to child health, like water or sanitation. A study on various economic, social and political causes of childhood deaths identified corruption as a significant predictor of worldwide child mortality, explaining roughly 1.6 per cent of child deaths (Hanf et al. 2011). In 2011, the year the study was published, this equated to approximately 140,000 deaths. While corruption has less explanatory power than GDP or sanitation quality in the authors' model, it is more strongly associated with child mortality than the level of political violence, political rights or percentage of the population that lives in rural areas. Corruption, in tandem with other factors that determine quality and access to essential services, can be lethal and particularly hard hitting on the youngest members of society.

Child trafficking

Human trafficking is especially severe in the case of children. In 2005, the ILO estimated that between 980,000 and 1,225,000 children were in a situation of forced labour due to child trafficking, which affects both boys and girls (ILO 2005).

When children are taken out of their protective environment, they are highly vulnerable to various forms of exploitation, from sexual exploitation, servitude, forced marriages, child soldiers, illegal intercountry adoption and even exploitation in professional sports. As with other forms of human

trafficking, corruption plays a key enabling role in perpetrating child misery through the use of bribes to police officers, judges and ministers at all levels to look the other way (UNODC 2016; Tiefenbrun 2017; ILO 2015; Cantwell 2017; UN 2018).

Indigenous peoples

There appears to be very limited research on the impact of corruption on Indigenous peoples, let alone on the links between these manifestations of corruption and broader discriminatory practices. This dearth of literature may be symptomatic of the limited representation of Indigenous peoples more generally.

Nonetheless, there is some evidence that Indigenous peoples are especially exposed to corruption as a result of the often limited protection afforded to them by state institutions such as the courts, as well as because of the connection between natural resources and the economic livelihoods of some Indigenous communities.

In addition to the need for greater access to existing institutions, Indigenous groups often rely on the recognition of specific cultural rights and protections (Vásquez 2014). However, there is a lack of consensus among the international community on how to secure these rights and thus substantial cross- and within-country variation with regard to their implementation. These factors heighten both the risk that Indigenous populations will be exposed to corruption as well as the likely impact of corruption.

Firstly, many Indigenous groups claim the right to ancestral land as property that is important to their culture and that they can reside in and subsist on (Chêne 2010). This right can be violated when a government or private entity tries to extract from or seize the land for natural resource development projects or to resettle the Indigenous peoples. Depending on the influence exerted on public officials and the motives of private sector

developers, corruption can be a driver of land grabbing and other land rights violations.

This process of expropriation is a long-standing practice that even predates the formation of modern states in many parts of the world, as documented by Vásquez (2014) in the case of colonial Peru. The International Indian Treaty Council (2020) notes that such practices continue unabated, including under the pretext of responding to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Other contemporary examples include the misappropriation of Aboriginal lands in Australia and the forced resettlement of Indigenous peoples in the Philippines (Chêne 2010). In all of these cases, the exchange of gifts, money and benefits occurred between government officials, the private sector and (sometimes) local leaders, yet the benefits were almost never distributed among the Indigenous peoples to compensate for their loss of land and the incalculable loss of cultural property. Moreover, loss of land rights can be directly linked to poverty and increased vulnerabilities in other sectors (Vásquez 2014).

To further compound these losses associated with land rights violations facilitated by corruption, Indigenous peoples often have poor access to formal redress mechanisms. Their low integration into public legal and social institutions tends to preclude them from demanding compensation for the losses incurred as a result of corruption (Chêne 2010).

Secondly, Indigenous peoples are exposed to corruption because their livelihoods are often tied to valuable natural resources, including but not limited to land. There is a significant risk of various forms corruption in the natural resource industry due to the vast amount of public funds involved in large-scale projects, the regulatory or permit process that can involve extensive bureaucratic hurdles as well as the large number of public officials who can potentially engage in rent-seeking behaviour (Dermawan et al. 2011). Corruption can range from

kickbacks during the process to award logging or mining rights to bribes to officials to turn a blind eye to illicit pollution and illegal land grabbing.

Illegal loggers are known to bribe public officials and police (Human Rights Watch 2019). A paper by the Climate Policy Initiative (2019) found that crime and corruption are "deeply ingrained" in illegal practices of land occupation and argued that countering illegal deforestation requires prioritising measures to tackle corruption.

Where corruption occurs, the costs are borne first and foremost by the Indigenous peoples who inhabit the territory for which logging or mining concessions are granted. A good example is a regulatory loophole in the forestry sector in Indonesia that allowed local political leaders to issue logging permits on Indigenous lands. According to a 2015 study, an estimated 70 per cent of Indigenous lands were carved up according to these logging permits, with all revenue going to district leaders (Alesina, Gennaioli and Lovo 2019). The paper also found that districts that included a greater share of Indigenous groups were more likely to award illegal logging contracts, while politicians in these areas were reportedly less responsive to complaints from these areas about deforestation (Alesina, Gennaioli and Lovo 2019).

