



Report on the Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007

**Release date: 6 December 2007
Policy and Research Department
Transparency International – International Secretariat
Alt Moabit 96
10559 Berlin, Germany
Tel: + 49-30-34 38 200
Fax: +49-30-34 70 39 12**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – GLOBAL CORRUPTION BAROMETER 2007.....	2
PAYING BRIBES AROUND THE WORLD CONTINUES TO BE ALL TOO COMMON	3
Figure 1. Demands for bribery, by region	3
Table 1. Countries most affected by bribery	4
Figure 2. Experience of bribery worldwide, selected services	5
Table 2. Percentage of respondents reporting that they paid a bribe to obtain a service	5
Figure 3. Experience with bribery, by service	6
Figure 4. Selected Services: Percentage of respondents who paid a bribe, by region	7
Figure 5. Comparing Bribery: 2006 and 2007	8
CORRUPTION IN KEY INSTITUTIONS: POLITICAL PARTIES AND THE LEGISLATURE VIEWED AS MOST CORRUPT	8
Figure 6. Perceived levels of corruption in key institutions, worldwide	9
Figure 7. Perceived levels of corruption in key institutions, comparing 2004 and 2007	10
EXPERIENCE V. PERCEPTIONS OF CORRUPTION – DO THEY ALIGN?.....	10
Figure 8. Corruption Perceptions Index v. citizens' experience with bribery	11
LEVELS OF CORRUPTION EXPECTED TO RISE OVER THE NEXT THREE YEARS....	11
Figure 9. Corruption will get worse, worldwide	11
Figure 10. Expectations about the future: Comparing 2003 and 2007	12
PUBLIC SCEPTICISM OF GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO FIGHT CORRUPTION – IN MOST PLACES	13
Table 3. How effectively is government fighting corruption? The country view	13
CONCLUSIONS	13
APPENDIX 1: THE GLOBAL CORRUPTION BAROMETER 2007 QUESTIONNAIRE	15
APPENDIX 2: THE GLOBAL CORRUPTION BAROMETER – ABOUT THE SURVEY	17
APPENDIX 3: REGIONAL GROUPINGS.....	20
GLOBAL CORRUPTION BAROMETER 2007	20
APPENDIX 4: COUNTRY TABLES.....	21
Table 4.1: Respondents who paid a bribe to obtain services	21
Table 4.2: Corruption's impact on different sectors and institutions	22
Table 4.3: Views of corruption in the future	23
Table 4.4: Respondents' evaluation of their government's efforts to fight corruption	24

Executive Summary – Global Corruption Barometer 2007

After years of analytical work by Transparency International (TI) and others, there remains no doubt about the harmful effect of corruption on people's welfare. With the Global Corruption Barometer, TI goes one step further by evaluating how and where ordinary people feel corruption's impact. The Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer (the Barometer) is a public opinion survey that has been administered around the world each year since 2003. The Barometer explores how corruption affects the daily lives of ordinary citizens, asking about the general public's attitudes toward corruption, the extent to which they believe corruption pervades public institutions, their experience with petty bribery and their sense of how the fight against corruption will fare in the future.¹

The Global Corruption Barometer 2007 interviewed 63,199 people in 60 countries and territories between June and September 2007.² The Barometer survey was carried out on behalf of Transparency International by Gallup International Association as part of its Voice of the People Survey.³ The Global Corruption Barometer 2007 covers seven countries not included in the 2006 edition: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Ecuador, Ghana, Ireland, Lithuania and Vietnam.⁴

Key findings in the Global Corruption Barometer 2007 are:

- The poor, whether in developing or highly industrialised countries, are the most penalised by corruption. They are also more pessimistic about the prospects for less corruption in the future.
- About 1 in 10 people around the world had to pay a bribe in the past year; reported bribery has increased in some regions, such as Asia-Pacific and South East Europe.⁵
- Bribery is particularly widespread in interactions with the police, the judiciary and registry and permit services.
- The general public believe political parties, parliament, the police and the judicial/legal system are the most corrupt institutions in their societies.
- Half of those interviewed – and significantly more than four years ago – expect corruption in their country to increase in the next three years, with some African countries the exception.
- Half of those interviewed also think that their government's efforts to fight corruption are ineffective.

¹ See Appendix 1 for the Global Corruption Barometer 2007 questionnaire.

² See Appendix 2 for the methodological description of the survey.

³ The Barometer 2007 questionnaire was also carried out by TI in special surveys in Armenia, Cambodia, Georgia and Lithuania. However, due to timing issues, only results from Cambodia and Lithuania can be included in this report. We expect the results from Armenia and Georgia to be available in the coming months.


⁴ Countries not included by Gallup International in the June-September 2007 edition of the Voice of the People Survey, and therefore that cannot be included in the Global Corruption Barometer 2007, but that were included in the Barometer 2006, are Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Fiji, Gabon, Israel, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Paraguay and Taiwan.

⁵ 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. The groupings used in this report can be seen in Appendix 3.

Paying bribes around the world continues to be all too common

The Global Corruption Barometer 2007 explores experiences of households with petty bribery. On average, more than one in ten of those interviewed had to pay a bribe in the past year to obtain a service. The reported experience of bribery is very different for people living in different places of the world, however (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Demands for bribery, by region



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Percentages are weighted and calculated for those respondents who came in contact with the services listed. Thin lines indicate confidence intervals at 95%.

Countries most affected by petty bribery include Albania, Cameroon, FYR Macedonia, Kosovo, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania and Senegal. Table 1 below groups countries in quintiles based on reported bribery for services. (See also Table 4.1 in Appendix 4.)

Table 1. Countries most affected by bribery⁶

	Quintile	Countries/Territories
% of respondents reporting they paid a bribe to obtain a service	Top quintile: More than 32%	Albania, Cambodia, Cameroon, FYR Macedonia, Kosovo, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Senegal
	Second quintile: 18 – 32%	Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Greece, India, Indonesia, Lithuania, Moldova, Peru, Serbia, Ukraine
	Third quintile: 6 – 18%	Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Panama, Russia, Turkey, Venezuela, Vietnam
	Fourth quintile: 2 – 6%	Argentina, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Finland, Hong Kong, Ireland, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom, United States
	Bottom quintile: Less than 2%	Austria, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Japan, South Korea, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007.


