



# **Report on the Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006**

**Embargoed until Thursday 7 December 2006  
at 10:00 GMT; 11:00 CET; 5:00 EST**

**Release date: 7 December 2006  
Policy and Research Department  
Transparency International – International Secretariat  
Alt Moabit 96  
10559 Berlin, Germany  
Tel: + 49-30-3438200  
Fax: +49-30-34703912**

## Table of contents

<b>SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: TI GLOBAL CORRUPTION BAROMETER 2006 .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ABOUT THE SURVEY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>EXPERIENCE OF BRIBERY .....</b>	<b>7</b>
FIGURE 1 WORLDWIDE BRIBERY: RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE HAD CONTACT AND PAID A BRIBE, BY SECTOR (%) .....	7
FIGURE 2 POLICE BRIBERY: RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE HAD CONTACT AND PAID A BRIBE TO THE POLICE, BY REGIONAL GROUPING (%) .....	8
TABLE 1 COUNTRIES MOST AFFECTED BY BRIBERY .....	8
FIGURE 3 AFRICA: THE AVERAGE COST OF THE LAST BRIBE PAID (€) .....	10
FIGURE 4 LATIN AMERICA: THE AVERAGE COST OF THE LAST BRIBE PAID (€).....	10
FIGURE 5 COMPARING EXPERT PERCEPTIONS OF CORRUPTION (CPI 2006) WITH EXPERIENCE OF BRIBERY .....	11
<b>GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE ON ANTI-CORRUPTION .....</b>	<b>11</b>
TABLE 2 ASSESSING THE CURRENT GOVERNMENT’S ACTIONS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION (%) .....	12
<b>HOW CORRUPTION AFFECTS PUBLIC SECTORS AND INSTITUTIONS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
FIGURE 6 SECTORS AND INSTITUTIONS MOST AFFECTED BY CORRUPTION, GLOBALLY (1 - NOT AT ALL CORRUPT ... 5 - EXTREMELY CORRUPT, MEAN SCORES) .....	14
<b>HOW CORRUPTION AFFECTS PERSONAL AND POLITICAL LIFE AND THE BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT .....</b>	<b>15</b>
TABLE 3 CORRUPTION AFFECTS POLITICAL LIFE TO A LARGE EXTENT.....	15
<b>CONCLUSION – CORRUPTION AS A WORLDWIDE PROBLEM .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>ANNEX I FULL TABLES .....</b>	<b>18</b>
TABLE 4 EXPERIENCE OF BRIBERY: BRIBE-PAYING THE PAST YEAR, ALL COUNTRIES.....	18
TABLE 5 HOW RESPONDENTS ASSESS THEIR GOVERNMENT’S FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION, ALL COUNTRIES .....	20
TABLE 6 CORRUPTION’S IMPACT ON DIFFERENT SECTORS AND INSTITUTIONS, ALL COUNTRIES .....	22
TABLE 7 CORRUPTION’S IMPACT ON POLITICAL LIFE, THE BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT, AND PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIFE – ALL COUNTRIES .....	24
<b>ANNEX II TI GLOBAL CORRUPTION BAROMETER 2006 – QUESTIONNAIRE.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>ANNEX III COUNTRY COVERAGE AND SAMPLE INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>ANNEX IV METHODOLOGICAL NOTE.....</b>	<b>30</b>



## **Summary of findings: TI Global Corruption Barometer 2006**

*Experience of bribery is widespread outside Europe and North America; police are most often bribed*

- The police are the sector most affected by bribery, with 17 percent of those who have had contact paying a bribe. Police are most commonly bribed in Africa and Latin America.
- Bribery for access to services is most common in Africa. The most commonly bribed sectors in Africa are the police, tax revenue and utilities.

*Government performance in the fight against corruption is not felt adequate in most countries*

- People around the world tend to be very negative about their government's attempt to fight corruption. Only one in five surveyed worldwide think that their government is effective to some degree in fighting corruption; nearly two in five say the government is 'not effective' in its anti-corruption work..
- One in six surveyed globally thinks that their government actually encourages corruption rather than fighting it.
- Despite relatively good scores on the Corruption Perceptions Index 2006, nearly one in five respondents in the United States and the United Kingdom think that their government encourages corruption rather than fighting it.

*The perception remains that political parties and parliament are most corrupt, followed by business and police*

- The public views political parties as the most corrupt institution, followed by parliament/legislature.
- Police are considered to be the sector most affected by corruption in both Africa and the Newly Independent States.
- These findings strongly support those of past editions of the Barometer.
- The Taiwanese public reports an increase in levels of corruption in most of the institutions and sectors covered by the Barometer 2006 during the last two years. The public in Hong Kong and Croatia also view corruption as worse in a number of sectors, while, in contrast, in India there have been some perceived improvements.

*Political and business life are judged more affected by corruption than family life in most countries*

- Political life is viewed as being most affected by corruption, followed closely by the business environment.
- These findings support those of previous editions of the Barometer.
- Corruption is reported as affecting family life very little in EU+ countries and the Newly Independent States, but a lot in Africa and South East Europe.
- Perceived corruption in political life in the United States has increased in the last two years; perceived corruption in Iceland's business environment and family life has increased; perceived corruption has increased in Spain and Japan's political life and business environment.

## About the survey

Transparency International's (TI) Global Corruption Barometer 2006 (the Barometer) explores how corruption affects ordinary people. It provides an indication of both the form and extent of corruption, from the viewpoint of citizens from around the world. The Barometer is unique in that it gives voice to those affected by corruption – and helps us better understand their concerns and experiences.

The Barometer 2006 explores experience of petty bribery in greater depth than ever before, presenting information on the institutions and public services most affected by bribery, the frequency of bribery, and how much people pay. Also new to the survey is a question to the public about government's efforts to fight corruption. As in years past, the Barometer asks people about their opinions regarding which sectors of society are the most corrupt and which spheres of life are most affected by corruption.

Information about public perception and experience of corruption, such as the Global Corruption Barometer 2006 offers, is vital to anti-corruption efforts. People's perceptions are an indicator of the success of anti-corruption policies and initiatives. In addition, establishing which public agencies have the highest level of corruption helps set priorities for reform. Finally, gaining insight into the frequency and cost of bribery helps us understand just how the public is victimised by corruption – and the very high price that corruption exerts on the poorest.

The Global Corruption Barometer 2006, now the fourth in the series, reflects the findings of a survey of 59,661 people in 62 low, middle and high-income countries. The survey was carried out on behalf of TI by Gallup International, as part of its Voice of the People Survey, between July and September 2006. This year's Barometer covers six countries not included in past editions: Albania, Congo-Brazzaville, Fiji, Gabon, Morocco and Sweden.<sup>1</sup>

The Global Corruption Barometer 2006 is one of TI's key global tools for measuring corruption. The public opinion focus complements the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) and Bribe Payers Index (BPI). The CPI and BPI reflect the opinions of experts and business leaders, and focus on the perception of public sector and political corruption, and the supply side of bribery, respectively.

For the purposes of analysis, individual countries have been grouped into regions. While regional groupings pose some problems, they can highlight areas that have broadly similar characteristics and challenges. Combining regional data also strengthens the reliability of some findings.

---

<sup>1</sup> Countries that dropped out of the Barometer since the last edition are Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Guatemala, Republic of Ireland, Lithuania, Nicaragua and Togo.

The groupings used in this report are:<sup>2</sup>

- **EU and other Western European Countries (EU+):** Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom;
- **South East Europe:** Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Romania, Serbia and Turkey;
- **Newly Independent States (NIS):** Moldova, Russia and Ukraine;
- **Africa:** Cameroon, Congo-Brazzaville, Gabon, Kenya, Morocco, Nigeria, Senegal and South Africa;
- **Latin America:** Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela;
- **Asia – Pacific:** Fiji, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea (South), Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan and Thailand; and
- **North America:** Canada and the United States.

