

Response to global crises must prioritise zero tolerance for corruption

Berlin, 26 October 2010 -- With governments committing huge sums to tackle the world's most pressing problems, from the instability of financial markets to climate change and poverty, corruption remains an obstacle to achieving much needed progress, according to Transparency International's 2010 *Corruption Perceptions Index* (CPI), a measure of domestic, public sector corruption released today.

The 2010 CPI shows that nearly three quarters of the 178 countries in the index score below five, on a scale from 0 (perceived to be highly corrupt) to 10 (perceived to have low levels of corruption), indicating a serious corruption problem.

"These results signal that significantly greater efforts must go into strengthening governance across the globe. With the livelihoods of so many at stake, governments' commitments to anti-corruption, transparency and accountability must speak through their actions. Good governance is an essential part of the solution to the global policy challenges governments face today," said Huguette Labelle, Chair of Transparency International (TI).

To fully address these challenges, governments need to integrate anti-corruption measures in all spheres, from the responses to the financial crisis and climate change to commitments by the international community to eradicate poverty. For this reason TI advocates stricter implementation of the UN Convention against Corruption, the only global initiative that provides a framework for putting an end to corruption.

"Allowing corruption to continue is unacceptable; too many poor and vulnerable people continue to suffer its consequences around the world. We need to see more enforcement of existing rules and laws. There should be nowhere to hide for the corrupt or their money," said Labelle.

Corruption Perceptions Index 2010: The results

In the 2010 CPI, Denmark, New Zealand and Singapore tie for first place with scores of 9.3. Unstable governments, often with a legacy of conflict, continue to dominate the bottom rungs of the CPI. Afghanistan and Myanmar share second to last place with a score of 1.4, with Somalia coming in last with a score of 1.1.

Where source surveys for individual countries remain the same, and where there is corroboration by more than half of those sources, real changes in perceptions can be ascertained. Using these criteria, it is possible to establish an improvement in scores from 2009 to 2010 for Bhutan, Chile, Ecuador, FYR Macedonia, Gambia, Haiti, Jamaica, Kuwait, and Qatar. Similarly, a decline in scores from 2009 to 2010 can be identified for the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Madagascar, Niger and the United States.

Financial Fallout

Notable among decliners are some of the countries most affected by a financial crisis precipitated by transparency and integrity deficits. Among those improving, the general absence of OECD states underlines the fact that all nations need to bolster their good governance mechanisms.

TI's assessment of 36 industrialised countries party to the OECD anti-bribery convention, which forbids bribery of foreign officials, reveals that as many as 20 show little or no enforcement of the rules, sending the wrong signal about their commitment to curb corrupt practices. While corruption continues to plague fledgling states, hampering their efforts to build and strengthen institutions, protect human rights and improve livelihoods, corrupt international flows continue to be considerable.

"The results of this year's CPI show again that corruption is a global problem that must be addressed in global policy reforms. It is commendable that the Group of 20 in pursuing financial reform has made strong commitments to transparency and integrity ahead of their November summit in Seoul," said Labelle. "But the process of reform itself must be accelerated."

TI calls on the G20 to mandate greater government oversight and public transparency in all measures they take to reduce systemic risks and opportunities for corruption and fraud in the public as well as in the private sector.

The message is clear: across the globe, transparency and accountability are critical to restoring trust and turning back the tide of corruption. Without them, global policy solutions to many global crises are at risk.

#

Transparency International is the global civil society organisation leading the fight against corruption

Note to Editors: The CPI is a composite index, drawing on 13 different expert and business surveys. Source surveys for the 2010 CPI were conducted between January 2009 and September 2010.

Media Contact

Deborah Wise Unger

Tel: +49 30 34 38 20 662 or
+49 30 34 38 20 666

Email: press@transparency.org

This Excel-sheet presents the Corruption Perceptions Index 2010 and additional background data. For information on data and methodology please consult the press release and the methodology documentation at www.transparency.org/cpi