Bribery: the poor must pay most of all

The Barometer 2007 found that respondents from low and middle income brackets are hit the hardest by petty bribery, as they are more likely than those from a high income bracket to pay bribes when seeking key services⁷ (Figure 2). This result holds true regardless of whether respondents were from richer or poorer countries: those who earn less must pay more often all over the world.

⁶ Due to problems with data, results for Colombia, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, Norway, Poland, Thailand, and Singapore could not be used. In Germany and Italy this question was not asked.

⁷ The regressiveness of bribery was tested by estimating a probit model that explains the probability of a household paying a bribe by the demographic characteristics of the respondent (gender, age, religion and education), income category and fixed regional effects. Even though the overall explanatory power of the model is low (Pseudo R-Squared=0.1286), the coefficient of the income variable is negative and significant (p<0.05) which indicates that high income citizens have a lower probability of paying a bribe to obtain a service.

Figure 2. Experience of bribery worldwide, selected services



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Thin lines indicate confidence intervals at 95%. Percentages are weighted. Services listed are among those reported by respondents to be most affected by bribery.

According to the Barometer 2007, women were less likely to pay a bribe than men. This does not mean that women are less corrupt than men, per se. Men reported more contact with institutions and services, such as the police and judiciary, where demands for bribery are more likely to occur.

The Barometer 2007 results also show that younger people are more likely to pay bribes than older people. Exploring the relationship between respondents' age and experience with bribery reveals that while 18 percent of those under 30 years old paid a bribe when asked, only 4 percent of citizens over age 65 did the same. This difference can be explained by the fact that older citizens rarely reported contact with agencies, such as the police or the judiciary, where demands for bribes were most prevalent. Overall, the Barometer 2007 findings show a decreased likelihood to bribe corresponding to an increase in age (Table 2).

Table 2. Percentage of respondents reporting that they paid a bribe to obtain a service

Age Group	% of respondents who paid a bribe
Total Sample	13%
Under 30	18%
30 - 50	13%
51 - 65	8%
65 +	4%

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Percentages are weighted and calculated for respondents who came in contact with services.


Police is the public institution reported as most affected by petty bribery

In the Global Corruption Barometer 2007, the general public was asked whether a bribe was demanded from them when they had contact with key public services such as the education sector, the health system, the judiciary and legal system, the police, registry and permit services, tax authorities or a number of utility providers – telephone, electricity, water and gas.

Out of the eleven services, citizens reported that contact with the police far and away involves the biggest bribery problem. One in every four citizens around the world who had contact with the police was asked to pay a bribe – and one of every six citizens reported that they ended up paying such a bribe. Bribery is also reported to be a considerable problem for the judiciary, registry and permit services, education and medical services as well as electricity providers.

The fact that the judiciary emerges as the sector, after the police, most affected by bribery casts serious doubts about citizens being guaranteed their democratic right to equal access to courts. Institutions such as the judiciary and the police are in charge of sanctioning corruption-related acts – if they are beset by bribery, as the Barometer 2007 indicates, then the very enforcement mechanisms that are crucial for effective anti-corruption efforts are hindered, and public trust is undermined.

The Barometer 2007 indicates that petty corruption is significantly less of a problem for services such as tax revenue authorities, as well as for water, gas and telephone providers⁸ (Figure 3).




⁸ These three groups have been defined by cluster analysis, and are reflected in Figure 3.

Different regions, different bribery challenges

Although the police is the institution most affected by bribery in five out of the seven regions (Africa, Asia-Pacific, NIS, Latin America and South East Europe), a closer look at these results uncovers substantial regional differences. Firstly, countries in the EU+ region report that out of the 11 services, **medical services** stand out as the most affected by bribery. Secondly, petty corruption is a serious problem in the **judiciary** for countries from Latin America, Asia-Pacific and North America. Finally, bribery in the **education and health sectors**, two of the most important sectors for human development, is a serious problem in Africa and NIS (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Selected Services: Percentage of respondents who paid a bribe, by region




Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Percentages are weighted and calculated for respondents who came in contact with the services listed.

Petty bribery – is it growing?

Between 2006 and 2007 the proportion of citizens who reported paying bribes to obtain a service remained the same, around 12 percent.⁹ However there has been a marked increase in bribe paying in countries from the Asia-Pacific and South East Europe regions. In Africa and Latin America there has been a slight reduction in the percentage of respondents reporting having paid a bribe to obtain a service (Figure 5).

⁹ Time comparisons in this report are made only for countries included in both editions of the Global Corruption Barometer (in this case 2006 and 2007) being compared.

Figure 5. Comparing Bribery: 2006 and 2007



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2006 and 2007. Percentages are weighted and calculated for respondents who came in contact with services.

Corruption in key institutions: Political parties and the legislature viewed as most corrupt


As in past editions, the Barometer 2007 also examines the extent to which people *perceive* that corruption affects key public sectors and institutions in their country – as opposed to their direct experience of bribery, explored above.

Political parties and the legislative branch – meaning parliament and congress – are perceived by people around the world to be the institutions most tainted by corruption. In addition, the police stood out as significantly more affected by corruption than other institutions and service sectors. On the more positive side, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), religious bodies and the military lead the group of institutions perceived by citizens to be the least affected by corruption¹⁰ (Figure 6). These findings are in line with past editions of the Global Corruption Barometer.

Perceptions about levels of corruption can influence the public’s dealings with these institutions, undermine effective support and create a disconnect between those governing and those governed. In the case of institutions with which the public has direct contact, perceptions of endemic corruption create 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.

¹⁰ Institutions/services were divided into three different groups using cluster analysis...

Figure 6. Perceived levels of corruption in key institutions, worldwide




Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Percentages are weighted.