The full tabular results, questionnaire, methodology and list of countries for the TI Global Barometer 2006 can be found in the annexes to this report.

*This report has been prepared by Robin Hodess and Tom Lavers of the Policy and Research Department at the Transparency International Secretariat. Professor Richard Rose, University of Aberdeen and a member of TI's Index Advisory Committee, contributed advice on the Barometer data.*

---

<sup>2</sup> Israel is also covered in the Barometer 2006. However, it does not easily fit in any of the regional groupings. As such Israel is not used in the regional analysis although Israeli respondents are included in overall Barometer calculations.

## Experience of bribery

The Global Corruption Barometer 2006 asks respondents whether they or anyone in their household has had contact during the past twelve months with seven familiar public sector agencies, including the police, health services, education and so forth, and whether they have had to pay bribes in their dealings with them. The results point to the public sector institutions, here also referred to as ‘sectors’, most tainted by bribery. The TI Barometer 2006 also asks the public about the amount paid in bribes.


Most people who pay bribes are the victims of corruption – extra ‘speed’ payments or illicit backhanders are often the only way they can gain access to services they are entitled to by law, or the only way to avoid administrative obstacles or legal wrangling with the authorities. By revealing the cost of bribery, the Barometer shows the scale of these ‘extra payments’. Corruption and bribery always hit the poor hardest, extracting an extra tax from those who can least afford it.

### *Bribery of police worst the world over*

According to the Global Corruption Barometer 2006, bribes are most commonly paid around the world to the police, and are substantially more frequent than to other services. This result presents enormous concerns regarding corruption in processes of law enforcement, particularly when viewed alongside the sector identified as the third most common recipient of bribes: the legal system and judiciary.

As Figure 1 shows, registry and permit services are the second most bribe-ridden sector, with nearly one in ten respondents who have had contact with them reporting that they had paid a bribe. In the Africa region, a full 32% indicated they had paid bribes for services in this sector.

**Figure 1 Worldwide bribery: respondents who have had contact and paid a bribe, by sector (%)**




Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006

The extent of the problem of police bribery varies enormously between regional groupings, as Figure 2 reveals. More than half the respondents in Africa who have had contact with the police in the past 12 months paid a bribe. In Latin America

approximately one in three respondents who have had contact with the police paid a bribe, and in the NIS, Asia-Pacific and South East Europe the figure varies between 15 and 20 percent. Only a very small proportion of respondents from North America and the EU+ regional groupings have paid a bribe to the police, which is in line with the overall low rates of bribe-paying among the general public in these regions.

**Figure 2 Police bribery: respondents who have had contact and paid a bribe to the police, by regional grouping (%)**



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006

*Bribery continues to plague people in poorer and transitional countries*

Taken together, responses from African, Latin American and NIS countries indicate that frequent bribe-paying is the norm – with a few notable exceptions – as is indicated in Table 1, below. In Asia-Pacific and SE Europe, bribe-paying was moderate while in North America and EU+ countries bribes were seldom paid for services.

**Table 1 Countries most affected by bribery**

Percentage of respondents that have paid a bribe in the last 12 months	More than 40%	Albania, Cameroon, Gabon, Morocco
	16-40%	Bolivia, Congo, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Greece, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Moldova, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Ukraine, Venezuela
	6 - 15%	Argentina, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Hong Kong, India, Kosovo, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Pakistan, Panama, Russia, Serbia, Thailand
	5% or less	Austria, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Turkey, United Kingdom, USA

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006

Bribery in poor and transitional countries represents a major impediment, one that holds back human development and economic growth. The poorest in society are least able to afford to pay bribes and often must go without basic services as a result. And respondents in several African countries, such as Congo, Nigeria and Senegal, admitted to paying multiple bribes, indicating an even greater burden.

In contrast to the situation in the African countries polled, the reported experience of bribery in the EU+ grouping and North America is relatively low, with less than 2 percent of respondents having paid a bribe. This experience of little or no bribery in daily life activities continues to stand in contrast to the perception of corruption in these regions, where respondents report that corruption severely affects key sectors and spheres of life (see discussion below, pp. 13-16).

In this case, it may be necessary to draw a distinction between the different forms of corruption, such as petty and grand. While in EU+ and North America there may be little need to pay small scale bribes in daily life, the public is familiar with reports on grand corruption affecting both public and private sectors. Therefore, while bribery for services does not seem to be a major problem, the public does remain concerned about large-scale corruption, such as in major government contracts or in political party funding, and its denigrating effect on their societies.

*Registrations and permits require the biggest bribes<sup>3</sup>*


Within Africa, Figure 3 shows that the largest bribes are paid to the legal system and judiciary, followed by the police and education system.<sup>4</sup> The average bribe to each of these organisations is greater than €50. The amount paid to utilities organisations, which are the second most commonly bribed, is much lower at only €6. For many people in these countries even such an amount is significant; for the poorest it would be prohibitive, with the result that they may be denied basic services due to an inability to pay bribes.

---

<sup>3</sup> Given the vast differences in the cost of living between continents, it is difficult to compare the size of bribes paid in different continents. Although Purchasing Power Parity exchange rates exist, inter-continental comparisons could be misleading. The comparisons here are therefore made between sectors within continents.

<sup>4</sup> The relatively large numbers of respondents with experience of paying bribes in Africa and Latin America provides a substantial sub-sample of at least 200 respondents to analyse data relating to the size of the last bribe paid. In the other regional groupings, the number of respondents with experience of bribery is lower.


**Figure 3 Africa: the average cost of the last bribe paid (€)**



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006

Figure 4 shows the cost of bribes paid by respondents in Latin America. By far the largest bribes were paid for medical services, on average more than €450. Bribes paid to the legal system/judiciary and tax revenue are the next largest, both surpassing €200. These amounts would be considerable to most people living in any part of the world; for the regions' poor they likely provide an insurmountable hurdle to securing basic health and legal services.

**Figure 4 Latin America: the average cost of the last bribe paid (€)**



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006

*How does experience of bribery relate to expert perceptions of corruption?*


The results of TI's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2006, which measures expert perceptions of public sector and political corruption, can be compared with the findings related to the experience of bribery. Figure 5, below, shows that there is a

link between scores on the CPI and the number of bribes paid in the countries polled in the Global Corruption Barometer 2006. The correlation for this is 0.63.

No country with a score of five or more in the CPI (indicating a lower level of perceived corruption) has more than seven percent of respondents who report paying a bribe in the past year; for most countries this figure is substantially less. For those countries whose results are poorer in the CPI 2006, there is far more differentiation in the experience of bribery.

In many countries, there are significant problems both in terms of perceived public sector and political corruption and bribery for services. In Albania, for example, this result is marked: Albania scored 2.6 in the CPI 2006 and two-thirds of respondents who had contact with public services also admitted to paying at least one bribe in the past year.

**Figure 5 Comparing expert perceptions of corruption (CPI 2006) with experience of bribery**



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006

## Government performance on anti-corruption

The TI Global Corruption Barometer 2006 examines how governments are tackling the problem of corruption in the eyes of the general public. Given that the CPI reflects the opinion of experts, some of whom are based outside the country being assessed, the Barometer offers a different perspective on government and its demonstrated ability to reduce corruption. While the Barometer data does not amount to an index of government effort to fight corruption, it does provide some feedback on the power of government to influence the public agenda, its political will to fight corruption and in some cases its power to effect real change in country, in terms of combating corruption.

