

GLOBAL CORRUPTION BAROMETER 2017 – ASIA PACIFIC

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

1. What is Transparency International's Global Corruption Barometer?
2. What kinds of questions are included?
3. Who conducts the survey and when was it carried out?
4. How were the surveys in India and China conducted?
5. Why were certain countries included/ not included in the survey?
6. How can the survey be used?
7. Can different editions of the Barometer be compared?
8. Why was the bribery module not asked in all countries?
9. How was the bribery module implemented?
10. How does the Barometer differ from Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index?
11. How was the number of bribe payers calculated?
12. How were the income categories determined for calculating rich and poor?

1. What is Transparency International's *Global Corruption Barometer*?

Transparency International's *Global Corruption Barometer* is the most extensive worldwide public opinion survey on views and experiences of corruption. For the 2016/2017 *Global Corruption Barometer*, the ninth edition, we are initially releasing the results in a series of regional reports. For this Asia Pacific report, the results are based on the responses of 21,861 people in 16 countries/ territories. The Africa, Middle East & North Africa, and Europe & Central Asia editions have already been published (please see [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#)). An Americas report and a global release will also be published in 2017.

2. What kinds of questions are included?

The *Global Corruption Barometer* asks for people's views on corruption in their country generally, how the level of corruption has changed and in which institutions the problem of corruption is most severe. It also provides a measure of people's experience of bribery in the past year across six different services. The survey asks people how well or badly they think their government has done at stopping corruption.

The 2016/2017 *Global Corruption Barometer* also includes a number of new questions. A battery of indicators asks respondents whether they have reported a corruption incident and what happened when they reported the incident. We also explore what barriers exist to reporting corruption in their country. Another module probes for details on the willingness of citizens to get involved in the fight against corruption.

The questionnaire has been reviewed by Transparency International's Index Advisory Committee of leading international experts in the field of corruption, research methodologies, econometrics and statistics.

3. Who conducts the survey and when was it carried out?

The 2016/2017 *Global Corruption Barometer* was coordinated on behalf of Transparency International by a number of survey companies. In each country, the survey was sampled and weighted to be nationally representative of all adults in the country.

The face to face surveys were organised by Effience3, Cvoter International, TNS Opinion (from September 2016 trading as Kantar Public Brussels), and Business Insights & Solutions. The face to face surveys were conducted either with Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) or Pencil and Paper interviewing (PAPI). A random probability stratified clustered sample was designed in each project country. The sample was stratified by regions and by level of urbanisation. Households were selected at random, either using a random walk, or using existing registers. The respondent was selected at random from all adults in the household.

Effience3 and Taiwan Real Survey Co organised the implementation of the survey used Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews (CATI) for countries with high landline telephone penetration. Random digital dialling was

using to randomly select households. Respondents were selected at random from all adults in the household. Both landline telephones and mobile phones were selected for interviewing. Samples were distributed across all regions in the country according to population size.

Fieldwork took place from July 2015 until January 2017. The questionnaire was translated into the local language(s) for each country.

A full description of the methodology on a country by country basis, is available on page 31 of the report.

4. How were the surveys in India and China conducted?

The surveys in India and China were conducted using the same approach as used in other countries, except a large sample size was achieved in order to allow for greater confidence in the results when analysing by demographic sub-groups due to their larger total population sizes.

In India, the total sample size was 2,802 adults. This includes a booster of 651 additional urban interviews in order to allow for greater confidence when disaggregating the data by level of urbanisation. The survey covers all states and union territories of India. The survey was translated and conducted in the following languages: Hindi, Marathi, Gujarati, Bengali, Oriya, Telugu, Tamil, Malayalam, Kannada, Assamese and Punjabi. The full methodology description is available on request.

In China, a total sample size of 4,068 was achieved. The sampling method uses the “GPS Assisted Area Sampling Method” which incorporates population as a measure of size, stratification and multi-stage PPS (Probabilities Proportional to Size). Primary sampling units were taken from the name list of all county level administrative units and the sample was distributed according to population size statistics from the Census. The full methodology description is available on request.

