

Bribery, Secrecy, and Communication: Theory and Evidence from Firms*

Jafar M. Olimov[†]

The Ohio State University

August 2024

Abstract

This paper studies if firms pay different types of bribes, and if corrupt bureaucrats have perfect information about resources of bribe-paying firms. We construct a model of corruption that allows for multiple informational scenarios in a single market for bribes and empirically test these scenarios on the original dataset of 429 firms operating in Tajikistan. The results indicate that firms simultaneously make voluntary and involuntary bribe payments, firms hide resources from corrupt bureaucrats to reduce involuntary bribe payments, and bureaucrats who receive voluntary bribe payments do not share bribery-relevant information with other bureaucrats.

Keywords: Bribes, Red tape, Firm behavior, Corruption

JEL Codes: D22, D73, D82, K42, O12

*We would like to thank Yaron Azrieli, Daniel Berkowitz, Paul Healy, Natalia Kravtsova, Alejandra Lopez, Farhod Olimov, Brian Roe, Jason Tayawa, Bruce Weinberg and seminar participants at the Ohio State University. Declarations of interest: none.

[†]Address: Department of Economics, The Ohio State University, 435 Arps Hall, 1945 N High Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43210; email: olimov.1@osu.edu

1 Introduction

The prominent approach in the literature on corruption is to view the market for bribes as centralized, with a single bureaucrat receiving bribes of one type in return for a public service that should be offered bribe-free¹. The literature offers two mutually exclusive perspectives on how to look at bribery. Under the "grease the wheels" bribery hypothesis, firms voluntarily make bribe payments to the corrupt bureaucrat to avoid burdensome bureaucratic barriers (Huntington (2006), Leff (1964)) or to obtain limited government resources (Vial and Hanoteau (2010), Lui (1985)). Under this hypothesis, bribery is viewed as beneficial both socially and at the individual firm level². Under the competing "sand in the wheels" bribery hypothesis, the corrupt bureaucrat extorts bribes from unwilling firms by threatening to subject them to costly red tape (e.g. Banerjee et al. (2013), Banerjee (1997)). Under this hypothesis, bribery is viewed as harmful both at the aggregate and at the individual firm levels (Uberti (2022), Paunov (2016), Mauro (1995)).

We present evidence that firms pay both types of bribes: non-extortionary (consistent with the "grease" hypothesis) and extortionary (consistent with the "sand" hypothesis). The coexistence of distinct types of bribery indicates the presence of at least two distinct groups of corrupt bureaucrats in the same market for bribes. We do not find evidence that bureaucrats engaging in distinct types of bribery share bribery-relevant information about bribe-paying firms. In particular, we find that bureaucrats engaging in non-extortionary bribery do not share information about

¹Typically, the literature takes the partial equilibrium approach and considers a single corrupt bureaucrat providing a single public service such as acceptance of a tax report, certification of economic activity, customs clearance, access to a government contract, employment in the public sector etc. (e.g. Lui (1985), Banerjee (1997), Burguet (2017)). There are studies that study decentralized markets for bribes and focus on the competition/coordination among corrupt bureaucrats (e.g. Shleifer and Vishny (1993), Waller et al. (2002)).

²Under this hypothesis, bribery can be modelled as a first-price auction, in which a corrupt bureaucrat auctions off the right to access limited government resources among firms that are willing to pay bribes. If more productive firms are willing to pay larger bribes, then auction winners with access to the limited government resources are the most productive firms, which leads to higher social efficiency. Weaver (2021) finds support for this hypothesis by empirically establishing that the allocation of healthcare supervisor positions in a developing country through bribery positively correlates with selection of individuals with superior professional characteristics. There are studies that find an opposite effect of bribery on social welfare (e.g. Bertrand et al. (2007)).

firms' financial resources with bureaucrats engaging in extortionary bribery. These results indicate that the assumption of centralized market for bribes may not always hold, and the commonly used measures of bribes in the empirical literature possibly aggregate over multiple types of bribes.

To address the questions of coexistence of distinct types of bribery and their interactions, we construct the theoretical model of corruption, study it under different informational scenarios, and empirically test which of the scenarios is consistent with the observed behavior of firms.

In our model of corruption, a single firm with hidden financial resources can pay two types of bribes (as in [Khalil et al. \(2010\)](#)) and can face bureaucratic delay (as in [Guriev \(2004\)](#) and [Banerjee \(1997\)](#))³. The firm can willingly participate in a contest to gain access to a public resource (e.g. obtain a procurement contract) by paying a (non-extortionary) bribe to a corrupt bureaucrat who administers the contest in the first period⁴. The same firm faces an (extortionary) bribe request that it is not willing to pay (e.g. when submitting an annual tax report) from another bureaucrat in the second period⁵. We consider three informational scenarios: the "no secrecy" scenario where the bureaucrat in the second period perfectly observes the firm's type and entry into the contest in the first period; the "secrecy with communication" scenario where the bureaucrat in the second period does not observe the firm's type but receives a message about the firm's entry into the contest from the bureaucrat in the first period; the "secrecy without communication" scenario where the bureaucrat in the second period neither observes the firm's type nor receives a message about the firm's entry into the contest from the bureaucrat in the first period.

Based on the equilibrium conditions of the model of corruption (Propositions [1](#), [3](#), and [5](#)), we formulate testable specifications ([EM1](#), [EM1.1](#)) to answer three main questions: (1) whether firms pay both non-extortionary and extortionary bribes (mul-

³As opposed to [Khalil et al. \(2010\)](#), who assume that the same corrupt bureaucrat receives both types of bribes, we assume that different types of bribes are paid to different bureaucrats who may or may not communicate. [Guriev \(2004\)](#) and [Banerjee \(1997\)](#) study only extortionary bribery. See [Burguet et al. \(2018\)](#) for an overview of the theoretical literature on bribery and corruption.

⁴To be consistent with the "grease" hypothesis, we model bribery in the first period as the first price auction.

⁵Consistently with the "sand" hypothesis, the behavior of a corrupt bureaucrat in the second period is modelled as a discriminating monopolist's problem.

tiplicity of bribe types), (2) whether firms hide at least a portion of their financial resources from corrupt bureaucrats (secrecy of bribe-paying firms' resources), and (3) whether bureaucrats receiving voluntarily made (non-extortionary) bribes share bribery-relevant information with bureaucrats that extract involuntarily made (extortionary) bribes (communication in the market for bribes).

The empirical analysis in our paper is related to firm-level studies of corruption (e.g. [Fisman et al. \(2022\)](#), [Colonnelli and Prem \(2021\)](#), [Bai et al. \(2017\)](#), [Freund et al. \(2016\)](#), [Sequeira and Djankov \(2014\)](#), [Rand and Tarp \(2012\)](#)). In contrast to existing empirical studies, we do not make causal arguments about determinants or consequences of corruption. Instead, we quantify frictions that set the scope for different types of bribery. In this regard, this paper is more closely related to firm-level studies that directly test mechanisms modelling bribery. These studies include [Svensson \(2003\)](#), who tests the bargaining hypothesis of bribery and finds that firms with smaller observable profit levels and larger outside options measured by market value of capital are able to negotiate lower bribes, and [Olken and Barron \(2009\)](#), who find evidence that corrupt officials exploit their monopoly power to extract larger bribes by using two-part tariffs and third-degree price discrimination.

To conduct empirical tests, we use the original data from a nationally representative survey of 429 firms operating in 2012-2014 in Tajikistan, where corruption is a common phenomenon⁶ (see [Tables 1 and 3](#) for data summaries). When collecting the data, we adopt the data collection methodology of the World Bank's Enterprise Surveys (WBES), which collect data on business practices of firms across the world⁷. We follow the WBES's guidelines when formulating questions about sensitive information such as bribe payments, unreported sales, and overstated costs (see [Section 3](#) in the online appendix for our formulations of questions).

⁶According to Transparency International, in 2015 Tajikistan was ranked 136th out of 168 countries in terms of corruption perception (source: <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2015/index/tjk>).

According to the World Bank's Ease of Doing Business index in 2015, Tajikistan was ranked 166th out of 189 countries in terms of friendliness of regulatory environment (source: World Bank (2014) *Doing Business 2015: Going Beyond Efficiency*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group).

⁷See <https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/en/methodology> for description of data collection procedure in WBES. Unlike WBES, which collect cross-sectional data, we collect panel data on three years of operation of firms. We employed the data-collection agency that had collected data for a similar World Bank's firm-level study.

Our first contribution is to show that both bribery types, non-extortionary and extortionary, coexist in the same market for bribes. This is the evidence to both the "grease" and the "sand" bribery hypotheses holding at the same time, and is in contrast to the current view in the literature that the two bribery hypotheses are mutually exclusive (Martins et al. (2020), Freund et al. (2016), Meon and Sekkat (2005), Wei and Kaufmann (1999)). The coexistence of different bribery types is consistent with findings in Gauthier et al. (2021), who differentiate between demand-side and supply-side bribery and find empirical evidence that bribery in the tax administration is mainly the demand-side bribery, while bribery in public procurement is mainly the supply-side bribery. In contrast to Gauthier et al. (2021), we assume that a single firm can potentially engage in both extortionary and non-extortionary bribery, which allows studying informational aspects in the single market for bribes.

Since we use the same data collection methodology as in WBES, our results indicate that the commonly used measure of bribes in WBES and similar firm-level data (annual bribe as a share of total sales) is an aggregation of bribe transfers with distinct payment mechanisms and distinct implications. Consequently, our results point out the need to account for heterogeneity in bribe types that may be present in aggregate bribe measures in the literature (some recent studies that use the WBES data and measure of bribes include Nishioka et al. (2023), Fisman et al. (2022), Gauthier et al. (2021), Amin and Soh (2021), Martins et al. (2020)).

Our second contribution concerns the question of unobservability of resources of bribe-paying firms. We use firms' profits that are intentionally kept secret from bureaucrats as a measure of unobservable bribery-relevant firm characteristics (see Shleifer and Vishny (1998) for discussion of profitability and bribery). We present evidence that more than 60 percent of firms in our data mis-report profits in tax statements by understating sales and by overstating operating costs (see Table 1 and related discussion). We find positive statistically significant correlation between aggregate bribes and profits that are reported in tax statements, and no such relationship between bribes and profits that are not reported in tax statements (see Table 4). This finding indicates that corrupt bureaucrats do not perfectly observe resources of bribe-paying firms, and it connects our paper to the literature on tax evasion (see Slemrod and Yitzhaki (2002) for review of the literature). We show that firms

may under-report profits in tax reports not only because of complexity of tax procedures (De Neve et al. (2021)), lax enforcement of tax regulations (Rubolino (2023)), or under-developed financial system (Guo and Hung (2020)), but also because firms attempt to reduce bribe demands from corrupt tax officials.

Our third contribution is to show the lack of communication about bribery-relevant firm characteristics among corrupt bureaucrats engaged in extortionary and non-extortionary bribery. This result is particularly important in the context of extortionary bribery with imperfect information, i.e. when bureaucrats without perfect information about firms' resources make bribe demands that firms are not willing to pay. If corrupt bureaucrats making extortionary bribe demands do not fully observe firms' resources, they can screen out firms with more resources by subjecting firms to differentiated levels of costly bureaucratic delay (Banerjee (1997)). Alternatively, the imperfectly informed corrupt bureaucrats can obtain information about firms' resources by observing past corrupt behavior of firms (Guriev (2004)), including non-extortionary bribe transfers. Because bribe transfers are generally unobservable to anyone aside from parties involved in the transfers (Shleifer and Vishny (1993)), information about firms' unobservable resources is revealed only if there is communication among distinct groups of corrupt bureaucrats.

While we find evidence of the use of bureaucratic delay as a screening device, we find no evidence of communication between bureaucrats engaged in non-extortionary and extortionary bribery. Consistently with the "secrecy without communication" scenario in our model of corruption, we find positive statistically significant correlation between non-extortionary bribes and profits that are reported to tax authorities and no statistically significant correlation between extortionary bribes and profits that are not reported to tax authorities (see Table 4 for estimates).

Our results about heterogeneity of bribe types, secrecy of bribery-relevant firm characteristics, and the lack of communication among distinct groups of corrupt bureaucrats indicate that the market for bribes studied in this paper is more appropriately described as decentralized. Consequently, the commonly made assumptions about homogeneity of bribery types and centralized bribery may not hold in arbitrary markets for bribes.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe the market

for bribes using data from the survey of firms in Tajikistan. In section 3, we present the model of corruption and derive equilibrium conditions to obtain empirical specification in Section 4. In section 5, we discuss the data, estimation approach, and present estimation results. We discuss results in section 6 and conclude in section 7.

2 The market for bribes

We define the market for bribes as a market of all government services, for which firms either transfer money to bureaucrats or for which bureaucrats demand money from firms on top of what is required by law, in economy in fiscal year. The demand side represents all firms that have at least tax registration and excludes firms that operate completely informally (without tax registration)⁸ since such firms may have no need to interact with bureaucrats. The supply side includes all bureaucrats that either receive voluntarily made payments or demand money for their services on top of what is required by law.

2.1 Bribes

The literature on corruption has long recognized differences in bribery types. The discussion of distinct bribe types originates in the law literature, and it does not overlap with the "grease vs. sand" bribery debate. In the law literature, [Ayres \(1997\)](#) defines extortion as a conspiracy initiated by a judge to achieve less than fair outcome for a defendant, and bribery as a conspiracy initiated by the defendant to achieve a more than fair outcome for himself. Both types of conspiracies involve illegal monetary transfers from the defendant to the judge. The key distinction lies in the nature of the relationship between the parties: the defendant transfers money to the judge voluntarily in the case of bribery and involuntarily in the case of extortion. [Khalil et al. \(2010\)](#) are the first to introduce this conceptual difference into the economics literature by characterizing bribery as a "cooperative" transaction that involves pursuit

⁸Our market for bribes includes all firms aside from completely informal ones. Completely informal firms are the firms operating without any required papers and without any formally employed workers. These firms include those that are too small to attract attention of bureaucrats and be forced to operate at least with tax registration and those that engage in illegal activities.

of a "common objective" by the firm and the corrupt bureaucrat, and extortion as an "antagonistic" transaction that benefits corrupt bureaucrat at the expense of the firm.

Although the literature on distinct bribe types and the "grease vs. sand" bribery debate do not overlap, there is no inconsistency between them. Under the "grease the wheels" hypothesis, a firm willingly transfers money to a corrupt bureaucrat to avoid bureaucratic obstacles or to gain access to public resources. This type of monetary transfer is consistent with bribery in the terminology of [Ayres \(1997\)](#). Under the "sand in the wheels" hypothesis, a corrupt bureaucrat demands a bribe that a firm is not willing to pay, and to incentivize the firm, the corrupt bureaucrat uses artificial barriers such as red tape. This bribery mechanism is consistent with the definition of extortion by [Ayres \(1997\)](#).

We follow the terminology of [Ayres \(1997\)](#) and [Khalil et al. \(2010\)](#) and call bribes that firms involuntarily pay to corrupt bureaucrats as *extortionary*. We assume that payment of these bribes is consistent with the "sand in the wheels" hypothesis. We call bribes that firms voluntarily pay to corrupt bureaucrats as *non-extortionary*, and assume that payment of these bribes is consistent with the "grease the wheels" bribery hypothesis.

There is the third type of informal transfers from firms to bureaucrats that are usually classified as bribes. These informal transfers are customary transfers from the public to members of the bureaucracy. These customary transfers represent gifts or donations that bureaucrats receive from the public, because transfers of such gifts are socially accepted or because they are a cultural norm (see [Malesky et al. \(2020\)](#), [Dong et al. \(2012\)](#), [Fisman and Miguel \(2007\)](#)). Note that customary transfers can not be explained by the non-extortionary bribery mechanism, because firms making such transfers do not expect any favors in return. Further, the customary transfers cannot be explained by the extortionary bribery mechanism, because these gifts or donations are not explicitly solicited by bureaucrats.

Despite the conceptual difference between bribe types, it is challenging to collect data on separate bribe payments for two main reasons. Firstly, since different bribe types are often paid simultaneously and there is no uniformly accepted codification of bribery, bribe-payers fail to determine whether a bribe is paid voluntarily or invol-

untarily, especially, if a bribe is a part of a larger transaction. Secondly, subjects of firm-level studies of corruption often refuse to report data on separate bribe payments either because they do not keep track of separate bribe payments or because they fear that reports of separate bribe payments may reveal information about their relationship with particular corrupt bureaucrats. For these reasons we follow the established approach in the literature and collect bribery data only in aggregate form (bribe as a share of total sales).

2.2 Bureaucrats

In a completely centralized market, the supply side is represented by a single bureaucrat, who sets a bribe payment for each government service for each firm with tax registration⁹. In this type of market, even with multiple bureaucrats receiving or demanding bribes, a single bureaucratic entity aggregates information about all bribe payments and identities of bribe-payers. In particular, in a centralized market, the single bureaucratic entity can condition later bribe demands on prior bribe payments for each firm paying multiple bribes.

In a decentralized market, the supply side is represented by multiple bureaucrats that individually receive or demand bribe payments. Typically, each bribe is paid in return for a public service for which each bureaucrat is responsible¹⁰. In this type of market, a bribe-receiving bureaucrat cannot condition his bribe demand on bribe payments made to other bureaucrats, unless bribe-receiving bureaucrats communicate or bribe transfers are public information.

Corrupt bureaucrats differ both in their reach of firms and in their ability to extract bribes. Corrupt bureaucrats who provide services that all firms are required to obtain by law have the most power to extract bribes and have the widest reach. For example, a corrupt tax inspector has the most power to extract bribes from all firms in his tax district, as all firms with tax registration have to submit annual tax reports, and operation without an approved tax report is illegal. In contrast, a

⁹The Philippines during Marcos regime is often cited as having centralized market for bribes (see [Shleifer and Vishny \(1993\)](#)).

¹⁰Countries in the Sub-Saharan Africa with weak central authority are usually cited as having decentralized markets for bribes.

corrupt bureaucrat administering a contest for allocation of a procurement contract among private firms has narrow reach and the least power to extract bribes since he can only target firms that have an interest in obtaining the contract. Further, because firms can exit the contest at will, the power to demand bribes of such bureaucrat is limited.

2.3 Firms

Firms differ in their ability to pay bribes. If bribe is a form of a tax on firms' disposable financial resources (profit), as argued by [Shleifer and Vishny \(1998\)](#), then most profitable firms should be able to pay largest bribes, whereas firms with non-positive profits should be able to pay only small bribes or no bribes at all. With perfect knowledge of firms' financial resources, corrupt bureaucrats with appropriate administrative powers can completely extract firms' resources, for example, by making take-it-or-leave-it offers to firms with positive profits while ignoring firms with non-positive profits. By ignoring low-productivity non-positive-profit firms, corrupt bureaucrats prevent such firms from exiting to the informal sector (see [Ulyssea \(2018\)](#) for discussion of such firms) or from completely shutting down operations. This is optimal from corrupt bureaucrats' perspective, as non-positive-profit firms operating in the formal sector (with tax registration) can be targeted later, when their profits increase.