Country Rank	Country / Territory	CPI 2010 Score	Surveys Used	Standard Deviation	Minimum Maximum Range		90 % Confidence Interval		ADB 2009	AIDB 2009	BF 2009	EIU 2010	FH 2010	GI 2010	IMD 2009	IMD 2010	PERC 2009	PERC 2010	WB 2009	WEF 2009	WEF 2010	
					Min	Max	Lower bound	Higher bound														
					1	Denmark	9.3	6														0.2
1	New Zealand	9.3	6	0.2	8.9	9.5	9.2	9.5				8.9	9.2	9.5	9.5						9.5	9.5
1	Singapore	9.3	9	0.2	8.9	9.5	9.2	9.4		9.3	8.9	9.2	9.3	9.2	9.3	9.4					9.3	9.5
4	Finland	9.2	6	0.2	8.9	9.5	9.1	9.3				8.9	9.2	9.5	9.4						9.2	9.1
4	Sweden	9.2	6	0.2	8.9	9.5	9.1	9.4				8.9	9.2	9.2	9.3						9.5	9.4
6	Canada	8.9	6	0.3	8.4	9.2	8.7	9.0				8.9	9.2	8.9	8.8						8.4	8.9
7	Netherlands	8.8	6	0.3	8.5	9.2	8.7	9.0				8.9	9.2	9	8.9						8.6	8.5
8	Australia	8.7	8	0.6	7.5	9.2	8.3	9.0				8.9	9.2	9.2	9.1	8.4	8.9				7.5	8.3
8	Switzerland	8.7	6	0.7	7.4	9.1	8.3	9.1				8.9	7.4	9.1	9.1						8.9	9
10	Norway	8.6	6	0.7	7.4	9.3	8.1	9.0				8.9	7.4	8.1	8.4						9.1	9.3
11	Iceland	8.5	5	1.1	6.8	9.2	7.7	9.2				6.8	9.2	7.9							9.2	9.1
11	Luxembourg	8.5	5	0.6	7.4	9.0	8.0	8.9					7.4	8.6	9						9	8.4
13	Hong Kong	8.4	8	0.5	7.4	8.9	8.1	8.7				8.9	7.4	8.4	8.2	8.9	8.4				7.9	8.9
14	Ireland	8.0	6	0.5	7.4	8.9	7.7	8.3				8.9	7.4	7.9	8						7.9	8
15	Austria	7.9	6	0.7	6.8	8.9	7.4	8.4				6.8	7.4	8.1	8.9						8.4	7.9
15	Germany	7.9	6	0.6	7.2	8.9	7.5	8.3				8.9	7.4	7.5	8.1						8.1	7.2
17	Barbados	7.8	4	0.9	6.8	8.9	7.1	8.5				8.9	7.4								6.8	8.1
17	Japan	7.8	8	0.6	6.8	8.8	7.5	8.2				6.8	7.4	7.5	8.5	7.5	7.7				8.1	8.8
19	Qatar	7.7	7	1.6	4.5	9.2	6.6	8.6		4.5	6.8	9.2	8.4	8.3							9.1	7.6
20	United Kingdom	7.6	6	0.5	6.8	8.2	7.3	7.9				6.8	7.4	7.9	7.7						7.5	8.2
21	Chile	7.2	7	0.3	6.8	7.7	7.0	7.4		7	6.8	7.4	6.9	7.3							7.1	7.7
22	Belgium	7.1	6	0.2	6.8	7.4	6.9	7.2				6.8	7.4	7.1	6.9						7.1	6.9
22	United States	7.1	8	1.1	5.7	8.9	6.5	7.7				8.9	7.4	6.8	6.7	7.5	7.9				5.7	5.7
24	Uruguay	6.9	5	0.4	6.2	7.4	6.5	7.1		7	6.8	7.4									6.2	6.7
25	France	6.8	6	0.6	5.8	7.5	6.4	7.2				6.8	5.8	7.5	7.2						6.7	6.9
26	Estonia	6.5	8	0.7	5.1	7.1	6.1	6.8		7	5.1	6.8	5.8	7.1	6.8						7.1	6.3
27	Slovenia	6.4	8	0.9	5.0	7.4	5.9	6.8		6.7	6.8	6.8	7.4	6.2	5						6.9	5.2
28	Cyprus	6.3	4	0.4	5.8	6.8	6.0	6.6				6.8	5.8								6.1	6.3
28	United Arab Emirates	6.3	5	1.3	4.9	7.5	5.4	7.3		4.9	5.1	7.3									7.5	6.8
30	Israel	6.1	6	0.7	5.1	7.2	5.7	6.6				5.1	5.8	6.7	6						7.2	6
30	Spain	6.1	6	0.6	5.3	6.8	5.7	6.5				6.8	5.8	6.6	6.3						5.6	5.3