It can be unfair to lay the entire blame of corruption in a country on governments that have been in power for only a short period of time. However, it is important that governments take firm and effective action to fight corruption, and that the public gain a sense that government efforts (among others') are taking hold and making a

difference in their lives. This is particularly the case in countries where the need to pay bribes for services ruins livelihoods and can even cost lives.

*Governments are underperforming in the fight against corruption*

The majority of people around the world have a poor opinion of their government’s anti-corruption efforts. While one in five surveyed find government actions positive, more than half indicate that the government is not doing a good job. Perhaps most worrying is the fact that a full 15 percent of the public worldwide believe that not only is government not effective in its anti-corruption work, but that government is actually a source of the problem in that it encourages corruption. Table 2 shows the opinions on government efforts to fight corruption, by region.

**Table 2 Assessing the current government’s actions in the fight against corruption (%)**

Government is...	Total Sample	EU+	South East Europe	NIS	Africa	Latin America	Asia-Pacific	North America
<b>Very effective</b>	5	4	6	3	17	7	4	2
<b>Effective</b>	17	18	21	14	27	18	15	17
<b>Not effective</b>	38	42	30	40	24	29	34	50
<b>Not fighting corruption at all</b>	16	14	19	24	20	19	18	9
<b>Not fighting corruption, but actually encouraging it</b>	15	14	9	15	9	23	15	19
<b>DK/NA</b>	8	8	14	5	3	4	15	4

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006

Only one in five members of the public in the EU+ and North America think that their governments are effective to any extent in fighting corruption. Of additional concern is the one in five in North America and one in seven in the EU+ who thinks that their government actually encourages corruption rather than fighting it.

In contrast to the results in Europe and North America, respondents in Africa and Latin demonstrate a considerable difference in opinion. More than half of respondents in Nigeria, for example, see their government’s efforts as effective or very effective, while only 11 percent in Gabon report the same. In Latin America, 43 percent of Mexicans believe the government actually encourages corruption, while 54 percent of those in the Dominican Republic believe the government is effective or very effective.

Respondents in the NIS paint a picture of governments that make little attempt to fight corruption. The most common response in the region was that governments were ‘not effective’ in the fight against corruption (40 percent), whilst 24 percent answered that the government does not fight corruption at all. The lack of effectiveness of government efforts to fight corruption, as judged by the public in the NIS and elsewhere, is different from the absence of political will to fight corruption, but is nevertheless a concern.

One partial explanation for the results here may be the importance of anti-corruption efforts in different regions. Concerted anti-corruption efforts by governments in Western Europe and North America are relatively limited and might mean the public is less aware of – in addition to being less confident in – government efforts to curb

corruption. Judgement by the public there is likely based on the prosecution of headline cases and not on the work of anti-corruption commissions or the implementation of anti-corruption strategies. In Africa, where corruption is generally considered to present a substantially higher risk, governments tend to address corruption, at least ensuring it is on the political agenda. This may or may not translate into effective action, but it does heighten awareness of government efforts in this regard.

*Views on government efforts and public sector corruption do not always align*

There is no correlation between a good score in the CPI 2006 and the public endorsement of a government's anti-corruption efforts. This may be because some governments will have been in power for only a short period of time when polling is done for the Barometer, while a country's performance in the CPI also reflects the performance of past administrations, not just the present one. In addition, good performance by government in anti-corruption can only come about through sustained change that translates into better quality of life for ordinary citizens.

It is interesting that some governments with good performance in the CPI have the approval of their people, for example Singapore has a CPI 2006 score of 9.4, and 89 percent of respondents believe that their government is effective or very effective in fighting corruption. Other top CPI performers have more mixed results. Denmark has a CPI 2006 score 9.5 and 50 percent of respondents judge their government as effective or very effective in its anti-corruption activities. In Iceland (CPI score 9.6) and Sweden (CPI score 9.2), however, the public does not rate government efforts so highly, with more than 60 percent indicating that government was not effective or did not fight corruption at all.

## **How corruption affects public sectors and institutions**


For the third year the Barometer provides data showing the extent to which people believe corruption affects different public sectors and institutions in their country. This public perception of the levels of corruption is a vital indicator of how corrupt or clean the average citizen finds a number of key institutions. Such perceptions can influence the public's dealings with these institutions, creating the expectation that graft is necessary to obtain services. Corruption in the system then becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, as people pay where they assume it is necessary.

*Political parties and parliament still viewed around the world as most corrupt*

The results of the TI Global Corruption Barometer 2006 show that political parties and parliament/legislature are perceived to be most affected by corruption (see Figure 6). The police are also viewed rather poorly, a result which coincides with the findings presented earlier in this report that the police are the institution most likely to be bribed around the world. Identifying parties, parliaments and police as corrupt throws into question some of the most representative and authoritative institutions in a society, and puts at risk their capacity to perform credibly with any degree of transparency and integrity.

The results are consistent with those of the Barometers in 2005 and 2004, and the lack of improvement is disappointing. The perception of parties and parliaments as most corrupt reinforces the view that governments are not on the whole acting effectively in fighting corruption. Rather, they themselves are seen to be a part of the problem, creating a dynamic in which they actually encourage corruption in a country.

**Figure 6 Sectors and institutions most affected by corruption, globally (1 - not at all corrupt ... 5 - extremely corrupt, mean scores)**



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006

*Police rate poorly in Africa and the NIS*

Respondents in Africa and the NIS consider the police to be the most corrupt sector (with mean scores of 4.6 and 4.1 respectively). This is in contrast to the results in the EU+ and North America, where the police are considered to be relatively less corrupt compared with most other sectors (2.7 and 3.1, respectively). In the EU+ and North America, political parties were viewed as the most corrupt, followed by business in EU+ and parliament/legislature in North America.

Political parties and the police are judged as equally bad in Latin America. In Eastern Europe, the legal system and medical services are considered the most corrupt.

In Taiwan, the Global Corruption Barometer 2006 highlights a substantial increase in the perceived level of corruption in many sectors: NGOs, religious bodies, police and military all emerged as more corrupt in the eyes of the public. Similarly, a number of sectors in Hong Kong (NGOs, business and media) and Croatia (media, education and business) reveal an increase in perceived corruption.

In contrast, Indians report a substantial reduction in the perceived level of corruption in a number of sectors. Improvements encompass education, the legal

system/judiciary, media, parliament/legislature, and utilities. It should be noted, however, that Indian respondents still indicate that the majority of sectors highlighted are significantly affected by corruption. These improvements should therefore be understood as a positive sign of progress, but not an indication that the problem of corruption has been solved.

## How corruption affects personal and political life and the business environment

Each of the four editions of the Global Corruption Barometer has asked respondents to assess to what extent corruption affects different spheres of life, including personal and family life, the business environment and political life on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 4 (to a large extent).

The Barometer 2006 strongly supports the findings of past editions, with political life (mean score 3.4) emerging as the sphere thought to be most affected by corruption, followed by the business environment (3.1), and, of much less concern, personal and family life (2.3). This ordering is the same in all regional groupings covered by the survey.

It is worth noting that respondents' answers for the three spheres of life align to a great extent. In particular, there is a statistically significant correlation between perceived corruption in business and political life.<sup>5</sup> Thus respondents that perceive corruption to be a problem in one sphere are more likely to perceive it to be a problem in the others. Stated differently, if one sphere is judged to be very corrupt, the others are likely to be judged similarly.

Although all regional groupings demonstrate a perception that corruption is a major problem in political life, at the country level there is considerable variation, as Table 3, below, shows. Nevertheless, the public in a majority of the countries covered in the Barometer believe corruption affects political life to a large extent.

In North America, there are very strong opinions about the extent to which corruption affects the business environment and political life. There, more than four out of five respondents think that the business environment and political life are affected by corruption to a moderate or large extent. In addition, corruption in political life in the United States is perceived to have worsened when compared with earlier Barometers.

