

**GLOBAL
CORRUPTION
BAROMETER
2013**

Transparency International is the global civil society organisation leading the fight against corruption. Through more than 90 chapters worldwide and an international secretariat in Berlin, we raise awareness of the damaging effects of corruption and work with partners in government, business and civil society to develop and implement effective measures to tackle it.

www.transparency.org

ISBN: 978-3-943497-36-6

© 2013 Transparency International. All rights reserved.

Printed on 100% recycled paper.

Authors: Deborah Hardoon, Finn Heinrich

© Cover photo: iStockphoto/pixelot

Design: Soapbox, www.soapbox.co.uk

Every effort has been made to verify the accuracy of the information contained in this report. All information was believed to be correct as of July 2013. Nevertheless, Transparency International cannot accept responsibility for the consequences of its use for other purposes or in other contexts.

Errata:

Please note that the following mistakes occurred in the report:

Pages 27-30:

Australia: The interview method was listed as CATI, when it should read Online

Bosnia and Herzegovina: BBSS was listed as the survey company,

when it should read Mareco Index Bosnia

Estonia: Riat was listed as the survey company, when it should read RAIT

Ethiopia: The interview method was listed as CATI, when it should read Face to face

Greece: Centrum was listed as the survey company, when it should

read Alternative Research

Hungary: The interview method was listed as Face to face, when it should read CATI

Iraq: IIASS was listed as the survey company and coverage as National,

when it should read IIACSS and Urban

Japan: The interview method was listed as Online, when it should read Face to face

Malaysia: The interview method was listed as CATI, when it should read Face to face

Maldives: The interview method was listed as Face to face and coverage as National,

when it should read CATI and Urban

New Zealand: The interview method was listed as CATI, when it should read Online

Serbia: BBSS was listed as the survey company, when it should read TNS

Medium Gallup

Slovenia: The interview method was listed as Face to face, when it should read CATI

South Sudan: The interview method was listed as CATI and coverage as National,

when it should read Face to face and Urban

Taiwan: WisdomAsia was listed as the survey company and CATI as the interview

method, when it should read Cass Research Centre and Online

Thailand: The interview method was listed as CATI, when it should read Face to face

Uganda: The coverage was listed as Urban+Rural, when it should read Urban

United Kingdom: ORC was listed as the survey company, when it should read ORB

We have corrected the report accordingly and apologise for these mistakes.

Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1 Key Findings	3
1.2 Recommendations	4
2. People's views on corruption	5
2.1 Views on the extent of corruption	6
2.2 Views on whether corruption is getting better or worse	6
3. Experiences of bribery	8
3.1 Bribery around the world	9
3.2 Bribery across public services	11
4. Beyond bribery – opinions on politics, government and corruption	13
4.1 Use of personal contacts and undue influence	14
4.2 Corruption in major institutions	15
4.3 Views on government anti-corruption efforts	18
5. The role of citizens in stopping corruption	20
5.1 People can make a difference	21
5.2 Turning rhetoric into practice – how people can stop corruption	22
Appendices	26
Appendix A: Global Corruption Barometer survey methodology	27
Appendix B: Questionnaire	31
Appendix C: Tables of results by country	33
List of figures and boxes	41
Endnotes	42
Acknowledgements	43

1

INTRODUCTION

Every day, all over the world, ordinary people bear the cost of corruption. In many countries, corruption affects people from birth until death. In Zimbabwe, women giving birth in a local hospital have been charged US\$5 every time they scream as a penalty for raising false alarm.¹ In Bangladesh, the recent collapse of a multi-story factory, which killed more than 1,100 people due to a breach of basic safety standards, has been linked to allegations of corruption.²

This report examines how corruption features in people's lives around the world. Drawing on the results of a Transparency International survey of more than 114,000 respondents in 107 countries, it addresses people's direct experiences with bribery and details their views on corruption in the main institutions in their countries. Significantly, Transparency International's Global Corruption Barometer also provides insights into how willing and ready people are to act to stop corruption.

The findings are clear: corruption is a very real burden, with more than one out of four respondents reporting having paid a bribe during the last year.³ When people are not in a position to afford a bribe, they might be prevented from buying a home, starting a business or accessing basic services. Corruption can, and often does, infringe on fundamental rights. For those surviving on less than US\$2 a day, and for women who are the primary caretakers of children around the globe, corruption and bribery are particularly devastating. For them, the additional cost of bribery can mean trade-offs are made between health and hunger, between school entrance fees and the shoes necessary to wear to school.

Not only do people pay the costs of corruption directly, but their quality of life is also affected by less visible forms of corruption. When powerful groups buy influence over government decisions or when public funds are diverted into the coffers of the political elite, ordinary people suffer.

When there is widespread belief that corruption prevails and the powerful in particular are able to get away with it, people lose faith in those entrusted with power. As the Global Corruption Barometer 2013 shows, corruption is seen to be running through the foundations of the democratic and legal process in many countries, affecting public trust in political parties, the judiciary and the police, among other key institutions.

Importantly, however, the people surveyed around the world as a part of the Global Corruption Barometer

do not view themselves as powerless victims of corruption. They believe they can be part of the solution. In India, in 2011, millions of people marched to demand the establishment of an independent anti-corruption commission; in Brazil, a citizen petition led to the passage of a law which bans corrupt politicians from running for office. Citizen action can lead to the exposure of corrupt acts, the sanctioning of corrupt officials and pressure upon reluctant governments to do more in the fight against corruption. The Global Corruption Barometer underscores the pressing desire of citizens to get involved in stopping corruption.

Efforts to stop corruption started in earnest in the early 1990s, at a time when corruption was a little-talked-about secret. Twenty years later, the Global Corruption Barometer 2013 shows that people recognise all too well the extent of the problem and are ready to tackle this issue themselves.

1.1 Key Findings

- **Bribery is widespread**
Overall, more than one in four people (27 per cent) report having paid a bribe in the last 12 months when interacting with key public institutions and services.
- **Public institutions entrusted to protect people suffer the worst levels of bribery**
Among the eight services evaluated, the police and the judiciary are seen as the two most bribery-prone. An estimated 31 per cent of people who came into contact with the police report having paid a bribe. For those interacting with the judiciary, the share is 24 per cent.
- **Governments are not thought to be doing enough to hold the corrupt to account**
The majority of people around the world believe that their government is ineffective at fighting corruption and corruption in their country is getting worse.
- **The democratic pillars of societies are viewed as the most corrupt**
Around the world, political parties, the driving force of democracies, are perceived to be the most corrupt institution.
- **Personal connections are seen as corrupting the public administration**
People surveyed regard corruption in their country as more than just paying bribes: almost two out

of three people believe that personal contacts and relationships help to get things done in the public sector in their country.

- **Powerful groups rather than the public good are judged to be driving government actions**
More than one in two people (54 per cent) think their government is largely or entirely run by groups acting in their own interests rather than for the benefit of the citizens.
- **People state they are ready to change this status-quo**
Nearly 9 in 10 surveyed say they would act against corruption. The majority of people said that they would be willing to speak up and report an incident of corruption. Two-thirds of those asked to pay a bribe say they refused.

1.2 Recommendations

- **Make integrity and trust the founding principles of public institutions and services**
 - Governments must operate with transparency and open up their books and activities to public scrutiny.
 - Codes of conduct should be developed and adhered to by all public servants.
 - Governments should embed transparency in how they work by passing and implementing comprehensive access to information laws.
 - Countries should adopt and enact standards for procurement and public financial management, consistent with UN Convention Against Corruption Article 9 and the OECD Principles on Enhancing Integrity in Public Procurement.
 - Governments must set up accountability mechanisms and channels that get the public engaged in oversight.
 - People should refuse to pay a bribe, wherever asked and whenever possible.
- **Bring back the rule of law**
 - Governments should prioritise anti-corruption reforms in the police, based on a thorough analysis of underlying problems.
 - Governments must ensure the independence and impartiality of their judiciaries.
 - Governments must set up adequate checks-and-balances to ensure that private
- **Hold the corrupt to account**
 - All governments must work to end impunity by effectively preventing, detecting, investigating, prosecuting and punishing acts of corruption.
 - Elected public officials should not enjoy immunity when charged with corruption offences.
 - People should make use of existing reporting mechanisms to speak out about corruption that they witness or experience.
 - People should use their voice, vote and spending to punish the corrupt, such as only voting for clean candidates and parties that stand in elections or only buying from companies that have strong integrity systems and clean business practices.
- **Clean-up democratic processes**
 - Governments should pass and implement laws on making party financing transparent, including requirements for political parties, political candidates and their donors to publicly disclose donations.
 - Parliaments should adopt comprehensive codes of conduct for members, including guidance on conflict of interest situations and rules for disclosure of assets, interests and income.
 - Parliaments should introduce mandatory registers of lobbyists.
- **Give people the tools and protections to fight against corruption**
 - Governments should pass and implement whistleblower laws. These laws should include appropriate follow up mechanisms to allow people to report wrongdoing in the public and private sectors and protect whistleblowers from retribution.
 - Governments should seek to provide people with effective mechanisms to report corruption and get redress.
 - Governments should enable independent civil society organisations to function as effective watchdogs of government and to help people to hold public officials to account.
- interests and power groups do not dictate a government's policies and actions.