Documented corruption in the REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation) process in particular has been shown to exclude Indigenous peoples from the economic benefits and contribute to the persistence of poverty among Indigenous groups (Chêne 2010; Dermawan et al. 2011).

Corruption in the context of conflicts over the use of land and resources can be especially devastating. Human Rights Watch (2019) identified more than 300 people who have been killed during the last decade because they stood in the way of criminal and corrupt enterprises violating land rights. Of these, many were members of Indigenous groups who denounced illegal logging to authorities.

LGBTI

LGBTI people's exposure to corruption is linked to discrimination they encounter both through formal legal channels as well as informal practices such as prejudice in hiring and workplace processes (Rotondo 2015).

LGBTI communities are particularly exposed to extortive corruption in the 78 states worldwide that criminalise same-sex behaviour, which makes them easy prey for corrupt officials while also denying them access to justice (Human Dignity Trust 2020). Many of the discriminatory laws against LGBTI people in Commonwealth states date back to British colonial legislation (Lennox and Waites 2013).

Even in countries that do not criminalise same-sex relations outright, other laws, including so-called "morality laws" or debauchery laws, are used to target LGBTI people and expose them to coercive corruption by law enforcement (Human Rights Watch 2020). The Equal Rights Trust (2015: 72; 2016: 86-7) reports that in Moldova and Ukraine, for instance, LGBTI individuals are subject to blackmail and extortion by police officers and struggle to have crimes committed against them investigated properly.

The interplay between discrimination and corruption often becomes apparent when political leaders use the LGBTI community as a scapegoat. During politically-charged periods, such as elections or in the midst of a political scandal, the LGBTI community has been known to be subject to politically motivated smear campaigns, presumably to deflect attention from the actual headline. This can occur in the form of an attack that seeks to redefine corruption from an "economic" or "political" problem to an overwhelmingly moral issue for which marginalised groups can be made responsible.

According to Gloppen and Rakner (2019), during the 2019 parliamentary elections in Poland, for instance, one party (amid allegations of corruption) tried to mobilise its supporters against LGBTI people, claiming they were a threat to Poland's culture and national values. In Ghana, Baisley (2015) states that between 2006 and 2011, another political party defamed LGBTI people, arguing that they were innately corrupt and that homosexuality would corrupt traditional Ghanaian values. Similarly, in Malawi, Currier (2014) writes that homophobia was used as a political tactic to distract from government corruption.

These morally charged attacks to distract from corruption have three effects. Firstly, they can increase physical risks for the LGBTI community where other parts of society adopt these sentiments and act with prejudice, violence or hatred. Secondly, politicians that effectively conceal corruption by attacking the LGBTI community may repeat and normalise this form of discrimination. Thirdly, where successful, these tactics allow corruption to go unpunished, which has negative consequences for society in general.

Ultimately, more research is needed on the particular forms of corruption that affect LGBTI people and the complex links with discriminatory practices.

People with disabilities

The literature indicates that people with disabilities are exposed to corruption through two primary channels: abuse by those that provide care (service providers) and through government agencies that misuse funding intended to benefit the disabled.

Firstly, corruption in the workplace can sometimes be associated with prejudice towards people with disabilities. Paterson et al. (2011) argue that staff at disability care centres, when faced with scarce resources and poor instructions from leadership, can be tempted to neglect their service users, take

14

advantage of power imbalances and, at the extreme, even be violent or coercive towards the disabled. Power asymmetries in such situations mean that people with disabilities may struggle to blow the whistle on corruption or other forms of abuse by duty bearers.

People with disabilities also suffer when corrupt practices in government agencies result in the embezzlement or misuse of funds that were earmarked for disability programmes. These risks are heightened where application and reporting requirements for grant programmes intended to benefit people with disabilities are overly complex or opaque, or where there are loopholes that allow collusive behaviour between state agencies and private sector providers.

During the Ebola crisis in 2013, people with disabilities were reportedly some of the first groups to become neglected by health systems in West Africa that became overloaded by the crisis (Baisley 2015). Funds from disability programmes were reallocated towards pandemic prevention, and much of this was reportedly stolen by government bureaucrats and service providers (Baisley 2015).

Even in situations where the public health system is not under undue stress, resources for people with disabilities can be prone to misallocation. In post-apartheid South Africa, Eide and Ingstad (2011) report that there was some initial conceptual confusion over the terms "disability" and "discrimination" and who had the right to reparation grants. According to the study, this ultimately led to some with people with disabilities who were not racially discriminated against under apartheid having to give back their grants once the law was revised. Following this, people with disabilities and the groups that represent them reported difficulties accessing grants and funds from the government (Eide and Ingstad 2011).

More generally, the lack of political representation of people with disabilities in policymaking

processes reportedly makes it easier to overlook their particular needs (Candidates with Disabilities Running for Elected Office 2018; Dénes and Republikon Institute 2019).