32	Portugal	6.0	6	0.9	5.0	7.4	5.4	6.7				6.8	7.4	5.3	5						6	5.6
33	Botswana	5.8	6	0.6	5.2	6.8	5.4	6.2		5.6	6	6.8	5.8								5.2	5.3
33	Puerto Rico	5.8	4	0.7	5.2	6.8	5.3	6.4				6.8	5.8								5.5	5.2
33	Taiwan	5.8	9	0.7	5.1	7.1	5.5	6.2			6.7	5.1	5.8	5.8	7.1	5.2	5.4				5.7	5.8
36	Bhutan	5.7	4	0.7	5.1	6.6	5.1	6.2	5.1		5.2		5.8						6.6			
37	Malta	5.6	3	0.3	5.3	5.8	5.3	5.8				5.8									5.3	5.5
38	Brunei	5.5	3	0.7	4.7	6.1	4.7	6.1				4.7									6.1	5.7
39	Korea (South)	5.4	9	0.5	4.6	6.0	5.1	5.7			6	5.1	4.7	5.7	5.8	5.8	5.6				5.2	4.6
39	Mauritius	5.4	6	0.8	4.7	6.8	4.9	5.9		4.8	5.6	6.8	4.7								5.2	5.2
41	Costa Rica	5.3	5	1.0	4.7	6.8	4.7	6.0			5.6	6.8	4.7								4.7	4.7
41	Oman	5.3	5	1.6	3.1	7.1	4.1	6.4				3.1	5.1	4.7							6.5	7.1
41	Poland	5.3	8	0.4	4.7	5.8	5.0	5.5			5.6	5.1	5.1	5.8	4.9	4.7					5.8	5.1
44	Dominica	5.2	3	0.6	4.7	5.8	4.7	5.8				5.1	5.8								4.7	
45	Cape Verde	5.1	4	1.3	3.4	6.6	4.1	6.1		5.6			3.4							6.6		5
46	Lithuania	5.0	8	1.0	3.4	6.8	4.4	5.5			5.6	6.8	4.8	3.4	4.9	5.1					4.7	4.5
46	Macau	5.0	3	1.4	3.4	5.8	3.4	5.8					3.4									
48	Bahrain	4.9	5	1.2	3.1	5.9	4.1	5.7			3.1	5.1	4.7								5.9	5.9
49	Seychelles	4.8	3	1.9	3.0	6.8	3.0	6.8		3		6.8	4.7									
50	Hungary	4.7	8	1.4	2.3	6.8	3.9	5.5			5.6	6.8	4.8	5.8	4.7	2.3					3.8	3.7
50	Jordan	4.7	7	1.3	3.1	6.1	4.0	5.5			3.1	3.3	4.7	6.1	5.6						6.1	4.3
50	Saudi Arabia	4.7	5	2.0	2.3	7.3	3.3	6.0			2.3	3.3	4.7								5.9	7.3
53	Czech Republic	4.6	8	0.9	3.3	5.8	4.1	5.1			5.2	5.1	5.1	5.8	4.7	4					3.8	3.3
54	Kuwait	4.5	5	1.8	2.7	7.4	3.3	5.9			2.7	3.3	7.4								4.4	4.5
54	South Africa	4.5	8	0.6	3.4	5.1	4.1	4.8		4.8	3.9	5.1	3.4	4.7	4.5						5.1	4.4
56	Malaysia	4.4	9	0.9	3.3	6.3	3.9	4.9			4.5	3.3	3.4	5.2	6.3	3.6	4.6				4.5	4.6
56	Namibia	4.4	6	0.8	3.3	5.1	3.9	4.9		3.7	4.9	3.3	4.7								5.1	5.1
56	Turkey	4.4	7	0.7	3.3	5.2	4.0	4.8			4.5	3.3	4.7	5.2	5.2						4.4	3.9
59	Latvia	4.3	6	0.8	3.4	5.1	3.7	4.8			4.9	5.1	5.1	3.4							3.6	3.6
59	Slovakia	4.3	8	1.0	3.1	5.8	3.8	4.9			5.2	5.1	4.5	5.8	3.8	3.6					3.4	3.1
59	Tunisia	4.3	6	2.0	2.3	6.6	3.0	5.6		2.5	2.3	3.3	4.7								6.6	6.6
62	Croatia	4.1	8	0.8	3.4	5.2	3.7	4.5			5.2	5.1	3.8	4.7	3.6	3.7					3.4	3.4
62	FYR Macedonia	4.1	5	0.5	3.3	4.7	3.7	4.5			4.5	3.3	4								4.7	4.3
62	Ghana	4.1	7	1.0	2.7	5.1	3.4	4.7		4.8	3.9	5.1	4.7								4.7	2.7
62	Samoa	4.1	3	0.7	3.4	4.7	3.4	4.7	4				3.4								4.7	
66	Rwanda	4.0	5	1.6	3.0	6.7	3.2	5.1		3	3.5		3.4									