2

PEOPLE'S VIEWS ON CORRUPTION

At a time when empty public coffers, rising unemployment, and the global financial crisis dominate the public debate, how much importance do people attach to the problem of corruption? Is it seen as on the rise or are things getting better?

2.1 Views on the extent of corruption

People around the world regard corruption as a serious, and in many cases, very serious problem for their societies. On a scale of one to five, where one means 'corruption is not a problem at all' and five means 'corruption is a very serious problem', the average score across the countries surveyed was 4.1.

People's views on corruption are worst in Liberia and Mongolia with a score of 4.8. In Denmark, Finland, Rwanda, Sudan and Switzerland, results were more optimistic. With scores below three, people there see corruption as a somewhat less serious problem.

2.2 Views on whether corruption is getting better or worse

Our survey finds that 53 per cent of people surveyed think that corruption has increased or increased a lot over the last two years. Twenty nine per cent of people think that it has stayed the same and just 18 per cent of people think that it has decreased.

In Algeria, Lebanon, Portugal, Tunisia, Vanuatu and Zimbabwe, people indicate that corruption has gotten much worse, with three out of four indicating an increase in corruption. The opposite trend can be observed in Belgium, Cambodia, Georgia, Rwanda, Serbia and Taiwan, where more than half of people surveyed think that corruption has decreased.

Figure 1: Public views on whether corruption in their country has increased, stayed the same or decreased over the last two years. >>

DO YOU THINK CORRUPTION HAS INCREASED IN YOUR COUNTRY?

Increased



No change



Decreased



Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Korea (South), Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia (FYR), Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palestine, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Romania, Russia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

3

EXPERIENCES OF BRIBERY

Bribery is often the most direct experience of corruption for a person. In many instances, bribery and the refusal to pay have life-changing consequences for the people involved, such as in the case of Ahmed.⁴ As part of a national programme in Morocco to relocate slum dwellers and provide them with more sanitary living conditions, Ahmed, living in a slum with his wife and two children, was entitled to a new plot of land. But the public officials responsible for administering the programme used their position of power to allocate land only to those people from whom they could extort money. Unable to pay, Ahmed, his wife and two children were left homeless when their slum was destroyed.

Bribery not only costs the individual paying the bribe – it also undermines the efficient and equitable allocation of resources, people's respect for the rule of law and the overall integrity of a society.

3.1 Bribery around the world

Across the world, on average, 27 per cent of people reported that they have paid a bribe in the past 12 months to one of the eight services asked about.⁵ In other words, in the last year, corruption has directly impacted on more than one in four people in the countries surveyed around the world.

This result is largely the same as the findings in the Global Corruption Barometer 2010/2011.⁶

Figure 2 reports the bribery rates per country, indicating that the prevalence of bribery differs strongly across the world. There are 16 countries where less than five per cent of people report having paid a bribe in the past 12 months, but there are 14 countries where more than half of the people report having paid a bribe. In Liberia and Sierra Leone, reported levels of bribery exceed 75 per cent.⁷

Bribery rates by gender: Around the world, 28 per cent of men report that they had paid a bribe, compared with 25 per cent of women. Yet in certain places, men are much more likely to report that they have paid bribes than women, such as in Nepal and Pakistan. However, the opposite holds in Colombia, where women are significantly more likely than men to report that they have paid bribes, with reported bribery rates of just 16 per cent for men and 27 per cent for women.

Bribery rates by income: The Global Corruption Barometer survey finds around the world that, on average, those that could afford to pay bribes are more likely to pay them. For people whose income is above the average in their country, 31 per cent report having paid a bribe against 26 per cent of those respondents with below average income.

Box 1: The cost of day-to-day bribery


Bribery between citizens and service providers is often termed 'petty bribery'. However, this term suggests that this is a petty or small corruption issue. This is hardly the case. Day-to-day bribery that occurs at the interface between citizens and public service providers is not only a cost to citizens in terms of the money that is handed over for unjust reasons, but it also has discriminatory effects on the provision and management of the service. It creates an environment where citizens resort to unfair means for access to services or speed of service and where people in charge of these services seek further opportunities to exploit their position to make more money.

While an average reported bribery rate around the world of 27 per cent is high enough to cause alarm, this is just the tip of the iceberg to understanding the scale and extent of bribery as it affects people.

Country-specific public opinion surveys which allow us to explore the dynamics of bribery in greater depth confirm that this type of bribery is by no means petty. The East Africa Bribery Index⁸ for example finds that the average bribe paid for land services is more than US\$100 (9,842 Kenyan Shilling) in Kenya and the average value of a bribe paid to the judiciary in Uganda is more than US\$200 (594,137 Ugandan Shilling). A survey in Mexico finds that the cost of bribery has a regressive effect on Mexican households hurting the poor the most, with an average-income household spending 14 per cent of that income on bribes and those with the lowest incomes spending 33 per cent.⁹ In Greece, the total costs households incurred due to corruption were estimated to amount to €420 million in 2012.¹⁰

Figure 2: Bribery around the world

HAVE YOU PAID A BRIBE?



MORE THAN 1 IN 4 PEOPLE AROUND THE
WORLD REPORT HAVING PAID A BRIBE

% OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORT HAVING PAID BRIBES IN THE PAST YEAR TO ANY ONE OF EIGHT SERVICES BY COUNTRY/TERRITORY¹¹

<5%

AUSTRALIA, BELGIUM,
CANADA, CROATIA,
DENMARK, FINLAND,
GEORGIA, JAPAN, KOREA
(SOUTH), MALAYSIA,
MALDIVES, NEW ZEALAND,
NORWAY, PORTUGAL,
SPAIN, URUGUAY

5–9.9%

BULGARIA, ESTONIA, ITALY,
SLOVENIA, SWITZERLAND,
UNITED KINGDOM, UNITED
STATES

10–14.9%

ARGENTINA, CHILE, EL
SALVADOR, HUNGARY,

ISRAEL, JAMAICA,
PALESTINE, PHILIPPINES,
RWANDA, VANUATU

15–19.9%

ARMENIA, CYPRUS,
CZECH REPUBLIC,
KOSOVO, LATVIA,
MACEDONIA (FYR),
ROMANIA, SRI LANKA,
SUDAN, THAILAND, TUNISIA

20–29.9%

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA,
COLOMBIA, GREECE, IRAQ,
LITHUANIA, MADAGASCAR,
MOLDOVA, PAPUA NEW
GUINEA, PARAGUAY, PERU,
SERBIA, SLOVAKIA, TURKEY,
VENEZUELA

30–39.9%

BANGLADESH, BOLIVIA,
EGYPT, INDONESIA,
JORDAN, KAZAKHSTAN,
MEXICO, NEPAL,
PAKISTAN, SOLOMON
ISLANDS, SOUTH SUDAN,
TAIWAN, UKRAINE,
VIETNAM

40–49.9%

AFGHANISTAN, ALGERIA,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF
THE CONGO, ETHIOPIA,
KYRGYZSTAN, MONGOLIA,
MOROCCO, NIGERIA, SOUTH
AFRICA

50–74.9%

CAMBODIA, CAMEROON,
GHANA, INDIA, KENYA, LIBYA,
MOZAMBIQUE, SENEGAL,
TANZANIA, UGANDA, YEMEN,
ZIMBABWE

≥75%

LIBERIA, SIERRA LEONE

3.2 Bribery across public services

Comparing major public services, people pay bribes most often when they interact with the police. Figure 3 reports the global bribery rates in eight common public services. According to respondents worldwide, the police are the most often bribed institution in the past year, followed by the judiciary. Of the eight categories we asked about, bribes are least likely to be paid for utilities. However, even for this service 13 per cent of people that had come into contact with utility providers report paying a bribe.


Bribery in law enforcement: Around the world, 31 per cent of people that have come into contact with the police report having paid a bribe. This rate is consistent with the result of the previous Global Corruption Barometer in 2010/2011, which also found the police to be the service most prone to bribery. Bribery rates of the police were highest (75 per cent or more) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone.

Reported bribes paid to the judiciary have increased significantly in some parts of the world going up by more than 20 per cent in Ghana, Indonesia, Mozambique, Solomon Islands and Taiwan. Apart from Taiwan, bribery to the police has also increased by more than 20 per cent in all these countries. However, reported bribery rates to the judiciary have gone down by more than 20 per cent in Ethiopia, Iraq, Palestine and South Sudan, where a decline in bribery rates to the police has also been seen.

Bribery in land services: Around the world, one in five people report that they had paid a bribe for land services. The high prevalence of bribery in the land sector creates a substantial informal cost for those trying to register or transfer land. It can make land administration services inaccessible to people who are not able to afford these illegal payments. By creating a disincentive to register property transactions, the informality of land tenure increases. People are left with little or no protection under the law, making them vulnerable to evictions and other abuses.

Figure 3: Bribery rates by service
Percentage of people who have paid a bribe to each service (average across 95 countries*)

In the past 12 months, when you or anyone living in your household had a contact or contacts with one of eight services, have you paid a bribe in any form?



*Data from the following countries was excluded due to validity concerns: Albania, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Burundi, Fiji, France, Germany, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Russia and Zambia.