Because firms differ in their ability to pay bribes and because in extortionary bribery corrupt bureaucrats are the ones making bribe demands, the extortionary bribery critically depends on corrupt bureaucrats' knowledge of firms' resources. The problem of informational asymmetry in extortionary bribery is exacerbated by the unwillingness of firms to reveal information about their resources, as firms participate in this type of bribery involuntarily. In this regard, corrupt tax officials are particularly apt to effectively exploit their administrative powers in extortionary bribery, as all firms with tax registration are obligated to file annual tax reports, and tax reports fully reveal firms' resources.

In contrast to bureaucrats in extortionary bribery, corrupt bureaucrats that receive non-extortionary bribes do not need to rely on their knowledge of firms' resources

Table 1: Shares of firms with positive, zero, and negative profits.

Year	Data	Negative profits	Zero profits	Positive profits
2012	Reported	55.9%	36.5%	7.6%
	Actual	20.5%	10.4%	69.1%
2013	Reported	55.1%	36.3%	8.6%
	Actual	17.9%	10.5%	71.6%
2014	Reported	59.3%	33.1%	7.6%
	Actual	21.7%	9.3%	69.0%

Note: The numbers are from the survey firms operating in Tajikistan in 2012 - 2014. The reported profits are the differences between firms' sales and costs reported to local tax offices. The actual profits are the differences between reported sales adjusted for the amount of under-reported sales and reported costs adjusted for the amount of over-stated costs, as evaluated by the firms themselves.

to elicit bribe offers. Since non-extortionary bribery can be viewed as a contest among firms that are willing to pay bribes, bribes of contest winners are determined by the competition among contest participants rather than by bribe demands of corrupt bureaucrats.¹¹

If firms anticipate extortionary bribe demands and expect non-positive-profit firms to pay no or only small bribes, then positive-profit firms have an incentive to imitate non-positive-profit firms, for example, by under-reporting revenues and over-stating costs in tax reports. We can test this conjecture by directly comparing distributions of firms by actual and reported profitability in our data. In Table 1, we report distributions of firms with negative, zero, and positive profits for each year in the data. The rows with "reported" numbers present shares of firms with negative, zero, positive profits calculated from revenues and costs submitted to local tax inspectors. As Table 1 shows, not all firms report their profits truthfully. This is evidenced by the clustering of firms reporting zero profit in their tax reports. Further evidence is given in rows with "actual" numbers that report shares of firms by profitability when accounted for under-reported sales and over-stated costs in tax reports.

From the perspective of corrupt bureaucrats, there are at least two types of firms in our market for bribes. The positive-profit firms that can afford to pay bribes belong

¹¹This view of bribery is most often adopted in the literature on corruption in procurement auctions. See, for example, [Compte et al. \(2005\)](#) for a discussion of how bribery affects bidding behavior in procurement auctions.




Figure 1: Bribes and delays (data of firms in Tajikistan in 2012 - 2014). A. Distributions of aggregate annual bribes per worker are estimated non-parametrically using Epanechnikov kernel (bandwidth=3), truncated at US \$60. B. Distributions of delays estimated non-parametrically using Epanechnikov kernel (bandwidth=2.5), truncated at 30 days.

to one type. The non-positive-profit firms that cannot pay bribes or can pay only small bribes belong to the other type. According to Table 1, about 70% of firms in the data are of the former type, 30% of the firms are of the latter type, and more than 60% of the positive-profit firms pretend to belong to the non-positive-profit type. If corrupt bureaucrats rely only on the reported tax data, then the actual type of about 90% of positive-profit firms is not observable, suggesting that corrupt bureaucrats may have to rely on a sorting mechanism to screen out the mimicking positive-profit firms.

To test whether the behavior of positive-profit firms is distinct from that of non-positive-profit firms, we compare distributions of reported bribe payments of positive-profit and non-positive-profit firms in Figure 1A. The behavior of firms is clearly distinct. While 84% of positive-profit firms report paying bribes, only 49% of non-positive-profit firms report doing so in the data. Further, as Figure 1A shows, positive-profit firms tend to pay larger bribes than non-positive-profit firms.

Because red tape is often associated with bribery (see Banerjee (1997), Fisman and Gatti (2006)), we also look at the differences in bureaucratic delays of positive-profit and non-positive-profit firms. The pattern is similar to that of bribery. Only 11% of positive-profit firms and 47% of non-positive-profit firms report having no bureau-

cratic delays. As shown in Figure 1B, bureaucratic delays are longer for positive-profit firms than for non-positive-profit firms. These comparisons indicate that the overwhelming majority of positive-profit firms pay bribes (84%) and face bureaucratic delays (89%). This is in contrast to the less than half of non-positive profit firms reporting paying bribes (49%) and facing bureaucratic delays (47%).

2.4 Summary of the market for bribes

We conclude that there are at least two types of bribery: extortionary and non-extortionary. The payment of extortionary bribes is consistent with the "sand in the wheels" bribery hypothesis, and the payment of non-extortionary bribes is consistent with the "grease the wheels" bribery hypothesis. Different bribery types are administered by corrupt bureaucrats with different reach and administrative powers. The question is whether these types of bribery are mutually exclusive, and if not, whether there is communication among different corrupt bureaucrats obtaining different types of bribes.

We also document at least two types of firms: positive-profit and non-positive-profit. The observable behavior of firms of different types is distinct, with positive-profit firms paying larger bribes and facing longer bureaucratic delays than non-positive-profit ones.

The data on tax reports indicates that corrupt bureaucrats may not fully observe firms' financial resources, suggesting that corrupt bureaucrats, especially those demanding extortionary bribes, may have to rely on communication with other corrupt bureaucrats and/or on a sorting mechanism to screen out firms with more resources.

3 The model of corruption

3.1 Model setup

Based on the discussion of the market for bribes in Section 2, we introduce a model of corruption with multiple types of bribery and potentially unobservable heterogeneous firm types. A single firm of type $i \in \{N, P\}$ can have positive ($i = P$) or non-positive ($i = N$) profit. We denote the profit of the i th type firm by Π_i . It is common

knowledge that the firm has non-positive profit with probability $\mathbb{P}(i = N) = \theta$ and positive profit with probability $\mathbb{P}(i = P) = 1 - \theta$. We express the P -type firm's profit as the sum of the N -type firm's profit and a positive increment $\Delta\Pi$, i.e. $\Pi_P = \Pi_N + \Delta\Pi$.

To capture the heterogeneity in bribery types, we assume that the firm can obtain two public services: a contract Γ from bureaucrat $B1$ in period 1 and a certificate from bureaucrat $B2$ in period 2. Although the firm can obtain the contract Γ from $B1$ at will, it is required to obtain the certificate from $B2$. Following [Gauthier et al. \(2021\)](#), we can think of acquisition of Γ from $B1$ as the participation in a contest for public procurement contract that any firm is free to enter or leave, and acquisition of certificate from $B2$ as an approval of tax report that any firm with tax registration is required to obtain. The acquisition of the contract in period 1 and the certificate in period 2 are unrelated: a firm with or without the contract is required to obtain the certificate, i.e. submit annual tax report.

The acquisition of both services is costly and may involve bribe payments and bureaucratic delays. Following [Ayres \(1997\)](#), we label the bribe paid to $B1$ in period 1 as non-extortionary and the bribe paid to $B2$ in period 2 as extortionary. This terminology reflects the voluntary nature of the relationship between the firm and $B1$ and the involuntary relationship between the firm and $B2$. Since data on individual bribe payments are not available, we focus on aggregate bribes. In our model of corruption, an aggregate bribe is the sum of non-extortionary and extortionary bribes paid by the firm in both periods.

We consider three informational scenarios: (1) $B2$ perfectly observes the firm's type and the firm's entry in the contest (no secrecy), (2) $B2$ does not observe the firm's type but $B1$ informs $B2$ about the firm's entry into the contest (secrecy with communication across periods), (3) $B2$ does not observe the firm's type and $B1$ does not inform $B2$ about the firm's entry into the contest (secrecy with no communication across periods). The interaction between $B1$ and $B2$ does not involve any strategic game between $B1$ and $B2$ and is limited only to information transmission about the firm's type. We do not model strategic interaction between $B1$ and $B2$, because our aggregate firm-level bribery data have no information about interactions between individual bureaucrats.




Figure 2: Timing of the model of corruption.

A completely centralized market for bribes is consistent with the first scenario (no secrecy), because the ability of $B2$ to fully observe the firm's type and action is an indication that information about the demand side is fully aggregated in centralized manner. A decentralized market with communication among corrupt bureaucrats is consistent with the second scenario (secrecy with communication), and a decentralized market without communication among corrupt bureaucrats is consistent with the last scenario (secrecy with no communication). The timing of the model is in Figure 2.

First period (non-extortory) bribery: The literature offers multiple ways to model non-extortory bribery. In the queuing model of corruption of [Lui \(1985\)](#), a firm willingly pays a bribe to move up in the queue and obtains a public service ahead of firms offering smaller bribes. In the model of petty corruption of [Lambert-Mogiliansky et al. \(2007\)](#), a firm willingly pays a sequence of sunk application fees and fixed bribes in return for approval of its application to implement a project. In the model of corruption in procurement auctions of [Compte et al. \(2005\)](#), firms initially place price bids in an auction for procurement contract and then can place bribe bids to the bureaucrat administering the auction. In the contracting model of corruption of [Burguet \(2017\)](#), a firm can pay a bribe in return for quality certification of the good that the firm contracts to deliver.

Although these models study bribery in different bureaucratic setups, all these models share three common properties: (1) free entry and exit of firms, so that the bribe is determined by the value of the relationship between the client firm and the corrupt bureaucrat, rather than by the total size of the firm's resources; (2) sunk entry/participation cost of bribery, so that the entry/participation cost does not affect the bribe size; (3) bribe size is either fixed or is determined by the competition among rivaling firms. Because we have only aggregate bribery data and no details

on how non-extortionary bribery is organized, we construct a general model of non-extortionary bribery that incorporates these three properties without ruling out any specific model of non-extortionary bribery.

In period 1, the firm decides whether to obtain contract $\Gamma \in \{0, 1\}$, with $\Gamma = 1$ for the firm obtaining the contract, and $\Gamma = 0$ otherwise. Since $B1$ is corrupt, the allocation of Γ is determined in a bribe contest, where firms offer bribes to $B1$ in return for the contract. The contract can be awarded to all firms offering bribes or only to a fraction of such firms. The net payoff from the contract to firms is V , and V is known to $B1$ ¹².

The firm makes the decision to enter the bribe contest with probability $1 - \phi$ and to stay outside with probability ϕ . The firm entering the contest secures the contract with certainty, so that the firm's probability of securing the contract is $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma = 1) = 1 - \phi$ and not securing the contract is $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma = 0) = \phi$. Note that this assumption can be relaxed by making the acquisition of the contract, conditional on entry, uncertain, leading to $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma = 1) = (1 - \phi)\mu$, where μ is the probability of obtaining the contract upon entry. We assume that $\mu = 1$ in the benchmark case of the model and consider implications of $\mu < 1$ for equilibrium bribe levels in Extension 7.

We assume that the firm's non-extortionary bribe to $B1$ can be expressed as a fraction $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ of the net payoff V , so that the firm transfers κV to $B1$ as the non-extortionary bribe and retains the payoff of $(1 - \kappa)V$ upon securing the contract¹³. To incorporate competition among rivaling firms (as in [Lui \(1985\)](#) and [Compte et al. \(2005\)](#)), the fraction κ can be made dependent on the number of rivaling firms¹⁴. Note that $B1$ does not need to observe the firm's type or V to elicit the bribe offer, as the bribe size is fully determined by the competition among rivaling firms in the contest (as in [Lui \(1985\)](#) and [Compte et al. \(2005\)](#)) or is a fixed fraction of V ¹⁵.

¹²To simplify exposition, we assume that V is commonly known and deterministic. We can easily extend the model to make V a commonly distributed random variable or have identical and independent distribution function for each firm.

¹³This assumption is realistic, as in such contests bribery often takes the form of profit-sharing schemes between participating firms and bureaucrats. Sometimes, corrupt bureaucrats demand a portion of their total bribe payment upfront, even before the contract has been executed and profit from the contract has been realized.

¹⁴We do not make this assumption, since we do not have any data on the number of rivaling firms.

¹⁵This is the standard assumption in the literature on auctions: the auction seller is assumed to know only the distribution of bidders' valuations but not valuations themselves. We can use

Consistently with the assumption of costly participation and the empirical evidence of positive participation costs in auctions across various industries (Hortacsu and Perrigne (2021)), we assume that the participation in the contest is costly¹⁶. The firm needs to pay fixed participation (entry) cost gn , where n is the number of days spent in the contest and $g > 0$ is the firm's daily participation cost. Consistently with the assumption that the cost is sunk (Lui (1985) and Lambert-Mogiliansky et al. (2007)), we assume that gn is sunk and cannot be recovered once the firm has entered the contest¹⁷. Given the participation cost gn and the non-extortionary bribe κV to $B1$, the firm's total cost of securing the contract is

$$NBC_i(\Gamma = 1) = gn + \kappa V \quad (1)$$

where NBC_i stands for the non-extortionary bribe cost of the i -type firm, $i \in \{N, P\}$.

We assume that the N -type firm cannot participate in the contest, because it cannot afford to pay the participation cost gn up-front. The evidence for this assumption can be found in the literature on both auctions (Hortacsu and Perrigne (2021)) and corruption (Gauthier et al. (2021)), which show that the entry in auctions in general and bribe contests in particular is endogenous due to positive entry costs, and firms that enter such contests are more productive and profitable than those that do not enter. Specifically, Gauthier et al. (2021) in their sample of 18,005 firms across 75 countries find that firms that participate in bribe contests for public procurement contracts are more likely to export their products, have larger capital stock and larger share of foreign ownership. This evidence supports our assumption that only the profitable firm enters the contest.

Given that the firm can have only two types and only the P -type firm enters the

an alternative mechanism to model the non-extortionary bribery, especially, if there is only one participant in the contest. With only one contestant, the non-extortionary bribery can be modeled as a bargaining game between the firm and $B1$ over the division of V . Then, $B1$'s share of V is measured by bribe κV , and the firm's share of V is measured by $(1 - \kappa)V$. As in the auction formulation of the contest, the division of V in the bargaining game does not require $B1$'s knowledge of the firm's type.

¹⁶For example, Li and Zheng (2009) estimate the entry cost of 8% of the winning bid in highway mowing auctions in Texas.

¹⁷Other types of sunk entry costs that play the same role as gn are search and matching costs, if we model the non-extortionary bribery as a matching process between the firm and $B1$.

contest, the participation in the contest and the bribe transfer to $B1$ fully reveal the firm's type i and the net payoff V to $B1$ ¹⁸. This implication relates to the more general question of how much information about the firm is revealed to $B1$ and how much information can $B1$ transmit to $B2$. Since only the P -type firm can afford to participate in the contest, $B1$ correctly concludes that any participating firm must be the P -type firm. Further, upon allocating the contract to the firm for the bribe, $B1$ concludes that the participating firm's profit must be larger by $(1 - \kappa)V$. Hence, $B1$ knows that the profit of the participating firm upon securing the contract is

$$\Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) = \Pi_N + \Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0) + (1 - \kappa)V \quad (2)$$

while the profit of the firm that does not enter the contest is either

$$\Pi_P(\Gamma = 0) = \Pi_N + \Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0) \quad (3)$$

or Π_N (profit of the N -type firm). Note that Π_N is independent of Γ .

We note that if $B1$ transmits all the available information about the firm to $B2$, then $B2$ correctly observes the type of the P -type firm with the contract but not the type of the P -type firm without the contract. This leaves some uncertainty about the P -type firm's type even in the presence of full communication across periods.

Lastly, to simplify exposition, we express the non-extortory bribe κV as a fraction of the P -type firm's profit, $\kappa V = \lambda \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1)$, where $\lambda > 0$ measures the size of the non-extortory bribe as a fraction of the P -type firm's profit. Then, the non-extortory bribe cost in equation (1) becomes

$$NBC_i(\Gamma = 1) = gn + \lambda \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) \quad (4)$$

where $i \in \{N, P\}$, and $\Pi_P(\Gamma = 1)$ is given by (2).

Second period (extortory) bribery: To model extortory bribery, we adopt the screening model of bribery of [Banerjee \(1997\)](#) and [Banerjee et al. \(2013\)](#). Consistently with these screening models, we assume that (1) participation in extortory

¹⁸For this reason, we do not introduce a more complicated model of information transmission.

bribery is involuntary, so that the non-extortory bribe is determined by the total amount of the firm's resources, (2) the participation cost, if positive, is not sunk, and (3) the corrupt bureaucrat uses screening to determine the bribe size.

In period 2, the firm applies for a certificate from bureaucrat $B2$. We can think of the certificate as an approval of the tax report that all firms with tax registration are required to possess independently of acquisition of the contract in period 1. The number of certificates is unlimited, and the firm meets all certificate requirements. The official certificate fee is F_L , and it takes $t_{min} \geq 0$ days for $B2$ to issue the certificate according to the law¹⁹.

Notation: For the remaining of the section, we assume that a firm's type is $i \in \{N, P\}$ and the contract is $\Gamma \in \{0, 1\}$.

$B2$ is free to charge an arbitrary certificate fee $F_{i,\Gamma} \in [F_L, \infty)$ and choose any amount of time $t_{i,\Gamma} \in [t_{min}, \infty)$ to issue the certificate to an i -type firm. Extortion occurs when $B2$'s choice of $F_{i,\Gamma}$ exceeds F_L , resulting in the extortory bribe

$$EB_{i,\Gamma} = F_{i,\Gamma} - F_L \quad (5)$$

We assume that the N -type firm does not pay any extortory bribe, so that $EB_N = F_N - F_L = 0$. This assumption is consistent with empirical evidence, because the median aggregate bribe of firms with non-positive profits in the data is zero. We relax this assumption in Extension 6 and test it empirically.

Bureaucratic delay (red tape) occurs when $B2$'s choice of processing time $t_{i,\Gamma}$ exceeds t_{min} , leading to the bureaucratic delay

$$m_{i,\Gamma} = t_i - t_{min} \quad (6)$$

Consistently with the definition of extortion in Ayres (1997), corrupt $B2$ initiates a dispute with the firm, demands an extortory bribe during the dispute, and uses bureaucratic delay at will during the dispute²⁰.

¹⁹The assumptions of unlimited number of certificates and compliance with all certificate requirements allow focusing only on the informational aspect of the screening problem in period 2. These assumptions imply that, for example, a tax inspector is free to issue as many approvals of tax reports as there are compliant firms.