**Table 3 Corruption affects political life to a large extent**

Corruption affects political life to a large extent	More than 70%	Bolivia, Cameroon, Greece, South Korea, Taiwan
	51 – 70%	Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, France, Gabon, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Macedonia, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Russia, Senegal, Spain, Turkey, UK, Ukraine, US
	31 – 50%	Canada, Colombia, Congo-Brazzaville, Czech Rep., Dominican Rep., Fiji, Germany, Iceland, India, Japan, Kosovo, Moldova, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Serbia, Singapore, Thailand, Venezuela

<sup>5</sup> Taking into account the very large sample size of 59,661 respondents, this correlation (.62) can be considered significant.

	11 – 30%	Austria, Denmark, Finland, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland
--	----------	---

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006

Corruption’s impact on family life is less a concern to most people around the world. One could argue that this may be an instance where the public compares real experience -- whether corruption has caused personal hardship – with perceptions of how corruption affects society more broadly, such as in the scandals reported in the media. The latter may often be viewed as more ever-present and pervasive in its influence.

However, respondents’ experience of corruption in their personal and family life differs substantially in different parts of the world. In the EU+ and the NIS, respondents state that corruption affects their lives very little (78 percent and 71 percent of respondents respectively answering ‘to a small extent’ or ‘not at all’). It would therefore seem that these respondents may have answered this question taking into account their direct experience of bribery and its influence on their household.

In contrast, 70 percent of respondents in Africa and 59 percent in South East Europe think that their family lives are affected to a ‘moderate’ or ‘large’ extent. In Africa, this is clearly supported by the data on experience of bribery reported above. In South East Europe, however, reported experience of bribery was relatively low.

As compared with previous Barometers, change for the worse has been demonstrated in Iceland, Japan and Spain. Corruption’s impact on in Iceland’s business environment and family life is perceived to have increased over the past two years. In Japan, the business environment is believed to be worse off when compared with the 2005 results. Finally, despite a reduction in the perceived level of corruption in Spanish political life and the business environment between 2004 and 2005, the scores for 2006 show large increases which more than cancel out previous improvements.

## **Conclusion – corruption as a worldwide problem**

Overall, these results show that people everywhere see corruption as a major problem. While there are differences between countries in the extent to which people experience corruption in their everyday lives, there is a widespread perception that the authority vested in institutions that ought to represent the public interest is, in fact, being abused for private gain.

Because bribe-paying is reported most in poorer countries, the burden of corruption falls hardest on those who can least afford it. In these countries, misuse of public funds does the greatest harm to the money available for safe water, schools and health care. The risks to lives are real, and those who can make a difference must act. Yet so far, in too many places in the world, government action to stop corruption has been judged lacklustre and ineffective.

People from all countries polled believe that corruption greatly affects their lives – and above all they express concern at the role of parties and elected politicians in the corruption equation. The challenge remains for political leaders to prove that they are

not actually fuelling corrupt practices, but are a genuine part of efforts to enhance transparency, accountability and integrity in societies around the world.

**Table 4 Experience of bribery: bribe-paying the past year, all countries<sup>6</sup>**

<i>In the past 12 months have you or anyone living in your household paid a bribe in any form ...</i>	Yes	No
<b>Total sample</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>91%</b>
<b>Africa</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>64%</b>
- Cameroon	57%	42%
- Congo, Republic of the	40%	59%
- Gabon	41%	59%
- Kenya	21%	79%
- Morocco	60%	40%
- Nigeria	38%	62%
- Senegal	29%	71%
- South Africa	5%	95%
<b>Asia - Pacific</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>93%</b>
- Fiji	3%	97%
- Hong Kong	6%	94%
- India	12%	88%
- Indonesia	18%	82%
- Japan	3%	97%
- Malaysia	3%	97%
- Pakistan	15%	85%
- Philippines	16%	84%
- Singapore	1%	99%
- South Korea	2%	98%
- Taiwan	2%	98%
- Thailand	10%	90%
<b>South East Europe</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>91%</b>
- Albania	66%	34%
- Bulgaria	8%	92%
- Croatia	7%	93%
- Kosovo	12%	88%
- Macedonia	9%	91%
- Romania	20%	80%
- Serbia	13%	87%
- Turkey	2%	98%
<b>EU and other Western Europe</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>98%</b>
- Austria	2%	98%
- Czech Republic	17%	83%
- Denmark	2%	98%
- Finland	1%	99%
- France	2%	98%
- Germany	2%	98%
- Greece	17%	83%
- Iceland	2%	98%
- Luxembourg	6%	94%
- Netherlands	2%	98%
- Norway	2%	98%
- Poland	5%	94%
- Portugal	2%	98%
- Spain	2%	98%
- Sweden	1%	99%
- Switzerland	1%	99%
- United Kingdom	2%	98%
<b>Latin America</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>83%</b>
- Argentina	6%	94%
- Bolivia	28%	72%
- Chile	7%	93%
- Colombia	7%	93%
- Dominican Republic	23%	77%
- Mexico	28%	72%
- Panama	8%	92%
- Paraguay	26%	74%
- Peru	21%	79%
- Venezuela	21%	79%
<b>North America</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>98%</b>
- Canada	3%	97%
- USA	2%	98%

<sup>6</sup> In the few instances where the responses do not add up to 100%, the remainder of the responses were ‘Don’t Know/No answer’.

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report

<i>In the past 12 months have you or anyone living in your household paid a bribe in any form ...</i>	Yes	No
<b>Newly Independent States</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>88%</b>
- Moldova	27%	73%
- Russia	8%	92%
- Ukraine	23%	77%
<b>Other</b>		
- Israel	4%	96%

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report

**Table 5 How respondents assess their government's fight against corruption, all countries**

<i>How would you assess your current government's actions in the fight against corruption?</i>	<b>Very effective</b>	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Not effective</b>	<b>Does not fight at all</b>	<b>Does not fight but actually encourages it</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>
<b>Total sample</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>Africa</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>3%</b>
- Cameroon	5%	12%	41%	15%	21%	6%
- Congo, Republic of the	10%	10%	25%	15%	19%	20%
- Gabon	5%	6%	21%	20%	33%	15%
- Kenya	10%	33%	39%	9%	8%	2%
- Morocco	3%	17%	39%	23%	15%	3%
- Nigeria	23%	29%	16%	22%	7%	3%
- Senegal	7%	13%	28%	20%	16%	17%
- South Africa	13%	25%	34%	13%	12%	3%
<b>Asia - Pacific</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>15%</b>
- Fiji	15%	29%	28%	15%	11%	2%
- Hong Kong	10%	73%	15%	1%	0%	0%
- India	7%	19%	39%	20%	15%	1%
- Indonesia	8%	21%	50%	9%	9%	3%
- Japan	2%	6%	35%	15%	11%	32%
- Malaysia	9%	36%	35%	5%	4%	11%
- Pakistan	4%	19%	23%	27%	10%	17%
- Philippines	8%	13%	31%	23%	24%	0%
- Singapore	37%	52%	4%	1%	1%	5%
- South Korea	2%	12%	45%	24%	17%	0%
- Taiwan	2%	21%	33%	15%	25%	4%
- Thailand	6%	34%	23%	11%	19%	8%
<b>South East Europe</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>14%</b>
- Albania	7%	33%	36%	13%	4%	7%
- Bulgaria	1%	12%	36%	15%	12%	25%
- Croatia	0%	5%	34%	21%	17%	22%
- Kosovo	6%	18%	24%	25%	18%	10%
- Macedonia	1%	9%	34%	27%	24%	6%
- Romania	0%	16%	39%	19%	11%	15%
- Serbia	6%	9%	35%	21%	17%	13%
- Turkey	9%	29%	25%	20%	6%	11%
<b>EU and other Western Europe</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>8%</b>
- Austria	6%	17%	29%	18%	9%	21%
- Czech Republic	1%	9%	40%	21%	21%	8%
- Denmark	9%	41%	28%	15%	3%	3%
- Finland	4%	21%	23%	18%	4%	29%
- France	1%	14%	45%	18%	15%	6%
- Germany	0%	12%	51%	12%	19%	5%
- Greece	5%	19%	41%	22%	12%	1%
- Iceland	3%	11%	27%	34%	11%	15%
- Italy	3%	24%	34%	14%	11%	14%
- Luxembourg	1%	29%	37%	13%	6%	14%
- Netherlands	2%	21%	51%	7%	3%	17%
- Norway	1%	22%	50%	9%	2%	16%
- Poland	2%	11%	41%	28%	12%	7%
- Portugal	4%	26%	39%	13%	10%	8%
- Spain	18%	15%	36%	13%	10%	8%
- Sweden	2%	25%	51%	12%	4%	6%
- Switzerland	4%	33%	36%	12%	8%	7%
- United Kingdom	6%	19%	40%	14%	18%	4%
<b>Latin America</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>4%</b>
- Argentina	2%	19%	36%	24%	14%	5%
- Bolivia	5%	35%	31%	15%	7%	7%
- Chile	1%	19%	54%	14%	8%	4%
- Colombia	17%	35%	16%	10%	20%	1%
- Dominican Republic	10%	44%	23%	11%	9%	3%
- Mexico	0%	9%	27%	20%	43%	0%
- Panama	14%	10%	35%	18%	21%	2%
- Paraguay	0%	4%	29%	27%	40%	1%
- Peru	4%	7%	32%	28%	19%	10%
- Venezuela	18%	18%	29%	13%	17%	5%
<b>North America</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>4%</b>
- Canada	5%	30%	36%	11%	11%	7%
- USA	1%	15%	52%	9%	19%	4%
<b>Newly Independent States</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>5%</b>