Corruption in the land sector is particularly critical in post-conflict societies and countries in transition, where transparent and efficient land management is necessary to rebuild and reconstruct the country. The high bribery rates for these services in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Iraq, Liberia, Pakistan and Sierra Leone, which range from 39 per cent to 75 per cent, are of particular concern. High levels of hunger coincide with the likelihood of having

to pay a bribe for land services for the 35 countries that score above five on the International Food Policy Research Institute's Global Hunger Index (signifying levels of hunger that are between 'moderate' and 'extremely alarming'), and that are also surveyed for the Global Corruption Barometer.¹² This suggests that in those countries where land use for food is critical for feeding the nation, land management is most corrupt.

Box 2: Police corruption in Venezuela

Fifty-year old Carmela* was sleeping at home when she was woken by banging and shouting from the apartment above, where her son lives. Rushing upstairs, she says she found the 27-year-old mechanic being beaten by police officers. Ignoring her cries, the officers dragged him from the apartment and took him to their local headquarters, where they demanded payment for his release.

Carmela's problem is not new in her community, a makeshift settlement where local people claim to suffer constant harassment from certain police officers who demand bribes in return for leaving them in peace. Fearing retaliation, people find a way to pay the officers, who reportedly ask for as much as several thousand US dollars. But for Carmela, a housekeeper with four children, one suffering from cancer, this was impossible.

Acting on Carmela's behalf, Transparency International Venezuela contacted senior government and police officials, calling on them to take action. As a result, when she went to the local police headquarters to pay the bribe, the state authorities were watching. As soon as the money changed hands, they moved in and arrested the officers involved. Her son was released without payment. The police officers were detained and now await trial, while a full investigation is underway.

*Names have been changed.

Box 3: Stopping corruption in land services

Since the food price spikes in 2007, the increased value of food production has had a knock-on effect on the value of land, which has resulted in the kind of rent-seeking behaviour that we are more used to associating with natural resources like diamonds or oil and gas. In the last decade, as much as 227 million hectares of land – the size of Western Europe¹³ – mostly in developing countries, has been sold or leased, mainly to international investors. With the scale of these land transactions covering so much of the world's finite resource, involving huge payments to governments and affecting so many people, it is essential that this sector is managed with maximum transparency to ensure an efficient and equitable outcome for much-needed homes, food production and commercial opportunities for citizens.

In Georgia, for example, Transparency International's anti-corruption legal advice centre has received more than 1,000 complaints related to land issues. In the past few years, people have become increasingly concerned by the government's growing interest in large-scale economic and tourism projects in less developed regions of the country.¹⁴ In response people have increased their efforts to register their land en mass, yet instead of facing routine procedures for this, they report encountering artificial barriers created by the state.

Transparency International Georgia has been working with the land claimants by educating people on their rights through mobile clinics set up in affected regions. A report published in 2011 helped to create a public outcry which, together with the pressure that was put on the system through investigations of the numerous cases brought forward, resulted in the government registering the land ownership rights of families evicted without compensation. Eventually every affected person received compensation.¹⁵

4

BEYOND BRIBERY
OPINIONS ON POLITICS,
GOVERNMENT & CORRUPTION

It has become virtually impossible to pick up a local newspaper anywhere in the world without reading some headline highlighting alleged corruption. These can range from the use of nepotism in awarding scholarships, the illegitimate sale of land to government cronies and the impunity of well-connected businesspeople and senior public officials. What do people think about forms of corruption such as these? Which institutions do they consider most affected by corruption? And what do they think about their government's efforts to curtail corruption?

4.1 Use of personal contacts and undue influence

Corruption in the public sector can manifest itself in a number of different ways. We have already seen how corruption can occur at the point of public service delivery by way of bribery to access or expedite these services. Other less common, but equally damaging, forms of corruption that have an impact on people occur when decisions to allocate public resources are distorted by money, power, access, connections or some combination of the above.

Almost two-thirds (64 per cent) of people around the world thought that personal contacts were important to get things done in the public sector (Figure 4). This percentage goes up to more than 80 per cent in Israel,

Italy, Lebanon, Malawi, Morocco, Nepal, Paraguay, Russia, Ukraine and Vanuatu.

Corruption can occur at every level in society, so we asked people to what extent they think their government is being run by a few big entities acting in their own self interest. Our survey found that 54 per cent of people think that the government is either largely or entirely captured by self-interested groups, rather than being run for the benefit of the public at large (Figure 5). In Cyprus, Greece, Lebanon, Russia, Tanzania and Ukraine, more than 80 per cent of people believe the government is either largely or entirely run by a few big entities acting in their own self interest.

Looking only at OECD countries, which as the world's largest economies ought to be strong performers on governance and anti-corruption, the wide range of people's perceptions as to the extent of government capture by special interests is striking (Figure 6). While only five per cent of Norwegians see their government captured by special interests, this goes up to more than two-thirds in countries where the economic crisis highlighted deep-rooted failures of governance, such as Greece, Italy and Spain, but also includes Belgium and Israel. This suggests that there are important lessons to be learned within the group of OECD countries from Norway and other Scandinavian countries about how to run one's government so that it is seen by most to serve the overall public good.

Figure 4: How important are personal contacts?
Average percentage from the 107 countries surveyed

In your dealings with the public sector, how important are personal contacts and/or relationships to get things done?




Figure 5: Undue influence of government
Average percentage from the 107 countries surveyed

To what extent is this country's government run by a few big interests looking out for themselves?




Figure 6: Undue influence of government – OECD countries
Average percentage from the 28 OECD countries in our survey

To what extent is this country's government run by a few big interests looking out for themselves? Percentage of respondents that answered 'large extent' or 'entirely'.

% respondents that think the government is run by a few big interests			
Norway	5	Canada	54
Switzerland	19	Germany	55
Denmark	24	France	57
Finland	28	Slovakia	60
Korea (South)	28	United Kingdom	60
Luxembourg	39	Mexico	62
Japan	44	Chile	63
New Zealand	44	Slovenia	63
Estonia	46	United States	64
Czech Republic	49	Spain	66
Turkey	49	Belgium	70
Australia	52	Italy	70
Hungary	52	Israel	73
Portugal	53	Greece	83

4.2 Corruption in major institutions

In a given country, corruption differs in its severity across different sectors and different institutions. Political parties were seen to be the most corrupt institution, scoring 3.8 on the scale of one to five. The police were seen to be the next most corrupt institution, followed by the judiciary, parliament and public officials. In short, it is the actors that are supposed to be running countries and upholding the rule of law that are seen as the most corrupt, judged to be abusing their positions of power and acting in their own interests rather than for the citizens they are there to represent and serve.

Religious institutions are seen as least corrupt around the world. However, people in a number of countries perceive even these institutions to be highly corrupt. In Israel, Japan, Sudan and South Sudan, religious bodies scored above four.

Box 4: Political corruption in Zimbabwe

When Robert* was elected into local government in Zimbabwe he was shocked by what he believed was institutionalised corruption. According to Robert, his fellow councillors were working with housing officials to buy up property and sell it on at exorbitant prices to families desperate for a home – sometimes at 10 times the market value. With nearly 10,000 people on the city’s housing waiting list, demand was high.

When he brought his concerns to Transparency International Zimbabwe, the organisation helped him draft a letter to the city’s governor. In response, the governor opened an investigation into the allegations and called for an urgent meeting with the councillors.

The city’s residents have rallied behind the governor’s initiative. More and more people are taking part in council meetings, budget consultations and residents’ associations. Organising public hearings, Transparency International Zimbabwe also helped hundreds of citizens come forward to raise concerns directly with their councillors.


It is too early to measure the impact on the housing market, but local people are positive about the future. “I had given up hope of ever being a house-owner because I cannot afford the informal rates being charged”, said one resident who had been on the waiting list for 30 years. “The inclusion of residents in allocation decisions has brightened up my accommodation prospects.”

*Name has been changed.

Figure 7: Perceptions of the extent of corruption in different institutions

Average score from the 107 countries surveyed

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means ‘not at all corrupt’ and 5 means ‘extremely corrupt’, to what extent do you see the following categories in this country to be affected by corruption?



Corruption in political parties: In 51 countries around the world, political parties were seen to be the most corrupt institution. The worst results were reported in Greece, Mexico and Nepal, where political parties scored 4.6 and, in Nigeria, 4.7.

There is increasing evidence that all around the world there are significant corruption risks in the political process and within political parties. As political parties require money in order to run their campaigns, one of the big corruption risks for political parties is how they are funded. The interests of the people and organisations that fund political parties can have a large influence on the actions of these parties.

Corruption in law enforcement: In 36 countries, the police are seen as the most corrupt institution. This finding is mirrored by the high levels of reported bribery to the

police reported in chapter three. In these 36 countries, an average of 53 per cent of people report having paid a bribe to the police, demonstrating that perceptions of corruption in this service are based on people's real experiences in everyday life.

In 20 countries, people believe the judiciary to be the most corrupt institution. In these countries, an average of 30 per cent of people who came into contact with the judiciary report having paid a bribe.

The integrity of the judiciary and the police service is inextricably linked. Police, lawyers and prosecutors are all involved in cases before they even reach the court room. When these critical law enforcement agencies cannot be trusted to act with integrity, the fundamental principles of implementing the rule of law in a country are undermined and impunity reigns.