Numerous differences emerge in the public's view of corruption in institutions across countries. Political parties are considered to be corrupt by more than four in five respondents in Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Bolivia, Cameroon, India, Japan, Panama and Nigeria – but by fewer than two in five in Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Singapore. Likewise, while more than four in five respondents in Cameroon, Ghana, India and Nigeria consider the police to be corrupt, fewer than two in five in Denmark, Germany, Finland, Singapore, Sweden and Switzerland report the same. (See Table 4.2 in Appendix 4.)

In general, citizens' perceptions about corruption in key institutions have not changed dramatically over the past four years. But opinion about some institutions, such as the private sector, has deteriorated over time. This means that the public now has more critical views of the role of business in the corruption equation than it did in the past. Comparing 2004 and 2007 data, more people around the world also consider non-governmental organisations to be corrupt. In contrast, the proportion of people around the world who consider the judiciary, parliament, the police, tax revenue authorities and medical and education services to be corrupt has decreased somewhat in the past four years (Figure 7).

Figure 7. Perceived levels of corruption in key institutions, comparing 2004 and 2007



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2004 and 2007. Percentages are weighted and represent percentage of respondents reporting that the institutions are considered corrupt or extremely corrupt.

Experience v. perceptions of corruption – do they align?


The experience and perceptions of corruption reported by the general public in the Barometer correspond to a great extent. According to this year’s results, there is a strong link between people’s perception of corruption in key services and their experience with bribery when coming in contact with the same services.¹¹ The more likely the average citizen is to be confronted with bribery in a particular institution, the more they will indicate they believe corruption affects that institution. For example, police are most frequently reported as the institution demanding bribes, and they are also viewed as highly corrupt around the world.

Moreover, the Barometer 2007 findings also show a strong correlation between citizens’ experiences with bribery and experts’ perceptions of corruption. Figure 8 shows the link between the general public’s experiences, gathered in the Global Corruption Barometer 2007, and experts’ views, as captured in TI’s Corruption Perceptions Index 2007. The results are clear: in those countries where business people, country analysts and experts perceive corruption to be widespread, a higher proportion of citizens are paying bribes to obtain a service.¹² This suggests that expert opinion is aligned with citizens’ experiences in terms of public sector corruption.

¹¹ The correlation coefficient between the percentage of respondents reporting they paid a bribe to the judiciary, the police, the registry and permit services, utilities, tax authorities, and medical and education services and the percentage of respondents considering these services as corrupt is 0.47 (p<0.01).

¹² The correlation coefficient between the CPI 2007 and percentage of citizens paying bribes is -0.66 (p<0.01).

Figure 8. Corruption Perceptions Index v. citizens' experience with bribery




Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007 and Corruption Perceptions Index 2007. Each dot represents a country.

Levels of corruption expected to rise over the next three years

More than half of the citizens polled around the world expect the level of corruption to increase to some degree over the next three years. Only one in every five respondents expected the level of corruption to decrease in the near future, while one in four expect the level of corruption to be the same (Figure 9).

Figure 9. Corruption will get worse, worldwide

% of respondents reporting that in three years corruption will...



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Percentages are weighted.


Among the most pessimistic countries are India, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Netherlands and the United Kingdom, where more than 70 percent of the respondents expect the level of corruption to increase in the coming three years. In contrast, interviewees in Ghana, FYR Macedonia, Kosovo and Nigeria are more optimistic – with more than 45 percent expecting corruption to decrease in the next three years (Table 4.1 in Appendix 4).

Detailed analysis reveals that women are slightly more pessimistic than men about future levels of corruption. Income levels are also a significant factor: low income citizens are more pessimistic than high income citizens, with three in five low income citizens expressing the view that corruption will increase, as compared to one in two high income citizens.

A discouraging finding is that public expectations about the extent of corruption in the future have become gloomier over time. In 2003, 43 percent of all interviewees expected corruption to increase in the next three years, but in 2007 this increased to 54 percent. As Figure 10 shows, however, important differences emerge when analysing trends by region.

In Africa people seem to be more optimistic now than they were five years ago: in 2007, three in ten Africans polled expect corruption levels to increase; in 2003, substantially more – five in ten – expected the same. This pattern is also true for South East Europe and the NIS, although less marked. On the contrary, in the Asia-Pacific region, people’s expectations have substantially deteriorated. In 2003, just three out of ten expected corruption in their countries to increase. By 2007 a full six out of ten in Asia-Pacific countries expect that corruption levels will be worse in the future. Likewise, in comparison to 2003, a bigger proportion of citizens in Latin America and the EU+ now expect that corruption will increase in their country in the near future.

Figure 10. Expectations about the future: Comparing 2003 and 2007



Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2003 and 2007. Percentages are weighted.

Public scepticism of government efforts to fight corruption – in most places

Citizens around the world are critical about the effectiveness of their government’s efforts to fight corruption. One in two citizens around the world thinks that their government is not doing a good job fighting corruption. Only one in three believes the opposite – that government efforts are effective. A closer look reveals that the greatest differences emerge between countries. Table 3 lists countries where respondents believe their government’s efforts to fight corruption are most and least effective.

Table 3. How effectively is government fighting corruption? The country view

Countries who believe government efforts to fight corruption are most effective	Countries who believe government efforts to fight corruption are least effective
Colombia	Albania
Dominican Republic	Argentina
Ecuador	Bulgaria
FYR Macedonia	Czech Republic
Ghana	Iceland
Hong Kong	Japan
Ireland	Lithuania
Malaysia	Norway
Nigeria	Peru
Singapore	Russia
Turkey	Ukraine
	United States

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Countries were sorted in quintiles based on responses from 1 (very effective) to 5 (very ineffective). Countries listed belong to the top and bottom quintile. For the complete list of country results see Table 4.4 in Appendix 4.