²⁰ $B2$ is a myopic utility maximizer and cannot commit not to maximize his per-period utility in

$B2$'s utility from issuing the certificate to the i -type firm is

$$W + (F_{i,\Gamma} - F_L) - c(t_{i,\Gamma}) \quad (7)$$

where W is $B2$'s official salary, $F_{i,\Gamma} - F_L$ is the extortionary bribe paid by the i -type firm, and $c(t_{i,\Gamma})$ is $B2$'s cost of spending $t_{i,\Gamma}$ amount of time processing the certificate. We assume that $c(t_{i,\Gamma})$ is of the form $c(t_{i,\Gamma}) := \frac{c}{t_{i,\Gamma}}$ for some $c > 0$, so that $B2$'s cost of processing time $c(t_{i,\Gamma})$ is positive and decreasing in the processing time $t_{i,\Gamma}$. Note that the assumption of $c > 0$ implies that $B2$ always prefers to take longer to issue the certificate, which resolves $B2$'s commitment problem with processing time when no bribe can be extracted: $B2$ wants to reduce the certificate processing time only for a firm that can afford to pay a positive extortionary bribe.

The firm's net payoff from getting the certificate is linear in $t_{i,\Gamma}$ and $F_{i,\Gamma}$ and is given by

$$U_{i,\Gamma} := \Pi_i(\Gamma) - F_{i,\Gamma} - s_i t_{i,\Gamma} \quad (8)$$

where s_i is the i -type firm's daily cost of time. The term $\Pi_i(\Gamma)$ takes values Π_N , $\Pi_P(\Gamma = 0)$ given by (3), and $\Pi_P(\Gamma = 1)$ given by (2).

Expressing $F_{i,\Gamma}$ and $t_{i,\Gamma}$ in terms of extortionary bribe and delay from equations (5) and (6), respectively, the firm's net payoff from getting a certificate becomes

$$U_{i,\Gamma} = \Pi_i(\Gamma) - F_L - s_i t_{min} - s_i m_{i,\Gamma} - EB_{i,\Gamma} \quad (9)$$

Note that because gn is sunk, it does not enter the firm's net payoff $U_{i,\Gamma}$ in period 2.

We assume that a firm with larger profit values the certificate more ($U_{P,\Gamma=1} > U_{P,\Gamma=0} > U_{N,\Gamma}$), the daily cost of time is positive and smaller for the N -type firm ($s_P > s_N > 0$), and the daily cost of time of the N -type firm is not too large ($s_N < \frac{(\Pi_N - M - F_N)^2}{c}$)²¹.

If the firm does not get the certificate, it exits the market by selling off its assets²².

period 2.

²¹The assumption of $s_N < \frac{(\Pi_N - M - F_N)^2}{c}$ implies that the N -type firm would have shorter paperwork processing time if it could pay a positive extortionary bribe to $B2$.

²²This assumption implies that $B2$ is the only bureaucrat with an authority to provide the certificate. As Shleifer and Vishny (1993) argue, if multiple bureaucrats have an authority to issue identical certificates, the competition among bureaucrats (e.g. a la Bertrand) can potentially com-

Hence, the firm's outside option in period 2 is the market value of capital M . This assumption is consistent with results in Svensson (2003), who finds that firms with larger market value of capital are able to negotiate lower bribes.

The i -type firm's payoff after period 2 is $U_{i,\Gamma} - (1 - \phi)gn$, which is the difference between the net payoff after obtaining the certificate in period 2 ($U_{i,\Gamma}$ given by equation (9)) and the cost of participation in the contest in period 1 (gn) weighted by the participation probability $(1 - \phi)$. Hence, the i -type firm's payoff after two periods is $\Pi_i(\Gamma) - F_L - s_i t_{min} - (1 - \phi)gn - s_i m_{i,\Gamma} - EB_{i,\Gamma}$.

3.2 Three informational scenarios

We consider three informational scenarios in our model. Each scenario captures the amount of information that $B2$ has about the firm. In the no secrecy scenario (NS), $B2$ observes the firm's type and gets a report about the firm's action in period 1 from $B1$. In the scenario with secrecy and communication (SC), $B2$ does not observe the firm's type but gets a report about the firm's action in period 1 from $B1$. In the scenario with secrecy and no communication (SwC), $B2$ neither observes the firm's type nor gets a report about the firm's action in period 1 from $B1$.

$B2$ faces the following possible events:

I1: N -type firm requests the certificate;

I2: P -type firm without the contract from period 1 requests the certificate;

I3: P -type firm with the contract from period 1 requests the certificate.

The NS scenario is modelled as a perfect information game, where $B2$ can distinguish among these three events. The SC scenario is modelled as an imperfect information game, where $B2$ can distinguish between event *I3* and the remaining two events, but cannot distinguish between events *I1* and *I2*. The SwC scenario is modelled as an imperfect information game, where $B2$ cannot distinguish among the three events.

pletely eliminate extortionary bribery.

3.2.1 No secrecy (NS)

In the NS scenario, $B2$ observes the firm's type and action in period 1 and acts as a perfectly price-discriminating monopolist. In this scenario, $B2$ distinguishes between three singleton information sets $\{I1\}$, $\{I2\}$, and $\{I3\}$, and makes three respective take-it-or-leave-it (processing time, certificate fee) offers: (t_N, F_N) for the N -type firm in $\{I1\}$, $(t_{P,\Gamma=0}, F_{P,\Gamma=0})$ for the P -type firm without the contract in $\{I2\}$, and $(t_{P,\Gamma=1}, F_{P,\Gamma=1})$ for the P -type firm with the contract in $\{I3\}$.

Note that since the N -type firm cannot pay any extortionary bribe, in the information set $\{I1\}$ we have $F_N = F_L$. The rest of the values of interest $t_N, t_{P,\Gamma=0}, F_{P,\Gamma=0}, t_{P,\Gamma=1}, F_{P,\Gamma=1}$ are the optimal solutions to the problem NS below.

The problem NS solves for optimal take-it-or-leave-it offers that $B2$ makes to the firm. $B2$ maximizes his utility (7) subject to the i th type firm's participation constraint $IR_{i,\Gamma}$, $i \in \{N, P\}$, $\Gamma \in \{0, 1\}$. An i th-type firm participates if its net payoff in the second period (8) is at least its market value M of the capital, i.e. the constraint $IR_{i,\Gamma}$ is given by $U_{i,\Gamma} \geq M$. For the objective function, recall that θ denotes the probability of the N -type firm, and ϕ denotes the probability of not entering the bribe contest (and not getting the certificate) in period 1. These probabilities weigh the terms in the $B2$'s objective (7), resulting in the following optimization problem NS:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{(t_N, t_{P,\cdot}, F_{P,\cdot})} && W - \theta \frac{c}{t_N} + (1 - \theta) \phi \left(F_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_L - \frac{c}{t_{P,\Gamma=0}} \right) \\
& && + (1 - \theta)(1 - \phi) \left(F_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_L - \frac{c}{t_{P,\Gamma=1}} \right) \\
\text{subject to} &&& IR_N : \Pi_N - s_N t_N - F_L \geq M \\
& && IR_{P,\Gamma=0} : \Pi_P(\Gamma = 0) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_{P,\Gamma=0} \geq M \\
& && IR_{P,\Gamma=1} : \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_{P,\Gamma=1} \geq M \tag{NS}
\end{aligned}$$

where for notational convenience $t_{P,\cdot}$ denotes optimization variables $t_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and $t_{P,\Gamma=1}$ and, similarly, $F_{P,\cdot}$ denotes variables $F_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and $F_{P,\Gamma=1}$.

Solution to NS: Note that $B2$ can strictly raise his payoff by increasing $F_{P,\Gamma=0}$, $F_{P,\Gamma=1}$, and t_N until each participation constraint is binding. Optimization with bind-

ing $IR_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and $IR_{P,\Gamma=1}$ yields the following solution (the superscript NS indicates the NS scenario):

$$t_N^{NS} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N} \quad (10)$$

$$F_N^{NS} = F_L \quad (11)$$

$$t_P^{NS} = t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS} = t_{P,\Gamma=1}^{NS} = \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_P}} \quad (12)$$

$$F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS} = \Pi_P(\Gamma = 0) - M - s_P t_P^{NS} \quad (13)$$

$$F_{P,\Gamma=1}^{NS} = \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) - M - s_P t_P^{NS} \quad (14)$$

Interpretation: The take-it-or-leave-it offer for the N -type firm has no bribe and longer certificate processing time than the one for the P -type firm with or without the contract ($t_N^{NS} > t_P^{NS}$)²³. The offer for the P -type firm without the contract has the same processing time as for the P -type firm with the contract but smaller fee ($t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS} = t_{P,\Gamma=1}^{NS}$ and $F_N^{NS} < F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS} < F_{P,\Gamma=1}^{NS}$). The firm accepts its offer in all information sets, and $B2$ completely extracts the firm's surplus.

Equilibrium bribes: Since the N -type firm cannot pay any bribe and $B2$'s increase in utility from serving the N -type firm only comes from taking longer to issue the certificate, $B2$ sets the certificate processing time for the N -type firm at the highest possible level, while satisfying the N -type firm's participation constraint. This yields the N -type firm's extortionary bribe of $EB_N^{NS} = F_N^{NS} - F_L = 0$ and bureaucratic delay of $m_N^{NS} = t_N^{NS} - t_{min}$, where t_N^{NS} is given by equation (10). As the N -type firm does not enter the bribe contest in period 1 and has zero non-extortionary bribe cost ($NBC_N = 0$), the N -type firm's aggregate bribe $Bribe_N^{NS}$ is identical to the extortionary bribe EB_N^{NS} , i.e. $Bribe_N^{NS} = EB_N^{NS} = 0$.

For the P -type firm with or without the contract, the take-it-or-leave-it certificate fees are given by $EB_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS} = F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS} - F_L$ and $EB_{P,\Gamma=1}^{NS} = F_{P,\Gamma=1}^{NS} - F_L$ respectively. Note that the extortionary bribe of the P -type firm with the contract is larger since

²³By $s_N < s_P$ and $c < \frac{(\Pi_N - M - F_N)^2}{s_N}$, we have $t_P^{NS} = \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_P}} < \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_N}} < \sqrt{\frac{(\Pi_N - M - F_N)^2}{s_N^2}} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_N}{s_N} = t_N^{NS}$.

$F_{P,\Gamma=1}^{NS} > F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS}$. Solving backwards, the P -type firm's dominant strategy is not enter the bribe contest in period 1 ($\phi = 1$), since by doing so it can avoid paying sunk participation cost gn while retaining zero surplus upon acceptance of the $B2$'s take-it-or-leave-it offer. Hence, the P -type firm's equilibrium extortionary bribe is $EB_P^{NS} = F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS} - F_L$, where $F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS}$ is given by equation (13). Letting $m_P^{NS} = t_P^{NS} - t_{min}$ to denote the firm's processing delay and recalling that the P -type firm does not enter the bribe contest in period 1, its aggregate bribe in equilibrium is

$$Bribe_P^{NS} = EB_P^{NS} = \Pi_N + \Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0) - M - F_L - s_P t_{min} - s_P m_P^{NS} \quad (15)$$

Proposition 1 reports equilibrium aggregate bribes in the NS scenario:

Proposition 1 (Bribery in the no secrecy (NS) scenario) *If $B2$ is perfectly informed about the firm's type and action in period 1, then*

- (a) *The N -type firm pays aggregate bribe $Bribe_N^{NS} = 0$,*
- (b) *The P -type firm never enters the bribe contest in period 1 ($\phi = 1$) and pays aggregate bribe $Bribe_P^{NS}$ given by equation (15).*

3.2.2 Secrecy with communication (SC)

In the SC scenario, $B2$ does not observe the firm's type, but $B1$ informs $B2$ about the firm's entry in the bribe contest in period 1. In this case, $B2$ has two information sets: $\{I1, I2\}$ and $\{I3\}$.

In the information set $\{I3\}$, $B2$ has perfect information about the firm's type and profit (the P -type firm with the contract), makes take-it-or-leave-it offer ($t_{P,\Gamma=1}$, $F_{P,\Gamma=1}$) to the firm, and fully extracts the firm's surplus. The certificate processing time and fee of the P -type firm with the contract coincide with those when there is no secrecy (NS in Section 3.2.1), i.e. $t_{P,\Gamma=1}^{SC} = t_{P,\Gamma=1}^{NS}$ as specified by equation (12), and $F_{P,\Gamma=1}^{SC} = F_{P,\Gamma=1}^{NS}$ as specified by equation (14) (the superscript SC indicates the secrecy with communication scenario).

In the information set $\{I1, I2\}$, $B2$ faces the request for certificate from the firm that did not enter the bribe contest in period 1, and therefore, $B2$ cannot rely on the

information about the firm's type from $B1$ even in the presence of communication. Nevertheless, $B2$ knows that with probability $\frac{\theta}{\theta+(1-\theta)\phi} > 0$ the request comes from the N -type firm and with probability $\frac{(1-\theta)\phi}{\theta+(1-\theta)\phi}$ from the P -type firm without the contract. Hence, in the information set $\{I1, I2\}$, $B2$ offers a menu of (t_N, F_N) and $(t_{P,\Gamma=0}, F_{P,\Gamma=0})$, where $F_N = F_L$ (since the N -type firm cannot afford to pay any extortionary bribe). The rest of the values t_N , $t_{P,\Gamma=0}$, and $F_{P,\Gamma=0}$ are the optimal solutions to the screening problem **SC** below.

The objective in the screening problem **SC** is to maximize $B2$'s utility (7), with terms representing contributions from the N -type firm and P -type firm without the contract weighted by their respective probabilities as described above. The participation constraints IR_N and $IR_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and the incentive compatibility constraints IC_N and $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}$ for the N -type firm and the P -type firm without the contract, respectively, use expression for $U_{i,\Gamma}$ given by equation (8)). Hence, in the information set $\{I1, I2\}$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{(t_N, t_{P,\Gamma=0}, F_{P,\Gamma=0})} W - \frac{\theta}{\theta+(1-\theta)\phi} \frac{c}{t_N} + \frac{(1-\theta)\phi}{\theta+(1-\theta)\phi} \left(F_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_L - \frac{c}{t_{P,\Gamma=0}} \right) \\
& \text{subject to } IR_N : \Pi_N - s_N t_N - F_L \geq M \\
& IR_{P,\Gamma=0} : \Pi_P(\Gamma=0) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_{P,\Gamma=0} \geq M \\
& IC_N : \Pi_N - s_N t_N - F_L \geq \Pi_N - s_N t_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_{P,\Gamma=0} \\
& IC_{P,\Gamma=0} : \Pi_P(\Gamma=0) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_{P,\Gamma=0} \geq \Pi_P(\Gamma=0) - s_P t_N - F_L
\end{aligned} \tag{SC}$$

The solution to the screening problem **SC** is given in Lemma 2. The proof of the lemma uses routine arguments and is relegated to the online appendix (Section 1).

Lemma 2 (Solution to the screening problem **SC)** *In the information set $\{I1, I2\}$, $B2$ offers processing time and certificate fee menu as $t_N^{SC} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N}$ and $F_N^{SC} = F_L$ for the N -type firm (same as in the NS case), and $t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} = \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_P}}$ and $F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} = s_P(t_N^{SC} - t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC}) + F_L$ for the P -type firm.*

Interpretation: As in the no secrecy scenario, the menu offer for the N -type firm has longer certificate processing time ($t_N^{SC} > t_P^{SC}$) and no payment of extortionary

bribe. Upon acceptance of the offer, the N -type firm is left indifferent between obtaining the certificate and taking the outside option.

The certificate processing time for the P -type firm without the contract in the information set $\{I1, I2\}$ is also identical to the one in the no secrecy scenario (NS in Section 3.2.1), i.e. $t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} = t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS}$ as specified by equation (12), due to the fact that the daily cost of time for the P -type in the secrecy with communication scenario remains fixed at s_P . The only difference from the no secrecy scenario is the lower certificate fee that $B2$ in this scenario demands from the P -type firm without the contract, i.e. $F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} < F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS}$. This is because in the information set $\{I1, I2\}$, $B2$ has to leave some surplus (information rent) to the P -type firm to prevent it from mimicking the N -type firm. Consequently, the P -type firm without the contract strictly prefers accepting $B2$'s offer to taking the outside option M .

Equilibrium bribes: Since the processing time for the N -type firm remains the same and no extortionary bribe is requested, the aggregate bribe of the N -type firm in this scenario is identical to the one in the no secrecy scenario, i.e. $Bribe_N^{SC} = Bribe_N^{NS} = 0$.

Because of the information rent, the payoff of the P -type firm without the contract strictly exceeds the payoff of the P -type firm with the contract, whose type is fully revealed in $B2$'s message to $B1$. By backward induction, we conclude that the P -type firm never obtains the contract in period 1 ($\phi = 1$), and the P -type firm's equilibrium extortionary bribe is $EB_P^{SC} = F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} - F_L$ which by Lemma 2 is $F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} - F_L = s_P (t_N^{SC} - t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC})$. Since by Lemma 2, $t_N^{SC} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N}$ and $m_P^{SC} = t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} - t_{min}$, we obtain

$$EB_P^{SC} = \frac{s_P}{s_N}(\Pi_N - M - F_L) - s_P t_{min} - s_P m_P^{SC} \quad (16)$$

Since $\phi = 1$, the P -type never enters the bribe contest in period 1, and the P -type firm's aggregate bribe is equal to the extortionary bribe $Bribe_P^{SC} = EB_P^{SC} > 0$. Note that $Bribe_P^{SC}$ in this scenario does not depend on the P -type firm's actual profit Π_P ; it is completely determined by waiting costs and bureaucratic delays.

Proposition 3 summarizes these findings and reports equilibrium aggregate bribes in the secrecy with communication (SC) scenario:

Proposition 3 (Bribery in the secrecy with communication (SC) scenario)

If $B2$ is uninformed about the firm's type but informed about the firm's action in period 1, then

- (a) The N -type firm pays aggregate bribe $Bribe_N^{SC} = 0$,
- (b) The P -type firm never enters the bribe contest in period 1 ($\phi = 1$) and pays aggregate bribe $Bribe_P^{SC}$ given by equation (16).

3.2.3 Secrecy without communication (SwC)

In the SwC scenario, $B2$ does not know the firm's type, and $B1$ does not inform $B2$ about the firm's participation in the bribe contest in period 1. $B2$ has the single information set $\{I1, I2, I3\}$, in which he cannot distinguish among requests for certificate from firms of different types. In this information set, $B2$ knows that the request for certificate comes from the N -type firm with probability θ , from the P -type firm without the contract with probability $(1 - \theta)\phi$, and from the P -type firm with the contract with probability $(1 - \theta)(1 - \phi)$.

In the single information set, $B2$ offers a menu of three certificate processing times and fees: (t_N, F_N) for the N -type firm, $(t_{P,\Gamma=0}, F_{P,\Gamma=0})$ for the P -type firm without the contract, and $(t_{P,\Gamma=1}, F_{P,\Gamma=1})$ for the P -type firm with the contract. We have $F_N = F_L$, as the N -type firm cannot pay any bribe. The rest of the values $t_N, t_{P,\Gamma=0}, F_{P,\Gamma=0}, t_{P,\Gamma=1}, F_{P,\Gamma=1}$ are the optimal solutions to the screening problem SwC below.