Corruption and multidimensional marginalisation

Historic and current patterns of discrimination that mean marginalised groups typically have a lower socio-economic status can further exacerbate the effects of corruption. Those especially exposed to corruption include individuals who experience discrimination on the basis of their identity, status or beliefs, and who display other characteristics of precarity, such as poverty, occupation in the informal sector or lack of legal identity.

For example, workers in the informal sector may be diverse in their racial, gender or ethnic makeup. Yet their experiences of corruption may be aggravated by their compound identities, particularly where such individuals are exposed to multidimensional forms of marginalisation, such as being a non-cisgender member of an ethnic minority group.

This final section describes a few possible forms of marginalisation that cut across ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation or ability category but that can also exacerbate the effects of corruption for individuals in these groups.

Informal sector workers

Workers in the informal sector live on the margins: they live pay check to pay check, they have limited access to government resources, are sometimes excluded from some social benefits programmes that require proof of formal employment, and have little options for recourse against opportunistic employers (Benjamin et al. 2014).

These vulnerabilities make informal sector workers ideal targets for bribes from street level bureaucrats or law enforcement agents. A study in Mexico found that those who live and work in the informal sector were more likely to be asked for a bribe than those in the formal sector (Fried, Lagunes and Venkataramani 2010). It seems plausible that the bribe takers were cognisant of the fact that informal sector workers have few outlets to register a complaint given they have no formal employment and little recourse to legal redress.

On the other hand, informal sector workers may be indirectly reliant on corrupt practices. A few studies from Latin America show that corruption in the presence of high levels of inequality can indirectly benefit the poor (Andres and Ramlogan-Dobson 2011; Dobson and Ramlogan-Dobson 2012). The authors contend that large-scale anti-poverty programmes are often the victims of political corruption. While these programmes are used as a poverty reduction tool and truly do benefit the poor, they are also often used as a tool to buy votes for the party in power or for those in power to skim some off the top (Diaz-Cayeros, Estévez and Magaloni 2016; Kurtz 2002). In this case, informal sector wage earners benefit in the short term from corrupt large-scale social programmes that provide income or goods as pork-barrel projects or clientalistic handouts. Despite these short term benefits, evidence suggests that informal sector workers suffer in the longer term from the poverty traps inherent in these programmes designed to make them dependent on the state (Diaz-Cayeros, Estévez and Magaloni 2016).

Low-wage migrants and others without legal identity

Those without official legal identity, often low-wage migrants, are especially exposed to extortive corruption as a result of their informal or illegal status (Pi and Zhou 2015). Female migrants in particular may be at risk of sextortion (Global Initiative to Combat Organized Crime 2018; Gotev 2018; UN University 2017).

An extreme example is the risks migrants face in refugee camps where they have no licit source of income and are essentially stranded in the camp with few safeguards in place to protect them from camp workers or guards that want to take advantage of them (Gotev 2018).

In a refugee camp in Uganda, a corruption scheme was uncovered in which South Sudanese refugees were being upsold their own registration documents, which are imperative for exiting the country and crossing other borders in the future (Africa at LSE 2018). Corruption through camp workers and guards can also take the form of sextortion, which mostly affects migrant women and people from the LGBTI community.

Indeed, in refugee camps and during the migration process, LGBTI migrants are especially exposed to different forms of corruption, violence and exploitation because of stigmatisation and thinner support networks (Merkle et al. 2017). Moreover, similar to the LGBTI community, migrants may be subject to nationalistic attacks founded on discrimination that are used to conceal corruption scandals (Gloppen and Rakner 2019).

References

Africa at LSE. 2018. "The Illegal Economy of Refugee Registration: Insights into the Ugandan Refugee Scandal #PublicAuthority |." Africa at LSE. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/africaatlse/2018/03/08/the-illegal-economy-of-refugee-registration-insights-into-the-ugandan-refugee-scandal-publicauthority/.

Alesina, Alberto, Caterina Gennaioli, and Stefania Lovo. 2019. "Public Goods and Ethnic Diversity: Evidence from Deforestation in Indonesia", *Economica,* vol.86(341).

Alesina, Alberto, Stelios Michalopoulos, and Elias Papaioannou. 2016. "Ethnic Inequality." Journal of Political Economy 124(2): 428–88.

Andres, Antonio R., and Dr Carlyn Ramlogan-Dobson. 2011. "Is Corruption Really Bad for Inequality? Evidence from Latin America." The Journal of Development Studies 47(7): 959–76.

Asian Development Bank. 2014. *Economic Costs of Inadequate Water and Sanitation*: South Tarawa, Kiribati. Mandaluyong City, Philippines: Asian Development Bank. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/41796/economic-costs-inadequate-water-sanitation.pdf

Baisley, Elizabeth. 2015. "Framing the Ghanaian LGBT Rights Debate: Competing Decolonisation and Human Rights Frames." Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue canadienne des études africaines 49(2): 383–402.