Corruption Perceptions Index 2010

Sources of information

Number	1	2	3
Abbreviation	ADB	AFDB	BTI
Source	Asian Development Bank	African Development Bank	Bertelsmann Foundation
Name	Country Performance Assessment Ratings	Country Policy and Institutional Assessments	Bertelsmann Transformation Index
Year published	2010	2010	2009
Internet	http://www.adb.org/Documents/Reports/Country-Performance-Assessment-Exercise/default.asp	http://www.afdb.org/pls/portal/url/ITEM/5008432D529957FAE040C00A0C3D3A86	http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/english
Who was surveyed?	Country teams, experts inside and outside the bank	Country teams, experts inside and outside the bank	Network of local correspondents and experts inside and outside the organisation
Subject asked	Transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector	Transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector	The government's capacity to punish and contain corruption
Number of replies	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Coverage	28 countries (eligible for ADF funding)	53 countries	128 less developed and transition countries

Number	4	5	6
Abbreviation	CPIA	EIU	FH
Source	World Bank (IDA and IBRD)	Economist Intelligence Unit	Freedom House
Name	Country Policy and Institutional Assessment	Country Risk Service and Country Forecast	Nations in Transit
Year published	2010	2010	2010
Internet	http://go.worldbank.org/S2THWI1X60	www.eiu.com	http://www.freedomhouse.hu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=196
Who was surveyed?	Country teams, experts inside and outside the bank	Expert staff assessment	Assessment by experts originating from or resident in the respective country
Subject asked	Transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector	The misuse of public office for private (or political party) gain: including corruption in public procurement, misuse of public funds, corruption in public service, and prosecution of public officials	Extent of corruption as practiced in governments, as perceived by the public and as reported in the media, as well as the implementation of anti-corruption initiatives.
Number of replies	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Coverage	77 countries (eligible for IDA funding)	135 countries	29 countries/territories

Number	7	8	9
Abbreviation	GI	IMD	
Source	Global Insight	IMD International, Switzerland, World Competitiveness Center	
Name	Country Risk Ratings	IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook	
Year published	2010	2009	2010
Internet	http://www.globalinsight.com	www.imd.ch/wcc	
Who was surveyed?	Expert staff assessment	Executives in top and middle management in domestic and international companies	
Subject asked	The likelihood of encountering corrupt officials, ranging from petty bureaucratic corruption to grand political corruption	Category Institutional Framework - State Efficiency: "Bribing and corruption exist/do not exist"	
Number of replies	Not applicable	3960	
Coverage	201 countries	57 countries	58 countries

Number	10	11
Abbreviation	PERC	
Source	Political & Economic Risk Consultancy	
Name	Asian Intelligence Newsletter	
Year published	2009	2010
Internet	www.asiarisk.com/	
Who was surveyed?	Expatriate business executives	
Subject asked	How serious do you consider the problem of corruption to be in the public sector?	
Number of replies	1750	2174
Coverage	16 countries	16 countries

Number	12	13
Abbreviation	WEF	WEF
Source	World Economic Forum	
Name	Global Competitiveness Report	
Year published	2009	2010
Internet	www.weforum.org	
Who was surveyed?	Senior business leaders, domestic and international companies	
Subject asked	Undocumented extra payments or bribes connected with 1) exports and imports, 2) public utilities, 3) tax collection, 4) public contracts and 5) judicial decisions are common/never occur	
Number of replies	More than 12,000	More than 13,000
Coverage	133 countries	139 countries

Corruption Perceptions Index 2010

Short methodological note

Data Sources:

- The Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2010 is an aggregate indicator that brings together data from sources that cover the past two years. For the CPI 2010, this includes surveys published between January 2009 and September 2010.
- The CPI 2010 is calculated using data from 13 sources by 10 independent institutions. All sources measure the overall extent of corruption (frequency and/or size of bribes) in the public and political sectors, and all sources provide a ranking of countries, i.e. include an assessment of multiple countries.
- Evaluation of the extent of corruption in countries/territories is done by two groups: country experts, both residents and non-residents, and business leaders. In the CPI 2010, the following seven sources provided data based on expert analysis: African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Bertelsmann Foundation, Economist Intelligence Unit, Freedom House, Global Insight and the World Bank. Three sources for the CPI 2010 reflect the evaluations by resident business leaders of their own country, IMD, Political and Economic Risk Consultancy, and the World Economic Forum.
- For CPI sources that are surveys, and where multiple years of the same survey are available, data for the past two years is included.
- For sources that are scores provided by experts (risk agencies/country analysts), only the most recent iteration of the assessment is included, as these scores are generally peer reviewed and change very little from year to year.