As before, the objective function in the screening problem is based on (7), and constraints are based on (8). $IR_{i,\Gamma}$ denotes the i -type firm's participation constraint. $IC_N(P, \Gamma)$ denotes the incentive compatibility constraint of the N -type firm imitating the P -type firm with or without the contract. $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}(N)$ and $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}(P, \Gamma = 1)$ denote the incentive compatibility constraints of the P -type firm without the contract imitating the N -type firm and the P -type firm with the contract, respectively. $IC_{P,\Gamma=1}(N)$ and $IC_{P,\Gamma=1}(P, \Gamma = 0)$ denote the incentive compatibility constraints of the P -type firm with the contract imitating the N -type firm and the P -type firm

without the contract, respectively. The **SwC** problem reads

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{(t_N, t_{P,\cdot}, F_{P,\cdot})} W - \theta \frac{c}{t_N} + \phi(1 - \theta) \left(F_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_L - \frac{c}{t_{P,\Gamma=0}} \right) + (1 - \phi)(1 - \theta) \left(F_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_L - \frac{c}{t_{P,\Gamma=1}} \right) \\
& \text{subject to } IR_N : \Pi_N - s_N t_N - F_L \geq M \\
& IR_{P,\Gamma=0} : \Pi_P(\Gamma = 0) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_{P,\Gamma=0} \geq M \\
& IR_{P,\Gamma=1} : \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_{P,\Gamma=1} \geq M \\
& IC_N(P, \Gamma = 0) : \Pi_N - s_N t_N - F_L \geq \Pi_N - s_N t_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_{P,\Gamma=0} \\
& IC_N(P, \Gamma = 1) : \Pi_N - s_N t_N - F_L \geq \Pi_N - s_N t_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_{P,\Gamma=1} \\
& IC_{P,\Gamma=0}(N) : \Pi_P(\Gamma = 0) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_{P,\Gamma=0} \geq \Pi_P(\Gamma = 0) - s_P t_N - F_L \\
& IC_{P,\Gamma=0}(P, \Gamma = 1) : \Pi_P(\Gamma = 0) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_{P,\Gamma=0} \geq \Pi_P(\Gamma = 0) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_{P,\Gamma=1} \\
& IC_{P,\Gamma=1}(N) : \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_{P,\Gamma=1} \geq \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) - s_P t_N - F_L \\
& IC_{P,\Gamma=1}(P, \Gamma = 0) : \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_{P,\Gamma=1} \geq \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_{P,\Gamma=0} \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{SwC})
\end{aligned}$$

where for notational convenience $t_{P,\cdot}$ denotes variables $t_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and $t_{P,\Gamma=1}$ and $F_{P,\cdot}$ denotes variables $F_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and $F_{P,\Gamma=1}$. The superscript *SwC* indicates the *SwC* scenario.

Solution to the screening problem **SwC and equilibrium bribes:** The processing time and fee in the optimal menu for the *N*-type firm are the same as in NS (Section 3.2.1) and SC (Section 3.2.2) scenarios: $t_N^{SwC} = t_N^{SC} = t_N^{NS} = t_N$ and $F_N^{SwC} = F_N^{SC} = F_N^{NS} = F_L$ as specified in equations (10)-(11) and Lemma 2. This is because the *N*-type firm always faces the longest possible processing time that is determined by its binding constraint IR_N .

Since the *P*-type firm's time cost s_P does not depend on the firm's entry into the bribe contest or on the informational scenario, *B2* cannot use certificate processing time to discriminate between the *P*-type firm with and without the contract. As a result, the optimal menu in the information set $\{I1, I2, I3\}$ has identical certificate time and fee offers for the *P*-type firm with and without the contract²⁴. That is, $t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SwC} = t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} = t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{NS} = t_{P,\Gamma=1}^{SwC} = t_{P,\Gamma=1}^{SC} = t_{P,\Gamma=1}^{NS}$ with value given in equation (12), and $F_{P,\Gamma=1}^{SwC} = F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SwC} = F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC}$ as given by Lemma 2.

²⁴We obtain the same result when the *P*-type firm's cost of time increases with participation in the bribe contest in Period 1, if probability of the *P*-type firm without the contract $((1 - \theta)\phi)$ is sufficiently small.

Solving backwards, the P -type firm enters the bribe contest to obtain the contract ($\phi = 0$), because it obtains a larger profit while paying the same extortionary bribe as without the contract. For this reason, $B2$ concludes that in $\{I1, I2, I3\}$ the firm can have only two profit levels: Π_N and $\Pi_P(\Gamma = 1)$. Since the solution to the screening problem with two firm types does not depend on the P -type firm's actual profit (Lemma 2), the certificate fee in the optimal menu for the P -type firm with the contract in this scenario must be identical to the one offered to the P -type firm in the SC scenario (as given in Lemma 2).

The solution to the **SwC** problem is presented in Lemma 4 below. The proof uses routine techniques and hence is relegated to the online appendix (Section 1).

Lemma 4 (Solution to the screening problem **SwC)** *In the information set $\{I1, I2, I3\}$, in equilibrium the N -type firm faces certificate processing time $t_N^{SwC} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N}$ and pays fee $F_N^{SwC} = F_L$. The P -type firm enters the bribe contest in period 1 ($\phi = 0$), faces certificate processing time $t_P^{SwC} = \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_P}}$ and pays fee $F_P^{SwC} = s_P(t_N^{SwC} - t_P^{SwC}) + F_L$.*

The aggregate bribe and delay of the N -type firm in this scenario remain the same as in the NS and SC scenarios, i.e. $Bribe_N^{SwC} = Bribe_N^{SC} = Bribe_N^{NS} = 0$ and $m_N^{SwC} = m_N^{SC} = m_N^{NS} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N} - t_{min}$. The delay and the extortionary bribe of the P -type firm are identical to those in the SC scenario, i.e. $m_P^{SwC} = m_P^{SC}$ and $EB_P^{SwC} = EB_P^{SC}$ as in (16). However, since the P -type firm enters the bribe contest ($\phi = 0$), it has positive non-extortory bribe cost $NBC_P(\Gamma = 1) = gn + \lambda\Pi_P(\Gamma = 1)$, yielding the equilibrium aggregate bribe

$$\begin{aligned} Bribe_P^{SwC} &= EB_P^{SwC} + NBC_P(\Gamma = 1) \\ &= \frac{s_P}{s_N}(\Pi_N - M - F_L) - s_P t_{min} - s_P m_P^{SwC} + gn + \lambda\Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Proposition 5 reports equilibrium aggregate bribes in SwC scenario:

Proposition 5 (Bribery in the secrecy without communication (SwC) scenario)

If $B2$ is uninformed about the firm's type and action in period 1, then

- (a) *The N -type firm pays aggregate bribe $Bribe_N^{SwC} = 0$*

(b) *The P-type firm pays aggregate bribe given by equation (17).*

Several extensions of the model naturally arise. Extensions 6 and 7 below are incorporated in the empirical estimation of the model as discussed in Sections 4 and 5. The extension with more than two firm types is presented and empirically tested in Section 2 of the online appendix.

Extension 6 (Positive extortionary bribe of the N-type firm) If the N -type firm could afford to pay a positive extortionary bribe, in all three scenarios, $B2$ would demand from the N -type firm a certificate fee F_N^* satisfying the N -type firm's participation constraint $IR_N : \Pi_N - s_N t_N - F_N \geq M$ as equality, leading to $F_N^* = \Pi_N - s_N t_N - M$.

Then (assuming that the N -type firm never enters the bribe contest in period 1) the N -type firm's aggregate bribe would be $Bribe_N^* = EB_N^* = F_N^* - F_L = \Pi_N - M - F_L - s_N t_{min} - s_N m_N$ (where, recall, m_N denotes delay of the N -type firm). Hence, to incorporate the possibility of the N -type firm paying positive extortionary bribe, we can express the N -type firm's aggregate bribe as

$$Bribe_N^* = 1_B(\Pi_N - M - F_L - s_N t_{min} - s_N m_N) \quad (18)$$

where $1_B = 1$ for the N -type firm paying positive extortionary bribe, and zero otherwise.

Extension 7 (Uncertain acquisition of contract in the bribe contest) Let μ denote the probability of the P -type firm winning in the bribe contest upon entry. In this extension, suppose that $\mu < 1$. Recall that when $\mu = 1$ (baseline model), the P -type firm never enters the bribe contest in the NS (Section 3.2.1) and SC (Section 3.2.2) scenarios. The same must hold true for $\mu < 1$, and the aggregate bribe of the P -type firm is unchanged for any $\mu \leq 1$.

In the SwC (Section 3.2.3) scenario, the P -type firm enters the bribe contest in equilibrium, but its extortionary bribe does not depend on its actual profit or participation in the bribe contest. Hence, the P -type firm's extortionary bribe is unchanged for any $\mu \leq 1$.

The P -type firm's non-extortionary bribe cost in the SwC scenario depends on whether the firm is the winner in the bribe contest, which happens with probability μ . In this scenario, the P -type firm's non-extortionary bribe cost is $NBC_P(\Gamma = 1) = gn + \lambda\Pi_P(\Gamma = 1)$ with probability μ and $NBC_P(\Gamma = 0) = gn$ with probability $1 - \mu$. The P -type firm enters the bribe contest only if its expected payoff from entry $\mu(1 - \kappa)V$ in period 1 exceeds its cost $gn + \lambda\mu\Pi_P(\Gamma = 1)$ in period 1, or if the probability of winning in the bribe contest upon entry is sufficiently large, $\mu > \mu^* = \frac{gn}{(1-\kappa)V - \lambda\Pi_P(\Gamma=1)}$.

To incorporate the case of $\mu < 1$ into the model, we introduce the indicator of the P -type firm winning in the bribe contest, $1_W = 1$. Then, for any $\mu \in (\mu^*, 1]$, the equilibrium aggregate bribe of the P -type firm in the SwC scenario is $Bribe_P^{SwC} = EB_P^{SwC} + 1_W NBC_P(\Gamma = 1) + (1 - 1_W)NBC_P(\Gamma = 0)$. In this expression, $EB_P^{SwC} = EB_P^{SC}$ (equation (17)), $NBC_P(\Gamma = 1) = gn + \lambda\Pi_P(\Gamma = 1)$ (equation (4)), and $NBC_P(\Gamma = 0) = gn$ (sunk cost of contest participation). This gives

$$Bribe_P^{SwC} = \frac{s_P}{s_N} (\Pi_N - M - F_L) - s_P t_{min} - s_P m_P^{SwC} + gn + 1_W \lambda \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1) \quad (19)$$

4 Empirical specification

The goal of the empirical analysis is (1) to test for the multiplicity of bribery types, namely, if bribe-paying firms pay a single or multiple types of bribes, and (2) to test for interactions between different types of bribery by establishing which informational scenario in the model of corruption is consistent with the observed behavior of firms: NS of Section 3.2.1, SC of Section 3.2.2, or SwC of Section 3.2.3.

Ideal data for the empirical analysis have separate reports of payments of each bribe type (extortionary and non-extortionary) made by firm of each profit level (N -type and P -type) in the single market for bribes. Unfortunately, such data are unavailable. The available data either have annual aggregate bribe reports, as in WBES and other firm-level surveys (e.g. Fisman et al. (2022), Bai et al. (2017), Svensson (2003)), or reports of separate bribe payments that are limited to a specific bureaucratic sector (e.g. administration of health care workers in Weaver (2021), trucking on public highways in Olken and Barron (2009), driver licenses in Bertrand et al.

(2007)).

Since each bribery type (extortionary vs. non-extortionary) dominates a single bureaucratic sector²⁵, even separate bribe reports from a single bureaucratic sector do not allow testing for the multiplicity of bribery types in a single market for bribes. For this reason, we use aggregate bribe reports (as in WBES) in the empirical analysis. To distinguish between different types of bribes, we rely on equilibrium aggregate bribe formulations in Propositions 1, 3, and 5.

4.1 Derivation of the empirical specification

To construct an empirical specification from the model of corruption, we use the following indicator variables that capture three possible modelling scenarios:

- 1_{disp} : an indicator of a dispute initiated by a bureaucrat; $1_{disp} = 1$ stands for an extortionary bribery bribe request (during dispute).
- $1_N, 1_P$: indicate the N -type and the P -type firms, respectively. Note that $1_N + 1_P = 1$.
- $1_{NS}, 1_{SC}, 1_{SwC}$: indicate the no secrecy (Section 3.2.1), the secrecy with communication (Section 3.2.2), and the secrecy without communication (Section 3.2.3) scenarios, respectively. Note that $1_{NS} + 1_{SC} + 1_{SwC} = 1$.

Recall from Propositions 1, 3, and 5 that in equilibrium, the P -type firm pays only extortionary bribes in NS and SC scenarios and both non-extortionary and extortionary bribes in the SwC scenario. The N -type firm may pay only extortionary bribe under all three scenarios (Extension 6). Hence, we can write an aggregate bribe

²⁵For example, following our definitions, the bribery in Weaver (2021) and Bertrand et al. (2007) is non-extortionary, and the bribery in Olken and Barron (2009) is extortionary.

in all informational scenarios for both firm types as

$$Bribe = \begin{cases} 1_B(\Pi_N - M - F_L - s_N t_{min} - s_N m_N) 1_{disp}, & \text{if } 1_N = 1 \text{ (from (18))} \\ (\Pi_N + \Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0) - M - F_L - s_P t_{min} - s_P m_P) 1_{disp}, & \text{if } 1_P = 1 \text{ \& } 1_{NS} = 1 \text{ from (15)} \\ \left(\frac{s_P}{s_N}(\Pi_N - M - F_L) - s_P t_{min} - s_P m_P\right) 1_{disp}, & \text{if } 1_P = 1 \text{ \& } 1_{SC} = 1 \text{ from (16)} \\ \left(\frac{s_P}{s_N}(\Pi_N - M - F_L) - s_P t_{min} - s_P m_P\right) 1_{disp} + gn + 1_W \lambda \Pi_P(\Gamma = 1), & \text{if } 1_P = 1 \text{ \& } 1_{SwC} = 1 \text{ from (19)} \end{cases}$$

After regrouping variables, we obtain the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} Bribe &= 1_{NS} \Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0) 1_P 1_{disp} + 1_{SwC} 1_W \lambda \Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1) 1_P \\ &+ \underbrace{\left[\left(1_B 1_N + 1_P \frac{s_N 1_{NS} + s_P (1 - 1_{NS})}{s_N} \right) 1_{disp} + 1_P 1_{SwC} 1_W \lambda \right]}_{\beta_{\Pi_N}} \Pi_N \\ &- \underbrace{\left(1_B 1_N + 1_P \frac{s_N 1_{NS} + s_P (1 - 1_{NS})}{s_N} \right)}_{\beta_M = \beta_{F_L}} M 1_{disp} \\ &- \underbrace{\left(1_B 1_N + 1_P \frac{s_N 1_{NS} + s_P (1 - 1_{NS})}{s_N} \right)}_{\beta_M = \beta_{F_L}} F_L 1_{disp} \\ &- \underbrace{(s_N 1_B 1_N + s_P 1_P)}_{\beta_{t_{min}}} t_{min} 1_{disp} - s_N 1_B \underbrace{m_N 1_N 1_{disp}}_{m_N} - s_P \underbrace{m_P 1_P 1_{disp}}_{m_P} + 1_{SwC} g \underbrace{n 1_P}_n \end{aligned}$$

where m_N is the delay of the N -type firm during dispute, m_P is the delay of the P -type firm during dispute, n is the P -type firm's participation time in the bribe contest. The β 's denote coefficients as indicated above. Thus, we obtain the following specification **EM1** from equilibrium aggregate bribes of the model of corruption:

$$\begin{aligned} Bribe &= (1_{NS}) \Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0) 1_P 1_{disp} + (1_{SwC} 1_W \lambda) \Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1) 1_P + (\beta_{\Pi_N}) \Pi_N \\ &+ (\beta_M) M 1_{disp} + (\beta_{F_L}) F_L 1_{disp} + (\beta_{t_{min}}) t_{min} 1_{disp} - (s_N 1_B) m_N - (s_P) m_P + (1_{SwC} g) n \end{aligned} \tag{EM1}$$

with coefficients to be estimated enclosed in parentheses.

Table 2: Identification of informational scenarios NS, SC, and SwC in the presence of both types of bribery.

Variables in EM1	NS scenario	SC scenario	SwC scenario
$\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0)1_P1_{disp}$	$1_{NS} > 0$	$1_{NS} = 0$	$1_{NS} = 0$
$\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1)1_P$	$1_{SwC}1_W\lambda = 0$	$1_{SwC}1_W\lambda = 0$	$1_{SwC}1_W\lambda > 0$
n	$1_{SwC}g = 0$	$1_{SwC}g = 0$	$1_{SwC}g > 0$
Π_N	$\beta_{\Pi_N} \geq 0$	$\beta_{\Pi_N} \geq 0$	$\beta_{\Pi_N} \geq 0$
$M1_{disp}$	$\beta_M \leq 0$	$\beta_M \leq 0$	$\beta_M \leq 0$
F_L1_{disp}	$\beta_{F_L} \leq 0$	$\beta_{F_L} \leq 0$	$\beta_{F_L} \leq 0$
$t_{min}1_{disp}$	$\beta_{t_{min}} \leq 0$	$\beta_{t_{min}} \leq 0$	$\beta_{t_{min}} \leq 0$
m_N	$s_N1_B \geq 0$	$s_N1_B \geq 0$	$s_N1_B \geq 0$
m_P	$s_P > 0$	$s_P > 0$	$s_P > 0$

Note: An informational scenario can be identified by coefficients in the first three rows (variables $\Delta(\Gamma = 0)1_P1_{disp}$, $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1)1_P$, and n). The red box indicates the scenario consistent with our data when we estimate the empirical specification [EM1.1](#) (see [Table 4](#) for the estimated coefficients).

4.2 Identification

We use specification [EM1](#) to simultaneously identify bribery types and informational scenarios. It is possible to identify three informational scenarios ([Table 2](#)) only in the presence of both types of bribery. The non-extortory bribery is identified only in the SwC scenario.

Identification of non-extortory bribery: The coefficients of n and $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1)1_P$ are the sources of identification of non-extortory bribery. The coefficient of n identifies $1_{SwC}g$, the P -type firm's daily cost of participation in the bribe contest in period 1 in the SwC scenario. In the presence of non-extortory bribery with costly participation, g is strictly positive. The zero g indicates negligent participation cost, and the negative g is inconsistent with non-extortory bribery. The coefficient of $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1)1_P$ identifies $1_{SwC}1_W\lambda$, the size of the non-extortory bribe (as a share of positive profit increment) paid to $B1$ by the winning firm in the bribe contest in the SwC scenario. In the presence of non-extortory bribery, λ is strictly positive. The zero λ indicates the absence of non-extortory bribery.