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report

<i>How would you assess your current government's actions in the fight against corruption?</i>	<b>Very effective</b>	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Not effective</b>	<b>Does not fight at all</b>	<b>Does not fight but actually encourages it</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>
- Moldova	4%	18%	30%	24%	15%	10%
- Russia	3%	17%	42%	22%	13%	2%
- Ukraine	1%	6%	33%	29%	20%	11%
<b>Other</b>						
- Israel	2%	14%	42%	24%	16%	2%

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report

**Table 6 Corruption's impact on different sectors and institutions, all countries**

<i>To what extent do you perceive the following sectors in this country/territory to be affected by corruption? (1: not at all corrupt, ... 5: extremely corrupt)</i>	Political parties	Parliament/ Legislature	Business/ private sector	Police	Legal system/ Judiciary	Media	Tax revenue	Medical services	Education system	The military	Utilities	Registry and permit services	NGOs	Religious bodies
<b>Total Sample</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Africa</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.8</b>
- Cameroon	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.7	4.4	3.6	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.3	3.2	3.8	3.1	2.9
- Congo (Brazzaville)	4.1	3.8	3.8	4.3	3.7	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.5	4.3	3.6	3.6	3.0	2.5
- Gabon	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.7	4.0	3.0	3.4	3.1	3.3
- Kenya	3.6	3.5	3.0	4.1	3.5	2.3	3.4	2.9	2.6	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.6	.
- Morocco	3.5	3.5	3.2	4.2	4.0	3.0	3.2	4.0	3.2	3.2	2.6	4.1	2.7	2.1
- Nigeria	4.5	4.1	3.7	4.9	4.1	3.2	3.5	3.4	4.3	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.0	3.0
- Senegal	4.2	3.9	3.6	4.3	4.4	3.2	3.6	3.2	3.1	2.3	2.1	4.0	2.2	2.1
- South Africa	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.9	3.2	2.9	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.3	2.9	2.5
<b>Asia - Pacific</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>
- Fiji	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.2	2.7	3.3	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.3	3.0	2.2	2.2
- Hong Kong	3.5	2.9	3.9	3.4	2.6	3.7	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.2	3.4	2.5
- India	4.2	3.5	3.2	4.3	3.4	2.4	3.0	3.1	3.1	1.9	2.8	3.3	2.9	2.8
- Indonesia	4.1	4.2	3.6	4.2	4.2	2.8	3.4	3.0	3.3	3.3	2.9	3.6	2.9	2.3
- Japan	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.0	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.7
- Malaysia	3.5	3.0	3.3	3.8	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.2	3.1	2.2	1.7
- Pakistan	4.0	3.9	3.6	4.4	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.4	3.1	3.1	3.8	3.9	3.4	2.8
- Philippines	3.8	3.9	3.2	3.9	3.4	2.5	3.7	2.9	3.0	3.4	2.9	3.2	2.6	2.1
- Singapore	2.1	1.8	2.5	1.9	2.0	2.2	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.8	2.5	2.1
- South Korea	4.3	4.2	3.7	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.1	3.3	3.2	2.4	2.4	2.9	3.1
- Taiwan	4.5	4.5	3.7	4.1	3.9	3.3	3.4	3.8	3.5	4.1	3.6	2.4	3.9	3.7
- Thailand	3.7	2.9	3.2	3.6	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.3	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.7	2.3
<b>South East Europe</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.3</b>
- Albania	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.8	3.8	2.5	3.4	4.1	2.8	2.7	3.2	3.6	3.0	2.3
- Bulgaria	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.4	3.2	4.0	4.2	3.7	2.9	3.3	3.8	3.3	3.1
- Croatia	4.1	4.1	4.2	.	4.4	3.3	3.5	4.3	3.6	2.9	3.1	3.7	2.6	2.6
- Kosovo	3.6	3.2	3.2	2.2	3.6	2.4	2.6	3.8	2.8	1.5	3.1	2.8	2.3	1.9
- Macedonia	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.5	3.4	3.4	4.3	4.0	2.9	2.9	3.2	2.9	2.6
- Romania	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.9	2.9	2.2	3.8	3.2	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.9	2.3
- Serbia	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.0	3.9	3.4	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.6	2.5
- Turkey	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.2	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0
<b>EU and other Western Europe</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>
- Austria	3.3	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.7	2.4	2.6
- Czech Republic	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.5	2.9	2.6	3.2	2.8	2.8	2.6	3.4	2.5	2.2
- Denmark	2.5	2.1	2.7	1.8	1.7	2.5	1.6	2.0	1.8	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.4
- Finland	3.0	2.6	2.8	1.8	2.1	2.9	2.1	2.1	2.0	1.8	2.3	1.7	2.3	2.4
- France	3.8	3.2	3.6	2.8	2.9	3.3	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.7
- Germany	3.7	3.1	3.5	2.3	2.5	3.1	2.4	2.6	2.2	2.5	2.8	2.0	2.8	2.6
- Greece	3.9	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.5	2.8	2.6	3.1	2.4	2.7	3.1
- Iceland	3.4	2.7	3.3	2.3	2.5	3.0	1.9	2.3	2.0	.	2.5	1.9	2.3	2.3
- Italy	4.0	3.3	3.5	2.4	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.2	2.3	2.4	2.7	3.2	2.3	2.4
- Luxembourg	3.0	2.6	3.0	2.4	2.5	2.9	2.3	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.3	2.7
- Netherlands	3.1	2.9	3.3	2.9	2.7	3.1	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.6	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.7
- Norway	3.0	2.6	3.5	2.3	2.3	3.2	2.0	2.6	2.2	3.1	2.7	1.9	3.0	3.3
- Poland	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.1	3.9	3.1	3.1	2.7	3.2	3.3	3.0
- Portugal	3.9	3.3	3.8	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.6	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.9	2.8
- Spain	3.9	3.3	3.7	2.9	3.1	3.4	3.1	2.3	2.3	2.7	2.9	3.4	2.4	3.0
- Sweden	2.8	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.2	2.8	1.8	2.1	1.8	2.1	2.4	1.9	2.1	2.5

