# PLAGIARISM SCAN REPORT

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Words | 528 | Date | March 31,2020 |
| Characters | 3571 | Exclude Url | |

| 0% | 100% | 0 | 25 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Plagiarism | Unique | Plagiarized Sentences | Unique Sentences |

Content Checked For Plagiarism

1. The relationship between corruption and growth is not well identified; and outcome of the projected gains of corruption control are predominantly aspirational. Argument for adopting the anti-corruption campaign goes on following lines: Corruption undermines government legitimacy (Bhargava, 2005; Meon & Weil, 2010); and corruption has negative correlation with economic growth (Mauro, 1995; Tanzi & Davoodi, 1998; Aghion, et al, 2004). The new governance agenda pushes through corruption control as a means of achieving economic growth. For example, if a country implements corruption control measures it should score better on various indices of governance and will eventually see increased growth. On the other hand, the country that does not adopt corruption control measures would witness low performance and eventually low growth. If these assumptions are true, the historical data should be consistent in showing that there is significant negative correlation between corruption and economic growth. Also the causality between corruption and economic growth should be able to be explained empirically in different settings. It is fact that the neo-liberal approach driven corruption control programme recognizes the basics of economic and cultural paradigms of corruption in addition to considering the mechanisms that allow the internal regulation of social interactions within corrupt networks (Vannucci, 2015). But, the neo-liberal view of corruption control is ahistorical (Bedirhanoglu, 2007) and is driven by the concerns over market competition. Khan (2013) produces evidence to show that except some exceptional cases like Kuwait, Botswana etc. corruption control has not helped any country to achieve economic growth. Similarly, the high growth economies like Japan, China, South Korea etc. did not take very active corruption control measures at the early stages of their development. Blackburn, et al, (2006) find little evidence to support the claim that corruption control promotes economic growth. They present evidence showing that many of the most poor and corrupt countries in the past still remain poor and corrupt. Similarly, the study conducted by Persson, et al (2010) found that the position of most of the African countries in corruption control remain the same since the anti-corruption reforms were initiated in the 1990s. Findings of Johnston (2005) and Kpundeh (2004) also indicate that corruption has become more entrenched in many developing countries along with their efforts to control corruption. The theoretical model developed by Aidt & Dutta (2008) shows that corruption has negative impact on economic growth in countries where institutional quality is strong and vice versa. Méon & Weill (2010) would also produce similar evidence in their study. The study of Egger & Winner (2005) for 73 countries shows that corruption stimulates growth by eliminating government failures emphasising the functional effects of corruption. These views lead to the argument that corruption control could be the function of economic development and the vice versa need not necessarily be true. Thus the neo-liberal way of corruption control is not an optimal policy choice particularly for the developing countries with inconsistent growth as these measures have merely aroused the aspiration for controlling corruption for growth without producing substantive outcomes over the period of three decades. Besides, the neo liberal way of approaching corruption has created governance crisis in developing countries by increasing the costs of

| Sources | Similarity |
|---|---|