Identification of extortionary bribery: The coefficients of m_P and m_N are the main sources of identification of extortionary bribery. The coefficient of m_P identifies $-s_P$, the negative of the P -type firm's daily cost of time. The coefficient of m_N identifies $-s_N 1_B$, the negative of the daily cost of time of the N -type firm paying positive extortionary bribe. When $B2$ uses bureaucratic delay as a screening device to extort bribes during bureaucratic dispute, these coefficients are negative, and the coefficient of m_P is larger in absolute size than the coefficient of m_N . When coefficients of m_P and m_N are similar in size, $B2$ cannot use bureaucratic delay for screening and has to act as a non-discriminating monopolist by setting a single bribe-delay combination for both firm types. Positive coefficients of m_P and m_N are inconsistent with extortionary bribery.

Identification of the NS scenario: The coefficient of $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0)1_P 1_{disp}$ is the main source of identification of the no secrecy scenario. When $B2$ is perfectly informed about the firm's type and action, the P -type firm's extortionary bribe (during bureaucratic dispute) is an increasing function of the actual profit $\Pi_P = \Pi_N + \Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0)$, and therefore, of both Π_N and the positive profit increment $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0)$. Hence, in this scenario, the coefficient of $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0)1_P 1_{disp}$ is strictly positive. Further, in this scenario the P -type firm never enters the bribe contest in equilibrium, and coefficients of parameters relevant for non-extortionary bribery, $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1)1_P$ and n , are zero.

Identification of the SC scenario: The secrecy with communication scenario is identified by the zero coefficients of $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0)1_P 1_{disp}$, $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1)1_P$, and n . When $B2$ is uninformed about the firm's type but receives a message from $B1$ about the firm's participation in the bribe contest, the P -type firm does not enter the bribe contest in equilibrium, and coefficients of both $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1)1_P$ and n are zero. Consequently, $B2$ relies only on the screening mechanism to extort a bribe from the P -type firm, which means that the extortionary bribe (during dispute) depends only on Π_N and not on $\Delta\Pi$. Therefore, in this scenario, the coefficient of $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0)1_P 1_{disp}$ is zero.

Identification of the SwC scenario: The coefficients of $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1)1_P$ and n are the main sources of identification of the secrecy without communication scenario. When $B2$ has no information about the firm's type and receives no message from $B1$ about the firm's participation in the bribe contest, the P -type firm enters the bribe contest in period 1, covers sunk participation cost gn , and pays $B1$ the non-extortionary bribe as a fraction of both Π_N and $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1)$. Hence, in this scenario, the coefficients of $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 1)1_P$ and n are strictly positive. Further, since in this scenario $B2$ relies only on the screening mechanism to extort a bribe, the extortionary bribe (during dispute) depends only on Π_N and not on the positive profit increment $\Delta\Pi$. Therefore, the coefficient of $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma = 0)1_P1_{disp}$ is zero.

Other variables: The coefficient of $t_{min}1_{disp}$ identifies $-(s_N1_B + s_P)$, the negative sum of daily time costs of both firm types. The coefficients of $M1_{disp}$ and F_L1_{disp} identify $-(1_N1_B + 1_P \frac{s_N1_{NS} + s_P(1-1_{NS})}{s_N})$, the negative of the weighted ratio of costs of time under different informational scenarios. In the presence of extortionary bribery with bureaucratic screening, coefficients of $t_{min}1_{disp}$, $M1_{disp}$, and F_L1_{disp} are weakly negative²⁶. The coefficient of Π_N identifies $(1_N1_B + 1_P \frac{s_N1_{NS} + s_P(1-1_{NS})}{s_N})1_{disp} + 1_P1_{SwC}1_W\lambda$, which is weakly positive in all informational scenarios and in the presence of both types of bribery²⁷. For this reason, we cannot use the coefficient of Π_N to identify either a particular type of bribery or a specific informational scenario.

5 Estimation

5.1 Data and estimation approach

We use data from the nationally representative survey of 429 firms operating in Tajikistan in 2012-2014 to estimate specification [EM1](#). The data were collected by an

²⁶These coefficients are strictly negative for the P -type firm and the N -type firm that can afford to pay an extortionary bribe. These coefficients are zero for the N -type firm that cannot afford to pay an extortionary bribe.

²⁷Similarly to coefficients of $t_{min}1_{disp}$, $M1_{disp}$ and F_L1_{disp} , the coefficient of Π_N is strictly positive for the P -type firm and the N -type firm that can afford to pay an extortionary bribe. This coefficient is zero for the N -type firm that cannot afford to pay an extortionary bribe.

agency that collected similar data for the World Bank, and the data collection procedure was identical to that of WBES. There are two differences between the data used in this paper and the data from WBES: (1) the data in this paper contain information about additional variables (e.g. bureaucratic disputes, bureaucratic delays, unreported profits) that are used in the estimation of [EM1](#) but not found in WBES, and (2) the data in this paper are panel data rather than cross-sectional. All variables involving monetary values were collected in local currency, adjusted for inflation, and converted to US dollars in 2014²⁸. Summary statistics are reported in [Table 3](#). The detailed information on the data collection procedure and construction of all variables is in [Section 3](#) of the online appendix. The key points of the construction are discussed below.

We use profit that each firm reports in its tax report as a measure for Π_N , and the difference between reported profit and the profit adjusted for under-reported sales and over-stated costs as a measure for the positive profit increment $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma)$. Firms with positive adjusted profits are the P -type firms ($1_P = 1$) and firms with non-positive adjusted profits are the N -type firms ($1_N = 1_P - 1$).

We use two measures of aggregate bribes. The first indirect measure (*Bribe*) is the difference between actual paperwork expenditures and expenditures only through official channels (measure of F_L), and it represents paperwork expenditures in excess of those required by law. The second direct measure (*Rep_bribe*) is the reported annual bribe a share of annual sales (bribe measure collected by WBES). The mean difference between these two measures is US \$ -0.4, and the 95% confidence interval is $[-13.9, 13.2]$.

Following [Ayres \(1997\)](#), we use the indicator for the positive number of disputes initiated by bureaucrats as the measure of extortionary bribery ($1_{disp} = 1$). To construct measures for bureaucratic delays (m_N, m_P, n), we use unspecified bureaucratic delay (*Delay*), which is the difference between the actual number of days that firms spend with bureaucrats and the aggregate paperwork processing time specified by law (measure of t_{min}). To measure m_P , we interact *Delay* with the in-

²⁸The data were adjusted for inflation rates of 6.076% in 2014 and 5.035% in 2013 (source: World Bank) and converted to US dollars at the rate of 5 TJ somonis per 1 US dollar (exchange rate in December 2014).

Table 3: Summary statistics (all years in 2014 US \$)

Variable name	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Reported profit Π_N (thousand \$)	1,503	-56.0	731.7	-22,283	1,764.4
Unreported profit $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma)$ (thousand \$)	1,323	423.3	2,705.1	0	47,734.2
Required papers <i>All_papers</i> (number)	1,503	8.1	3.027	1	30
Capital M (thousand \$)	1,473	554.3	4,062.1	0.066	63,645.6
Workers (number)	1,503	42.7	83.9	2	1,040
Official paperwork processing cost F_L (\$)	1,483	40,981	321,482	10.6	9,361,830
Actual paperwork processing cost F (\$)	1,486	42,950	323,543	21.2	9,361,830
Aggregate bribe <i>Bribe</i> (\$)	1,483	1,994	27,000.5	0	800,000
Reported aggregate bribe <i>Rep_bribe</i> (\$)	1,347	2,195	28,323.5	0	800,000
Disputes 1_{disp} (1, if # disputes ≥ 1)	1,503	0.220	0.415	0	1
Official paperwork process. time t_{min} (days)	1,497	11.6	11.1	0	150
Actual paperwork processing time t (days)	1,497	16.1	14.7	0	170
Bureaucratic delay <i>Delay</i> (days)	1,497	4.5	6.5	0	100

indicator of the P -type firm (1_P) and the indicator of bureaucratic disputes (1_{disp}), so that $m_P = Delay1_P1_{disp}$. To measure m_N , we interact *Delay* with the indicator of the N -type firm ($1_N = 1 - 1_P$) and the indicator of bureaucratic disputes ($m_N = Delay(1 - 1_P)1_{disp}$). To measure n , we interact *Delay* with the indicator of the P -type firm ($n = Delay1_P$).

We exploit the panel structure in our data and use the fixed effects estimator with firm fixed effects to estimate specification [EM1](#). The estimator relies on the cross-time and within-firm variation in the data, and therefore, gives estimates that are not biased due to omitted time-invariable controls. This is the main advantage of the fixed effects estimator relatively to those that only exploit the cross-sectional variation in the data²⁹. The omitted time-invariable controls include unobservable characteristics of firms that remain constant over time (e.g. firms' bureaucratic connections, firms' level of competence and transparency, firms' paperwork productivity), time-invariable industry-wide and location-specific characteristics (e.g. general levels of corruption in tax districts, bureaucratic congestion rates, density of firms in tax districts, industry-wide productivity shocks), and sample selection controls.

The use of the fixed effects estimator mitigates the sample selection bias, because

²⁹See, for example, studies that use data from WBES.

the selection of firms into the sample primarily depended on the ability of interviewers to convince firm managers of confidentiality of disclosed data, as firm managers had to directly admit to illegal activities such as bribe payments and hidden profits. Since the same interviewer collected data from the same firm in all years, the sample selection equation can be explicitly modelled as a function of interviewer fixed effects³⁰. As interviewer fixed effects do not vary over time, the fixed effects estimator eliminates the sample selection bias³¹.

The fixed effects estimator cannot identify coefficients of variables in [EM1](#) that are constant over time, and this is its main disadvantage. Hence, when interpreting estimation results, the statistical insignificance of variables in [EM1](#) can indicate both the lack of empirical support for some theoretical predictions and the insufficient cross-time variation in the data measuring these variables.

As summary statistics show (see [Table 3](#)), the data are skewed. For example, some smaller firms in the data report paying bribes as small as US \$1 and some larger firms report paying bribes as large as US \$ 800,000. Similar patterns hold for firms' employment levels, capital size, and bureaucratic burden. To reduce skewness in the data, we normalize all variables in specification [EM1](#) by the total number of workers (*Workers*). This normalization reduces standard errors of controls by several orders of magnitude³².

The model of corruption constructed in [Section 3](#) does not account for all bribery mechanisms. In particular, the model ignores customary transfers that firms make to bureaucrats. These customary transfers reflect cultural norms in our market for bribes, and they represent socially accepted gifts or donations from firms to members of the bureaucracy (see [Section 2.1](#) for the discussion and related literature). Firms that have more paperwork requirements make larger customary transfers, as acquisition of each certificate is accompanied by transfer of a socially accepted gift to a bureaucrat who is responsible for issuing the certificate.

To account for the customary transfers, we use firms' reports of the total number

³⁰For example, in the Heckman selection model, the sample selection variable would enter as an inverse Mills ratio estimated at the interviewer fixed effects.

³¹The data contain interviewer fixed effects.

³²See [Table B7](#) in the online appendix for the 95% confidence intervals and standard errors of normalized variables.

of required legal papers (*All_papers*) outside and during disputes (*All_papers1_{disp}*) and the intercept. This results in adding the terms $\frac{All_papers}{Workers}$ and $\frac{All_papers1_{disp}}{Workers}$ with coefficients β_{AP} and β_{APD} , respectively, when constructing the empirical specification based on [EM1](#) to be estimated from the data. Also, recall that the variables m_N , m_P and n bribe are measured from the data using *Delay* as described in *Bureaucratic delay* (m_N , m_P , n) of [Section 5.1](#), which is another notational change to [EM1](#) when constructing empirical specification below. Lastly, we use year fixed effects to account for economy-wide shocks (this results in adding the terms $1_{Year=2013}$ and $1_{Year=2014}$ to [EM1](#)). With these adjustments, we obtain the following empirical specification [EM1.1](#):

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{Bribe}{Workers} = & \beta_{\Pi_N} \frac{\Pi_N}{Workers} + (1_{NS}) \frac{\Delta\Pi(\Gamma=0)1_P1_{disp}}{Workers} + (1_{SwC}1_W\lambda) \frac{\Delta\Pi(\Gamma=1)1_P}{Workers} \\
& + \beta_M \frac{M1_{disp}}{Workers} + \beta_{FL} \frac{FL1_{disp}}{Workers} + \beta_{tmin} \frac{t_{min}1_{disp}}{Workers} + (-s_N1_B) \frac{Delay(1-1_P)1_{disp}}{Workers} \\
& + (-s_P) \frac{Delay1_P1_{disp}}{Workers} + (1_{SwC}9) \frac{Delay1_P}{Workers} + 1_{(Year=2013)} + 1_{(Year=2014)} \\
& + \beta_{AP} \frac{All_papers}{Workers} + \beta_{APD} \frac{All_papers1_{disp}}{Workers} + Intercept
\end{aligned} \tag{EM1.1}$$

As a robustness check, we estimate two additional specifications constructed as follows:

EM1.2 We replace the indirectly measured bribe $\frac{Bribe}{Workers}$ with the directly measured bribe $\frac{Rep_Bribe}{Workers}$.

EM1.3 We omit controls for unreported profits $\frac{\Delta\Pi(\Gamma=0)1_{disp}}{Workers}$ and $\frac{\Delta\Pi(\Gamma=1)}{Workers}$. We do so, because measures for unreported profits can be interpreted as perceived rather than actual.

We emphasize that neither specifications [EM1](#), [EM1.1](#), EM1.2, EM1.3 nor the theoretical model itself provide any basis for causal arguments about bribes and bureaucratic delays. Specification [EM1](#) is derived from equilibrium conditions of the theoretical model, where aggregate bribe is expressed as a function of optimal choices for bureaucratic delays. Indeed, one can obtain similar equilibrium conditions by expressing bureaucratic delay as a function of optimal aggregate bribe.

Table 4: Estimated coefficients.

Coefficients	EM1.1	EM1.2	EM1.3
β_{Π_N}	5.029** (2.238)	6.159*** (1.593)	5.014** (2.242)
1_{NS}	-0.007 (0.098)	0.017 (0.118)	
$1_{SwC}1_W\lambda$	0.039*** (0.007)	0.039*** (0.008)	
β_M	-0.022 (0.046)	-0.026 (0.046)	-0.026 (0.049)
β_{FL}	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.005)
$\beta_{t_{min}}$	1.729 (3.268)	2.557 (4.055)	1.873 (3.334)
$-s_N1_B$	-5.595 (21.625)	-2.090 (21.968)	-6.992 (21.769)
$-s_P$	-8.804** (4.116)	-9.142** (4.650)	-9.418** (4.178)
$1_{SwC}g$	8.929** (4.143)	9.539** (4.849)	9.578** (4.179)
β_{AP}	27.626** (13.120)	30.258** (14.438)	24.576* (14.672)
β_{APD}	14.693 (9.133)	12.725 (9.662)	15.627 (9.590)
<i>Intercept</i>	35.930*** (7.971)	39.397*** (8.727)	37.916*** (8.816)
Year FX	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm FX	Yes	Yes	Yes
Within R^2	0.087	0.098	0.084
Between R^2	0.633	0.664	0.651
Overall R^2	0.485	0.522	0.499
Observations	1,279	1,202	1,279

- (a) The dependent variable is $\frac{Bribe}{workers}$ in columns 1,3 and $\frac{Rep-Bribe}{workers}$ in column 2;
(b) Robust standard errors in parentheses are clustered by firm id's;
(c) Π_N , $\Delta\Pi$, and M are measured in thousand US \$;
(d) ***, **, * - statistical significance at 1%, 5%, 10% level.

5.2 Estimation results

Estimates of specification EM1.1 are reported in the first two columns in Table 4. Additional results concerning extension to more than two firm types are presented and discussed in Section 3 of the online appendix.

Evidence for coexistence of both bribery types: Recall from the discussion of identification in Section 4.2 that $1_{SwC}1_W\lambda > 0$ and $1_{SwC}g > 0$ identify the presence of non-extortionary bribery. Here, both estimates indeed are positive and statistically significant. The estimate of $1_{SwC}1_W\lambda$ is 0.039, indicating that the P -type firm's non-extortionary bribe is about 4% of a thousand USD in actual profits. The estimate of $1_{SwC}g$ is 8.929, indicating that the P -type firm's daily participation cost in a bribe

contest is about US \$ 9.

Recall also from Section 4.2 that $s_P > 0$ and $s_N 1_B \geq 0$ give evidence of extortionary bribery. Estimation results indeed provide empirical support to these conditions. The estimate of $-s_P$ is -8.804 , and it is statistically significant, suggesting that the daily cost of time of the P -type firm is about US \$ 9. The statistically significant negative relationship between bribes and delay during bureaucratic disputes, as measured by the estimate of $-s_P$, indicates that a day of bureaucratic delay reduces extortionary bribe by about US \$ 9. Note that estimates of g and s_P are similar in size, which shows that the P -type firm has identical daily participation and time costs. This is not surprising, since g and s_P essentially measure the same parameter: managers' daily cost of time when negotiating with different corrupt bureaucrats either to gain access to government resources or to reduce bribe demands during bureaucratic disputes. The magnitudes of the estimated s_P and g support this argument, as both are similar in size to an average daily salary of a firm manager (1.5 of average daily salary of a worker).

The estimate of $-s_N 1_B$ is negative but statistically insignificant. We interpret this result as evidence in support of the assumption that the N -type firm cannot afford to pay any extortionary bribe ($1_B = 0$). Alternatively, it can be interpreted as evidence of zero cost of time ($s_N = 0$) without assuming away the N -type firm's ability to pay positive extortionary bribe ($1_B = 1$). Note, however, that the N -type firm with zero cost of time will always prefer to accept $B2$'s offer with the longest waiting time and zero extortionary bribe. Hence, whether the N -type firm has positive cost of time and is unable to pay any extortionary bribe ($s_N > 0$ and $1_B = 0$) or it has zero cost of time and is able to pay positive extortionary bribe ($s_N = 0$ and $1_B = 1$), it never pays an extortionary bribe in equilibrium. Since s_N is not identified when $1_B = 0$, we cannot make a claim about the N -type firm's daily cost of time (s_N).

Evidence for the SwC informational scenario: Recall from Section 4.2 and Table 2 that parameter values $1_{SwC} 1_W \lambda > 0$, $1_{SwC} g > 0$, and $1_{NS} = 0$ identify the SwC scenario. Estimates are consistent with these parameter values, indicating empirical support for the SwC scenario. The estimate of $1_{SwC} 1_W \lambda$ is 0.039, and it indicates that the P -type firm's non-extortionary bribe is about 4% of a thousand

USD in actual profits. The estimate of $1_{SwC}g$ is 8.929, indicating that the P -type firm's daily participation cost in a bribe contest is about US \$ 9. Both estimates are statistically significant.

Additional supporting evidence for the SwC scenario comes from the statistically insignificant estimate of 1_{NS} . Note that the empirical support for the SwC scenario simultaneously rejects the other two scenarios (NS and SC), as all three scenarios are mutually exclusive.