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report

<i>To what extent do you perceive the following sectors in this country/territory to be affected by corruption? (1: not at all corrupt, ... 5: extremely corrupt)</i>	Political parties	Parliament/ Legislature	Business/ private sector	Police	Legal system/ Judiciary	Media	Tax revenue	Medical services	Education system	The military	Utilities	Registry and permit services	NGOs	Religious bodies
- Switzerland	3.0	2.6	2.9	2.2	2.3	2.9	2.5	2.2	1.9	2.4	2.2	2.0	2.4	2.5
- United Kingdom	3.7	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.4	2.8	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.6	2.8
<b>Latin America</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2.8</b>
- Argentina	4.4	4.3	3.7	4.2	4.2	3.4	3.2	2.8	2.7	3.4	3.1	3.3	2.9	3.1
- Bolivia	4.4	4.0	3.3	4.4	4.3	3.0	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.6	3.0	3.2	2.9	2.1
- Chile	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.2	2.8	2.7	2.8	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.7
- Colombia	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.5	3.4	2.9	3.5	3.1	2.8	3.2	3.3	2.9	2.9	2.6
- Dominican Republic	4.3	4.1	3.1	4.4	4.1	3.1	3.4	3.0	2.7	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.2
- Mexico	4.4	4.3	3.7	4.5	4.2	3.5	3.8	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.9	3.2	3.2
- Panama	4.3	4.3	3.4	4.2	4.1	2.9	3.1	2.8	3.3	4.1	3.0	3.5	3.1	2.1
- Paraguay	4.6	4.6	3.1	4.6	4.4	2.9	3.9	3.4	3.2	4.1	3.6	4.2	3.0	2.2
- Peru	4.2	4.3	3.4	4.2	4.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.3	3.7	3.1	2.4
- Venezuela	4.0	3.7	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.0	3.7	3.1	3.8	3.7	2.8
<b>North America</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>
- Canada	3.6	3.2	2.9	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.2	2.5	2.7
- USA	4.3	3.9	3.6	3.2	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.1	2.5	3.2	3.0
<b>Newly Independent States</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2.4</b>
- Moldova	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.1	3.9	3.2	2.7	3.8	3.6	3.0	2.3	3.1	2.7	2.2
- Russia	3.8	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.5	2.9	3.6	3.1	2.4
- Ukraine	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.2	3.1	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.1	2.8	3.4	3.0	2.2
<b>Other</b>														
- Israel	4.2	3.8	3.2	3.3	2.8	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.6	2.2	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.6

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report

**Table 7 Corruption's impact on political life, the business environment, and personal and family life – all countries**

<i>Some people believe that corruption affects different spheres of life in this country. In your view does corruption affect: (1: Not at all ... 4: To a large extent)</i>	Political life	The business environment	Your personal and family life
<b>Total sample</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2.3</b>
<b>Africa</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>
- Cameroon	3.7	3.5	2.6
- Congo, Republic of the	3.1	2.8	2.1
- Gabon	3.1	2.9	2.1
- Kenya	3.3	3.3	3.2
- Morocco	3.1	2.9	2.6
- Nigeria	3.5	3.3	3.3
- Senegal	3.5	3.0	1.5
- South Africa	3.5	3.3	2.6
<b>Asia - Pacific</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2.5</b>
- Fiji	3.1	3.0	2.5
- Hong Kong	3.4	3.2	2.8
- India	2.9	2.6	2.3
- Indonesia	3.4	3.2	2.9
- Japan	3.1	2.7	1.9
- Malaysia	2.9	2.7	1.6
- Pakistan	3.1	2.9	2.4
- Philippines	3.4	3.4	3.4
- Singapore	2.9	3.0	2.2
- South Korea	3.7	3.6	3.0
- Taiwan	3.8	3.7	2.9
- Thailand	3.0	3.0	2.7
<b>South East Europe</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>2.8</b>
- Albania	3.6	3.3	2.8
- Bulgaria	3.6	3.3	2.2
- Croatia	3.5	3.5	2.3
- Kosovo	3.2	3.0	2.7
- Macedonia	3.4	3.1	2.6
- Romania	3.2	3.0	2.3
- Serbia	3.1	2.9	2.2
- Turkey	3.5	3.5	3.3
<b>EU and other Western European</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>
- Austria	2.7	1.8	1.3
- Czech Republic	3.2	2.9	1.6
- Denmark	2.4	2.4	1.5
- Finland	2.6	2.5	1.4
- France	3.3	2.3	1.3
- Germany	3.3	2.0	1.7
- Greece	3.6	3.5	2.5
- Iceland	3.3	3.4	2.3
- Italy	3.4	3.4	1.5
- Luxembourg	2.9	2.7	1.7
- Netherlands	2.6	2.8	1.6
- Norway	3.0	3.0	1.3
- Poland	3.4	3.3	2.4
- Portugal	3.6	3.6	2.2
- Spain	3.6	3.4	1.9
- Sweden	2.7	2.7	1.6
- Switzerland	2.7	2.9	1.4
- United Kingdom	3.3	3.0	1.9
<b>Latin America</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.5</b>
- Argentina	3.4	3.0	2.5
- Bolivia	3.7	2.8	3.1
- Chile	3.5	3.2	1.9
- Colombia	3.0	2.8	2.6
- Dominican Republic	3.0	2.9	2.8
- Mexico	3.4	2.8	2.7
- Panama	3.2	2.9	2.7
- Paraguay	3.6	3.1	2.5
- Peru	3.5	3.0	2.7
- Venezuela	2.8	2.7	2.3
<b>North America</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>2.6</b>
- Canada	3.2	3.0	2.1
- USA	3.6	3.4	2.6

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report

<i>Some people believe that corruption affects different spheres of life in this country. In your view does corruption affect:</i> (1: Not at all ... 4: To a large extent)	Political life	The business environment	Your personal and family life
<b>Newly Independent States</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>
- Moldova	3.1	2.9	2.4
- Russia	3.3	2.9	1.9
- Ukraine	3.5	3.2	1.9
<b>Other</b>			
- Israel	3.5	3.3	2.5

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report  
**Annex II TI Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Questionnaire**

First we would like to ask you a few questions about corruption. In this survey we are using corruption to mean the abuse of entrusted power – by a public official or a businessperson for example – for private gain. This could include material gain or other benefits.

1. Some people believe that corruption affects different spheres of life in this country. In your view, does corruption affect... not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent or to a large extent?

*READ OUT AND ROTATE. SINGLE CODE FOR EACH*

Spheres	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent	DK/NA
Your personal and family life	1	2	3	4	9
The business environment	1	2	3	4	9
Political life	1	2	3	4	9

2. How would you assess your current government’s actions in the fight against corruption?

*READ OUT AND ROTATE. SINGLE CODE*

- The government is very effective in the fight against corruption 1
- The government is effective in the fight against corruption 2
- The government is not effective in the fight against corruption 3
- The government does not fight corruption at all 4
- Not only does the government not fight against corruption but it encourages it 5
- DK/NA 9

3. To what extent do you perceive the following categories in this country to be affected by corruption? Please answer on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 meaning not at all corrupt, 5 meaning extremely corrupt). Of course you can use in-between scores as well.

