



Tulane Economics Working Paper Series

Tax and Corruption: A Global Perspective

Chris Evans
UNSW Sydney and
University of Pretoria;
cc.evans@unsw.edu.au

Richard Krever
University of Western
Australia
rkrever@gmail.com

James Alm
Department of Economics
Tulane University
jalm@tulane.edu

Working Paper 1805
March 2018

Abstract

This paper summarizes the discussion and the lessons at two recent conferences on corruption.

Keywords: Corruption; taxation; tax compliance

JEL codes: H2, H26, D73

Tax and Corruption: A Global Perspective

Chris Evans, Richard Krever, and James Alm*

Abstract:

This paper summarizes the discussion and the lessons at two recent conferences on corruption.

Keywords:

Corruption; taxation; tax compliance;

No society is immune from corruption,¹ and within any society taxation plays a pivotal role in relation to such activity – which can be both positive and negative. Positively the tax system can provide the kind of regulatory framework and institutional foundations which can help to eradicate or constrain corrupt practices. On the negative side, corruption reduces tax compliance.² Even perceptions of corruption, whether ‘grand’ or ‘petty’, seriously undermine taxpayers’ intentions to report actual income or sales.³ The relationship between tax and corruption is therefore both complex and critical.

Two events with the common theme of “Tax and Corruption”, held in Australia in April 2017 and in South Africa in October 2017, explored this complex and critical relationship. In Sydney, in a symposium convened by UNSW Sydney, hosted by KPMG and sponsored by the Asia Development Bank Institute, the focus was on tax and corruption in the Asia-Pacific region. In Johannesburg, in a symposium sponsored by the South African Institute of Chartered Accountants and convened by the University of Pretoria, UNSW Sydney and the University of Western Australia, the focus shifted to Africa. But, despite the regional variations, the two events canvassed many of the same themes and came to many of the same conclusions – affirming the view that whilst there will always be country-specific aspects, the issues raised by the relationship between tax and corruption are more than often global.

Both events were attended by between 30 and 40 invited delegates from all over the world, including representatives from academia, the tax profession, international organisations, the business community, civil society and senior tax administrators and policy makers. The symposia, each lasting two days, were designed to provide a safe environment in which research, thoughts and ideas relating to the problems of tax and corruption, and possible solutions or ways forward to tackle some of the problems, could be freely debated. Both followed broadly similar formats.

After welcomes from senior representatives of the organising institutions, each symposium commenced with a keynote address designed to contextualise or set the scene for the papers

* UNSW Sydney and University of Pretoria; University of Western Australia; Tulane University.

¹ Transparency International, ‘Corruption Perceptions Index 2015’ <<http://www.transparency.org/cpi2015>>

² James Alm, Jorge Martinez-Vazquez, Chandler McClellan, ‘Corruption and Firm Tax Evasion’ (2016) 124 *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 146, 146.

³ Arifin Rosid, Chris Evans and Binh Tran-Nam, ‘Do Perceptions of Corruption Influence Personal Income Taxpayer Reporting Behaviour? Evidence from Indonesia’ (2016) 14(2) *eJournal of Tax Research* 387.

and presentations to follow. In Sydney, the keynote address on the topic of “Corruption, Complexity and Tax Evasion” was delivered by the former Director of the Fiscal Affairs Department of the International Monetary Fund, Dr Vito Tanzi. The Johannesburg keynote address was provided by Professor James Alm of Tulane University, USA who spoke to a similar title (“Corruption, Taxation and Tax Evasion”), but with an entirely different content and emphasis. Dr Tanzi’s address explored the thesis that tax evasion is facilitated by corruption and that corruption in turn is facilitated by tax complexity. His presentation argued, and provided evidence to support the argument, that tax systems have become far more complex than they need to be, with a resulting impact upon corruption and evasion. In contrast, Professor Alm’s keynote examined three specific questions. First, on a general level, what are the causes and consequences of corruption? Second, on a more specific level, what is the relationship between corruption and taxation? Third, on an even more specific level, what is the relationship between corruption, taxation, and tax evasion? He concluded with a discussion of how this evidence can be used to control corruption, making use of a different, if related, body of work on tax evasion.

Early sessions at both events explored the relationship between tax and corruption from the broader macro-economic and social perspectives. They considered issues such as the complex relationships between corruption, inequality and economic growth; and the economic and social costs of corruption and how those could be mitigated. In addition, they provided a general overview and analysis of the problems of corruption in the Asian-Pacific and African tax environments and considered international and national legislative and strategic frameworks governing corruption. The sessions also analysed the state of the current literature and research designs and methodologies adopted in academic publications on tax and corruption.

Sessions in both events were devoted to the challenges and possible solutions for specific countries in the two regions. Hence country-specific presentations on tax and corruption in Australia, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Mongolia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines and Thailand were made in the Sydney symposium, and on Ghana, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda in the Johannesburg event.