On average, all regions except Africa are very sceptical about the effectiveness of their government’s actions against corruption. In Africa, however, Ghana and Nigeria are very positive and dominate this result; Cameroon, South Africa and Senegal are more critical of government efforts. North Americans and EU+ citizens report very negatively on government efforts, while at the same time they are the least likely to have to make petty bribes themselves. This suggests that citizens there may be concerned about problems of grand corruption and state capture. In addition, in North America and the EU+ relatively few governments have explicit anti-corruption strategies or policies, meaning that there may be little generalised attention to anti-corruption efforts in the public domain. Criticism of government efforts in the Asia-Pacific region might be linked to the fact that more citizens there report involvement in petty bribery as compared to last year.

Conclusions

The findings of the Global Corruption Barometer 2007 offer clear evidence that corruption affects ordinary people everywhere regardless of where they live or what they earn. The poorest in all societies are the ones hit the hardest by bribery, however, as they face the most demands for bribes and they are more likely to pay. This in turn means that corruption acts as a regressive tax that increases income inequality. Denied their basic rights and free access to public services, the poor suffer most in corrupt environments. Their pessimism about prospects for corruption being reduced in the future is another sign of disenfranchisement.

The Global Corruption Barometer 2007 shows that the general public continues to view parliaments and political parties as the institutions most tainted by corruption around the world, while the direct experience of those polled points to highest levels of bribery in the police and the judiciary. The result is that key institutions in society, in particular institutions central to the integrity and accountability of government, are compromised. There can be little doubt that corruption undermines the legitimacy of government and those who govern in many countries.

The Barometer 2007 also sheds light on a discouraging fact: relative to 2006, petty bribery has not lessened, but indeed has increased in several countries around the globe. This climate of extortion undermines efforts to root out corruption – as well as public hope that the situation can improve in the future.

Worldwide, the general consensus is that government efforts to stop corruption are not effective and that corruption will increase in the near future. The results of the Global Corruption Barometer 2007 show that governments need to work harder to clean up basic services and to prove to their constituencies that they are committed to fighting corruption in word and deed. But governments are not the only group responsible for making anti-corruption initiatives effective. All anti-corruption stakeholders, whether in government, in the private sector or in civil society, must redouble efforts to make progress and demonstrate results in the struggle against malfeasance and graft.

The Global Corruption Barometer 2007 reveals that views and experiences of corruption among ordinary people vary, as corruption has many faces around the world. Anti-corruption strategies need to reflect these crucial differences at country level, matching solutions to local concerns and problems. It is urgent that anti-corruption reforms create results that have real impact on people's lives and that offer people a future where corruption no longer robs them of opportunities – or hope.

Appendix 1: The Global Corruption Barometer 2007 Questionnaire

Now 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. Do you expect the level of corruption in the next 3 years in this country to change? Will it: **READ OUT – SINGLE CODE**

Increase a lot	1
Increase a little	2
Stay the same DO NOT READ OUT	3
Decrease a little	4
Decrease a lot	5
Don't know/no response	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 somewhat effective in the fight against corruption	2
The government is neither effective nor ineffective in the fight against corruption DO NOT READ OUT	3
The government is somewhat ineffective in the fight against corruption	4
The government is very ineffective in the fight against corruption	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 CODE 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
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

4. 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 CODE FOR EACH**
INTERVIEWER: Living in household = people included in your house e.g. parents, children, etc

ASK FOR EACH INSTITUTION MENTIONED WITH CODE 1 (YES) IN Q6 IF NONE MENTIONED, GO TO Q7.1

4.1 In the past 12 months have you or anyone living in your household been requested a bribe from someone in the following institution/ organization?

ASK FOR EACH INSTITUTION MENTIONED WITH CODE 1 (YES) IN Q6

4.2 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?

A4

4.3. 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 - IF CANNOT SPECIFY AMOUNT LEAVE IT BLANK

Sectors	Q4				Q4.1				Q4.2				Q4.3
	Had a contact				Was requested to pay a bribe				Paid a bribe				cost of last bribe ¹³
	YES	NO	DK	NA	YES	NO	DK	NA	YES	NO	DK	NA	Col
Education system	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	
Legal system	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	
Judiciary	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	
Medical services	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	
Police	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	
Registry and permit services (civil registry for birth, marriage, licenses, permits, land and property ownership and transfer of ownership)	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	
Telephone	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	
Electricity Provider	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	
Water Service Provider	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	
Gas Provider	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	
Tax revenue	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	

¹³ Although the Global Corruption Barometer 2007 questionnaire included a question on the cost of the last bribe paid, the data collected did not enable statistically robust conclusions to be reached and was therefore not included in this report.

Appendix 2: The Global Corruption Barometer – About the Survey

The Global Corruption Barometer is a public opinion survey that assesses the general public's perceptions of corruption and experience with bribery. In most of the countries evaluated, the survey is carried out on behalf of Transparency International by Gallup International as part of its Voice of the People Survey. In other countries, TI commissions polling organisations to run the survey specifically for the Barometer. The TI Global Corruption Barometer 2007 includes 63,199 respondents.

Coverage

Overall, the Voice of the People survey was conducted in 60 countries. However, in some countries some of the questions were omitted from the survey (e.g. in Germany and Italy, question 6 was omitted from the survey). Moreover, not all questions were asked in Vietnam and problems in the coding of responses for Colombia, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, Norway, Poland, Thailand and Singapore prevented us from using some data.

Timing of fieldwork

The fieldwork for the survey was conducted between June and September 2007.

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 2007 was completed by Robin Hodess and Juanita Riaño 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.