Benjamin, Nancy, Kathleen Beegle, Francesca Recanatini, and Massimiliano Santini. 2014. Informal Economy and the World Bank. The World Bank. http://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/book/10.1596/1813-9450-6888.

Berghs, Maria. 2016. "Neoliberal Policy, Chronic Corruption and Disablement: Biosecurity, Biosocial Risks and the Creation of 'Ebola Survivors'?" Disability & Society: 1–5.

Bray, Mark. 2003. Adverse Effects of Private Supplementary Tutoring: Dimensions, Implications and Government Responses. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Brockerhoff, M. and P. Hewett. 2000. "Inequality of Child Mortality among Ethnic Groups in sub-Saharan Africa." World Health Organ 78(1): 30-41.

Cantwell, Nigel. 2017. *The Sale of Children and Illegal Adoption.* Den Haag: Terre des Hommes Netherlands. https://defenceforchildren.org/new-report-sale-children-illegal-adoption-nigel-cantwell/.

Cap-Net and the Gender and Water Alliance. 2014. W*hy Gender Matters in IWRM: A Tutorial for Water Managers.* Rio de Janeiro: Cap-Net. http://www.thewaterchannel.tv/gender/content/img/frd-full-resource-document-web-version.pdf.

Carnegie, Sara. 2019. *Sextortion, A Crime of Corruption and Sexual Exploitation.* London: International Bar Association. https://www.ibanet.org/Article/NewDetail.aspx?ArticleUid=c0e2c3ec-fde8-45f3-b3af-731fb9d4d34f

Castro, Teresita. 2018. "Exposing and Preventing Sextortion in the Judiciary", United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. " https://www.unodc.org/dohadeclaration/en/news/2018/11/exposing-and-preventing-sextortion-in-the-judiciary.html.

Cerqueti, Roy, and Raffaella Coppier. 2016. "A Game Theoretical Analysis of the Impact of Income Inequality and Ethnic Diversity on Fiscal Corruption." Annals of Operations Research 243(1): 71–87.

Chatterjee, P. 2011. Lineages of Political Society: Studies in Postcolonial Democracy. Columbia University Press.

Chêne, Marie. 2009. Gender, Corruption and Education. Anti-Corruption Resource Centre. U4 Expert Answer. https://www.u4.no/publications/gender-corruption-and-education.

Chêne, Marie. 2010. Impact of Corruption on Indigenous People. Transparency International: Transparency International. U4 Expert Answer. https://knowledgehub.transparency.org/helpdesk/impact-of-corruption-on-indigenous-people

Climate Policy Initiative. 2019. "Combating Illegal Deforestation. Strengthening Command and Control is Fundamental," *Climate Policy Initiative White Paper*
https://climatepolicyinitiative.org/publication/combating-illegal-deforestation/.

Currier, Ashley. 2014. "Arrested Solidarity: Obstacles to Intermovement Support for LGBT Rights in Malawi." Women's Studies Quarterly 42(3/4): 146–63.

Dahlberg, S., and Holmberg, S. 2014. "Democracy and Bureaucracy: How Their Quality Matters for Popular Satisfaction." *West European Politics* 37(3): 515–537.

Darden, Joe T. 1988. *Blacks and Other Racial Minorities: The Significance of Color in Inequality.* Los Angeles, CA: University of California.
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5c83023b

Dénes, Dóra, and Republikon Institute. 2019. "Disabled Representation in Politics: Why Do We Still Need to Talk About It?" 4Liberty.eu.
http://4liberty.eu/disabled-representation-in-politics/

Dermawan, Ahmad et al. 2011. REDD+, Corruption and Anti-Corruption Efforts in Indonesia. Center for International Forestry Research.
https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep02298.7

Diaz-Cayeros, Alberto, Federico Estévez, and Beatriz Magaloni. 2016. The Political Logic of Poverty Relief: Electoral Strategies and Social Policy in Mexico. Cambridge University Press.

Dincer, Oguzhan C. 2008. "Ethnic and Religious Diversity and Corruption." Economics Letters 99(1): 98–102.

Dobson, Stephen, and Carlyn Ramlogan-Dobson. 2012. "Why Is Corruption Less Harmful to Income Inequality in Latin America?" World Development 40(8): 1534–45.

Duncan, Christopher. 2007. "Mixed Outcomes: The Impact of Regional Autonomy and Decentralization on Indigenous Ethnic Minorities in Indonesia". *Development and Change* 38(4): 711–733

Eide, Arne H., and Benedicte Ingstad, eds. 2011. Disability and Poverty: A Global Challenge. 1st ed. Bristol University Press.
http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/j.ctt9qgths

Epprecht, Michael, Daniel Müller and Nicholas Minot. 2011. "How Remote Are Vietnam's Ethnic Minorities? An Analysis of Spatial Patterns of Poverty and Inequality." *The Annals of Regional Science* 46: 349–368.