Steps to calculate the CPI:

1. The first step to calculate the CPI is to standardise the data provided by the individual sources (that is, translate them into a common scale). We use what is called a matching percentiles technique that takes the ranks of countries reported by each individual source. This method is useful for combining sources that have different distributions. While there is some information loss in this technique, it allows all reported scores to remain within the bounds of the CPI, i.e. to remain between 0 and 10.
2. The second step consists of performing what is called a beta-transformation on the standardized scores. This increases the standard deviation among all countries included in the CPI and makes it possible to differentiate more precisely countries that appear to have similar scores.
3. Finally, the CPI scores are determined by averaging all of the standardised values for each country.

Results:

- The CPI score and rank are accompanied by the number of sources, the highest and lowest values given to every country by the data sources, the standard deviation and the confidence range for each country.
- The confidence range is determined by what is called a bootstrap (non-parametric) methodology, which allows inferences to be drawn on the underlying precision of the results. A 90 percent confidence range is then established, where there is only a five percent probability that the value is below and a five per cent probability that the value is above this confidence range.

For a more detailed explanation of the CPI method please visit www.transparency.org/cpi

Corruption Perceptions Index 2010

Frequently Asked Questions

- What is the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI)?
- What is corruption and how does the CPI measure it?
- Why is the CPI based only on perceptions?
- Whose opinion is polled for the surveys used in the CPI?
- What are the sources of data for the 2010 CPI?
- Why are countries/territories removed from the index, and why are new countries/territories added?
- What are the sources of data for the CPI?
- Can country/territory scores in the 2010 CPI be compared to those in past editions of the CPI?
- Which matters more, a country/territory's rank or its score?
- Is the country/territory with the lowest score the world's most corrupt country and vice versa?
- What other research does TI produce to analyse corruption?

What is the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI)?

The CPI ranks countries/territories based on how corrupt a country's public sector is perceived to be. It is a composite index, a combination of polls, drawing on corruption-related data from expert and business surveys carried out by a variety of independent and reputable institutions. The CPI reflects views from around the world, including those of experts living and working in the countries/territories evaluated. For a country/territory to be included in the ranking, it must be included in a minimum of three of the CPI's source surveys. Thus, inclusion in the index is not an indication of the existence of corruption but rather dependent solely on the availability of information.

What is corruption and how does the CPI measure it?

Corruption is the abuse of entrusted power for private gain. This is the working definition used by TI, applying to both the public and private sectors. The CPI focuses on corruption in the public sector, or corruption which involves public officials, civil servants or politicians. The surveys used to compile the index include questions relating to the abuse of public power and focus on: bribery of public officials, kickbacks in public procurement, embezzlement of public funds, and on questions that probe the strength and effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts in the public sector. As such, it covers both the administrative and political aspects of corruption.

In producing the index, the scores of countries/territories in source surveys and assessments derived from the specific corruption-related questions, are combined to calculate a single score for each country.

Why is the CPI based only on perceptions?

Corruption generally comprises illegal activities, which mainly come to light only through scandals, investigations or prosecutions. It is thus difficult to assess absolute levels of corruption in countries or territories on the basis of hard empirical data. Possible attempts to do so such as by comparing bribes reported, the number of prosecutions brought or court cases directly linked to corruption cannot be taken as definitive indicators of corruption levels. Rather they show how effective prosecutors, the courts or the media are in investigating and exposing corruption. One reliable method of compiling comparable country data is to capture perceptions of those in a position to offer expert assessments of public sector corruption in a given country.

Whose opinion is polled for the surveys used in the CPI?

The expertise reflected in the CPI scores draws on the understanding of corrupt practices held by country analysts and business people based in both industrialised and developing countries. Sources providing data for the CPI rely on these experts living in and outside of the country being assessed. It is important to note that the viewpoints of in-country experts correlate well with those of non-resident experts.

What are the sources of data for the CPI?