Other coefficients: The estimate of the coefficient of reported profit (β_{Π_N}) is positive and statistically significant: a thousand dollar increase in reported profit raises aggregate bribe by almost US \$ 5. Estimates of coefficients of capital (β_M), official paperwork processing cost (β_{F_L}), and official paperwork processing time ($\beta_{t_{min}}$) are statistically insignificant. The statistical insignificance of β_M , β_{F_L} , and $\beta_{t_{min}}$ is due to the use of the fixed effects estimator, since capital (M), official paperwork processing cost (F_L), and official paperwork processing time (t_{min}) do not sufficiently vary over time.

Estimates of coefficients measuring customary transfers are positive and statistically significant. The estimate of the coefficient of the total number of required legal papers (β_{AP}) is 27.626. Its magnitude indicates that an additional certificate is accompanied by a socially accepted gift to bureaucrats of US\$ 27. The coefficient of the total number of required legal papers during disputes (β_{APD}) is statistically insignificant, which suggests that no customary transfers are made during bureaucratic disputes. The estimate of the intercept is statistically significant, and its magnitude is an indication of a baseline customary annual transfer of US\$ 36 for firms with registration at the tax office (all firms in the data).

Estimated coefficients of specification EM1.2 that rely on the directly measured bribe reports (Rep_Bribe) as the dependent variable are reported in the two middle columns of Table 4. Estimation results are similar, with estimates of β_{Π_N} , g , s_P , and β_{AP} slightly larger than those of specification EM1.1.

The last two columns report estimates of specification EM1.3, where variables representing firms' unreported profit $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma)$ are dropped from estimation. Without controls for $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma)$, it is impossible to estimate 1_{NS} and $1_{SwC}1_W\lambda$. Estimated de-

lay coefficients of specification EM1.3 are similar to those of specification EM1.1, which implies that estimates of delay coefficients are not affected by the variation in unreported profits.

6 Discussion

In this section, we discuss estimation results in the context of the model of corruption and the ongoing debates in the literature.

The "grease vs. sand" bribery debate: Estimation results give evidence that in our market for bribes firms simultaneously pay both types of bribes: extortionary and non-extortionary. The empirical evidence for the extortionary bribery in the data supports the "sand-in-the-wheels" bribery hypothesis, while the empirical evidence for the non-extortionary bribery supports the "grease-the-wheels" bribery hypothesis. Hence, our empirical results indicate that both bribery hypotheses can simultaneously hold in the same market for bribes.

We exploit the varying bribe-delay relationships that arise in distinct bribery mechanisms to identify different types of bribery. The negative relationship between bribes and bureaucratic delay identifies the extortionary bribery. The bureaucratic delay is negatively related to extortionary bribes, because more profitable firms with higher cost of time prefer to pay larger bribes in return for shorter bureaucratic delays. This negative bribe-delay relationship persists only during bureaucratic disputes.

The positive relationships between bribes and delay and between bribes and unreported profit identify the non-extortionary bribery. The positive bribe-delay relationship indicates that firms that pay non-extortionary bribes experience bureaucratic delay that can be attributed to participation in bribe contests. The positive relationship between bribes and unreported profit indicates that non-extortionary bribes take the form of profit-sharing schemes: firms that pay non-extortionary bribes allocate a portion of their actual profits to corrupt bureaucrats that administer the bribe contests. These positive relationships persist outside bureaucratic disputes, which means that bribes paid outside of disputes are consistent with non-extortionary bribes and the "grease-the-wheels" bribery hypothesis.

Since we find empirical support for both bribery hypotheses in our market for

bribes, the question of whether bribery in general benefits or harms individual firms does not have an unequivocal answer³³. On the one hand, non-extortionary bribery helps individual firms by allowing these firms to gain access to government contracts. On the other hand, extortionary bribery hurts individual firms through reduction in firms' profits and subjection to costly bureaucratic delay. The overall effect of bribery is determined by the gain from non-extortionary bribery and the loss from extortionary bribery. For *N*-type firms, which face only extortionary bribe demands, the net effect is clearly negative. For *P*-type firms, which partake in both types of bribery, the net effect can be positive, negative, or zero, depending on which type of bribery dominates in the market.

Information transmission in the market for bribes: Estimation results give no evidence of communication between bureaucrats engaged in different types of bribery. These results are consistent with the scenario of secrecy without communication in the model of corruption. Estimation results demonstrate that bureaucrats receiving non-extortionary bribes during bribe contests have information about at least a portion of firms' unreported profits, as an increase in unreported profit of US \$1,000 raises non-extortionary bribe on average by US \$39 (the estimate of $1_{SwC}1_W\lambda$ in Table 4). There is no evidence of a similar effect for extortionary bribes: an increase in unreported profit has no statistically significant effect on extortionary bribes (the estimate of 1_{NS} in Table 4 is zero). This means that bureaucrats receiving non-extortionary bribes during bribe contests do not share information about contestants' identities or valuations with other bureaucrats.

In the absence of information about firms' resources, corrupt bureaucrats with an extortionary bribe motive have to resort to the screening mechanism that utilizes bureaucratic delay. The extortionary bribes elicited through the delay-based screening mechanism are completely determined by firms' costs of time, and therefore, have no relation to unreported profits. This is why we can interpret the absence of statistically significant effect of unreported profits on extortionary bribes as the primary evidence of the lack of communication between distinct corrupt bureaucrats in the market for bribes.

³³While there is a universal agreement that bribery has negative effect on aggregate economic performance, the effect of bribery at the individual level is not clear.

Aggregate bribes and delays: How to reconcile our estimation results with aggregate patterns in the market for bribes? Recall from Figure 1B that firms with non-positive profits face shorter aggregate bureaucratic delays than firms with positive profits. This seems to contradict our result that positive-profit firms should have shorter bureaucratic delays, because their time is more costly. Note, however, that since aggregate delays combine participation times in bribe contests that only positive-profit firms face and bureaucratic delays due to extortion, aggregate bureaucratic delays of non-positive-profit firms can be indeed shorter than those of positive profit firms.

As Figure 1A illustrates, some non-positive-profit firms report paying positive aggregate bribes. This may appear inconsistent with our result that non-positive-profit firms pay zero extortionary bribes by choosing maximum bureaucratic delays and zero non-extortionary bribes by avoiding participation in bribe contests³⁴. Recall, however, that firms make positive customary transfers, and positive aggregate bribes of N -type firms can be explained by these customary transfers.

7 Concluding remarks

The market for bribes in our data is characterized by bribe payments that are consistent both with the "grease" and the "sand" bribery hypotheses. The evidence of bureaucratic delays positively correlated with bribes indicates that firms with financial resources willingly pay bribes to gain access to public resources. The evidence of bureaucratic delays negatively correlated with bribes indicates that firms with financial resource prefer to pay larger bribes to reduce bureaucratic delays that corrupt bureaucrats intentionally create for screening. Uninformed corrupt bureaucrats are compelled to exploit bureaucratic delays because firms differ in their costs of time and because firms hide large portions of their actual profits.

³⁴In Table A2 in the online appendix, we present estimation results of a baseline specification EM1.1 with separately estimated intercepts for N -type and P -type firms, and with separately estimated costs of participation in bribe contests for N -type (g_N) and P -type (g_P) firms. The estimates of the intercept (1_N), participation cost (g_N), and cost of time (s_N) for the N -type are statistically insignificant, indicating that N -type firms indeed do not pay non-extortionary and extortionary bribes and make the same customary transfers as P -type firms.

We do not find evidence of communication among corrupt bureaucrats in the data. Corrupt bureaucrats that receive non-extortionary bribes do not transmit relevant information about resources of bribe-payers to other corrupt bureaucrats. The lack of evidence of transmission of bribery-relevant information suggests that the market for bribes in our paper is more accurately described as decentralized.

The coexistence of extortionary and non-extortionary bribery indicates that the question of whether bribery benefits or stifles economic activity at the individual firm level cannot be easily answered. Instead, the effect of bribery should be evaluated based on implications that bribery creates for related markets and for misallocation of resources. We view two sets of implications as particularly important.

Firstly, bribery and bureaucratic delay have direct impact on the firms' decisions to operate informally (without all or only with some legal papers on hand)³⁵. The extortionary bribery not only serves as an entry barrier, it also encourages exit and transition of firms to the informal sector of economy. Firms that have the strongest incentive to move operations to the informal sector are the least profitable (*N*-type) firms that cannot afford to pay bribes. Because corrupt bureaucrats who make extortionary bribe demands do not observe firms' actual profits and have to utilize bureaucratic delay as a screening device, the amount of delay imposed on the least profitable firms is excessively high, making such firms indifferent between obtaining legal papers and operating without them³⁶. Hence, the least profitable firms are most likely to operate in the informal sector, even if their productivity is sufficiently high to allow operation in the formal sector. If corrupt bureaucrats could observe firms' actual resources, these low-profit but sufficiently productive firms would face no bribe demands and no delay, thus, remain in the formal sector. Hence, although bribery is not the only reason for informality, the ability of corrupt bureaucrats to make extortionary bribe demands coupled with their inability to fully observe firms' financial resources can potentially explain large informal sectors in many developing countries with weak institutions.

Secondly, as a sister activity to taxation, bribery creates incentives for misalloca-

³⁵See [Ulyssea \(2018\)](#) for discussion of different types of informality and the their impact on performance of firms.

³⁶The indifference between participation and exit for the lowest type (*N*-type firm in our model) is the standard result in all screening models.

tion of resources within and across firms. The main source of misallocation within firms is the firms' strategy of concealment of financial resources from corrupt bureaucrats. For this strategy to be effective, firms have to adopt production plans that appear consistent with firms' reported financial statements. Since firms under-report output in financial statements, they are compelled to replace inputs that are harder to conceal with inputs that are easier to conceal or inputs that have more variable output. For example, firms that face extortionary bribe demands may be more inclined to substitute capital with labor, as production that relies more on labor and particularly on part-time labor is easier to hide from bureaucrats. This may lead to the misallocation of resources within firms from more productive capital-intensive production to less productive labor-intensive production³⁷.

Bribery-induced idiosyncratic shocks are the source of misallocation across firms. As Restuccia and Rogerson (2008) demonstrate, taxation can lead to particularly large drops in aggregate output and TFP even holding aggregate capital accumulation rates and market-wide tax rates constant, if negative shocks caused by taxes are specific to each firm. The source of these drops is the misallocation of resources across firms that differ in productivity. A similar argument can be made about the effect of bribery on misallocation of resources across firms, if bribery is to be viewed as a sister activity to taxation. Our estimates give some idea about the nature of shocks induced by bribery. Estimates in Table 4 show that most of the variation in bribes that firms report paying is due to the variation in explanatory variables that differ across firms (Between $R^2=0.633$) rather than due to the variation within each firm and across time (Within $R^2= 0.087$). We interpret this result as an indication that bribery is mostly determined by characteristics that are specific to each firm or that bribery mostly creates idiosyncratic shocks for firms.

References

Amin, Mohammad and Yew Chong Soh, "Does Greater Regulatory Burden

³⁷This argument is similar to the one in Choi and Thum (2004), who look at the effect of extortionary bribes on firms' choice of technology. In their work, technology is characterized not by the observability of inputs but by the size of sunk investment.

- Lead to More Corruption? Evidence using Firm-level Survey Data for Developing Countries,” *The World Bank Economic Review*, 2021, 35 (3), 812–828.
- Ayres, Ian**, “The twin faces of judicial corruption: extortion and bribery,” *Denver University Law Review*, 1997, 74, 1231–1253.
- Bai, Jie, Seema Jayachandran, Edmund J. Malesky, and Benjamin A. Olken**, “Firm Growth and Corruption: Empirical Evidence from Vietnam,” *The Economic Journal*, 2017, 129, 651–677.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, Rema Hanna, and Sendhil Mullainathan**, “Corruption,” in Robert Gibbons and John Roberts, eds., *The Handbook of Organizational Economics*, Princeton University Press, 2013, pp. 1109–1147.
- Banerjee, Abhijit V.**, “A Theory of Misgovernance,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1997, 112 (4), 1289–1332.
- Bertrand, Marianne, Simeon Djankov, Rema Hanna, and Sendhil Mullainathan**, “Obtaining a Driver’s License in India: An Experimental Approach to Studying Corruption,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2007, 122 (4), 1639–1676.
- Burguet, Roberto**, “Procurement Design with Corruption,” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, May 2017, 9 (2), 315–41.
- , **Juan-Jose Ganuza, and Jose G Montalvo**, “The microeconomics of corruption,” in Luis C. Corchon and Marco A. Marini, eds., *Handbook of Game Theory and Industrial Organization, Volume II*, Chapters, Edward Elgar Publishing, 2018, chapter 16, pp. 420–450.
- Choi, Jay Pil and Marcel Thum**, “The Economics of Repeated Extortion,” *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 2004, pp. 203–223.
- Colonnelli, Emanuele and Mounu Prem**, “Corruption and Firms,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 07 2021, 89 (2), 695–732.

- Compte, O., A. Lambert-Mogiliansky, and T. Verdier**, “Corruption and Competition in Procurement Auctions,” *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 2005, 36 (1), 1–15.
- Dong, Bin, Uwe Dulleck, and Benno Torgler**, “Conditional Corruption,” *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 2012, 33 (3), 609–627.
- Fisman, Ray and Roberta Gatti**, “Bargaining for Bribes: The Role of Institutions,” in “International Handbook on the Economics of Corruption,” Edward Elgar Publishing, April 2006.
- Fisman, Raymond and Edward Miguel**, “Corruption, Norms, and Legal Enforcement: Evidence from Diplomatic Parking Tickets,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2007, 115 (6), 1020–1048.
- , **Sergei Guriev, Carolin Ioramashvili, and Alexander Plekhanov**, “Corruption and Firm Growth: Evidence from around the World,” 2022.
- Freund, Caroline, Mary Hallward-Driemeier, and Bob Rijkers**, “Deals and Delays: Firm-level Evidence on Corruption and Policy Implementation Times,” *World Bank Economic Review*, 2016, 30 (2), 354–382.
- Gauthier, Bernard, Jonathan Goyette, and Wilfried A.K. Kouame**, “Why Do Firms Pay Bribes? Evidence on the Demand and Supply Sides of Corruption in Developing Countries,” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 2021, 190, 463–479.
- Guo, Jang-Ting and Fu-Sheng Hung**, “Tax Evasion and Financial Development under Asymmetric Information in Credit Markets,” *Journal of Development Economics*, 2020, 145, 102463.
- Guriev, Sergei**, “Red Tape and Corruption,” *Journal of Development Economics*, 2004, 73 (2), 489–504.
- Hortacsu, Ali and Isabelle Perrigne**, “Chapter 11 - Empirical Perspectives on Auctions,” in Kate Ho, Ali Hortacsu, and Alessandro Lizzeri, eds., *Handbook of*

Industrial Organization, Volume 5, Vol. 5 of *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, Elsevier, 2021, pp. 81–175.

Huntington, Samuel P, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, Yale University Press, 2006.

Khalil, Fahad, Jacques Lawarree, and Sungho Yun, “Bribery versus Extortion: Allowing the Lesser of Two Evils,” *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 2010, 41 (1), 179–198.

Lambert-Mogiliansky, Ariane, Mukul Majumdar, and Roy Radner, “Strategic Analysis of Petty Corruption: Entrepreneurs and Bureaucrats,” *Journal of Development Economics*, 2007, 83 (2), 351–367.

Leff, Nathaniel H., “Economic Development through Bureaucratic Corruption,” *American Behavioral Scientist*, 1964, 8 (3), 8–14.

Li, Tong and Xiaoyong Zheng, “Entry and Competition Effects in First-Price Auctions: Theory and Evidence from Procurement Auctions,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2009, 76 (4), 1397–1429.

Lui, Francis T, “An Equilibrium Queuing Model of Bribery,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 1985, 93 (4), 760–781.

Malesky, Edmund J, Thang V Nguyen, Thang N Bach, and Bao D Ho, “The effect of market competition on bribery in emerging economies: An empirical analysis of Vietnamese firms,” *World Development*, 2020, 131, 104957.

Martins, Lurdes, Jorge Cerdeira, and Aurora AC Teixeira, “Does Corruption Boost or Harm Firms’ Performance in Developing and Emerging Economies? A Firm-Level Study,” *The World Economy*, 2020, 43 (8), 2119–2152.

Mauro, Paolo, “Corruption and Growth,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1995, 110 (3), 681–712.

Meon, Pierre-Guillaume and Khalid Sekkat, “Does Corruption Grease or Sand the Wheels of Growth?,” *Public Choice*, 2005, 122, 69–97.

- Neve, Jan-Emmanuel De, Clement Imbert, Johannes Spinnewijn, Teodora Tsankova, and Maarten Luts**, “How to Improve Tax Compliance? Evidence from Population-wide Experiments in Belgium,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2021, 129 (5), 1425–1463.
- Nishioka, Shuichiro, Sumi Sharma, and Tuan Viet Le**, “Political regimes and firms’ decisions to pay bribes: theory and evidence from firm-level surveys,” *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 2023, 19 (6), 764–786.
- Olken, Benjamin A. and Patrick Barron**, “The Simple Economics of Extortion: Evidence from Trucking in Aceh,” *Journal of Political Economy*, June 2009, 117 (3), 417–452.
- Paunov, Caroline**, “Corruption’s asymmetric impacts on firm innovation,” *Journal of Development Economics*, 2016, 118, 216–231.
- Rand, John and Finn Tarp**, “Firm-Level Corruption in Vietnam,” *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 2012, 60 (3), 571 – 595.
- Restuccia, Diego and Richard Rogerson**, “Policy Distortions and Aggregate Productivity with Heterogeneous Establishments,” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 2008, 11 (4), 707–720.
- Rubolino, Enrico**, “Does Weak Enforcement Deter Tax Progressivity?,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 2023, 219, 104833.
- Sequeira, Sandra and Simeon Djankov**, “Corruption and Firm Behavior: Evidence from African Ports,” *Journal of International Economics*, 2014, 94 (2), 277–294.
- Shleifer, Andrei and Robert W. Vishny**, “Corruption,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1993, 108 (3), 599–617.
- **and Robert W Vishny**, *The Grabbing Hand: Government Pathologies and Their Cures*, Harvard University Press, 1998.

- Slemrod, Joel and Shlomo Yitzhaki**, “Tax Avoidance, Evasion, and Administration,” in A. J. Auerbach and M. Feldstein, eds., *Handbook of Public Economics*, Vol. 3 of *Handbook of Public Economics*, Elsevier, 2002, chapter 22, pp. 1423–1470.
- Svensson, Jakob**, “Who Must Pay Bribes and How Much? Evidence from a Cross Section of Firms,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2003, 118 (1), 207–230.
- Uberti, Luca J**, “Corruption and growth: Historical evidence, 1790–2010,” *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 2022, 50 (2), 321–349.
- Ulyssea, Gabriel**, “Firms, Informality, and Development: Theory and Evidence from Brazil,” *American Economic Review*, 2018, 108 (8), 2015–2047.
- Vial, Virginie and Julien Hanoteau**, “Corruption, manufacturing plant growth, and the Asian paradox: Indonesian evidence,” *World Development*, 2010, 38 (5), 693–705.
- Waller, Christopher J., Thierry Verdier, and Roy Gardner**, “Corruption: Top Down or Bottom Up?,” *Economic Inquiry*, 2002, 40 (4), 688–703.
- Weaver, Jeffrey**, “Jobs for sale: Corruption and misallocation in hiring,” *American Economic Review*, 2021, 111 (10), 3093–3122.
- Wei, Shang-Jin and Daniel Kaufmann**, *Does Grease Money Speed up the Wheels of Commerce?*, The World Bank, 1999.