5. Why were certain countries included/ not included in the survey?

The *Global Corruption Barometer* aims to include as many countries as possible in the survey on the basis of where we can safely conduct the interviews, and on the basis of our available limited funding for the survey. We will aim to increase our coverage in the next round of the survey.

6. How can the survey be used?

The *Global Corruption Barometer* is a rich insight into people’s personal experience of corruption, as well as their views on the situation in their country. Policy makers can use the survey to identify public institutions and services that are seen as corrupt and where bribes are most frequently paid by citizens. This enables anticorruption policies and programmes to effectively target the most at risk services and institutions in a country. Civil society and journalists can use the survey as evidence of the views of people in a country with respect to this important issue. The data can be used to raise awareness about the impact of corruption on people in their everyday lives. It can also be used to mobilise people to get involved in stopping corruption, for example, by demonstrating popular willingness to engage personally by reporting incidences of corruption. The private sector can use the *Global Corruption Barometer* to better understand the political climate in a country and the strength of national institutions. Researchers can use the survey to explore determinants and consequences of corruption and bribery in a wide range of countries. It offers both a breadth of country coverage and some time series data for a number of important questions. The *Global Corruption Barometer* is therefore a rich and unique data source for the research community.

7. Can different editions of the Barometer be compared?

Where questions have been repeated in multiple editions, the Barometer allows direct comparisons over time to be established. After the 2013 edition of the survey, we undertook an academic review of the questionnaire. Due to that, we made a number of changes and also questions have changed from year to year, with some cycling in and out. Therefore only data for questions that have been repeated are comparable over time. Please contact the research department for further information. For previous editions of the Barometer visit:

www.transparency.org/research/qcb/

8. Why were some questions not asked in certain countries?

Transparency International was provided with data from a comparable shortened corruption module asked in China as coordinated by the Asian Barometer Surveys. The Asian Barometer surveys had data available for key questions which were comparable to the Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer module (bribery, and change in level of corruption over time). However, not all questions from the GCB module were asked in China as the survey was run independently in China.

In Mongolia, the *Global Corruption Barometer* module was included as part of a longer survey implemented by TNS Opinion. This meant that there was limited space available in the survey for the GCB module, and some questions could not be asked due to lack of space.

9. How was the bribery module implemented?

Our GCB bribery module firstly asks respondents to say whether they have had contact with any of six public services in the last 12 months. If they have had contact, they are then asked how many times if ever they needed to pay a bribe for that service in the last 12 months. In Mongolia and China the bribery rates are based on 5 public services, as 'utility services' were not asked there. In Mongolia, the questions asked about household bribery rather than individual bribe payments, as the GCB was implemented as part of a longer existing survey by TNS.

10. How does the Barometer differ from Transparency International's *Corruption Perceptions Index*?

The Barometer is a public opinion survey that offer views of the general public on corruption and its impact on their lives, including personal experience with bribes. The *Corruption Perceptions Index* (CPI) relies on the views of experts. The CPI reflects the perception of informed observers on corruption in the public sector and politics. For more information on the CPI, please see: www.transparency.org/research/cpi/

11. How was the number of bribe payers calculated?

When calculating the total number of people in the 16 countries/territories who have paid a bribe in the last 12 months, we extrapolated from the total bribery rate for each country (i.e. the percentage of all respondents in each country who paid a bribe, not controlling for contact) using the current population size estimates of adults aged 18+ in each country using the CIA factbook estimates. For South Korea the total population size is based on all adults aged 20+ in the country, as this is the age of adulthood as used for sampling in the survey. The total number of adults living in the region is estimated to be 2,635,345,537, and using the individual country bribery rates for each country, we estimate that 919,998,712 have paid a bribe. For ease of reporting we round this to over 900 million.

12. How was the income categories determined for calculating rich and poor?

The income categories were determined using subjective income questions as asked by the various survey companies in each country. The 5 point scales were grouped into 4 distinct categories ranging from those who feel very financially stable to those who feel very financially unstable.