Equal Rights Trust. 2008. *Declaration of Principles on Equality.*
https://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/Pages%20from%20Declaration%20perfect%20principle.pdf

Equal Rights Trust. 2012. *In the Spirit of Harambee: Addressing Discrimination and Inequality in Kenya.*
https://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/In_the_Spirit_of_Harambee.pdf

Equal Rights Trust. 2015. *In the Crosscurrents: Addressing Discrimination and Inequality in Ukraine.*
https://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/From%20Words%20to%20Deeds%20Addressing%20Discrimination%20and%20Inequality%20in%20Moldova_0.pdf

Equal Rights Trust. 2016. *From Words to Deeds: Addressing Discrimination and Inequality in Moldova.*
https://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/From%20Words%20to%20Deeds%20Addressing%20Discrimination%20and%20Inequality%20in%20Moldova_0.pdf

Evans, Barbara et al. 2013. *Public Health and Social Benefits of At-House Water Supplies: Final Report.* Leeds, UK: University of Leeds.
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08a0240f0b652dd000506/61005-DFID_HH_water_supplies_final_report.pdf

Fair Share of Women Leaders. 2020. "More Women in Leadership Positions",
https://fairsharewl.org/more-women-in-leadership-positions/

Fried, Brian J., Paul Lagunes, and Atheendar Venkataramani. 2010. "Corruption and Inequality

At the Crossroad: A Multimethod Study of Bribery and Discrimination in Latin America." Latin American Research Review 45(1): 76–97.

Gandhi, Kingdon. 2002. "The Gender Gap in Educational Attainment in India: How Much Can Be Explained?" The Journal of Development Studies 39(2). https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0022 0380412331322741

Geere, Jo-Anne et al. 2010. "Domestic Water Carrying and Its Implications for Health: A Review and Mixed Methods Pilot Study in Limpopo Province, South Africa". *Environmental Health* 9:52.

Giannoccolo, Pierpaolo and Maurizio Lisciandra. 2019. "Political Corruption and Minority Capture". *Economics & Politics* 31(3): 485-510.

Global Initiative to Combat Organized Crime. 2018. Understanding Contemporary Human Smuggling as a Vector in Migration. Global Initiative to Combat Organized Crime. https://globalinitiative.net/understanding_human_s muggling/

Gloppen, Siri, and Lise Rakner. 2019. "The Perfect Enemy: From Migrants to Sexual Minorities." CMI Brief 2019:05. https://www.cmi.no/publications/6861-the-perfect-enemy-from-migrants-to-sexual-minorities

Goetz, A., and R. Jenkins. 2004. Reinventing Accountability: Making Democracy Work for Human Development. Springer.

Gotev, Georgi. 2018. "EU Flags Fraud and Corruption in Refugee Settlements in Uganda." www.euractiv.com.

Grassroots Policy Project. 2000. *Race and the Role of Government*. https://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/Rac e_and_Government.pdf

Hanf, Matthieu et al. 2011. "Corruption Kills: Estimating the Global Impact of Corruption on Children Deaths" ed. James G. Beeson. PLoS ONE 6(11): e26990.

Hinojosa, Maria. 2012. Black Officials More Likely Probed For Corruption? https://www.npr.org/2012/07/13/156724059/black-officials-more-likely-probed-for-corruption?t=1591648304692 (June 6, 2020).

Hossain, N., Musembi, N., and Hughes, J. 2010. Corruption, Accountability and Gender: Understanding the Connections

Human Dignity Trust. 2020. "Country Profile: Kenya." https://www.humandignitytrust.org/country-profile/kenya/

Human Rights Watch. 2019. Rainforest Mafias - How Violence and Impunity Fuel Deforestation in Brazil's Amazon. New York: Human Rights Watch. https://www.hrw.org/report/2019/09/17/rainforest-mafias/how-violence-and-impunity-fuel-deforestation-brazils-amazon#_ftn55

Human Rights Watch. 2020. "This pride month, shame on you: exposing anti-LGBT government strategies in MENA." https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/06/08/pride-month-shame-you-exposing-anti-lgbt-government-strategies-mena

Hunt, Jennifer. 2007 "How Corruption Hits People When They Are Down*." Journal of Development Economics* 84(2): 574–589.