For further information on any individual country results, please see contact information below:

Country	Contact	E-mail	Company	Mode	Sample Type	Size	Fieldwork Dates
Albania	Maria Dede	maridede@albn.net	TNS Index Albania GI	Face-to-face	National	1000	August 8 – August 17
Argentina	Constanza Cilley	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	804	July 12 – August 13
Bolivia	Luis Alberto Quiroga Arce	proyectos@encuestas-estudios.com	Encuestas & Estudios	Face-to-face	Urban	1364	June 26 – July 31

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007 – Report

Bosnia and Herzegovina	Aida Hadziavdic-Begovic	aida.hadziavdic@mib.ba	Mareco Index Bosnia	Telephone	National	500	June 7 – June 15
Bulgaria	Marin Stoychev	m.stoychev@gallup-bbss.com	TNS BBSS Gallup International	Face-to-face	National	1016	June 25 – July 7
Cambodia	Kay Engelhardt	kay.engelhardt@tns-global.com	TNS Vietnam	Face-to-face	National	1016	September 16-September 28
Cameroon	Placide Yaptie	pyaptie@rms-international.net	RMS Cameroon	Face-to-face	Douala & Yaoundé	519	August 15 – August 20
Canada	Diane Rousseau	drousseau@legermarketing.com	Leger Marketing	Telephone	National	1007	July 4 – July 20
Colombia	Cristina Querubin	cquerubin@cncol.com	Centro Nacional de Consultoria	Telephone	Urban	600	July 9 - July 16
Croatia	Mirna Cvitan	Mirna.cvitan@puls.hr	PULS d.o.o.	Face-to-face	National	1000	August 2–August 19
Czech Republic	Jan Trojacek	trojacek@mareco.cz	Mareco s.r.o.	Face-to-face	National	1000	June 6 – June 16
Denmark	Jens Daugaard	Jens.Daugaard@tns-gallup.dk	TNS Gallup	CAWI	National	1118	June 20 – June 26
Dominican* Republic	Leonard Kemp	l.kemp@sigmados-international.com	SIGMA DOS	Face-to-face	Urban	471	August 8 - August 14
Finland	Mirva Väyrynen	mirva.vayrynen@tns-gallup.fi	TNS Gallup	Online panel	National	1154	June 8 – June 13
France	Marc-André Allard	marc-andre.allard@tns-sofres.com	TNS Sofres	Face-to-face	National	1000	July 25- July 28
Germany	Johannes Huxoll	johannes.huxoll@tns-ernid.com	TNS Emnid	Telephone	National	500	August 24 – August 25
Ghana	Dinesh Kithany	dkithany@rms-africa.com	RMSI Ghana	Face-to-face	National	2003	July 11 – July 23
Greece	Ero Papadopoulou	ero.papadopoulou@tnsicap.gr	TNS ICAP	Telephone	Urban	1000	July 12 – August 6
Guatemala	Edgar Estr	edgarest@gmail.com	Multivex-Sigma Dos Guatemala	Face-to-face	Urban	500	September 14 – September 17
Hong Kong	Winnie Yiu	winnie.yiu@tns-global.com	TNS	Online panel	National	1006	August 2 – August 14
Iceland	Gudbjorg Andrea Jonsdottir	gudbjorg.andrea.jonsdottir@capacent.is	Capacent Gallup	Net panel	National	1081	July 3 – July 25
India	Suvigya Rathi	suvigya.rathi@tns-global.com	TNS India	Face-to-face	Urban	1069	July 16 – July 27
Indonesia	Widya Ria Kencana	Widya.Kencana@tns-global.com	TNS Indonesia	Face-to-face	Urban	1010	August 4–August 21
Ireland	Jon Coll	jon.coll@tns-global.com	TNS mrbi	Telephone	National	1020	June 10 – June 19
Italy	Paolo Colombo	paolo.colombo@doxa.it	Doxa s.p.a	Telephone	National	1000	July 12 – July 16
Japan	Kiyoshi Nishimura	nisimura@nrc.co.jp	Nippon Research Center, Ltd.	Combination of “face-to-face” and “self-administered questionnaire”	National	1200	August 1–August 13
Kosovo* (UN Administration)	Assen Blagoev	a.blagoev@gallup-bbss.com	BBSS-Index Kosovo	Face-to-face	Albanian plus population	504	August 11–August 16
Lithuania*	Vladas Gaidys	vladas@vilmorus.lt	Vilmorus	Face-to-face	National	1001	September 6 – September 9
Luxembourg	Louis Mevis	Louis.mevis@tns-ilres.com	TNS ILRES	Online Panel	National	504	August 2 – August 7
Macedonia	Ivana Ivanovic	office@brima-gallup.com.mk	BRIMA	Face-to-face	National	1141	July 2 – July 11
Malaysia	Bee Yoke Yang	BeeYoke.Yang@tns-global.com	TNS Malaysia	Face-to-face	Peninsula Malaysia Urban	1250	July 2 – August 5
Moldova*	Jigau Ion	office@cbs-axa.org cbs_axa@yahoo.com	Joint venture “CBS AXA” Ltd	Face-to-face	National	1237	August 1 – August 15
Netherlands	Dagmar Strikwerda	Dagmar.strikwerda@tns-nipo.com	TNS Nipo	CASI	National	1009	August 11 – August 23
Nigeria	Femi Laoye	olaoye@rms-africa.com	RMS	Face-to-face	National	5017	July 12 – July 25

Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007 – Report

Norway	Elise Wedde	elise.wedde@tns-gallup.no	TNS Gallup Norway	Web Interviews	Nationally representative of Internet-population	1006	August 17- August 29
Pakistan	Fatima, Idrees	fatima.idrees@gallup.com.pk	Gallup Pakistan	Face-to-face	National	1013	June 25 – July 5
Panama*	Max Del Cid	psmcorre@cwpanama.net	PSM SIGMA DOS PANAMA	Telephone	Urban	685	July 25 – August 18
Peru	Gustavo Yrala	gyrala@datum.com.pe	DATUM Internacional S.A.	Face-to-face	National	1133	August 3 – August 7
Philippines	Raymund Pascua	raymund.pascua@asiaresearch.com.ph	Asia Research Organization Inc.	Face-to-face	National	1000	July 17 – August 12
Poland	Marek Fudala	marek.fudala@mareco.pl	Mareco Polska	Face-to-face	Urban	1048	August 27 – August 31
Portugal	Ana Paraiba	ana.paraiba@tns-global.com	TNS Euroteste	Telephone	National	1000	July 4 - July 17
Romania	Janina Stancicu	janina.stancicu@csop.ro	TNS - CSOP	Face-to-face	National	1054	June 25 – July 2
Russia	Victor Pratushevich	Pratushevich.V@rmh.ru	Romir Monitoring	Face-to-face	National	1573	June 15 – June 21
Senegal*	Erickman TOGNA	etogna@rms-international.net	RMS-Senegal	Face-to-face	Urban	507	June 22 – June 25
Serbia	Sladjana Brakus	sladjana@tnsmediumgallup.co.yu	TNS Medium Gallup	Face-to-face	National	1003	June 13 - June 19
Singapore	Jasmine Yang	Jasmine.Yang@tns-global.com	TNS Singapore Pte.Ltd.	Telephone	National	1020	July 18 – August 21
South Africa	Mari Harris	marih@markinor.co.za	Markinor	Telephone	National	1496	August 2– August 7
South Korea	Hwanhee Lee	hhlee@gallup.co.kr	Gallup Korea	Face-to-face	National	1001	June 5- June 19
Spain	Josefina Fernández	josefinaf@sigmados.com	Sigma Dos	Telephone	National	1000	June 1 – August 10
Sweden	Matz Johansson	matz.johansson@tns-gallup.se	TNS Gallup AB	Online interviews	National	1000	August 14 – August 20
Switzerland	Nadja Mueller	nadja.mueller@isopublic.ch	ISOPUBLIC AG	Face-to-face	National	1037	July/ – August
Thailand	Tippayarat Wudhiprecha	tippayarat.wudhiprecha@tns-global.com	TNS	Telephone	National	500	August 18 – August 29
Turkey	Bengi Ozboyaci	bengi.ozboyaci@tns-global.com	TNS Piar	Face-to-face	National	2015	June 7– July 4
UK	Emma Dolby	emma.dolby@tns-global.com	TNS	Telephone	National	1000	August 24 – August 26
Ukraine	Alla Vlasjuk	Alla.vlasjuk@tnsofres.com.ua	TNS Ukraine	Face-to-face	National	1200	May 31 – June 7
USA	Joe Vogt	Joe.vogt@tns-global.com	TNS	Online	National	1019	August 2 – August 16
Venezuela	Romel Romero	romel@sigmados-international.com	Sigma Dos Venezuela	Face-to-face	Urban	1058	August 18 – September 11

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

Appendix 3: Regional Groupings

Global Corruption Barometer 2007

Africa: Cameroon; Ghana; Nigeria; Senegal; and South Africa.

Asia-Pacific: Cambodia; Hong Kong; India; Indonesia; Japan; Korea, south; Malaysia; Pakistan; Philippines; Singapore; Thailand; and Vietnam.

EU+: Austria; Bulgaria; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Greece; Iceland; Ireland; Italy; Lithuania; Luxembourg; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Romania; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; and United Kingdom.

Latin America: Argentina; Bolivia; Colombia; Dominican Republic; Ecuador; Guatemala; Panama; Peru; and Venezuela.

Newly Independent States (NIS): Moldova; Russia; and Ukraine.

North America: Canada and United States.

South East Europe: Albania; Bosnia-Herzegovina; Croatia; FYR Macedonia; Kosovo; Serbia; and Turkey.

Appendix 4: Country Tables

Table 4.1: Respondents who paid a bribe to obtain services

Country/Territory	Percentage of respondents who paid a bribe
Total Sample	13%
Africa	42%
Cameroon	79%
Ghana	*
Nigeria	40%
Senegal	38%
South Africa	3%
Asia Pacific	22%
Cambodia	72%
Hong Kong	3%
India	25%
Indonesia	31%
Japan	1%
Korea, south	1%
Malaysia	6%
Pakistan	44%
Philippines	32%
Singapore	*
Thailand	*
Vietnam	14%
EU+	5%
Austria	1%
Bulgaria	7%
Czech Republic	13%
Denmark	2%
Finland	2%
France	1%
Germany	**
Greece	27%
Iceland	1%
Ireland	2%
Italy	**
Lithuania	29%
Luxembourg	6%
Netherlands	2%
Norway	*
Poland	*
Portugal	2%
Romania	33%
Spain	3%
Sweden	1%
Switzerland	1%
United Kingdom	2%
Latin America	13%
Argentina	5%
Bolivia	27%
Colombia	*
Dominican Republic	28%
Ecuador	*
Guatemala	*
Panama	13%
Peru	18%
Venezuela	12%
NIS	21%
Moldova	30%
Russia	17%
Ukraine	30%
North America	2%
Canada	1%
United States	2%
South East Europe	12%
Albania	71%
Bosnia-Herzegovina	5%
Croatia	8%
Kosovo	67%
FYR Macedonia	44%
Serbia	21%
Turkey	6%

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Percentages are weighted and calculated for respondents who came in contact with services.

* Due to problems with data, results for Colombia, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, Norway, Poland, Thailand, and Singapore could not be used.