Figure 8: Most corrupt institution in each country
Institution scoring highest on perceived level of corruption
among a set of 12 major institutions, by country/territory*

Political parties (51)	Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Korea (South), Latvia, Luxembourg, Macedonia (FYR), Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Palestine, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Taiwan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen
Police (36)	Bangladesh, Bolivia, Burundi, Cameroon, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, Venezuela, Vietnam, Zambia, Zimbabwe
Judiciary (20)	Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Madagascar, Moldova, Peru, Serbia, Slovakia, Tanzania, Ukraine
Public officials/ Civil servants (7)	Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Mongolia, Pakistan, Russia, Serbia
Parliament/Legislature (7)	Colombia, Indonesia, Japan, Lithuania, Maldives, Paraguay, Taiwan
Medical and health services (6)	Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Ethiopia, Morocco, Serbia
Media (4)	Australia, Egypt, New Zealand, United Kingdom
Religious bodies (3)	Denmark, South Sudan, Sudan
Business/Private sector (3)	Algeria, Fiji, Norway

*Some countries are listed more than once because respondents rated more than one institution the same. Education system, military and NGOs were not seen in any country as the most corrupt institution.

4.3 Views on government anti-corruption efforts

A country's government is in a unique position to lead the societal response to corruption, to set standards, to put anti-corruption laws in place and ensure they are implemented. But are governments around the world doing enough?


The majority of people (54 per cent) in the Global Corruption Barometer survey consider their government to be ineffective at fighting corruption (Figure 9). This lack of confidence in governmental efforts has grown compared to people's views in our last survey in 2010/2011 when just under half (47 per cent) of people surveyed thought the government to be ineffective.

Figure 9 shows that in as many as 88 countries the majority of people consider their government to be ineffective in addressing corruption.

Looking at the G20 countries, which have repeatedly committed themselves to act as global leaders in good governance and anti-corruption, 16 out of the 17 G20 countries included in the survey belong to this group. Only in Turkey do a relative majority of people think that their government has been effective. In December 2012, G20 leaders committed to a two-year Anti-corruption Action plan for 2013 and 2014, placing an emphasis on closing the implementation and enforcement gap.¹⁶ Recognising the role that people have to play in stopping corruption, the passing and implementation of effective whistleblower protection legislation for all public and private sector employees will need to be a priority. This should ensure prompt, effective and independent follow-up and include full legal remedies in case of retaliation.

Figure 9: Perceived effectiveness of government in fighting corruption
Number of countries for which the relative majority of respondents perceived governments to be effective versus ineffective

How effective do you think your governments actions are in the fight against corruption?



Box 5 – Ending impunity for the corrupt

Bending the law, beating the system or escaping punishment – and getting away with it – define impunity for corruption. Impunity is anathema to the fight against corruption and, especially in the judiciary and law enforcement sectors, is a direct challenge to the rule of law. But rooting out undue influence from government or business interests in the legal system, or detecting bribery, is difficult. That 31 per cent of people who came into contact with the police and 24 per cent of people who came into contact with the judiciary in the previous 12 months report paying a bribe only underscores the unjust and persistent nature of impunity for corrupt acts.

There is much that can be done to end impunity. Emphasising the appropriate political, legal and social sanctions for those who enjoy impunity for corruption, Transparency International's efforts increase accountability and make it ever more difficult for individuals, corporations and others to get away with corruption.

Transparency International is working around the world to end impunity, particularly through strengthening the judicial system. To enhance the integrity of judicial bodies, Transparency International's chapter in Palestine prepared codes of conduct and trained both judges and prosecutors. In Senegal, we are enhancing the technical capacity of the judiciary, by providing technical expertise on issues related to asset recovery and illicit enrichment. While in Slovakia, we are developing an online tool that allows citizens to observe, monitor, and discuss decisions of individual judges.

5

THE ROLE OF CITIZENS IN STOPPING CORRUPTION

In 2013, it was revealed that a whistleblower sent the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists 2.5 million electronic files containing what the consortium calls “the biggest stockpile of inside information about the offshore system ever obtained by a media organization”.¹⁷ The actions of this one individual resulted in the largest-ever exposé of a high-stakes, secretive world that fosters and hides large-scale fraud, money laundering, tax evasion, corruption and other wrongdoing.

With corruption seen as a serious problem around the world, and on the rise, and with governments being largely judged as insufficient, it is important that ordinary people feel empowered to do their part in stopping corruption.

5.1 People can make a difference

Two in three (67 per cent) people around the globe believe that ordinary people can make a difference in the fight against corruption. Behind these global results are some significant variations across countries, as shown in Figure 10.

On average around the world – regardless of their age, income or gender – respondents agree that ordinary people can make a difference. In some places, young people believe this more than others. For those aged between 18 and 25, the majority of young people in Estonia and Lithuania at 50 per cent and 51 per cent respectively do believe that ordinary people can make a difference, compared with 37 per cent and 35 per cent of those people aged over 25. The fact that young people in these countries feel more empowered to stop corruption bodes well for the future.

However, compared to the Global Corruption Barometer 2010/2011, the degree of belief in citizens’ power to address corruption has dropped from 72 per cent to 67 per cent for the 91 countries covered in both surveys. There was more than a 20 per cent drop in Burundi, Hungary, Iraq, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Morocco, Pakistan, Slovenia and Yemen. The optimism about citizen power in these countries has waned.

Of those who believe they can make a difference, more are likely not to have paid a bribe. Sixty-seven per cent of people who had not paid a bribe believe that ordinary people can make a difference, versus 62 per cent of those who report paying a bribe.

Figure 10: Belief in ordinary people’s ability to make a difference
Percentage of respondents who ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’, countries/territories grouped in quintiles

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

“Ordinary people can make a difference in the fight against corruption.”

0–20%	–
21–40%	Armenia, Estonia, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Serbia, Tunisia, Ukraine
41–60%	Algeria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, France, Germany, India, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Korea (South), Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Uganda, Vietnam, Yemen, Zimbabwe
61–80%	Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bolivia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, Georgia, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kosovo, Macedonia (FYR), Madagascar, Mozambique, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Zambia
81–100%	Bangladesh, Brazil, Cambodia, Denmark, Fiji, Greece, Jamaica, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Palestine, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Venezuela

5.2 Turning rhetoric into practice – how people can stop corruption

With the majority of people around the world believing that people can make a difference in the fight against corruption, the question now turns to how exactly citizens can get involved.

Say ‘No’ to bribes: When people are put in challenging positions and asked to pay a bribe, it is possible to stand up against this form of corruption and refuse to pay the bribe. The survey finds that among those respondents who were asked to pay a bribe, as many as 66 per cent have at least once refused to pay.

Report an incident of corruption: 69 per cent of people said that they would be willing to report an incident of corruption.

More than 90 per cent of people were willing to report in Australia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Fiji, Germany, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Uruguay and Vanuatu.

Although this is a strong majority of people around the world, people are less willing to report an incident than they were two years ago; the average was 77 per cent of people willing to report in 2010/2011 against 69 per cent of people in 2013.¹⁸ In the following 16 countries,

the majority of people would not be willing to report an incident of corruption: Armenia, Ethiopia, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Libya, Morocco, Slovakia, South Sudan, Ukraine, Vietnam and Yemen.

To what extent people are willing to report is shaped by the political situation in which they live. In the 48 countries surveyed that are categorised by Freedom House as ‘free’ countries,¹⁹ where people can speak their minds and elections are free and fair, 75 per cent of people were willing to report, against 68 per cent of people in the 41 countries categorised as ‘partly free’ and 59 per cent of people in the 18 countries categorised as ‘not free’.

Reasons for not reporting: Close to one-third of respondents say they would not report an incident of corruption. What are the reasons? Around the world, 45 per cent of people say they would not report because it wouldn’t make any difference, indicating lack of confidence in the existing laws and their enforcement. This is the most common reason given in 73 countries, including some of the countries where the majority of people would not be willing to report: Armenia, Hungary, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Morocco, Ukraine, Vietnam and Yemen.

But the main reason given varied across countries and, in 32 countries, people are most afraid of

Box 6: Say ‘no’ to bribery

The zero currency note is a practical tool that has been designed to help people demonstrate their refusal to pay bribes. The project started in India, where, in 2007, the non-profit organisation, 5th Pillar, unveiled the “zero-rupee note”. Closely patterned after the nation’s 50-rupee notes, these documents instead included anti-corruption slogans such as “Eliminate corruption at all levels” and “I promise to neither accept nor give bribes”. These zero-rupee notes were designed for use by Indian citizens who have been requested to pay bribes in order to obtain services that are legally free or who are hit with illicit surcharges on routine government transactions. Such currency devices enable the citizen to register their opposition to the illegal request in a tangible form, “paying” the official with these valueless, alternative notes.

This approach not only allows a citizen to register their protest against corruption, but also provides corrupt officials with a sign that efforts are ongoing to combat systemic government corruption and a reminder that laws against bribery exist. This campaign has since been extended worldwide as the Zero Currency campaign.²⁰

Vijay Anand, the President of 5th Pillar, explains how the zero currency note works in practice: “One auto rickshaw driver was pulled over by a policeman in the middle of the night who said he could go if he was ‘taken care of’. The driver gave him the note instead. The policeman was shocked but smiled and let him go. The purpose of this is to instil confidence in people to say ‘no’ to bribery.”

reprisals. This includes Ethiopia, Indonesia, Libya, Slovakia and South Sudan, where the majority of people in the country would not report an incident of corruption. It is clear from these responses that there is a need to establish safe and effective mechanisms to facilitate and empower people to report incidences of corruption.