ILO. 2005. *A Global Alliance against Forced Labour*. Geneva, Switzerland: ILO. https://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/relm/il c/ilc93/pdf/rep-i-b.pdf

ILO. 2015. *Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Trafficking of Children "in a nutshell" A Resource for Pacific Island Countries.* Geneva, Switzerland: ILO. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---ilo-suva/documents/publication/wcms_494314.pdf

ILO. 2017. *Global Estimates of Modern Slavery: Forced Labour and Forced Marriage.* Geneva, Switzerland: ILO. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_575479.pdf

Inoi, H., Nishiwaki, M., and Doi. K. 2017. 'Social Exclusion Related to Mobility in Urban Area', *Transportation Research Procedia,* vol.25 pp: 4219-4228
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352146517306804

The International Indian Treaty Council. 2020. "COVID-19 Resources".
https://www.iitc.org/resources-links/covid-19/

Inter-Parliamentary Union. 2019. "Women in Parliaments: World and Regional Averages." Women in National Parliaments.
http://archive.ipu.org/wmn-e/arc/world011019.htm

Isaksson, Ann-Sofie. 2015. "Corruption Along Ethnic Lines: A Study of Individual Corruption Experiences in 17 African Countries." The Journal of Development Studies 51(1): 80–92.

Jones, Terry. 1978. "Blacks in the American Criminal Justice System: A Study of Sanctioned Deviance" *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare 5(3): 356-372.*

Kenya Human Rights Commission. 2011. The Outlawed amongst Us: A Study of the LGBTI Community's Search for Equality and Non-Discrimination in Kenya. Nairobi, Kenya: Kenya Human Rights Commission.

Kistner, U. 2014. "The 'political society' of the governed? Marginalia Beyond 'Marginalisation'", Theological Studies 70(1).
http://www.scielo.org.za/pdf/hts/v70n1/115.pdf

Koelble, T. 2018. "The Politics of Violence and Populism in Post-colonial Democracy: The Role of Political Society in South Africa", WZB Discussion Paper. https://bibliothek.wzb.eu/pdf/2018/v18-102.pdf

Koerth, Maggie. 2018. How Money Affects Elections.
https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/money-and-elections-a-complicated-love-story/

Konadu-Agyemang, Kwadwo and Judith Shabaya. 2005. "What has Corruption Got to Do with It? Understanding the Persistence of Rural-Urban and Inter-Regional Inequalities in Ghana and Zimbabwe." *GeoJournal* 62(1/2): 129-146.

Kotch, Alex. 2015. The Face of Election Money In North Carolina – The Disconnect Between Changing Demographics and the Political Donor Class in a Battleground State. Durham, NC: Institute for Southern Studies.

Kotch, Alex and Donald Shaw. 2019. Wealthy, White, and Over 50: The Demographics of the Democratic Presidential Donors.
https://readsludge.com/2019/08/08/wealthy-white-and-over-50-the-demographics-of-the-democratic-presidential-donors/

Kromm, Chris. 2020. Citizens United at 10: Why Fighting Corruption is a Racial Justice Issue.
https://www.facingsouth.org/2020/01/citizens-united-10-why-fighting-corruption-racial-justice-issue

Kurtz, Marcus J. 2002. "Understanding the Third World Welfare State after Neoliberalism: The Politics of Social Provision in Chile and Mexico." Comparative Politics 34(3): 293–313.

Lennox, Corinne and Matthew Waites. 2013. Human Rights, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in The Commonwealth: Struggles for Decriminalisation and Change. London: Institute of Commonwealth Studies.

Lyons, David. 2017. "Wealth Concentration, Racial Subordination, and Political Corruption." *American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy* 58: 226-234.

Massey, Douglas S. and Mitchell L. Eggers. 1990. "The Ecology of Inequality: Minorities and the Concentration of Poverty, 1970-1980." *American Journal of Sociology* 95(5): 1153-1188.

Mattingly, Michael and Luke M. Obala. 2013. "Ethnicity, Corruption and Violence in Urban Land Conflict in Kenya - Luke M Obala, Michael Mattingly, 2014." Urban Studies.
http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0042098013513650

McGee, Marcus J. 2015. "The Co-Optation of LGBT Movements in Mexico and Nicaragua: Modernizing Clientelism?" Latin American Politics and Society 57(4): 51–73.

McElwee, Sean. 2016. Whose Voice, Whose Choice? The Distorting Influence of the Political Donor Class in Our Big-Money Elections. New York: Demos.
https://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/Whose%20Voice%20Whose%20Choice_2.pdf

Merkle, Ortrun et al. 2017. *A Gender Perspective on Corruption Encountered during Forced and Irregular Migration.* Bonn: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH.

Migiro, Katy and Magdalena Mis. 2014. "Kenyan Women Pay the Price for Slum Water "Mafias". Reuters.
http://in.reuters.com/article/women-cities-kenyawater-idINKCN0JA0P620141126

Musgrove, G.D. 2012. *Rumor, Repression and Racial Politics: How the Harassment of Black Elected Officials Shaped Post-Civil Rights America*, University of Georgia Press.