The 2010 CPI draws on 13 source surveys from 10 independent institutions. The sources of information used for the 2010 CPI were published between January 2009 and September 2010. Except for surveys that include corruption as one of several issues measured, the CPI includes only sources that provide a ranking of countries/territories and measure some aspect of corruption levels. TI ensures that the sources used are of the highest quality and that source surveys are carried out with complete integrity. To qualify, survey data must be well documented and the methodology published to enable an assessment of its reliability and must provide a ranking of countries/territories and measure the overall extent of corruption.

For a full list of data sources, questions asked, and the number and type of respondents for each country, please see the CPI sources.

Why are countries/territories removed from the index, and why are new countries/territories added?

Countries/territories are only included in the index when three or more of the sources of information TI relies upon for the CPI assess the country/territory in question. When less than three source surveys are available, countries cannot be included in the index.

The 2010 index scores two fewer countries than last year, because of a reduction in the number of surveys available. Kosovo has been added to the index but St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Suriname have dropped off.

Can country/territory scores in the 2010 CPI be compared to those in past indexes?

The index is based on rankings of countries/territories calculated using a changing set of source surveys. The CPI is therefore not the appropriate tool for comparisons over time. Additionally, the number of sources and countries included has varied over time since the CPI's inception in 1995. Certain source surveys have been added or discontinued. In an effort to improve the index over the last 15 years, TI has also made slight modifications to the methodology. As a consequence, the CPI cannot be used for accurate trend analysis.

Individual data sources can be used to identify whether compared to the previous year's CPI score there has been a change in perceived levels of corruption in a particular country. TI has used this approach in 2010 to assess country progress and identify what can be considered as changes in perceptions of corruption, using the two criteria that:

- (a) a change of at least 0.3 points in the CPI score is present, and;
- (b) the direction of this change is confirmed by more than half of the data sources evaluating the country.

Based on these criteria, the following countries showed an improvement from 2009 to 2010: Bhutan, Chile, Ecuador, FYR Macedonia, the Gambia, Haiti, Jamaica, Kuwait, and Qatar. The following countries showed deterioration from 2009 to 2010: the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Madagascar, Niger and the United States.

Which matters more, a country/territory's rank or its score?

A country/territory's score (0 to 10) indicates the perceived level of public sector corruption in a country while a country's rank indicates its position relative to the other countries/territories included in the index. It is important to keep in mind that a country's rank can change simply because new countries enter the index or others drop out.

Is the country/territory with the lowest score the world's most corrupt nation?

No. The country/territory with the lowest score is the one where public sector corruption is perceived to be greatest *among those included in the list*. There are more than 200 sovereign nations in the world, and the 2010 CPI ranks 178 of them. The CPI provides no information about countries/territories that are not included. Moreover, the CPI is mostly an assessment of perception of administrative and political corruption. It is not a verdict on the levels of corruption of entire nations or societies or of their international policies and activities. Citizens of those countries/territories that score at the lower end of the CPI have shown the same concern about and condemnation of corruption as the public in countries that perform strongly. For more information, see TI's [Global Corruption Barometer](#).

What other research does TI produce to analyse corruption?

TI produces independent empirical research on corruption. Our global research portfolio combines qualitative approaches with quantitative ones, macro-level indicators with in-depth diagnostics, expert analysis with experience, as well as perceptions-based survey work. This body of research provides a comprehensive picture of the scale, spread and dynamics of corruption around the world. It also serves to mobilise and support evidence-based, effectively-tailored policy reform. In addition to the Corruption Perceptions Index, TI's portfolio of global research includes:

- **Global Corruption Barometer (GCB):** a representative survey of more than 70,000 households in more than 65 countries on people's perceptions and experiences of corruption. The most recent Global Corruption Barometer can be found at:
http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/gcb.
- **Bribe Payers Index (BPI):** a ranking of leading, exporting countries according to the perceived likelihood of their firms to bribe abroad. It is based on a survey of executives focusing on the business practices of foreign firms in their country. The most recent Bribe Payers Index can be found at:
http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/bpi.
- **Global Corruption Report (GCR):** a thematic report that explores corruption with regard to a specific sector or governance issue. The report provides expert research and analysis as well as case studies. The most recent Global Corruption Report was published on 23 September 2009 and can be found at: <http://www.transparency.org/publications/gcr>
- **National Integrity System assessments (NIS):** a series of in-country studies providing an extensive assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the key institutions that enable good governance and integrity in a country (the executive, legislature, the judiciary, anti-corruption agencies and other similar areas). For a full list of reports and more information on the National Integrity System model, please see:
http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/nis