Proactively take a stand against corruption: People who have been exposed to corruption can refuse to pay a bribe or report it. Often, they can play a direct role in stopping corruption. The Global Corruption Barometer 2013 proposed a number of different ways through which people can demonstrate their concerns for this issue by taking action.

As the results in Figure 12 show, a critical mass of people are prepared to engage in a variety of different activities against corruption. On average, across the 107 countries surveyed, 87 per cent of people would be willing to get involved in at least one of the ways

Figure 11: Reason given for not reporting an incident of corruption

Average percentage from the 107 countries surveyed

If you answered that you would not be willing to report an incident of corruption, why not?



Box 7: Reporting corruption through Transparency International's Advocacy and Legal Advice Centres

Transparency International's Advocacy and Legal Advice Centres provide free and confidential legal advice to witnesses and victims of corruption.


Offering a simple, credible and viable mechanism for citizens to pursue their corruption-related complaints, the centres empower citizens to stop corruption. They also play a critical role in identifying corruption hotspots that demand reform or official action. Harnessing the powerful, real-life data gathered by the centres on the consequences and mechanisms of corruption, Transparency International engages in strategic advocacy to bring about systemic change in public policy and practice, and ultimately to challenge societies' acceptance of corrupt practices.

Advocacy and Legal Advice Centres were first opened in 2003. Today there are more than 90 centres worldwide from Argentina to Azerbaijan, Haiti to Hungary, Venezuela to Vanuatu, with further expansion planned. They work on corruption at all levels, from day-to-day bribery, to grand-scale corruption worth billions of Euros. Cases cover a wide range of sectors from procurement and construction to the environment, defence to human rights, health to the judiciary and education to privatisation. Whether a walk-in advice service in urban Pakistan, online reporting platforms in Russia or community outreach to the mountains of Nepal and islands of Papua New Guinea, Advocacy and Legal Advice Centres reach people from all sectors of society. Clients range from the unemployed and vulnerable through to successful entrepreneurs.

The centres' concept of linking individual cases with policy advocacy has resulted in positive change around the world. In Palestine, for example, more than 6,000 civil servants were using government cars, costing over US\$18 million in fuel and maintenance alone. Many were being used for personal, rather than official reasons. After receiving citizen complaints, the centre launched a media campaign, demanded an official investigation and called on the Prime Minister to address the issue. A ban was introduced on the use of vehicles for private reasons, increasing respect for public resources and making significant savings.

Figure 12: Different ways for people to get involved in the fight against corruption
Average percentage of people from 107 countries surveyed

Would you be willing to do any of the following?



listed.²¹ Only in Armenia do less than half of people say they would be willing to do anything.

People are willing to get involved to different extents and in different ways in each country surveyed. While more than 90 per cent of people are willing to sign a petition asking the government to do more to stop corruption in Bangladesh, Cyprus, Fiji, Israel, Kosovo, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, less than one in three people would do this in Armenia. Figure 13 categorises countries according

to the activity which emerged as the most preferred anti-corruption action by the respondents from the respective country.

The results support a move to engage people much more deeply in the fight against corruption. There is a widespread willingness to get involved through these various means which the anti-corruption movement should make the most of to take the fight against corruption to a larger scale.

Figure 13: Anti-corruption activity people would be most willing to engage in
Highest percentage of ‘yes’ answers by respondents by country/territory,
of the five activities listed*

Would you be willing to do any of the following?

SIGN A PETITION

Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Korea (South), Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia (FYR), Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Taiwan, Thailand, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam

JOIN A PROTEST

Afghanistan, Burundi, Cambodia, Morocco, Nepal, Palestine, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Tanzania, Tunisia

JOIN AN ORGANISATION

Burundi, Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Solomon Islands, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

PAY MORE

Ethiopia, Japan, Jordan, Korea (South), Libya, Madagascar, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey

SOCIAL MEDIA

Algeria, Lebanon, Papua New Guinea, Russia, Sudan

*Some countries are listed more than once because respondents rated more than one activity the same.

APPENDICES



Appendix A: Global Corruption Barometer survey methodology

For the Global Corruption Barometer, approximately 1,000 people from each of 107 countries were surveyed between September 2012 and March 2013. Five hundred people were surveyed in countries with a population of less than 1,000,000 (see table below). The survey sample in each country has been weighted to be nationally representative where possible. In six countries, the sample was urban only. The survey questionnaire was translated into local languages and used for face to face, CATI (Computer Assisted

Telephone Interviewing) or online interviews depending on the country context.

The data has been checked and analysed at the Transparency International Secretariat in Berlin and verified by an independent analyst. The results presented in the report do not include ambiguous responses (don't know/no answer). Global results are the un-weighted average across the 107 countries surveyed and any apparent small difference in the aggregated global results is due to rounding differences. The full results at individual respondent level are available free of charge on request from Transparency International.

COUNTRY/TERRITORY	COMPANY	SAMPLE	METHOD	COVERAGE
Afghanistan	Ascor	2040	Face to face	National
Albania	BBSS	999	Face to face	National
Algeria	BJ Consult	1000	Face to face	National
Argentina	Ibopé	1001	CATI	National
Armenia	MPG LLC	1068	Face to face	National
Australia	Colmar Brunton	1206	Online	National
Azerbaijan	SIAR	1001	CATI	National
Bangladesh	TI-Bangladesh	1822	Face to face	National
Belgium	iVox	1000	Online	National
Bolivia	Ibopé	1000	Face to face	National
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mareco Index Bosnia	2000	Face to face	National
Brazil	Ibopé	2002	Face to face	National
Bulgaria	BBSS	1002	Face to face	National
Burundi	Infinite Insight	1000	Face to face	National
Cambodia	Indochina Research	1000	Face to face	National
Cameroon	RMS Africa	1055	Face to face	National
Canada	Leger Marketing	1000	Online	National
Chile	Ibopé	1000	CATI	Urban
Colombia	Sigma Dos	1001	Face to face	National
Croatia	BBSS	1000	Face to face	National
Cyprus	TI-Cyprus	570	Online	National
Czech Republic	Mareco	1000	Face to face	National
Democratic Republic of the Congo	RMS Africa	1062	Face to face	Urban

COUNTRY/TERRITORY	COMPANY	SAMPLE	METHOD	COVERAGE
Denmark	DMA Research	1007	Online	National
Egypt	REACH	1000	Face to face	National
El Salvador	Sigma Dos	1000	Face to face	National
Estonia	RAIT	1000	Face to face	National
Ethiopia	Reach	1000	Face to face	National
Fiji	Tebbutt Research	1000	CATI	National
Finland	Taloustukimus	974	Face to face	National
France	BVA	1009	Online	National
Georgia	IPM	1000	Face to face	National
Germany	Produkt + Markt	1000	Online	National
Ghana	TI-Ghana	2207	Face to face	National
Greece	Alternative Research	1001	CATI	National
Hungary	Mareco	1000	CATI	National
India	Dataprompt	1025	CATI	National
Indonesia	Deka	1000	Face to face	National
Iraq	IIACSS	1113	Face to face	Urban
Israel	Brandman	1004	Online	National
Italy	Doxa	1010	Face to face	National
Jamaica	Dichter & Neira	1003	Face to Face	National
Japan	NRC	1200	Face to face	National
Jordan	Reach	1000	CATI	National
Kazakhstan	Romir	1000	CATI	National
Kenya	TI-Kenya	1121	Face to face	National
Korea (South)	Gallup Korea	1500	Face to face	National
Kosovo	BBSS	998	Face to face	National
Kyrgyzstan	Romir	1000	Face to face	Urban (8 cities)
Latvia	RAIT	1054	Face to face	National
Lebanon	Reach	1000	CATI	National
Liberia	RMS Africa	1028	Face to face	National
Libya	Reach	1000	CATI	National
Lithuania	RAIT	1007	Face to face	National
Luxembourg	TNS	502	Online	National
Macedonia (FYR)	Brima	1010	CATI	National
Madagascar	ATW Consultants	1049	Face to face	National
Malawi	Infinite Insight	1000	Face to face	National

COUNTRY/TERRITORY	COMPANY	SAMPLE	METHOD	COVERAGE
Malaysia	TNS Malaysia	1000	Face to face	National
Maldives	SRGB	1002	CATI	Urban
Mexico	Ibope	1052	Face to face	Urban
Moldova	BBSS	1211	Face to face	National
Mongolia	TI-Mongolia	1000	Face to face	National
Morocco	BJ Consult	1004	Face to face	National
Mozambique	GSC Research	1086	Face to face	National
Nepal	SRG Bangladesh Ltd (SRGB)	1001	Face to face and CATI	National (major regions)
New Zealand	Colmar Brunton	1000	Online	National
Nigeria	Infinite Insight	1002	Face to face	National
Norway	CMA Research	1005	Online	National
Pakistan	Gallup Pakistan	2451	Face to face	National
Palestine	PCPO	1039	Face to face	National
Papua New Guinea	Tebbutt Research	1044	CATI	National
Paraguay	Ibope	1000	CATI	National
Peru	Datum	1211	Face to face	National
Philippines	PSRC	1000	Face to face	National
Portugal	Markttest	1003	CATI	National
Romania	CSOP	1143	Face to face	National
Russia	Romir	1000	Face to face	National
Rwanda	TI-Rwanda	1000	Face to face	National
Senegal	RMS Africa	1054	Face to face	National
Serbia	TNS Medium Gallup	1011	Face to face	National
Sierra Leone	RMS Africa	1028	Face to face	National
Slovakia	Mareco	1000	Face to face	National
Slovenia	BBSS	1003	CATI	National
Solomon Islands	Tebbutt Research	509	CATI	National
South Africa	TRS	1000	Face to face	Urban
South Sudan	Reach	1000	Face to face	Urban
Spain	Instituto DYM	1009	Face to face	National
Sri Lanka	Gallup Pakistan	1001	Face to face	National
Sudan	Reach	1000	CATI	National
Switzerland	Isopublic	1004	Online	National
Taiwan	Cass Research Centre	1000	Online	National