** In Germany and Italy this question was not asked.

Table 4.2: Corruption’s impact on different sectors and institutions

To what extent do you perceive the following sectors in this country/territory to be affected by corruption? (1: not all corrupt.. 5:extremely corrupt)														
	Political Parties	Parliament/ Legislature	Business/Private Sector	Media	The Military	NGOs	Religious Bodies	Education System	Legal System/Judiciary	Medical Services	Police	Registry and Permit Services	Utilities	Tax Revenue Authorities
Total Sample	4.0	3.6	3.5	3.3	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.0	3.1	3.3
Africa	4.2	3.8	3.2	3.0	3.2	2.8	2.4	3.4	3.5	3.1	4.5	3.5	3.6	3.7
Cameroon	4.2	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.6	2.5	2.5	4.0	4.3	3.9	4.6	3.4	2.8	4.3
Ghana	3.6	3.4	3.0	2.8	2.4	2.2	2.2	3.2	3.7	2.8	4.6	3.4	3.3	3.4
Nigeria	4.3	3.8	3.2	3.1	3.3	2.9	2.4	3.3	3.4	3.1	4.5	3.5	3.7	3.8
Senegal	<u>4.1</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>3.1</u>
South Africa	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.5</u>
Asia-Pacific	4.0	3.7	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.9	3.1	3.1	3.4
Cambodia	2.9	2.6	2.5	2.2	2.6	1.7	1.7	2.5	<u>3.6</u>	2.6	3.3	2.1	1.8	2.8
Hong Kong	3.2	2.7	<u>3.5</u>	3.4	2.4	3.0	2.4	2.7	2.4	3.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.2
India	<u>4.6</u>	3.9	3.4	2.5	1.8	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.8	3.3	4.5	3.7	3.3	3.4
Indonesia	4.0	4.1	3.1	2.5	3.0	2.8	2.2	3.0	4.1	<u>2.8</u>	<u>4.2</u>	3.8	3.1	3.6
Japan	<u>4.3</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.3</u>
Korea, south	4.2	4.1	3.5	3.4	3.2	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.5	3.3	3.5	2.4	2.4	3.3
Malaysia	3.6	2.8	3.0	2.5	2.2	2.3	1.9	2.2	2.7	2.2	<u>3.7</u>	3.1	2.2	2.3
Pakistan	3.9	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.6	2.7	3.0	3.5	3.4	<u>4.3</u>	3.9	3.9	4.1
Philippines	3.4	3.5	2.9	2.1	2.9	2.4	1.8	2.5	3.0	2.5	<u>3.6</u>	2.9	2.6	3.1
Singapore	2.2	2.0	<u>2.7</u>	2.4	1.9	2.7	2.4	1.9	2.1	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.9
Thailand	<u>4.2</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>3.1</u>
Vietnam			2.5	2.4		2.5	1.7			<u>3.1</u>				2.8
EU+	3.7	3.2	3.4	3.2	2.4	2.7	2.6	2.3	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.8
Austria	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.0	2.9	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.8	2.6	2.3	2.7
Bulgaria	<u>4.3</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>3.6</u>
Czech Republic	3.6	3.4	3.3	2.8	3.2	2.6	2.4	2.9	3.6	3.4	<u>3.8</u>	3.4	2.5	2.6
Denmark	3.1	2.5	3.2	3.1	2.4	2.6	<u>3.3</u>	2.3	2.0	2.5	2.2	1.9	2.5	2.2
Finland	<u>3.3</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.1</u>
France	3.7	2.9	3.5	3.4	2.1	2.4	2.5	1.9	2.6	2.3	2.8	2.2	2.3	2.6
Germany	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.1	2.4	2.8	2.5	2.2	2.5	2.8	2.3	2.0	3.1	2.3
Greece	<u>4.1</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.8</u>
Iceland	3.7	2.9	<u>3.8</u>	3.3		2.7	2.8	2.2	2.8	2.5	2.4	2.2	2.7	2.3
Ireland	3.4	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.1	2.3	2.7	2.1	2.9	2.5	2.7	2.2	2.4	2.6
Italy	4.2	3.7	3.3	3.2	2.2	2.6	2.5	2.4	3.1	3.2	2.3	3.4	2.8	3.4
Lithuania	4.0	<u>4.0</u>	3.6	3.0	2.3	2.6	2.0	2.9	3.9	3.9	3.7	2.9	2.1	2.4
Luxembourg	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.4	2.7	2.7	3.1	2.6	3.0	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.5	2.8
Netherlands	<u>3.0</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.4</u>
Norway	<u>3.0</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.2</u>
Poland	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.7	2.7	3.2
Portugal	4.1	3.6	3.6	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.4	3.2	3.2	2.6	2.8	3.6
Romania	3.9	<u>3.9</u>	3.6	2.8	2.4	2.6	2.2	3.0	3.8	3.7	3.7	2.9	2.4	2.6
Spain	3.9	3.1	3.6	3.4	2.5	2.7	2.8	2.3	3.0	2.2	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.0
Sweden	3.2	2.5	3.1	3.2	2.4	2.3	3.1	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.4	1.9
Switzerland	2.8	2.5	3.0	2.9	2.2	2.3	2.4	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.9	2.4
United Kingdom	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.7</u>
Latin America	4.1	4.1	3.5	3.2	3.5	3.0	2.8	2.9	3.9	3.1	4.0	3.5	3.3	3.5
Argentina	4.4	4.3	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.0	3.3	2.9	4.2	3.1	4.3	3.8	3.5	3.5
Bolivia	4.3	4.0	3.4	3.0	3.2	3.1	2.3	3.0	4.0	3.1	4.2	3.2	3.1	3.5
Colombia	4.0	3.9	3.2	2.9	3.3	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.1	3.2	3.4
Dominican Republic	4.2	3.6	3.1	3.0	3.8	3.3	2.1	2.4	3.7	2.7	<u>4.3</u>	3.4	3.1	3.5
Ecuador	4.6	<u>4.7</u>	3.3	3.0	3.2	2.9	2.6	3.2	4.1	3.1	4.1	3.8	3.3	3.2
Guatemala	3.9	4.0	3.4	3.1	3.8	3.4	3.0	3.2	3.8	3.2	<u>4.3</u>	3.2	3.4	3.5
Panama	<u>4.4</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.4</u>
Peru	<u>4.2</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.4</u>
Venezuela	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>3.4</u>
NIS	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.5	3.6	3.2	2.4	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.1	3.6	3.0	3.5
Moldova	3.7	3.6	3.5	2.8	2.6	2.4	2.2	3.3	3.7	3.8	4.1	3.2	2.4	3.1
Russia	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.2	2.5	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.0	3.4
Ukraine	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.2	3.1	3.2	2.3	3.8	<u>4.2</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>4.0</u>
North America	4.1	3.7	3.5	3.6	2.9	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.5	3.1	3.1	2.6	3.0	3.4
Canada	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.1	2.6	2.7	3.0	2.5	3.1	2.6	2.9	2.3	2.7	2.9
United States	<u>4.1</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.5</u>
South East Europe	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.8	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.9
Albania	3.3	3.2	2.9	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.9	3.8	4.2	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6
Bosnia-Herzegovina	<u>4.4</u>	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.8	4.0
Croatia	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.3	2.8	2.6	2.6	3.3	<u>4.3</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.4</u>
FYR Macedonia	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.1	3.4	3.2	4.3	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.7</u>
Kosovo	3.8	3.5	3.1	2.5	1.2	2.2	1.7	2.5	3.5	<u>3.8</u>	2.2	2.9	2.9	2.7
Serbia	4.0	3.6	3.7	3.5	2.9	3.5	2.6	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.6	2.7	2.6	2.9
Turkey	<u>3.7</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Figures are weighted. Shaded scores are the highest for that particular country.