*READ OUT AND ROTATE. SINGLE ANSWER FOR EACH*

Sectors	Not at all corrupt				Extremely corrupt	DK/NA
Political parties	1	2	3	4	5	9
Parliament/Legislature	1	2	3	4	5	9
Business/ private sector	1	2	3	4	5	9
Media	1	2	3	4	5	9
The military	1	2	3	4	5	9
NGOs (non governmental organizations)	1	2	3	4	5	9
Religious bodies	1	2	3	4	5	9

4. And to what extent do you perceive the following categories in this country to be affected by corruption? Please answer on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 meaning not at all corrupt, 5 meaning extremely corrupt). Of course you can use in-between scores as well.

*READ OUT AND ROTATE. SINGLE ANSWER FOR EACH*

Sectors	Not at all corrupt				Extremely corrupt	DK/NA
	1	2	3	4	5	
Education system	1	2	3	4	5	9
Legal system/Judiciary	1	2	3	4	5	9
Medical services	1	2	3	4	5	9
Police	1	2	3	4	5	9
Registry and permit services (civil registry for birth, marriage, licenses, permits)	1	2	3	4	5	9
Utilities (telephone, electricity, water, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	9
Tax revenue	1	2	3	4	5	9

5. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone living in your household had a contact with the following institution/organisation?

*READ OUT AND ROTATE. SINGLE ANSWER FOR EACH*

- 1.Yes 2.No 8.DK 9.NA

ASK FOR EACH INSTITUTION MENTIONED WITH CODE 1 (YES) IN Q5. IF NONE MENTIONED GO TO Q6

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report

5.1 In the past 12 months have you or anyone living in your household paid a bribe in any form to each of the following institution/organisation?

INTERVIEWER: Living in household = people included in your house e.g. parents, children, etc

1.Yes 2.No 8.DK 9.NA

ASK FOR EACH INSTITUTION MENTIONED WITH CODE 1 (YES) IN Q 5.1 IF NONE MENTIONED, GO TO Q6.

5.2. How many times in the past 12 months have you or anyone living in your household paid a bribe in any form to each of the following institutions/ organisations? (give a number)

98 DK 99 NA

ASK FOR EACH INSTITUTION MENTIONED WITH CODE 1 (YES) IN Q 5.1

5.3. What was the cost of the last bribe paid?

INTERVIEWER: TO BE ASKED IN LOCAL CURRENCY BUT CODED BY YOU IN EUROS ACCORDING TO THE CURRENCY EXCHANGE SUBMITTED BY YOUR COMPANY

Sectors	Q5				Q5.1				Q5.2	Q5.3
	Had a contact				Paid a bribe				Number of times	cost of last bribe
Education system	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9		
Legal system/Judiciary	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9		
Medical services	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9		
Police	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9		
Registry and permit services (civil registry for birth, marriage, licenses, permits)	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9		
Utilities (telephone, electricity, water, etc.)	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9		
Tax revenue	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9		

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report  
**Annex III Country coverage and sample information**

Country	Contact	E-mail	Company	Mode	Sample Type	Size	Fieldwork Dates
Albania	Maria Dede	maridede@albn.net	TNS Index Albania GIA	Face-to-face	Urban	800	August 7 – August 15
Argentina	Ricardo Hermelo Constanza Cilley	ricardo.hermelo@tns-gallup.com.ar constanza.cilley@tns-gallup.com.ar	TNS Gallup Argentina	Face-to-face	National	1010	August 18– August 22
Austria	Ingrid Lusk	i.lusk@gallup.at	Karmasin Marktforschung Gallup Österreich	Face-to-face	National	969	July 27 – August 20
Bolivia	Luis Alberto Quiroga	proyectos@encuestas-estudios.com	Encuestas & Estudios	Face-to-face	Urban	1319	August 1 – August 17
Bulgaria	Anton Valkovski	a.valkovski@gallup-bbss.com	TNS BBSS Gallup International	Face-to-face	National	1001	July 25 – August 8
Cameroon	Simplice Ngampou	Sngampou@rms-international.net	RMS Cameroon	Face-to-face	Douala & Yaoundé	528	August 11 – August 15
Canada	Anne-Marie Marois	Ammarois@legermarketing.com	Leger Marketing	Telephone	National	1000	July 12 – July 16
Chile*	Claudio Contardo	claudiocontardo@sigmados.cl	Sigma Dos Chile S.A.	Face-to-face	Urban	500	July 27 – August 21
Colombia	Carlos Lemoine Cristina Querubin	Clemino@cncol.com cquerubin@cncol.com	Centro Nacional de Consultoría	Telephone	Urban	600	August 18 August 25
Congo*	Simplice Ngampou	sngampou@rms-international.net	RMS Cameroon	Face-to-face	Brazzaville and Pointe Noire	517	July 13- July 18
Croatia	Sdragan Domicic Mima Cvitan	Sdragan.domicic@puls.hr Mima.cvitan@puls.hr	PULS d.o.o.	Face-to-face	National	1000	August 1– August 22
Czech Republic	Jan Trojacek	trojacek@mareco.cz	Mareco s.r.o.	Face-to-face	National	1000	July 29 - August 9
Denmark	Carina Hogsted Helle Damkjær	carina.hogsted@tns-gallup.dk helle.damkjaer@tns-gallup.dk	TNS Gallup	Telephone	National	500	July 19 – August 11
Dominican* Republic	Amalia Peña	sdrd_datos@verizon.net.do	SIGMA DOS	Face-to-face	Santo Domingo and Santiago	537	August 12 - August 20
Fiji**	Tim Wilson	tim@tebuttresearch.com	Tebutt Research	Face-to-face	Urban	1024	August 15 August 22
Finland	Sakari Nurmela Mirva Väyrynen	sakari.nurmela@tns-gallup.fi mirva.vayrynen@tns-gallup.fi	TNS Gallup	Online panel	National	1244	August 18 August 23
France	Marc-André Allard	marc-andre.allard@tns-sofres.com	TNS Sofres	Face-to-face	National	1012	July 26- July 27
Gabon*	Simplice Ngampou	sngampou@rms-international.net	RMS Cameroon	Face-to-face	Libreville and Port-Gentil	515	July 20- July 25
Germany	Klaus-Peter Schoepner Johannes Huxoll	Kp.schoepner@tns-ernid.com johannes.huxoll@tns-ernid.com	TNS Emnid	Telephone	National	505	August 8 – August 11
Greece	Ero Papadopoulou	ero.papadopoulou@tnsicap.gr	TNS ICAP	Telephone	Urban	1000	July 14 – July 26
Hong Kong	Ellen Tops	ellen.tops@tns-global.com	TNS	Online	National	1001	August 4 – August 16
Iceland	Asdis G. Ragnarsdottir	asdisg@gallup.is	IMG Gallup	Net panel	National	1018	August 8– August 25
India	Sharmistha Das	sharmistha.das@tns-global.com	TNS India	Face-to-face	National	1058	July 14 – July 22
Indonesia	Widya Ria Kencana	Widya.Kencana@tns-global.com	TNS Indonesia	Face-to-face	Urban	1000	July 24 – August 10
Israel	Dori Shadmon Tamar Fuchs	Dori.shadmon@tns-teleseker.com tamar.fuchs@tns-teleseker.com	TNS/Teleseker	Telephone	Urban (National representative in Jewish and mixed towns – representative of approximately 90% of total adult population)	500	July 18 – July 19
Italy	Paolo Colombo	paolo.colombo@doxa.it	Doxa	Telephone	National	988	July 26 – July 31
Japan	Kiyoshi Nishimura	nisimura@nrc.co.jp	Nippon Research Center, Ltd.	Self administered questionnaires	National	1203	July 27 – August 7
Kenya	George Waititu Paul Omondi	george@steadman-group.com paul@steadman-group.com	Steadman Group International	Face-to-face	National	2001	July 8 – July 13
Kosovo* (UN Administration)	Assen Blagoev	a.blagoev@gallup-bbss.com	BBSS-Index Kosovo	Face-to-face	Albanian plus population	979	August 11– August 17
Luxembourg	Marc Thiltgen	marc.thiltgen@tns-ilres.com	TNS ILRES	Telephone and Online Access Panel	National	528	July 20 – July 31
Macedonia	Elida Medarovska	e.medarovska@brima-gallup.com.mk	BRIMA	Face-to-face	National	1001	July 14 – July