COUNTRY/TERRITORY	COMPANY	SAMPLE	METHOD	COVERAGE
Tanzania	Infinite Insight	1001	Face to face	Urban + Rural
Thailand	InfoSearch co. Ltd	1000	Face to face	National
Tunisia	Emrhod	1000	Face to face	National
Turkey	Barem	1027	CATI	National
Uganda	Infinite Insight	1000	Face to face	Urban
Ukraine	Romir	1200	Face to face	National
United Kingdom	ORB	1000	Online	National
United States	Leger USA	1000	Online	National
Uruguay	Ibope Inteligencia	1010	CATI	National
Vanuatu	Tebbutt Research	505	CATI	National
Venezuela	Sigma Dos	1000	Face to face	Urban
Vietnam	Indochina Research	1000	Face to face	National
Yemen	Reach	1000	Face to face	National
Zambia	TRS	1003	Face to face	National
Zimbabwe	TI-Zimbabwe	1000	Face to face	National

Appendix B: Questionnaire

Q1. Over the past two years, how has the level of corruption in this country changed?

- 1 – Decreased a lot
- 2 – Decreased a little
- 3 – Stayed the same
- 4 – Increased a little
- 5 – Increased a lot

Q2. To what extent do you believe corruption is a problem in the public sector in your country? By public sector we mean all institutions and services which are owned and/or run by the government. Please answer on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is ‘not a problem at all’ and 5 is ‘a very serious problem’.

- 1 – Not a problem at all
- 2 – ...
- 3 – ...
- 4 – ...
- 5 – A very serious problem

Q3. In your dealings with the public sector, how important are personal contacts and/or relationships to get things done?

- 1 – Not important at all
- 2 – Of little importance
- 3 – Moderately important
- 4 – Important
- 5 – Very important

Q4. To what extent is this country’s government run by a few big entities acting in their own best interest?

- 1 – Not at all
- 2 – Limited extent
- 3 – Somewhat
- 4 – Large extent
- 5 – Entirely

Q5. How effective do you think your government’s actions are in the fight against corruption?

- 1 – Very effective
- 2 – Effective
- 3 – Neither effective nor ineffective
- 4 – Ineffective
- 5 – Very ineffective

Q6. To what extent do you see the following categories to be affected by corruption in this country? Please answer on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means ‘not at all corrupt’ and 5 means ‘extremely corrupt’.

- A – Political parties
- B – Parliament/legislature
- C – Military
- D – NGOs
- E – Media
- F – Religious bodies
- G – Business/private sector
- H – Education system
- I – Judiciary
- J – Medical and health services
- K – Police
- L – Public officials/civil servants

Q7. A. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone living in your household had a contact or contacts with one of the following [INSERT CATEGORY NAME 1–8]?

- 1 – Education system
- 2 – Judicial system
- 3 – Medical and health services
- 4 – Police
- 5 – Registry and permit services
- 6 – Utilities
- 7 – Tax
- 8 – Land services

Q7. B. If yes to Q7A, in your contact or contacts have you or anyone living in your household paid a bribe in any form in the past 12 months?

Yes/no

Q8. What was the most common reason for paying the bribe/bribes? Please give only one answer.

- 1 – As a gift, or to express gratitude
- 2 – To get a cheaper service
- 3 – To speed things up
- 4 – It was the only way to obtain a service

Q9. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

“Ordinary people can make a difference in the fight against corruption.”

- 1 – Strongly agree
- 2 – Agree
- 3 – Disagree
- 4 – Strongly disagree

Q10. There are different things people could do to fight corruption and I am now going to ask whether you would be willing to do any of the following: Please answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

- A – Sign a petition asking the government to do more to fight corruption
- B – Take part in a peaceful protest or demonstration against corruption
- C – Join an organisation that works to reduce corruption as an active member
- D – Pay more to buy goods from a company that is clean/corruption-free
- E – Spread the word about the problem of corruption through social media
- F – Report an incident of corruption

Q11. A. If yes to Q10F, to whom would you report it?

- 1 – Directly to the institution involved
- 2 – A general government anti-corruption institution or hotline
- 3 – An independent non-profit organisation
- 4 – News media
- 5 – Other

Q11. B. If no to Q10F, why not (report an incident of corruption)?

- 1 – I do not know where to report
- 2 – I am afraid of the consequences
- 3 – It wouldn’t make any difference
- 4 – Other

Q12. A. Have you ever been asked to pay a bribe?

Yes/no

Q12. B. If yes, have you ever refused to pay a bribe?

Yes/no

- D1. Rural/urban
- D2. District/province:
- D3. City/town/village:
- D4. Sex:
- D5. Age:
- D6. Total household income before taxes:
- D7. Education: Highest attained
- D8. Employment

Appendix C: Tables of results by country/territory

Table 1 – Bribery rates around the world

COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	% OF PEOPLE WHO REPORT HAVING PAID A BRIBE TO 1 OF 8 SERVICES	COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	% OF PEOPLE WHO REPORT HAVING PAID A BRIBE TO 1 OF 8 SERVICES
Global	27	Hungary	12
Afghanistan	46	India	54
Algeria	41	Indonesia	36
Argentina	13	Iraq	29
Armenia	18	Israel	12
Australia	1	Italy	5
Bangladesh	39	Jamaica	12
Belgium	4	Japan	1
Bolivia	36	Jordan	37
Bosnia and Herzegovina	28	Kazakhstan	34
Bulgaria	8	Kenya	70
Cambodia	57	Korea (South)	3
Cameroon	62	Kosovo	16
Canada	3	Kyrgyzstan	45
Chile	10	Latvia	19
Colombia	22	Liberia	75
Croatia	4	Libya	62
Cyprus	19	Lithuania	26
Czech Republic	15	Macedonia (FYR)	17
Democratic Republic of the Congo	46	Madagascar	28
Denmark	1	Malaysia	3
Egypt	36	Maldives	3
El Salvador	12	Mexico	33
Estonia	6	Moldova	29
Ethiopia	44	Mongolia	45
Finland	1	Morocco	49
Georgia	4	Mozambique	62
Ghana	54	Nepal	31
Greece	22	New Zealand	3
		Nigeria	44

COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	% OF PEOPLE WHO REPORT HAVING PAID A BRIBE TO 1 OF 8 SERVICES	COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	% OF PEOPLE WHO REPORT HAVING PAID A BRIBE TO 1 OF 8 SERVICES
Norway	3	Vanuatu	13
Pakistan	34	Venezuela	27
Palestine	12	Vietnam	30
Papua New Guinea	27	Yemen	74
Paraguay	25	Zimbabwe	62
Peru	20		
Philippines	12		
Portugal	3		
Romania	17		
Rwanda	13		
Senegal	57		
Serbia	26		
Sierra Leone	84		
Slovakia	21		
Slovenia	6		
Solomon Islands	34		
South Africa	47		
South Sudan	39		
Spain	2		
Sri Lanka	19		
Sudan	17		
Switzerland	7		
Taiwan	36		
Tanzania	56		
Thailand	18		
Tunisia	18		
Turkey	21		
Uganda	61		
Ukraine	37		
United Kingdom	5		
United States	7		
Uruguay	3		

Table 2 – Perceptions of corruption, by institution

AGGREGATED, BY COUNTRY - Score scale 1–5, where 1 means not at all corrupt, 5 means extremely corrupt

COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	POLITICAL PARTIES	PARLIAMENT/ LEGISLATURE	MILITARY	NGOS	MEDIA	RELIGIOUS BODIES	BUSINESS/PRIVATE SECTOR	EDUCATION SYSTEM	JUDICIARY	MEDICAL AND HEALTH	POLICE	PUBLIC OFFICIALS/ CIVIL SERVANTS
Global	3.8	3.6	2.8	2.7	3.1	2.6	3.3	3.1	3.6	3.2	3.7	3.6
Afghanistan	3.0	3.1	2.4	2.9	2.4	2.3	3.0	2.9	3.7	2.9	2.9	3.3
Albania	4.1	3.9	2.9	2.3	2.9	1.8	2.7	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.7	3.5
Algeria	3.9	3.8	3.3	3.1	3.2	1.8	4.1	3.7	4.1	3.6	3.8	3.8
Argentina	4.3	4.1	2.9	2.5	3.3	2.9	3.5	2.6	3.9	2.7	4.0	4.2
Armenia	3.7	3.7	3.2	2.8	3.0	2.9	3.5	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0
Australia	3.6	3.2	2.8	2.8	3.6	3.3	3.4	2.6	2.8	2.5	3.0	3.2
Azerbaijan	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.8	3.1	3.1	2.9	2.8
Bangladesh	3.4	3.2	1.5	1.7	2.0	1.5	2.6	2.0	3.5	2.9	3.9	2.9
Belgium	3.9	3.5	3.0	2.7	3.2	3.6	3.3	2.5	3.3	2.7	3.2	3.5
Bolivia	4.2	3.9	3.4	2.8	2.7	2.2	3.0	3.0	4.1	2.9	4.5	4.0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	4.2	4.0	2.7	2.6	3.4	2.9	3.6	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.9
Brazil	4.3	4.1	2.7	2.9	3.1	2.8	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.5	4.0	3.3
Bulgaria	4.2	4.0	2.9	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.4	4.4	4.2	3.9	3.9
Burundi	2.2	2.1	1.9	1.4	1.2	1.2	3.2	3.4	4.0	1.9	4.3	3.4
Cambodia	2.8	2.4	2.6	1.7	2.3	1.9	2.7	2.6	3.7	2.6	3.1	2.9
Cameroon	3.9	3.7	3.7	2.5	3.3	2.5	3.4	4.0	4.2	3.6	4.4	3.9
Canada	3.8	3.4	2.6	2.7	3.2	3.0	3.4	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.9	3.2
Chile	4.2	4.0	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.3	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.7
Colombia	4.3	4.3	3.4	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.8	3.8	3.7	4.0
Croatia	4.0	3.8	2.6	2.8	3.4	2.8	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.9
Cyprus	4.4	4.0	3.6	2.6	3.9	3.3	3.2	2.9	3.1	3.6	4.1	3.7
Czech Republic	4.1	3.8	3.4	2.5	2.9	2.4	3.4	3.0	3.5	3.3	3.6	4.0
Democratic Republic of the Congo	4.1	4.2	3.7	2.7	3.7	2.5	3.7	4.0	4.4	2.7	4.3	4.3
Denmark	2.9	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.9	3.1	3.0	2.0	1.7	2.2	2.0	2.2
Egypt	4.0	3.8	3.2	2.8	4.1	2.6	3.3	3.8	3.6	3.9	4.1	4.0
El Salvador	4.5	4.1	3.6	2.9	3.2	2.7	3.2	3.1	4.3	3.1	4.5	4.3
Estonia	3.7	3.1	2.0	2.4	2.6	2.1	3.3	2.3	2.8	2.7	2.6	3.2

COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	POLITICAL PARTIES	PARLIAMENT/ LEGISLATURE	MILITARY	NGOS	MEDIA	RELIGIOUS BODIES	BUSINESS/PRIVATE SECTOR	EDUCATION SYSTEM	JUDICIARY	MEDICAL AND HEALTH	POLICE	PUBLIC OFFICIALS/ CIVIL SERVANTS
Ethiopia	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.6	3.0	2.8	3.1	3.1	2.8
Fiji	3.5	3.1	2.2	2.5	2.7	2.5	3.6	2.7	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.4
Finland	3.4	2.9	1.9	2.4	3.1	2.3	3.3	2.1	2.0	2.4	1.8	2.8
France	4.0	3.5	2.5	2.8	3.6	2.8	3.7	2.3	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.4
Georgia	2.9	3.0	1.9	2.0	3.2	1.6	2.8	2.4	3.4	2.8	2.5	2.6
Germany	3.8	3.4	2.9	3.0	3.6	3.1	3.7	2.7	2.6	3.4	2.7	3.4
Ghana	4.2	3.6	2.6	2.3	3.3	2.3	3.0	3.9	4.0	3.0	4.7	3.6
Greece	4.6	4.3	2.9	3.1	4.4	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.9	4.1	3.6	3.9
Hungary	3.9	3.6	2.5	2.7	3.5	2.4	3.8	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.1
India	4.4	3.8	2.5	2.9	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.3	3.6	4.1	3.8
Indonesia	4.3	4.5	3.1	2.8	2.4	2.7	3.4	3.2	4.4	3.3	4.5	4.0
Iraq	3.4	3.1	2.5	2.2	2.3	2.0	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.0
Israel	4.2	3.5	2.6	3.3	3.5	4.1	3.5	2.7	2.9	3.1	3.5	3.7
Italy	4.5	4.1	2.8	2.8	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.0	3.4	3.6	2.9	3.8
Jamaica	4.5	4.1	2.4	1.9	2.9	2.4	3.1	2.3	3.3	2.5	4.5	3.3
Japan	4.2	4.2	3.2	3.3	3.8	4.1	3.4	3.7	3.0	3.5	3.8	3.9
Kazakhstan	2.6	2.6	2.9	2.6	2.4	2.1	3.2	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.5
Kenya	3.5	4.0	3.0	2.3	2.0	2.1	2.7	3.0	3.6	3.2	4.8	3.6
Korea (South)	3.9	3.8	3.1	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.3
Kosovo	4.2	3.9	1.6	2.3	3.0	2.0	3.5	3.3	4.3	4.0	3.1	3.3
Kyrgyzstan	4.2	4.2	3.7	2.9	3.1	2.4	3.6	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.6
Latvia	4.0	3.7	2.3	2.4	3.0	2.1	3.4	2.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.8
Lebanon	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8
Liberia	4.0	4.7	3.4	3.1	3.6	2.1	4.0	4.5	4.5	3.5	4.8	3.5
Libya	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.6	3.1	3.1	2.6	3.2	2.7	3.2	3.2	3.3
Lithuania	4.2	4.3	2.4	2.6	3.3	2.5	3.6	3.2	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9
Luxembourg	3.6	3.1	2.7	2.6	3.2	3.3	3.4	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.9	3.2
Macedonia (FYR)	4.0	3.5	2.3	3.0	3.5	2.8	3.1	3.3	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.6
Madagascar	4.0	3.8	3.6	2.2	2.4	1.9	3.2	3.6	4.6	3.2	4.5	4.2
Malawi	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.0	3.1	2.6	3.8	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.7	4.3
Malaysia	3.8	3.3	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.0	3.2	2.4	3.0	2.2	4.0	3.3
Maldives	4.2	4.2	3.2	2.5	3.3	2.6	3.2	2.6	4.0	2.9	3.2	3.3

COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	POLITICAL PARTIES	PARLIAMENT/ LEGISLATURE	MILITARY	NGOS	MEDIA	RELIGIOUS BODIES	BUSINESS/PRIVATE SECTOR	EDUCATION SYSTEM	JUDICIARY	MEDICAL AND HEALTH	POLICE	PUBLIC OFFICIALS/ CIVIL SERVANTS
Mexico	4.6	4.3	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.1	3.5	3.3	4.3	3.2	4.6	4.5
Moldova	4.1	4.2	3.2	2.9	3.0	2.3	3.6	3.7	4.3	4.0	4.2	3.9
Mongolia	3.7	3.7	2.8	2.4	3.1	2.0	3.3	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.2
Morocco	3.9	3.8	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.2	3.6	3.7	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.1
Mozambique	3.6	3.3	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.3	3.2	4.2	3.9	3.9	4.4	4.0
Nepal	4.6	4.2	3.2	3.2	2.8	2.9	3.5	3.2	4.1	3.0	4.3	4.4
New Zealand	3.3	3.0	2.2	2.6	3.3	2.9	3.1	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.7	2.8
Nigeria	4.7	4.2	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.4	3.0	3.4	3.9	3.0	4.7	4.0
Norway	3.3	2.6	2.4	2.9	3.2	3.2	3.3	2.4	2.0	3.0	2.4	2.9
Pakistan	4.2	3.8	2.8	3.1	3.1	2.7	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	4.3	4.3
Palestine	3.1	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.6
Papua New Guinea	4.0	3.8	3.1	2.1	2.5	1.8	3.2	3.4	3.2	2.8	4.4	4.0
Paraguay	4.4	4.5	3.1	2.8	2.6	2.3	2.9	3.0	4.2	3.2	4.4	3.8
Peru	4.3	4.3	3.7	3.3	3.4	2.4	3.4	3.4	4.4	3.5	4.3	3.9
Philippines	3.7	3.5	3.2	2.7	2.2	2.3	2.9	2.8	3.5	2.8	4.0	3.8
Portugal	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.5	3.1	3.9	3.0	3.2	3.4
Romania	4.2	4.0	2.5	2.7	3.1	2.5	3.5	2.9	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.4
Russia	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.3	3.7	3.1	3.6	4.0	4.4	4.1	4.5	4.6
Rwanda	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.6	1.3	1.3	1.7	1.4	2.0	1.3	2.1	1.7
Senegal	4.1	3.6	2.3	2.5	3.4	2.5	2.9	3.4	4.0	3.5	4.1	3.7
Serbia	4.3	4.0	3.0	3.7	4.0	2.8	3.6	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3
Sierra Leone	3.1	3.5	2.7	2.8	3.2	2.3	3.3	3.8	4.0	3.6	4.3	3.4
Slovakia	3.9	3.7	3.0	2.7	3.2	2.9	3.4	3.2	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9
Slovenia	4.2	3.9	2.7	2.8	3.4	3.2	3.3	2.8	3.6	3.3	3.2	3.5
Solomon Islands	3.5	3.4		2.0	2.4	1.4	3.0	3.0	2.6	2.8	4.4	3.6
South Africa	4.2	4.0	2.0	3.2	3.1	2.3	3.5	2.7	3.2	3.6	4.4	4.1
South Sudan	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.4	4.0	3.8	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.2	3.3
Spain	4.4	3.9	2.6	2.4	3.2	3.1	3.3	2.1	3.5	2.3	3.1	3.3
Sri Lanka	3.4	3.1	1.9	2.6	2.4	1.9	2.6	2.9	2.5	2.4	3.8	3.0
Sudan	3.9	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.8	4.1	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.8
Switzerland	3.3	2.8	2.6	2.5	3.1	2.7	3.1	2.2	2.2	2.6	2.3	2.7
Taiwan	4.1	4.1	3.6	3.1	3.8	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.7

COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	POLITICAL PARTIES	PARLIAMENT/ LEGISLATURE	MILITARY	NGOS	MEDIA	RELIGIOUS BODIES	BUSINESS/PRIVATE SECTOR	EDUCATION SYSTEM	JUDICIARY	MEDICAL AND HEALTH	POLICE	PUBLIC OFFICIALS/ CIVIL SERVANTS
Tanzania	3.9	3.5	3.0	3.4	3.2	2.3	3.4	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.1
Thailand	4.0	3.4	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.4	3.2	3.1	2.5	2.8	4.0	3.7
Tunisia	4.0	3.1	1.8	2.8	3.4	2.4	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.8	3.9	3.3
Turkey	3.9	3.5	2.7	2.9	3.6	3.1	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.2
Uganda	3.6	3.6	3.1	2.4	2.3	2.0	3.0	3.3	4.2	3.6	4.5	4.0
Ukraine	4.1	4.2	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.9	4.0	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.3
United Kingdom	3.9	3.6	2.5	2.6	3.9	3.0	3.5	2.6	2.7	2.6	3.0	3.3
United States	4.1	3.7	2.9	3.0	3.7	3.1	3.6	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.6
Uruguay	3.5	3.2	2.9	2.5	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.6	3.1	2.9	3.3	3.2
Vanuatu	4.4	4.0	3.1	2.0	2.2	2.0	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.7	3.9
Venezuela	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.0	3.8	3.2	4.1	3.3	4.4	4.3
Vietnam	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.9	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.0	3.6
Yemen	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9
Zambia	4.0	3.3	3.9	3.0	3.0	2.6	3.6	4.1	4.3	3.5	4.7	3.8
Zimbabwe	4.0	3.9	3.1	2.6	3.7	2.9	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.5	4.0

Table 3 – Willingness to get involved

COUNTRY/TERRITORY	% OF PEOPLE WHO SAID YES TO ANY 1 OF THE 5 ACTIVITIES	COUNTRY/TERRITORY	% OF PEOPLE WHO SAID YES TO ANY 1 OF THE 5 ACTIVITIES
Global	87	Germany	93
Afghanistan	93	Ghana	96
Albania	83	Greece	97
Algeria	93	Hungary	54
Argentina	95	India	99
Armenia	43	Indonesia	63
Australia	93	Iraq	81
Azerbaijan	81	Israel	98
Bangladesh	100	Italy	77
Belgium	91	Jamaica	97
Bolivia	95	Japan	83
Bosnia and Herzegovina	88	Jordan	71
Brazil	80	Kazakhstan	67
Bulgaria	72	Kenya	99
Burundi	96	Korea (South)	86
Cambodia	96	Kosovo	99
Cameroon	94	Kyrgyzstan	67
Canada	93	Latvia	74
Chile	99	Lebanon	59
Colombia	97	Liberia	75
Croatia	88	Libya	76
Cyprus	98	Lithuania	77
Czech Republic	80	Luxembourg	94
Democratic Republic of the Congo	88	Macedonia (FYR)	90
Denmark	91	Madagascar	95
Egypt	68	Malawi	97
El Salvador	85	Malaysia	79
Estonia	69	Maldives	95
Ethiopia	76	Mexico	93
Fiji	99	Moldova	69
Finland	92	Mongolia	92
France	91	Morocco	84
Georgia	87	Mozambique	90

COUNTRY/TERRITORY	% OF PEOPLE WHO SAID YES TO ANY 1 OF THE 5 ACTIVITIES
Nepal	90
New Zealand	94
Nigeria	90
Norway	94
Pakistan	75
Palestine	86
Papua New Guinea	99
Paraguay	99
Peru	91
Philippines	84
Portugal	93
Romania	77
Russia	92
Rwanda	96
Senegal	97
Serbia	88
Sierra Leone	99
Slovakia	78
Slovenia	95
Solomon Islands	99
South Africa	89
South Sudan	75
Spain	84
Sri Lanka	81
Sudan	83
Switzerland	94
Taiwan	94
Tanzania	93
Thailand	92
Tunisia	72
Turkey	94
Uganda	89
Ukraine	68
United Kingdom	91

COUNTRY/TERRITORY	% OF PEOPLE WHO SAID YES TO ANY 1 OF THE 5 ACTIVITIES
United States	87
Uruguay	94
Vanuatu	100
Venezuela	92
Vietnam	79
Yemen	97
Zambia	97
Zimbabwe	92

List of figures and boxes

Figures

1. Public views on corruption	p7
2. Bribery around the world	p10
3. Bribery rates by service	p11
4. How important are personal contacts?	p14
5. Undue influence of government	p15
6. Undue influence of government – OECD countries	p15
7. Perceptions of the extent of corruption in different institutions	p16
8. Most corrupt institution in each country	p17
9. Perceived effectiveness of government in fighting corruption	p18
10. Belief in ordinary people's ability to make a difference	p21
11. Reason given for not reporting an incident of corruption	p23
12. Different ways for people to get involved in the fight against corruption	p24
13. Anti-corruption activity people would be most willing to engage in	p25

Boxes

1. The cost of day-to-day bribery	p9
2. Police corruption in Venezuela	p12
3. Stopping corruption in land services	p12
4. Political corruption in Zimbabwe	p16
5. Ending impunity for the corrupt	p19
6. Say 'no' to bribery	p22
7. Reporting corruption through Transparency International's Advocacy and Legal Advice Centres	p23

Endnotes

- 1 Transparency International Zimbabwe followed up this case with the Deputy Prime Minister, who demanded a full investigation to be carried out by the Ministry of Health. Since then, no further reports have been received and Transparency International Zimbabwe maintains close contact with the local community to monitor the situation. For more information on the case, see www.transparency.org/news/story/captive_mothers
- 2 "The Most Hated Bangladeshi, Toppled from a Shady Empire", New York Times, 2013, www.nytimes.com/2013/05/01/world/asia/bangladesh-garment-industry-reliant-on-flimsy-oversight.html?pagewanted=all
- 3 For more information on the survey methodology, see Appendix A.
- 4 www.transparency.org/news/story/slum_evictions
- 5 Valid data for this question was available from 95 countries.
- 6 For the 80 countries surveyed in the Global Corruption Barometer 2010/2011, the bribery rate was 26 per cent. For the same 80 countries in the Global Corruption Barometer 2013, the bribery rate was 27 per cent.
- 7 For full list of bribery rates per country, see Appendix C, Table 1.
- 8 East Africa Bribery Index 2012, Transparency International Kenya, www.tkenya.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=134&Itemid=146
- 9 2010 National Index of Good Governance and Corruption, Transparencia Mexicana
- 10 National Survey on Corruption in Greece – 2012, Transparency International Greece, http://en.transparency.gr/download.aspx?file=/Uploads/File/NSCG2012_EN.pdf
- 11 Education system, judiciary, medical and health services, police, registry and permit services, utilities, tax and/or customs, or land services.
- 12 Global Hunger Index, International Food Policy Research Institute: www.ifpri.org/ghi/2012 Correlation coefficient 0.52
- 13 "Land and power: The growing scandal surrounding the new investments in land", Oxfam, Oxfam Briefing Paper 151, www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/bp151-land-power-rights-acquisitions-220911-en.pdf
- 14 Land grab victims speak out: <http://blog.transparency.org/2013/04/12/land-grab-victims-speak-out>
- 15 "Problems related to the protection of property rights – the case of Mestia", 2011, Association Green. Alternative, Georgian Young Lawyers Association, Transparency International Georgia and Georgian Regional Media Association: http://transparency.ge/sites/default/files/post_attachments/Report_Mestia_ENG_July_2011_.pdf
- 16 G20 Anti-Corruption Action Plan 2013-2014: <http://g20mexico.org/en/anticorruption>
- 17 Secrecy for Sale: Inside the Global Offshore Money Maze. International Consortium of Investigative Journalists: www.icij.org/offshore
- 18 For sub-set of 91 countries surveyed in 2010/11 and 2013.
- 19 Based on Freedom House classification into 'free', 'partially free' and 'not free' countries. See www.freedomhouse.org
- 20 5th Pillar: <http://zerocurrency.org>
- 21 Full list of countries and people's willingness to get involved in Appendix C, Table 3.

Acknowledgements

Generous support for the Global Corruption Barometer 2013 was provided by Ernst & Young, the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), the UK Department for International Development (DfID), Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ).

The Global Corruption Barometer was co-funded through the generous core support the Transparency International Secretariat receives from the Canadian Agency for International Development; the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Danida); the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland; Irish Aid; the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands; the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation; Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida); the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation; and the UK Department for International Development (DfID).

We are grateful for these contributions to our activities. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the views of these donors.

For a full list of all contributors and to find out how you can support our work please visit www.transparency.org

Transparency International
International Secretariat
Alt-Moabit 96
10559 Berlin
Germany

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

ti@transparency.org
www.transparency.org

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