Table 4.3: Views of corruption in the future

Country/Territory	Percentage of respondents who think that in the next three years corruption will...		
	Decrease	Stay the same	Increase
Total Sample	20%	26%	54%
Africa	58%	9%	33%
Cameroon	23%	12%	65%
Ghana	62%	6%	32%
Nigeria	62%	9%	29%
Senegal	17%	10%	73%
South Africa	26%	7%	67%
Asia Pacific	15%	21%	64%
Cambodia	38%	19%	43%
Hong Kong	17%	48%	34%
India	7%	4%	90%
Indonesia	22%	18%	59%
Japan	9%	30%	61%
Korea, south	34%	19%	47%
Malaysia	18%	19%	63%
Pakistan	11%	30%	59%
Philippines	19%	2%	79%
Singapore	38%	30%	32%
Thailand	25%	9%	66%
EU+	18%	24%	58%
Austria	8%	35%	57%
Bulgaria	32%	36%	32%
Czech Republic	22%	31%	47%
Denmark	5%	57%	38%
Finland	4%	53%	43%
France	23%	35%	42%
Germany	16%	15%	69%
Greece	19%	21%	59%
Iceland	7%	29%	64%
Ireland	44%	9%	47%
Italy	16%	23%	61%
Lithuania	27%	35%	37%
Luxembourg	5%	41%	54%
Netherlands	8%	19%	73%
Norway	6%	32%	62%
Poland	27%	34%	39%
Portugal	20%	16%	64%
Romania	34%	30%	36%
Spain	22%	24%	54%
Sweden	8%	33%	59%
Switzerland	7%	50%	43%
United Kingdom	15%	13%	72%
Latin America	23%	25%	52%
Argentina	12%	37%	51%
Bolivia	34%	25%	41%
Colombia	34%	13%	52%
Dominican Republic	33%	8%	59%
Ecuador	31%	16%	53%
Guatemala	11%	23%	66%
Panama	14%	21%	65%
Peru	26%	30%	44%
Venezuela	34%	21%	45%
NIS	16%	41%	44%
Moldova	16%	21%	63%
Russia	15%	40%	45%
Ukraine	18%	44%	38%
North America	7%	36%	58%
Canada	12%	39%	49%
United States	6%	35%	59%
South East Europe	26%	30%	44%
Albania	22%	61%	17%
Bosnia-Herzegovina	18%	13%	69%
Croatia	28%	32%	40%
Kosovo	52%	8%	39%
FYR Macedonia	53%	23%	25%
Serbia	32%	34%	34%
Turkey	24%	30%	46%

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Percentages are weighted.

Table 4.4: Respondents' evaluation of their government's efforts to fight corruption

Country/Territory	Percentage of respondents who think their government efforts to fight corruption are...		
	Effective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Ineffective
Total Sample	28%	18%	54%
Africa	62%	11%	27%
Cameroon	32%	7%	61%
Ghana	67%	6%	28%
Nigeria	64%	12%	23%
Senegal	33%	10%	56%
South Africa	40%	6%	54%
Asia Pacific	24%	14%	62%
Cambodia	29%	27%	44%
Hong Kong	82%	13%	4%
India	25%	7%	68%
Indonesia	37%	16%	47%
Japan	8%	17%	75%
Korea, south	24%	7%	69%
Malaysia	53%	10%	37%
Pakistan	22%	26%	52%
Philippines	35%	2%	64%
Singapore	88%	4%	7%
Thailand	42%	8%	49%
EU+	28%	12%	60%
Austria	30%	24%	46%
Bulgaria	14%	15%	72%
Czech Republic	14%	22%	64%
Denmark	34%	42%	25%
Finland	31%	26%	42%
France	37%	25%	38%
Germany	20%	3%	77%
Greece	26%	15%	59%
Iceland	18%	37%	45%
Ireland	46%	3%	52%
Italy	21%	8%	70%
Lithuania	9%	14%	77%
Luxembourg	26%	37%	37%
Netherlands	39%	11%	51%
Norway	15%	47%	38%
Poland	22%	30%	48%
Portugal	23%	13%	64%
Romania	26%	19%	55%
Spain	42%	6%	51%
Sweden	24%	33%	44%
Switzerland	35%	32%	33%
United Kingdom	34%	2%	64%
Latin America	29%	17%	54%
Argentina	15%	12%	73%
Bolivia	25%	44%	31%
Colombia	49%	10%	41%
Dominican Republic	44%	12%	45%
Ecuador	47%	14%	38%
Guatemala	24%	16%	59%
Panama	27%	26%	47%
Peru	20%	28%	53%
Venezuela	38%	30%	33%
NIS	12%	33%	54%
Moldova	37%	15%	48%
Russia	13%	37%	50%
Ukraine	8%	22%	70%
North America	19%	27%	54%
Canada	24%	15%	61%
United States	19%	28%	53%
South East Europe	44%	15%	41%
Albania	20%	53%	27%
Bosnia-Herzegovina	29%	12%	59%
Croatia	25%	13%	62%
Kosovo	34%	4%	62%
FYR Macedonia	65%	14%	21%
Serbia	27%	17%	56%
Turkey	49%	14%	37%

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2007. Percentages are weighted.