Online Appendix for

Bribery, Secrecy, and Communication: Theory and Evidence from Firms

1. Proofs of Lemmas

1.1 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. Since $U_{P,\Gamma=1} > U_{P,\Gamma=0} > U_{N,\Gamma}$, the participation constraint $IR_{P,\Gamma=0}$ never binds and can be ignored. Further, IC_N and $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}$ together imply that $t_N \geq t_{P,\Gamma=0}$, which means that IC_N can be replaced with monotonicity condition $t_N \geq t_{P,\Gamma=0}$. In particular, by adding IC_N and $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}$, we get the condition $(s_P - s_N)(t_N - t_{P,\Gamma=0}) \geq 0$, which holds as long as $t_N \geq t_{P,\Gamma=0}$. Hence, we have only two constraints, IR_N and $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}$, and the monotonicity condition $t_N \geq t_{P,\Gamma=0}$.

Next, note that $B2$ can strictly improve his payoff by increasing t_N until IR_N is binding without violating the monotonicity condition and $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}$. The increase in t_N does not violate $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}$, because it lowers only the right-hand side of $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}$. Given the binding IR_N , $B2$'s processing time offer for the N -type firm is $t_N^{SC} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N}$. In addition, $B2$ can strictly improve his payoff by raising $F_{P,\Gamma=0}$ to make $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}$ binding without violating the monotonicity condition and IR_N .

$B2$'s optimization problem can be simplified by expressing $F_{P,\Gamma=0}$ in terms of $t_{P,\Gamma=0}$ given the binding $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}$. Then, $B2$'s problem is to choose $t_{P,\Gamma=0}$ to maximize $W - \frac{\theta}{\theta + (1-\theta)\phi} \frac{cs_N}{\Pi_N - M - F_L} + \frac{(1-\theta)\phi}{\theta + (1-\theta)\phi} \left(s_P \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N} - s_P t_{P,\Gamma=0} - \frac{c}{t_{P,\Gamma=0}} \right)$. The optimization yields the processing time for the P -type firm of $t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} = \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_P}}$. The optimal processing times for both firm types, $t_N^{SC} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N}$ and $t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} = \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_P}}$, satisfy the monotonicity condition ($t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} = \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_P}} < \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_N}} < \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N} = t_N^{SC}$), implying that $IC_{N,\Gamma=0}$ is also satisfied. Lastly, we can find the P -type firm's certificate fee, $F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC}$, by plugging in optimal processing times $t_N^{SC} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N}$ and $t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SC} = \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_P}}$ into the binding $IC_{P,t_{P,\Gamma=0}}$. ■

1.2 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. Since $U_{P,\Gamma=1} > U_{P,\Gamma=0} > U_{N,\Gamma}$, we can discard IR constraints $IR_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and $IR_{P,\Gamma=1}$, as they always hold. $IC_N(P, \Gamma = 0)$ and $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}(N)$ together imply that $t_N \geq t_{P,\Gamma=0}$, which means that we can replace $IC_N(P, \Gamma = 0)$ with monotonicity condition $t_N \geq t_{P,\Gamma=0}$. Similarly, $IC_N(P, \Gamma = 1)$ and $IC_{P,\Gamma=1}(N)$ together imply that $t_N \geq t_{P,\Gamma=1}$, which means that we can replace $IC_N(P, \Gamma = 1)$ with monotonicity condition $t_N \geq t_{P,\Gamma=1}$. Next, $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}(N)$ and $IC_{P,\Gamma=1}(P, \Gamma = 0)$ are equivalent to $IC_N(P, \Gamma = 1)$, which means that $IC_N(P, \Gamma = 1)$ can be ignored. Lastly, $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}(P, \Gamma = 1)$ and $IC_{P,\Gamma=1}(P, \Gamma = 0)$ together imply the equality

$$s_P(t_{P,\Gamma=0} - t_{P,\Gamma=1}) = F_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_{P,\Gamma=0}.$$

Hence, $B2$'s constraints reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} IR_N : \Pi_N - s_N t_N - F_L &\geq M, \\ IC_{P,\Gamma=0}(N) : s_P(t_N - t_{P,\Gamma=0}) &\geq F_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_L, \\ s_P(t_{P,\Gamma=0} - t_{P,\Gamma=1}) &= F_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_{P,\Gamma=0}, \\ t_N &\geq t_{P,\Gamma=0}, \\ t_N &\geq t_{P,\Gamma=1}. \end{aligned}$$

$B2$ can raise his expected payoff by increasing t_N until IR_N binds without violating any of the remaining constraints. This gives the optimal time for the N -type firm: $t_N^{SwC} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N}$. Similarly, $B2$ can raise his payoff by simultaneously raising $t_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and $t_{P,\Gamma=1}$ until $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}(N)$ binds without violating any of the remaining constraints. This yields the binding $IC_{P,\Gamma=0}(N)$:

$$\begin{aligned} s_P(t_N - t_{P,\Gamma=0}) &= F_{P,\Gamma=0} - F_L \\ \iff F_{P,\Gamma=0} &= s_P(t_N - t_{P,\Gamma=0}) + F_L. \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, the equality constraint $s_P(t_{P,\Gamma=0} - t_{P,\Gamma=1}) = F_{P,\Gamma=1} - F_{P,\Gamma=0}$ can be written

as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{P,\Gamma=1} &= s_P(t_{P,\Gamma=0} - t_{P,\Gamma=1}) + F_{P,\Gamma=0} \\
&= s_P(t_{P,\Gamma=0} - t_{P,\Gamma=1}) + s_P(t_N - t_{P,\Gamma=0}) + F_L \\
&= s_P(t_N - t_{P,\Gamma=1}) + F_L.
\end{aligned}$$

By replacing t_N with t_N^{SwC} , $F_{P,\Gamma=0}$ with $s_P(t_N - t_{P,\Gamma=0}) + F_L$, and $F_{P,\Gamma=1}$ with $s_P(t_N - t_{P,\Gamma=1}) + F_L$ in $B2$'s objective function, we obtain

$$W - \theta \frac{c}{t_N^{SwC}} + \phi(1-\theta) \left(s_P(t_N^{SwC} - t_{P,\Gamma=0}) - \frac{c}{t_{P,\Gamma=0}} \right) + (1-\phi)(1-\theta) \left(s_P(t_N^{SwC} - t_{P,\Gamma=1}) - \frac{c}{t_{P,\Gamma=1}} \right).$$

The maximization of this objective function with respect to $t_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and $t_{P,\Gamma=1}$ gives identical processing times for the P -type firm with and without the contract, $t_P^{SwC} = t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SwC} = t_{P,\Gamma=1}^{SwC} = \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_P}}$. The optimal processing times $t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SwC}$ and $t_{P,\Gamma=1}^{SwC}$ satisfy monotonicity conditions $t_N \geq t_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and $t_N \geq t_{P,\Gamma=1}$ and

$$t_N^{SwC} = \frac{\Pi_N - M - F_L}{s_N} > \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_N}} > \sqrt{\frac{c}{s_P}} = t_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SwC} = t_{P,\Gamma=1}^{SwC}.$$

By plugging optimal processing times into $F_{P,\Gamma=0}$ and $F_{P,\Gamma=1}$, we obtain optimal fees for the P -type firm with and without the contract: $F_P^{SwC} = F_{P,\Gamma=1}^{SwC} = F_{P,\Gamma=0}^{SwC} = s_P(t_N^{SwC} - t_P^{SwC}) + F_L$.

Since extortionary bribe $EB_P^{SwC} = F_P^{SwC} - F_L$ and delay $m_P^{SwC} = t_P^{SwC} - t_{min}$ of the P -type firm do not depend on participation in the bribe contest in period 1, the P -type firm's payoff from entering the contest strictly exceeds that from not entering. Hence, it is dominant strategy for the P -type firm to enter to contest in period 1, and $\phi = 0$. ■

2. Extensions and additional estimation results

Extension to multiple firm types: With more than two (or continuum) of firm types, the results in all three Propositions of the main text remain unchanged: the

N -type firm pays no bribe and faces the longest delay, the highest-profit firm with the highest cost of time pays the largest bribe and faces the shortest delay, and firms with intermediate profits and time costs may pay smaller bribes and have longer delay than the highest-profit firm.

The monotonicity of bribes by profit level (more profitable firms pay larger bribes) holds if $\frac{\partial}{\partial s}(\frac{\partial U}{\partial F}/\frac{\partial U}{\partial t}) < 0$ (Spence-Mirrlees condition), which is satisfied for the firm's payoff function in this paper. Since the strict ordering of bribes by profit level (no pooling of types) holds for any distribution function of types satisfying the monotone hazard rate property, whether the bribe of a firm with intermediate profit is strictly less than that of the firm with the highest profit depends on the particular distribution function of firms by profit level. We test the extension with three firm types in the online appendix.

Estimation with three firm types: Our arguments can be extended to more than two firm types. Let the N -type firm represent a non-positive-profit firm, the M -type firm represent a firm with positive profit below the median, and the H -type firm represent a firm with positive profit above the median. As in the case with two types, the N -type firm does not pay any non-extortory bribe by avoiding participation in the bribe contest and does not pay any extortory bribe by choosing maximum bureaucratic delay. The M -type firm with the medium profit and the H -type firm with large profit enter the bribe contest in period 1, and therefore, incur positive daily participation costs g_M and g_H , respectively. When facing an extortory bribe demand in period 2, both the M -type firm and the H -type firm prefer to pay positive extortory bribes and have shorter delays than the N -type firm due to larger costs of time, s_M and s_H , respectively. Lastly, the more profitable H -type firm has higher cost of time than the M -type firm, which gives the following ranking of time costs: $s_H > s_M > s_N$. Note that actual extortory bribes and delays of M -type and H -type firms may or may not differ. In a pooling equilibrium, both firm types choose the same bribe-delay combination, and in a separating equilibrium, bribe-delay combinations of M -type and H -type firms are different.

In Table A1, we report estimated coefficients of the baseline specification EM1.1 of the main text with separately estimated participation costs (g_M and g_H) and costs

of time (s_M and s_H) of firms with positive adjusted profits below the median (M -type firms) and above the median (H -type firms). Because we split positive-profit firms into two groups and estimation of coefficients for each firm type exploits fewer observations, the resulting estimates are not precise. Nevertheless, estimates indicate that both M -type and H -type firms participate in bribe contests and pay extortionary bribes during disputes. The estimate of s_M is US\$ 6.6 and the estimate of g_M is US\$ 4.3. The estimate of s_H is US\$ 13.5 and the estimate of g_H is US\$ 13.5. As before, there is no empirical evidence that N -type firms pay either extortionary or non-extortionary bribes.

Estimates of the model with three firm types are consistent with main predictions of the model of corruption with only two firm types. Whether we have two or three firm types, firms with positive profits engage in both types of bribery. Because bureaucratic delay is more costly for more profitable firms, these firms prefer to pay larger extortionary bribes.

Table A1. Baseline specification with three firm types.

Coefficients	$\frac{Bribe}{workers}$		$\frac{Rep_Bribe}{workers}$	
β_{Π_N}	5.030**	(2.239)	6.161***	(1.593)
1_{CI}	-0.004	(0.099)	0.019	(0.118)
$1_{CU}1_W\lambda$	0.039***	(0.007)	0.039***	(0.008)
β_M	-0.020	(0.047)	-0.023	(0.046)
β_{FL}	-0.002	(0.005)	-0.003	(0.004)
$\beta_{t_{min}}$	1.607	(3.586)	2.425	(4.009)
$-s_N1_B$	-6.603	(21.710)	-3.044	(22.078)
$-s_M$	-6.627	(4.340)	-7.915*	(4,651)
$-s_H$	-13.503*	(7.716)	-12.991	(8.131)
1_{CUGM}	4.297	(3.271)	2.731	(4.203)
1_{CUGH}	13.584*	(7.711)	13.269	(8.111)
β_{AP}	26.785**	(12.911)	29.623***	(14.273)
β_{APD}	15.662*	(9.316)	13.596	(9.365)
<i>Intercept</i>	31.643***	(8.841)	39.899***	(8.598)
Year FX	Yes		Yes	
Firm FX	Yes		Yes	
Within R^2	0.087		0.099	
Between R^2	0.633		0.666	
Overall R^2	0.484		0.523	
Observations	1,279		1,202	

(a) The dependent variable is $\frac{Bribe}{workers}$ in column 1 and $\frac{Rep_Bribe}{workers}$ in column 2;

(b) Robust standard errors in parentheses are clustered by firm id's;

(c) Π_N , $\Delta\Pi$, and M are measured in thousand US \$;

(d) ***, **, * - statistical significance at 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Table A2. Baseline specification EM1.1 with separately estimated intercepts and participation costs of N -type and P -type firms.

Coefficients	$\frac{Bribe}{workers}$		$\frac{Rep_Bribe}{workers}$	
β_{Π_N}	5.095**	(2.204)	6.171***	(1.584)
1_{NS}	0.009	(0.099)	0.014	(0.118)
$1_{SwC}1_W\lambda$	0.039***	(0.008)	0.039***	(0.008)
β_M	-0.023	(0.047)	-0.028	(0.048)
β_{FL}	-0.002	(0.005)	-0.002	(0.004)
$\beta_{t_{min}}$	2.488	(3.265)	3.071	(4.022)
$-s_N1_B$	-13.443	(18.509)	-8.605	(19.412)
$-s_P$	-10.689***	(4.020)	-11.024**	(4.601)
1_{SwCGN}	-2.385	(11.311)	14.282	(16.810)
1_{SwCGP}	11.011***	(3.935)	11.693**	(4.728)
β_{AP}	27.160**	(13.379)	28.119**	(15.186)
β_{APD}	15.297	(9.316)	14.160	(10.081)
1_N	13.866	(9.724)	3.115	(6.256)
<i>Intercept</i>	31.643***	(8.143)	37.805***	(8.936)
Year FX	Yes		Yes	
Firm FX	Yes		Yes	
Within R^2	0.087		0.099	
Between R^2	0.636		0.662	
Overall R^2	0.487		0.520	
Observations	1,279		1,202	

(a) The dependent variable is $\frac{Bribe}{workers}$ in column 1 and $\frac{Rep_Bribe}{workers}$ in column 2;

(b) Robust standard errors in parentheses are clustered by firm id's;

(c) Π_N , $\Delta\Pi$, and M are measured in thousand US \$;

(d) ***, **, * - statistical significance at 1%, 5%, 10% level.

3. Data collection and construction of variables

3.1 Data collection

The data contain responses of senior managers/accountants of 501 firms operating in Tajikistan in 2012-2014. The collection of data was commissioned and funded by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. The data were collected by Research Center SHARQ, Tajikistan, between July 27, 2015 and September 18, 2015. Research Center SHARQ had prior experience collecting firm-level data in Tajikistan for the World Bank's Enterprise Surveys, Asian Development Bank's enterprise-level surveys, and United Nation Development Programme's enterprise-level surveys.

The stratified random sampling procedure was used to construct the sample for the study. The sample was stratified by geographical location and industry type. The sample covers all administrative units (city of Dushanbe, Khatlon province, Districts of Republican Subordination (DRS), Sughd province, and Mountainous Badakhshon Autonomous Province (MBAP)) and all industries: construction, manufacturing, trade, agriculture, and other services. The sample of 2,000 firms was constructed based on the population of firms in Tajikistan in 2015 (24,525 establishments), according to the data presented by the State Statistical Committee of Tajikistan in June of 2015. Table B1 presents the population of firms used as the sample frame. Table B2 presents the sample of 2,000 firms based on the sample frame, and Table B3 presents the achieved sample of 501 firms. The sampling procedure was similar to those adopted by the World Bank's Economic Surveys³⁸.

Respondents had an option to answer the questionnaire either in Tajik or in Russian. To improve accuracy of responses, respondents were assured that the data were to be used anonymously and in aggregate form. To achieve higher response rates, each respondent was guaranteed to receive US\$ 8 upon completion of an interview, which was equivalent to 1.25 of an average daily salary in September 2015. Table B4 describes variables used in the analysis in the paper, and Table B5 lists codes and names of 65 tax districts.

The achieved sample and properties of the data are similar to those of the World

³⁸See <https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/en/methodology> for details.

Bank's Enterprise Surveys. The World Bank's Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey (BEEPS V) in Tajikistan in 2013-2014 is the closest reference in terms of the time of data collection and sample size. The BEEPS V study is a part of the World Bank's Enterprise Surveys, and it had similar objective of collecting firm-level data on business practices and administrative environment in Tajikistan in 2013-2014.

All firm-level studies of business practices and corruption, including ours, have relatively low response rates. The response rate in our study was 25.05% (501 responses out of 2000 sampled). But, not all firms that agreed to participate in the survey gave complete answers about variables of interest. Excluding those firms that did not provide complete answers, the response rate in our study was 21.45% (429 complete responses out of 2000 sampled). This response rate is similar to the one in the BEEPS V study in 2014 (our reference study). The BEEPS V study had response rate of 22% (359 complete responses out of 1620 sampled). Because all such studies require firms' disclosure of sensitive information (e.g. unreported revenues, unpaid taxes, operation without permits), the selection of subjects is driven by the ability of interviewers to convince subjects of confidentiality of disclosed data. For this reason, one approach to eliminate the selection bias in these studies is to control for interviewer fixed effects. Since we have panel data with firm fixed effects and the same interviewer collected data from the same firm in all years, the interviewer fixed effects are accounted for by the firm fixed effects.

The comparison of the achieved sample of 501 firms (Table B3) with the constructed sample of 2000 firms (Table B2) shows that the achieved sample over-represents firms in categories B (manufacturing) and D (wholesale and retail trade). For example, the probability of a firm falling into category B in the achieved sample is 25% versus 10% in the population of firms. The probability of a firm falling into category D in the achieved sample is 33% versus 24% in the population of firms.

Table B6 presents observable characteristics (reported profit, market value of capital, number of workers, number of permits, official paperwork cost, official paperwork processing time, and the number of bureaucratic disputes) of firms reporting positive delays and aggregate bribes, reporting positive delays and zero aggregate bribes, reporting neither delays nor bribes, and those with missing delay or bribes data. If

firms that agreed to participate in the survey but did not disclose sensitive information about bribes and delays are similar to the firms that decided not to participate in the survey, we can compare sub-samples with missing and complete delay and bribes data to get an idea about how firms that selected to participate in the survey are different from those that chose not to do so. The last two columns in Table B6 give this information. The comparison of firms with complete bribes and delay data and firms with missing bribes and delay data shows that reported profits and official paperwork processing times are different, and the difference is statistically significant at 1% level. In addition, the difference in market value of capital across the two types of firms is statistically significant at 10% level. Differences in other variables are not statistically significant. These differences suggest that the achieved sample (429 firms) under-represents smaller firms with lower levels of capital and fewer paperwork/certification requirements relatively to the firms in the sample that chose not to participate in the survey.