National Council on Independent Living. "Candidates with Disabilities Running for Elected Office." 2018. National Council on Independent Living.
https://ncil.org/candidates/

Nawaz, Farzana, and Marie Chêne. 2009. Gender, Corruption and Health. Anti-Corruption Resource Centre. U4 Expert Answer.
https://www.u4.no/publications/gender-corruption-and-health

Nielsen, R. 2003. 'Corruption Networks and Implications for Ethical Corruption Reform', *Journal of Business Ethics,* vol.42(2), pp- 125-149

Orjuela, C., Herath, D., and Lindberg, J. 2016. *"Corrupt Peace? Corruption and Ethnic Divides in Post-war Sri Lanka," Journal of South Asian Development*, vol.11(2): pp. 149–174

Oxford English Dictionary. 2020. "Marginalisation."
https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/marginalization

Paterson, Brodie et al. 2011. "How Corrupted Cultures Lead to Abuse of Restraint Interventions: If Services Are to Be Made Safer for Staff and the People in Their Care, Managers Must Recognise the Risk Factors That Can Turn an Organisation

Toxic, Say Brodie Paterson and Colleagues." Learning Disability Practice 14(7): 24–28.

Pi, Jiancai, and Yu Zhou. 2015. "The Impacts of Corruption on Wage Inequality and Rural–Urban Migration in Developing Countries." The Annals of Regional Science 54(3): 753–68.

Protsyk, Oleh, Inter-parliamentary Union, and United Nations Development Programme. 2010. The Representation of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples in Parliament. Geneva; New York: Inter-Parliamentary Union; United Nations Development Programme.

Ramasamy, Ramesh. 2020. "Quality of Government, Public Service Delivery and Institutional Impartiality in Ethnically Polarised Societies: Evidence for Policy Makers." *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration* 42(1): 46-60.

Rheinbay, Janna, and Marie Chêne. 2016. Gender and Corruption Topic Guide. Transparency International.
https://www.transparency.org/files/content/corruptionqas/Topic_guide_gender_corruption_Final_2016.pdf

Roberts, Rebecca and Matt Ford. 2015. *Police Corruption, Spying and Racism: The Ethnic Penalty*.
https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/resources/police-corruption-spying-and-racism-ethnic-penalty

Rothstein, Bo and Eric M. Uslaner. 2005. "All for All: Equality, Corruption, and Social Trust." *World Politics* 58(1): 41-72.

Rothstein, Bo 2011. *The Quality of Government: Corruption, Social Trust and Inequality in International Perspective*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Rotondo, Stephanie. 2015. "Employment Discrimination against LGBT Persons." Georgetown Journal of Gender and the Law 16(1): 103–40.

Sen, Gita, Piroska Östlin, and Asha George. 2007. *Unequal Unfair Ineffective and Inefficient. Gender Inequity in Health: Why It Exists and How We Can Change It. Final Report to the WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health.*

https://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/csdh_media/wgekn_final_report_07.pdf

Skendaj, Elton. 2016. "Social Status and Minority Corruption in the Western Balkans, Problems of Post-Communism". *Problems of Post-Communism* 00: 1–13.

Stendahl, Ludvig. 2016. Fighting Corruption: A Cross-National Study on the Effect of Reserved Legislative Seats for Ethnic Groups on Corruption. http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-274164

Thiranagama, Sharika. 2013. "Claiming the state: Postwar reconciliation in Sri Lanka." *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism and Development* 4(1): 93–116.

Tiefenbrun, Susan. 2007. "Child Soldiers, Slavery, and the Trafficking of Children". *TJSL Legal Studies Research Paper* No. 1020341.

Transparency International Zimbabwe. 2019. "Gender and Corruption in Zimbabwe". https://www.tizim.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Gender-and-Corruption-in-Zimbabwe-2019.pdf

Transparency International. 2011. "Corruption and Human Trafficking". https://images.transparencycdn.org/images/2011_3_TI_CorruptionandHumanTrafficking_EN.pdf

Transparency International. 2014. *Gender, Equality and Corruption: What Are the Linkages?* https://images.transparencycdn.org/images/2014_Policybrief1_GenderEqualityCorruption_EN.pdf

Transparency International. 2016. *Topic Guide on Gender and Corruption.* https://knowledgehub.transparency.org/assets/uploads/kproducts/Topic_guide_gender_corruption_Final_2016.pdf

Transparency International. 2017. "Monitoring Corruption and Anti-Corruption in the Sustainable Development Goals: A Resource Guide."