The topic of corruption in revenue agencies was also a key sessional theme at both events. In Sydney, the session included a paper on best practice in Australia designed to detect and combat internal revenue officer fraud, and case studies relating to East Timor, Indonesia, the Philippines and Vietnam were used to illustrate the potential for, and threat of, corrupt activity at all levels of officialdom in revenue agencies in both developed and emerging economies. The Johannesburg symposium featured a presentation on integrity as the keystone to good tax delivered by a former Australian Commissioner of Taxation, whilst other presenters separately explored the principles and practice of tackling corruption in developing countries and how petty tax corruption of revenue officials impacted upon manufacturing innovation.

Later sessions focused on responses to combat corruption, ranging from transparency (“Is sunlight the best disinfectant” was the compelling title of one presentation) and disclosure (including whistle-blowing) through to the many aspects of policy, legislative and administrative or institutional reform and governance designed to tackle corruption in the tax environment.

Despite a total of 26 presentations being made in the Sydney symposium and 21 in Johannesburg, plenty of room was left for discussion and debate in all sessions, an opportunity not missed by the participants.

A large number and variety of themes emerged from the two symposia. Inter alia it was noted that corruption has many faces and many definitions, and that significant work was being done on the drivers and the effects of corruption in the tax world. But despite the growing research on corruption, that research was difficult, due largely to data and measurement issues. Moreover, a lot of the research was very case, context or country-specific, with the result that any solutions were also often likely to be case, context or country-specific.

One valuable outcome of the symposia was the critical questioning of current responses. A senior tax administrator, for example, pointed out that the practice of “rotating” staff to disrupt any ties that might be built between taxpayers and tax officers has the negative effect of preventing the organisation from building up higher levels of expertise in particular areas or losing the value of that expertise where it already exists. Also, the problem it seeks to address is actually symptomatic of a broader tax administration structural issue. Ties between taxpayers and tax officials only pose a risk if the tax assessment and appeal process rely on individual contact between taxpayers and tax officials. A modern administration system employing rigorously applied processes that separate assessments, collections and appeals from individual contacts can remove the need for rotations.

There were a number of other lessons that emerged from the papers and presentations. For example, it was clear that corruption is widespread, linked to tax evasion, often driven by greed, but also by poor governance/institutions and monopoly power in such institutions. Other factors included a lack of transparency, complicated and/or discretionary tax systems, poor enforcement, perceptions of unfairness in taxation and services, poor government services, low government wages, and a lack of integrity/ethics/morality. The point was also strongly made that responsibility did not simply lie with public officials: business was not blameless since corruption is generally a two-sided transaction. Corruption was shown to have clear (and usually detrimental) effects on innovation, fiscal citizenship and tax compliance.

Much of the content of the presentations and papers, and the discussions they prompted, focused on potential means by which corruption in the tax environment could be addressed. Very clearly corruption can be reduced by a host of possible strategies. Some which emerged included: increasing enforcement; instilling integrity/ethics/morality in government officials – and their business counterparts; increasing transparency, along with the power to act on transparency; establishing anti-corruption bodies and laws; changing human resource management practices; reducing tax compliance costs; eliminating or restricting discretionary practices in taxation – ensuring revenue authorities were precise on what is allowed and what is not allowed, even if this increases tax complexity; focusing on “basic” implementation of taxes on domestic taxpayers; educating the “next generation” of citizens and tax administrators (accepting that many of the current generation may be lost); improving institutions and building capacity; having the political will to address corruption; and protecting the “whistle-blower”.

Although it was obvious from the array of quality research papers and the quality of the discussions that much more is now known about corruption than when the explosion of corruption research began in the 1990s, there was nonetheless a feeling that the papers,

presentations and discussions often merely confirmed what participants knew (or thought they knew) when they walked into the events. Arguably it is more important to establish the new things that participants learned and to establish the areas on which participants changed their minds. It is also critical that further research needs to be undertaken to address some of the “unknowns” that emerged from the proceedings. These include:

- there is the widespread perception that corruption is widespread, but exactly how much corruption is there? That is, can country-level estimates of the extent of corruption be calculated?
- there is the widespread perception that corruption has many (harmful) effects, but exactly how large are these effects of corruption?
- there have been many suggested anti-corruption policies, but do any or all of the many proposed and enacted anti-corruption strategies actually work?
- the focus is typically on anti-corruption policies in the public sector, but what about policies that might work via the private sector?
- many have said that it is essential to instill “integrity/ethics/morality” to reduce corruption, but what are the specific actions that can be taken to do this, so that people will “do the right thing”?
- we want to think that there are “best practices” that should be enacted, but can we expect policies that work in one country will always work elsewhere?

Perhaps this was the most valuable outcome of the two symposia – the identification of areas where much more research is needed. And clearly such research needs to provide the empirical data upon which future evidence-based strategies can be developed, potentially involving a host of methodologies including the judicious use of field experiments, laboratory experiments, administrative data and other approaches.

A selection of papers from the two events have been refereed and will be published in December 2017 in a Special Issue on Tax and Corruption of the *e-Journal of Tax Research*.

Chris Evans, UNSW Sydney and University of Pretoria
Richard Krever, University of Western Australia
James Alm, Tulane University