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report

Country	Contact	E-mail	Company	Mode	Sample Type	Size	Fieldwork Dates
							20
Malaysia	Mei Yeng Chia Bee Yoke Yang	MeiYeng.Chia@tns-global.com BeeYoke.Yang@tns-global.com	TNS	Face-to-face	Peninsula Malaysia Urban	1250	July 24 – August 22
Mexico	Luis Herrera	Luis.herrera@tns-gallup.com.mx	TNS Gallup	Face-to-face	National	700	August 2 – August 15
Moldova*	Jigau Ion	cbs_axa@yahoo.com ijig@mail.md	CBS Axa	Face-to-face	National	993	August 19 – August 26
Morocco*	Ilham Abouchraa Rochdi Bakor	i.abouchraa@legermarketing.ma rochdibakor@legermarketing.ma	Leger Marketing Morocco	Face-to-face	Main cities	516	August 5 – August 6
Netherlands	Hanneke Sjerps	hanneke.sjerps@tns-nipo.com	TNS Nipo	CASI	National	1000	August 23 – August 28
Nigeria	Maslina Mokhtar	mmaslina@rms-international.net	RMS	Face-to-face	Urban	500	July 25 – July 31
Norway	Ole Fredrik Ugland Roar Hind	ole.fredrik.ugland@tns-gallup.no roar.hind@tns-gallup.no	TNS Gallup Norway	Web Interviews	National	1008	August 15- August 24
Pakistan	Fatima Idrees	fatima.idrees@gallup.com.pk	Gallup Pakistan	Face-to-face	Urban	796	August 21– September 4
Panama*	Max Del Cid	psmcorre@cwpanama.net	PSM SIGMA DOS PANAMA	Telephone	Urban	498	July 21 – August 15
Paraguay*	Marlene Heinrich	cam@pla.net.py	CAM Sigma Dos	Face-to-face	Urban	500	July 30 – August 18
Peru	Gustavo Yrala	gyrala@datum.com.pe	DATUM Internacional S.A.	Face-to-face	National	1123	July 15 – July 18
Philippines	Raymund Pascua	raymund.pascua@asiaresearch.com.ph	Asia Research Organization Inc.	Face-to-face	National	1000	July 10 – August 13
Poland	Grzegorz Dabrowzky	Grzegorz.Dabrowzky@mareco.pl	Mareco Poland	Face-to-face	Urban	1021	July 27 – July 31
Portugal	Hugo Baptista	hugo.baptista@tns-global.com	TNS Euroteste	Telephone	National	1000	July 28 - August 18
Romania	Andrei Musetescu Georgina Radulescu	andrei.musetescu@csop.ro Georgina.radulescu @csop.ro	CSOP	Face-to-face	National	1081	August 2 – August 7
Russia	Victor Pratusevich	Pratusevich.V@rmh.ru	Romir Monitoring	Face-to-face	National	1502	July 19 – July 26
Senegal*	Placide Yaptie	pyaptie@rms-africa.com	RMS-Senegal	Face-to-face	Dakar region	511	July 27- July 29
Serbia	Sladjana Brakus	sladj@tnsmediumgallup.co.yu	TNS Medium Gallup	Face-to-face	National	1000	July 14- July 19
Singapore	Jasmine Yang	Jasmine.Yang@tns-global.com	TNS Singapore Pte.Ltd.	Telephone	National	1002	July 13 – August 23
South Africa	Mari Harris	marih@markinor.co.za	Markinor	Telephone	National	1001	August 15– August 19
South Korea	Hwanhee Lee	hhlee@gallup.co.kr	Gallup Korea	Face-to-face	National	1504	July 18- August 11
Spain	Gines Garrido	ggarrido@sigmados.com	Sigma Dos	Telephone	National	1000	August 2 – August 10
Sweden	Mai Månsson- Hjelm Matz Johansson	mai.mansson-hjelm@tns-gallup.se matz.Johansson@tns-gallup.se	TNS Gallup AB	Telephone	Urban	1000	August 14– August 30
Switzerland	Matthias Kappeler Andrea Büchi	matthias.kappeler@isopublic.ch andrea.buechi@isopublic.ch	ISOPUBLIC AG	Telephone	National	1000	July 19 – August 15
Taiwan	Eric Liu	ericliu@ort.com.tw	Opinion Research Taiwan	Telephone	National	1000	July 13 – August 2
Thailand	Kulchat Wuttigate	kulchat.wuttigate@tns-global.com	TNS Thailand	Telephone	Urban	1000	July 19 – August 4
Turkey	Bengi Ozboyaci	bengi.ozboyaci@tns-global.com	TNS Piar	Face-to-face	National	2045	July 13 – August 15
UK	Emma Dolby	emma.dolby@tns-global.com	TNS	Telephone	National	1025	July 28 – July 30
Ukraine	Alla Vlasyuk	Alla.vlasyuk@tnsofres.com.ua	TNS Ukraine	Face-to-face	National	1200	August 2 – August 9
USA	Thomas Daniels Joe Vogt	thomas.daniels@tns-global.com Joe.vogt @tns-global.com	TNS NA	Online Interactive	National	1022	August 7 – August 15
Venezuela	Romel Romero	romel@sigmados-international.com	Sigma Dos Venezuela	Face-to-face	Urban	1000	August 9 – August 16

\*These are not Members of Gallup International Association but reliable companies that we have worked with in these countries.

\*\*Transparency International contact.

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 – Report  
**Annex IV Methodological note**

The TI Global Corruption Barometer 2006 is a worldwide public opinion survey conducted for TI by Gallup International with 59,661 respondents. The Barometer 2006 consists of a set of five questions included in the Voice of the People survey 2006. The TI Global Corruption Barometer has been conducted annually since 2002.

**Coverage**

Overall, the Voice of the People survey was conducted in 63 countries. However, in Italy, question 5 was omitted from the survey.

**Timing of fieldwork**

The fieldwork for the survey was conducted between June and September 2006.

**Demographic variables**

The demographic variables, Age, Education, Household income, Education, Employment, and Religion were recoded from their original form in the survey by Gallup International.

**Sampling**

The sample type is mostly national, but in some countries it is urban only. It should be underlined that in global terms the findings are quite heavily based on urban populations. In most of the countries the sampling method is based on quota sampling, using sex/age/socioeconomic condition/regional/urban balances as variables. In some countries random sampling has been done.

The interviews were conducted either face to face, using self-administered questionnaires, by telephone or internet (mostly in developed countries) with male and female respondents, aged 15+ .

**Weighting**

Sample imbalances in the data within a country (e.g. slight corrections to the proportions of age groups, sex, etc.) have been weighted first in order to provide a representative sample of the national population (or a representative sample of the stated universe, if this is not a total population sample). Subsequently, each country has been weighted to its relevant population (universe). For example, countries where only the urban population was interviewed were weighted up to a total urban population.

**Data coding, quality check and analysis**

The data coding and quality check, as well as preliminary analysis, was done by Gallup International.

The full report of the TI Global Corruption Barometer 2006 was completed by the Robin Hodess and Tom Lavers of the Policy and Research Department at the International Secretariat of TI. Professor Richard Rose of Aberdeen University, a member of TI's Index Advisory Committee, also contributed advice on the Barometer data.

A standard margin of error for the survey is +/- 4.