Transparency International. 2017a. "Nearly Six in Ten Americans Believe the US Became More Corrupt in 2017". https://www.transparency.org/en/press/nearly-six-in-ten-americans-believe-the-us-became-more-corrupt-in-2017

Transparency International. 2017b. "Correlation between Corruption and Inequality". https://knowledgehub.transparency.org/helpdesk/correlation-between-corruption-and-inequality

Transparency International. 2017c. "The Impact of Corruption on Access to Safe Water and Sanitation for People Living in Poverty". https://knowledgehub.transparency.org/helpdesk/the-impact-of-corruption-on-access-to-safe-water-and-sanitation-for-people-living-in-poverty

Transparency International. 2018. *Women, Land and Corruption.* https://www.transparency.org/en/publications/women-land-and-corruption-resources-for-practitioners-and-policy-makers

Transparency International. 2019a. "Gender and Anti-Corruption: Where Do We Go from Here?" https://www.transparency.org/en/blog/gender-and-corruption-where-do-we-go-from-here

Transparency International. 2019b. "Projects and Activities – Land and Corruption in sub-Saharan Africa: Developing Gender-Sensitive Responses." https://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/activity/land_and_corruption_in_sub_saharan_africa

Transparency International. 2019c. "Global Corruption Barometer 2019". https://www.transparency.org/en/gcb

Transparency International. 2020a. "What is Corruption?" https://www.transparency.org/en/what-is-corruption

Transparency International. 2020b. "Breaking the Silence around Sextortion. The Links between Power, Sex and Corruption".

UN University. 2017. "UNU-MERIT » Corruption & Migration: How Women & Girls Pay a Heavy Toll." https://www.merit.unu.edu/corruption-migration-how-women-girls-pay-a-heavy-toll/

UN Women. 2009. Progress of the World's Women 2008/2009: Who Answers to Women? New York, NY: United Nations. https://www.unwomen.org/digital-

library/publications/2008/1/progress-of-the-world-s-women-2008-2009-who-answers-to-women

UN. 2016. *The World Social Situation Report*. New York: United Nations. https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/rwss/2016/full-report.pdf

UN. 2018. "Sale and Sexual Exploitation of Children, Including Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Other Child Sexual Abuse Material" https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1638578?ln=en#record-files-collapse-header

UNDP. 2012. *Seeing Beyond the State: Grassroots Women's Perspectives on Corruption and Anti-Corruption*. New York: UNDP.

UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education. 2010. Gender Responsive Budgeting in Education. United Nations. https://gender-financing.unwomen.org/en/resources/g/e/n/gender-responsive-budgeting-in-education

UNIAP. 2007. "Labour Rights Promotion Network, 'From facilitation to trafficking: Brokers and agents in Samut Sakhon".

United Nations Development Fund for Women. 2010. Corruption, Accountability and Gender: Understanding the Connections. New York, NY: United Nations.

UNODC. 2016. *Global Report on Trafficking in Persons 2016*. Vienna: UNODC.

UReport. 2018. "African Citizens Fighting Corruption." UReport. https://ureport.in/story/574/

Uslaner, Eric. 2008. *Corruption, inequality and the rule of law.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van De Walle, Dominique and Dileni Gunewardena. 2000. "Sources of Ethnic Inequality in Vietnam." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Van der Gaag, Nikki. 2010. *Because I Am a Girl: The State of the World's Girls 2010: Digital and Urban Frontiers: Girls in a Changing Landscape.* Graphicom, Italy: Plan International.

Vásquez, Patricia I. 2014. Oil Sparks in the Amazon: Local Conflicts, Indigenous Populations, and Natural Resources. University of Georgia Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/j.ctt46n84z

Water Integrity Network. 2016. *Water Integrity Global Outlook.* Berlin: Water Integrity Network. http://www.waterintegritynetwork.net/wigo/

White, K. 2016. Political Corruption and Fractionalization in the United States: Federal Convictions, Public Perceptions, and Societal Diversity, Proceeding of the National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR) 2016.

World Bank Group. 2002. Engendering Development: Through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources and Voice. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank Group. 2015. World Bank Group Gender Strategy (FY16-23): Gender Equality, Poverty Reduction and Inclusive Growth. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank Group. 2018. "No, 70% of the World's Poor Aren't Women, but that Doesn't Mean Poverty Isn't Sexist."

World Bank Group. 2019. "What Can the World Bank Group's Integrity Vice Presidency (INT) investigate?"

World Economic Forum. 2020. Global Gender Gap Report 2020. Davos: World Economic Forum. https://www.weforum.org/reports/gender-gap-2020-report-100-years-pay-equality/

World Health Organisation. 2019. "Social Exclusion." https://www.who.int/social_determinants/themes/socialexclusion/en/

World Vision UK. 2016. *No Shame in Justice: Addressing Stigma against Survivors to End Sexual Violence in Conflict Zones*. London: World Vision UK

You, Jong-Sung and Sanjeev Khagram. 2005. "A Comparative Study of Inequality and Corruption." *American Sociological Review* 70: 136-157.

Transparency International
International Secretariat
Alt-Moabit 96
10559 Berlin
Germany

Phone: +49 - 30 - 34 38 200
Fax: +49 - 30 - 34 70 39 12

tihelpdesk@transparency.org
www.transparency.org

blog.transparency.org
facebook.com/transparencyinternational
twitter.com/anticorruption

Transparency International chapters can use the Helpdesk free.
*Email us at **tihelpdesk@transparency.org***