3.2 Construction of variables

We describe the construction of variables used in estimation of specification EM1.1 in the main text. The summary statistics of these variables are reported in Table III in the main text.

Firms' types (1_N and 1_P): As we argue in the paper, high-profit firms have an incentive to hide their profits to reduce bribe demands from corrupt bureaucrats. Typically, such high-profit firms over-state their operating costs and under-state revenues. To calculate the size of hidden profit, we ask each firm to report its assessment of under-reported revenue and over-stated cost of a similar firm in the same line of business³⁹. We calculate adjusted profit for each firm by adjusting the firm's reported

³⁹The exact formulation of the question was, "We understand that some establishments face barriers when complying with tax regulations. What percentage of total annual sales/total annual costs do establishments of the same size and operating in the same line of business report in their tax reports?"

It is the standard practice to elicit sensitive information such as this one in the indirect form (see, for example, Svensson (2003)). For instance, in the World Bank's BEEPS V Enterprise Survey in Tajikistan in 2013, sensitive information about firms' informal payments and compliance was elicited in the same indirect form. When eliciting information about under-reported revenues and

revenue for its own assessment of under-reported revenue and reported cost for its own assessment of over-stated cost. If we use the adjusted profit to evaluate the distribution of firms by profitability, we find that about 20% of firms have negative profit, 10% have zero profit, and 70% have positive profit (see Table I of the main text).

We use adjusted profits to separate firms into two groups. Firms with positive adjusted profits represent P -type firms and are indicated by 1_P , while firms with zero or negative adjusted profits represent N -type firms and are indicated by $1_N = 1_P - 1$. The median bribe of firms with zero or negative profits in the data is zero, which is consistent with the theoretical assumption that the N -type firm does not participate in the bribe contest and does not pay extortionary or non-extortionary bribes. Note that adjusted profits of some N -type firms, while negative, still exceed what they report in tax reports. This is because some firms with negative or zero adjusted profits have positive differences between adjusted and reported profits.

Profit of the N -type firm (Π_N): We use profit that each firm reports in its tax report as a measure for Π_N . Specifically, we take the difference between annual total sales and annual total costs reported to the tax service by each firm in each year. As Table III in the main text shows, the mean reported profit is US \$ -56 thousand, and the overwhelming majority of the firms (about 92%) report negative or zero profit. The use of the reported profit to measure Π_N is consistent with the assumption of perfect observability of Π_N in the model of corruption.

Positive profit increment ($\Delta\Pi(\Gamma)$): We use the difference between adjusted and reported profits as a measure for the positive profit increment $\Delta\Pi(\Gamma)$. Whether corrupt bureaucrats observe the unreported difference in profits is an important question that we attempt to answer in the empirical exercise. The mean of the positive profit increment is US \$ 423 thousand, with the minimum of US \$ 0 and the maximum of US \$ 47,734 thousand.

over-stated costs, each firm was assured that the disclosed information would not be reported to administrative authorities.

Bureaucratic burden (*All_papers*): Different firms have different bureaucratic requirements. To measure differences in the bureaucratic burden, we ask firms to report the total number of required legal papers (*All_papers*) that firms have to possess according to the law⁴⁰. The required legal papers include all certificates, permits, and licenses required for operation in a fiscal year. The mean number of required legal papers is 8.1, the minimum is 1 paper, and the maximum is 30 papers.

Market value of capital (*M*): We use firms' reported market value of capital (equipment, machinery, land, and real estate) to measure *M*. The market value of capital *M* captures each firm's outside option, if the firm decides to shut down and sell off its capital. In the data, the mean market value of capital is US \$ 554 thousand, and the value varies between US \$ 66 and US \$ 63,645 thousand.

Official paperwork processing cost (*F_L*): To measure *F_L*, we use firms' reports of annual aggregate expenditures on completion of all bureaucratic requirements, if these requirements were to be satisfied strictly according to the law. This measure aggregates bureaucratic expenditures only through official channels and includes tax payments, certification and registration fees, and all associated compliance costs⁴¹. The mean of this measure is US \$ 40,981, with the minimum of US \$ 10.6 and the maximum of US \$ 9,361 thousand.

Aggregate bribe (*Bribe*): We use two measures of aggregate bribe. The first measure is constructed indirectly. We ask each firm to report its actual aggregate expenditures on satisfying bureaucratic requirements (through official and unofficial channels)⁴². Then, we subtract from this reported value the firm's measure for official

⁴⁰The exact formulation of the question was, "Do you possess all legal papers, certificates, licenses, permits and resolutions from all administrative and supervisory officials that are required to achieve a fully legal status according to the law? Indicate the total number of required legal papers and the share of legal papers in your possession."

⁴¹The exact formulation of the question was, "What would be the aggregate expenses only through official channels (including notary fees and expenses on lawyers) on full compliance with tax requirements, customs requirements, acquisition of licenses, certificates, registration papers, and other administrative papers to ensure legal and transparent operation of your firm according to the law?"

⁴²The exact formulation of the question was, "What were the actual expenses on compliance with tax requirements, customs requirements, acquisition of licenses, certificates, registration papers, and

paperwork processing cost (measure of F_L). The resulting difference is our indirect measure of aggregate bribe ($Bribe$) that we use to estimate empirical specification EM1.1 of the main text. The main advantages of this indirect measure are the higher measurement accuracy and the higher response rate of firms, as firms did not have to explicitly admit to payment of bribes when reporting actual and official bureaucratic expenditures. The mean of the indirect measure of aggregate bribe is US \$ 1,994, the minimum is US \$ 0, and the maximum is US \$ 800,000.

The second measure uses direct reports of annual aggregate bribes. Each firm reported annual aggregate informal payment as a share of annual revenue made by a firm of similar size in the same line of business (Rep_bribe)⁴³. This is the same measure of bribes that is used in the WBES data, and we use this directly measured aggregate bribe to estimate the alternative empirical specification EM1.2 that serves as our robustness check (see the empirical specification EM1.1 of the main text and subsequent discussion). The mean reported aggregate bribe is US \$ 2,195, with the minimum of US \$ 0 and the maximum of US \$ 800,000. The mean difference between direct and indirect measures of aggregate bribes is US \$ -0.4, and the 95% confidence interval is $[-13.9, 13.2]$. The largest difference is in response rates. We have 494 (out of 501) indirectly measured aggregate bribe reports and 449 directly measured aggregate bribe reports.

Bureaucratic disputes (1_{disp}): Our measure of bribes combines extortionary and non-extortionary bribes, as reports of bribes made to individual bureaucrats are impossible to collect. To distinguish between extortionary and non-extortionary bribes, we rely on the definitions in Ayres (1997) and Khalil et al. (2010). Following Ayres (1997), we define extortionary bribery as the bribery initiated by bureaucrats. To capture this type of bribery, we use information about disputes that are initiated by bureaucrats rather than firms. We ask firms to report the total number of disputes that government officials initiated by citing lack of required legal papers or

other administrative papers to ensure operation of your firm?"

⁴³The exact formulation of the question was, "On average, what share of your annual sales does an establishment of your size and in your line of business spend on informal payments (including gifts and services to government officials and involuntary charity contributions)?"

inconsistencies in available legal papers⁴⁴. The indicator for the positive number of bureaucratic disputes is our indicator of extortionary bribery, and it takes the value of one ($1_{disp} = 1$) for a firm reporting at least one bureaucratic dispute and the value of zero ($1_{disp} = 0$) for a firm reporting no such disputes. More than 22% of firms in the sample reported at least one such dispute in fiscal year. The mean number of disputes among firms with at least one dispute is 1.4, with the maximum of 10 disputes.

Official paperwork processing time (t_{min}): To measure t_{min} , we use firms' reports of the total number of days necessary to satisfy all bureaucratic requirements only through official channels and according to the law⁴⁵. The mean number of days is 11.6 days, with the minimum of 0 days and the maximum of 150 days. Note that although there are time limits for paperwork processing times, these time limits are often exceeded.

Bureaucratic delay (m_N, m_P, n) : There are three types of time periods that firms spend with bureaucrats: bureaucratic delay of the N -type firm due to extortionary bribery (m_N), bureaucratic delay of the P -type firm due to extortionary bribery (m_P), and the P -type firm's time in the bribe contest (n). Just as with separate bribe reports, we would like to have separate measures for these time periods. Unfortunately, such measures are unavailable, because of the complexity of informal transfers and the general inability of firms to classify bribery and associated time losses into different categories.

To construct measures for these time periods, we first construct a measure of unspecified bureaucratic delay ($Delay$). To do so, we subtract the measure of official paperwork processing time (t_{min}) from the actual number of days that firms spend

⁴⁴The exact formulation of the question was, "Report the total number of cases when tax, customs, or any other administrative officials initiated disputes because of missing tax or customs declarations, certificates, or other required permits or inconsistencies in these papers."

⁴⁵The exact formulation was, "How many days it would have taken to obtain all required papers only through official channels (complete tax requirements, customs requirements, acquire licenses, certificates, registration papers, and other administrative papers to ensure operation of your firm) to achieve the fully legal status according to the law?"

with bureaucrats while satisfying bureaucratic requirements in fiscal year⁴⁶. The resulting difference is our measure of unspecified bureaucratic delay. This measure captures total time that firms spend with bureaucrats in excess of what is permissible by law, and it includes the negotiation time with bureaucrats when trying to gain access to government resources (time in bribe contests) and the intentionally created bureaucratic delay when corrupt bureaucrats forcibly extract bribes (bureaucratic delay). The average unspecified bureaucratic delay is 4.5 days, the minimum is 0 days, and the maximum is 100 days.

To measure m_P , we interact the unspecified bureaucratic delay ($Delay$) with the indicator of the P -type firm (1_P) and the indicator of bureaucratic disputes (1_{disp}), so that $m_P = Delay1_P1_{disp}$. To measure m_N , we interact the unspecified bureaucratic delay with the indicator of the N -type firm ($1_N = 1 - 1_P$) and the indicator of bureaucratic disputes, so that $m_N = Delay(1 - 1_P)1_{disp}$. To measure n , we interact the unspecified bureaucratic delay with the indicator of the P -type firm, so that $n = Delay1_P$.

⁴⁶The exact formulation of the question was, “How many days did it take you to complete tax requirements, customs requirements, acquire licenses, certificates, registration papers, and other administrative papers to ensure operation of your firm?”

Table B1. Population of firms (Source: State Statistical Committee of Tajikistan, 2015).

Industrial category	Dushanbe city	Sughd Province	Khatlon Province	DRS (Districts of Repub. Subord.)	MBAP (Mount. Badakhshon Autonomous Province)	Total
A. Agriculture; Forestry & fishing;	34	2131	5500	505	111	8281
B. Manufacturing; Mining & quarrying; Electricity, gas, steam, air & water supply;	750	892	579	212	54	2487
C. Construction; Real estate, professional, scientific, technical, administrative & support service activities;	2271	893	810	285	171	4430
D. Wholesale & retail trade; Repair of motor vehicles & motorcycles; Accommodation & food services; Arts, entertainment, recreation & other services;	2415	2001	1375	636	222	6649
E. Transportation, storage, information & communication;	548	272	126	37	55	1038
F. Financial & insurance activities;	165	55	27	6	8	261
G. Human health, social work & education;	410	416	364	104	85	1379
Total	6593	6660	8781	1785	706	24525

Table B2. The constructed sample based on the population of firms (2000 firms).

Industrial category	Dushanbe city	Sughd Province	Khatlon Province	DRS (Districts of Repub. Subord.)	MBAP (Mount. Badakhshon Autonomous Province)	Total
A. Agriculture; Forestry & fishing;	4	172	448	40	8	672
B. Manufacturing; Mining & quarrying; Electricity, gas, steam, air & water supply;	60	72	48	16	4	200
C. Construction; Real estate, professional, scientific, technical, administrative & support service activities;	184	72	68	24	12	360
D. Wholesale & retail trade; Repair of motor vehicles & motorcycles; Accom- modation & food services; Arts, entertainment, recreation & other services;	200	164	112	52	20	548
E. Transportation, storage, information & communication;	44	24	12	4	4	88
F. Financial & insurance activities;	12	4	4	0	0	20
G. Human health, social work & education;	32	36	32	8	4	112
Total	536	544	724	144	52	2000

Table B3. The achieved sample (501 firms).

Industrial category	Dushanbe city	Sughd Province	Khatlon Province	DRS (Districts of Repub. Subord.)	MBAP (Mount. Badakhshon Autonomous Province)	Total
A. Agriculture; Forestry & fishing;	0	25	85	9	2	121
B. Manufacturing; Mining & quarrying; Electricity, gas, steam, air & water supply;	36	49	27	10	2	124
C. Construction; Real estate, professional, scientific, technical, administrative & support service activities;	14	14	12	10	3	53
D. Wholesale & retail trade; Repair of motor vehicles & motorcycles; Accommodation & food services; Arts, entertainment, recreation & other services;	52	40	42	26	6	166
E. Transportation, storage, information & communication;	8	13	8	1	0	30
F. Financial & insurance activities;	0	1	0	0	0	1
G. Human health, social work & education;	4	2	0	0	0	6
Total	114	144	174	56	13	501

Table B4. Description of variables.

Variable name	Description
id	Firm identification number
year	Year of reported data
location	Region: "1" - Dushanbe city, "2" - Khatlon province, "3" - DRS, "4" - Sughd province, and "5" - MBAP
tax_district	Code number for tax district
year_estab	Year, when the firm was established
ownership	Ownership status: "1" - sole proprietorship, "2" - joint stock company, "3" - cooperative, "4" - corporation, "5" - other privately owned company, "6" - other ownership form
state_share	Share of state ownership (in percent)
industry_group	Industrial category: ISIC rev. 4 two-digit industrial division code
industry	Industrial sub-category: ISIC rev. 4 four-digit industrial class code
sector_outputTJ	Total output in TJS in agriculture, construction, manufacturing, trade, transportation and communication, services (source: State Stat. Comm.)
revenueTJ	Total sales reported to the tax service in TJ somonis
costTJ	Total production cost reported to the tax service in TJ somonis
capital_costTJ	Market value of capital in TJ somonis
reported_sales	Share of actual sales reported to the tax service (in percent of actual sales)
reported_cost	Excess production cost reported to the tax service (in percent of actual cost)
official_feeTJ	Official paperwork cost in TJ somonis
official_days	Official paperwork time in days
actual_feeTJ	Actual expenditures on completing paperwork in TJ somonis
actual_days	Actual time spent on completing paperwork in days
allworkers	Number of employees
paper_number	Total number of required legal papers (certificates, permits, licenses etc.)
rep_bribes	Reported annual aggregate bribe in TJ somonis
dispute_number	Annual number of disputes
interviewer	Interviewer code
date	Date of the interview

Table B5. Tax district names and codes.

District name	District code	District name	District code	District name	District code
Asht	1	Kuhistoni		Spitamen	51
		Mastchohi	26	Tavildara	52
Ayni	2	Kulob	27	Temurmaliq	53
Baljuvon	3	Mastchoh	28	Tojikobod	54
Bobojon Gafurov	4	Muminobod	29	Tursunzoda	55
Bohtar	5	Murgob	30	Vahdat	56
Danghara	6	Norak	31	Vahsh	57
Darvoz	7	Nosiri Hisrav	32	Vanj	58
Faizobod	8	Nurobod	33	Varzob	59
Farhor	9	Panj	34	Vose'	60
Firdavsi	10	Panjakent	35	Yovon	61
Gonchi	11	Kabodiyon	36	Zafarobod	62
Hamadoni	12	Kumsangir	37	Kurgon Teppa	63
Hisor	13	Rasht	38	Khujand	64
Ibn Sino	14	Rogun	39	Khorog	65
Isfara	15	Roshtqal'a	40		
Ishkoshim	16	Rudaki	41		
Ismoili Somoni	17	Rumi	42		
Istaravshan	18	Rushon	43		
Jabbor Rasulov	19	Sarband	44		
Jilikul	20	Shahrinav	45		
Jirgatal	21	Shahriston	46		
Jomi	22	Shahritus	47		
Khovaling	23	Shohmansur	48		
Khuroson	24	Shugnon	49		
Konibodom	25	Shurobod	50		

Table B6. Comparisons of firm characteristics (means in 2014 USD).

Variables	Delay & bribes	Delay & no bribes	No delay & no bribes	Complete bribe & delay data	Missing delay or bribes data
Reported profit	-72,903	-6,947	-23,372	-56,754	-112***
Market value of capital	672,668	384,854	271,287	560,690	91,162*
Workers (number)	42.975	42.337	39.440	42.102	90.000
Legal papers (number)	7.988	8.196	8.623	8.158	6.850
Official paper. cost	25,654	21,547	89,919	40,981	N.A.
Official paper. time	11.476	8.272	12.801	11.605	9.321***
Disputes	0.243	0.304	0.144	0.221	0.150
Number of firms	1022	92	361	1483	20

Note: ***, **, * - the sub-sample with missing data is statistically different from the sub-sample with complete data at 1%, 5%, 10% level in the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Table B7. Summary statistics for normalized variables (all years in 2014 US \$).

Variable name	Mean	Std. Err.	95% Confidence Interval
Reported profit per worker $\frac{\Pi_N}{workers}$ (thousand \$)	-1.372	0.284	[-1.929, -0.814]
Unreported profit per worker $\frac{\Delta\Pi(\Gamma)}{workers}$ (thousand \$)	11.105	3.299	[4.632, 17.577]
Required papers per worker $\frac{All_papers}{workers}$ (number)	0.627	0.016	[0.595, 0.658]
Capital per worker $\frac{M}{workers}$ (thousand \$)	18.288	5.849	[6.814, 29.763]
Official process. cost per worker $\frac{FL}{workers}$ (\$)	1338.4	334.7	[681.6, 1995.3]
Actual process. cost per worker $\frac{F}{workers}$ (\$)	1394.8	335.1	[737.4, 2052.3]
Aggregate bribe per worker $\frac{Bribe}{workers}$ (\$)	56.396	9.619	[37.523, 75.268]
Reported aggregate bribe per worker $\frac{Rep_bribe}{workers}$ (\$)	57.006	9.638	[38.095, 75.916]
Official process. time per worker $\frac{t_{min}}{workers}$ (days)	0.818	0.030	[0.758, 0.877]
Actual process. time per worker $\frac{t}{workers}$ (days)	1.185	0.047	[1.094, 1.277]
Bureaucratic delay per worker $\frac{Delay}{workers}$ (days)	0.367	0.022	[0.324, 0.411]