



People see corruption getting worse but are ready to get involved, says biggest Transparency International global public opinion survey

Yerevan, 9 December 2010 – Corruption has increased over the last three years, say six out of 10 people around the world, and one in four people report paying bribes in the last year. These are the findings of the [2010 Global Corruption Barometer](#), a worldwide public opinion survey on corruption, released today, [International Anti-Corruption Day](#), by Transparency International (TI).

Views on corruption trends are most negative in Europe and North America, where 73 per cent and 67 per cent of people respectively think corruption has increased over the last three years.

Despite these results, the survey also found that although a large majority of people – seven out of 10 – say they would report a corrupt act if they saw one, however, if they are victims of corruption, this drops to about half.

“The fall-out of the financial crises continues to affect people’s opinions of corruption, particular in Europe and North America. Institutions everywhere must be resolute in their efforts to restore good governance and trust,” said Huguette Labelle, Chair of Transparency International. “It is heartening that so many people are ready to take a stand against corruption. This willingness must be mobilised.”

The 2010 Global Corruption Barometer surveys more than 91,000 people in 86 countries and territories. It focuses on petty bribery, perceptions of public institutions and views of whom people trust to combat corruption.

Political parties are perceived as the most corrupt institution around the world

The 2010 Barometer asked respondents for their views on the extent to which they believe 11 key sectors and institutions in their country are affected by corruption. TI has selected 11 key sectors and institutions: Table 1 summarizes data on the issue. Globally, political parties are perceived as the most corrupt, with 79 percent of respondents reported them to be corrupt or extremely corrupt. Public officials/civil servants (62 percent) and parliaments/legislature (60 percent) come next to political parties as most corrupt. Table 1 reveals that political parties are perceived as the most corrupt institution in 6 out of 8 regions, exceptions are made in NIS+ and Sub-Saharan Africa, where the police are perceived to be the most corrupt institution. In addition, in NIS+ the police are followed by judiciary and public officials/civil servants.

Petty bribery: regional differences matter

According to GCB 2010, in general no reduction is recorded in petty bribery levels worldwide. When examined at the institution/service level, even more concerning results emerge: there are substantially more reported bribes to the judiciary, the police, and registry and permit services than previously. 27 percent of users paid a bribe to receive attention from relevant service providers/institutions in the past 12 months. Moreover, in Sub-Saharan African countries (56 percent), Middle East and North Africa (36 percent) and in NIS+ (32 percent) these numbers are even higher. Globally the police are the institution most often reported as the recipient of bribes (31 percent). The registry and permit services (22 percent) and judiciary (16 percent) follow.

The survey showed that in the past 12 months one in four people paid a bribe to one of nine institutions and services, from health to education to tax authorities. The police are named the most frequent recipient of bribes, according to those surveyed, with about 30 per cent of those who had contact with the police reporting that they paid a bribe.

Most worrying is the fact that bribes to the police have almost doubled since 2006, and more people report paying bribes to the judiciary and for registry and permit services than did so five years ago.



Sub-Saharan Africans report paying the most bribes: more than one in two people report paying a bribe in the past 12 months. This compares to 36 per cent of people surveyed in the Middle East and North Africa, 32 per cent in the Newly Independent states, 23 per cent in Latin America, 19 per cent in the Western Balkans and Turkey, 15 per cent in Asia Pacific and just 5 per cent in Europe Union countries and North America.

Almost half of all respondents say they paid bribes to avoid problems with the authorities and a quarter say it was to speed up processes.

More than 20 countries report significantly more petty bribery than in 2006, when the same question was asked in the Barometer. The biggest number of reported bribery payments in 2010 is in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Cameroon, Iraq, Liberia, Nigeria, Palestine, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Uganda where more than 50 per cent of people surveyed paid a bribe in the past 12 months.

Bribery and the poor

The demographics of bribery continue to disadvantage the poor and the young. As in past surveys, lower income earners report paying more bribes than higher income earners. Poorer people are twice as likely to pay bribes for basic services, such as utilities and education, than wealthier people.

A third of all people under the age of 30 report paying a bribe in the past 12 months, compared to less than one in five people over 51 years of age.

Lack of trust in public officials

Sadly, few people trust their governments or politicians. Eight out of 10 say political parties are corrupt or extremely corrupt. The civil service and parliament are considered the next most corrupt institutions.

According to the findings of GCB 2010, the general public continue to perceive government efforts to curb corruption ineffective. Half the people questioned think so, while only 29 percent of respondents think that these efforts are effective. The countries of EU+ and Latin American regions are most disappointed of their current governments' actions in the fight against corruption with 74 and 73 percents respectively. In NIS region this percentage is equal to 46%. Such a relatively low level of those, who think that their governments' efforts are not effective, is mainly conditioned by rather low numbers in Georgia, Belarus and Azerbaijan. In particular, only 12% of Georgian respondents consider the actions of its government as inefficient (second lowest result among all countries covered by GCB 2010), and only 26% each of Belarusian and Azerbaijani respondents think so.

This reflects little change over time; however, opinions have worsened slightly since 2007 in Asia Pacific, Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa – while they have improved in the Newly Independent States and North America.

GCB 2010 Results for Armenia

GCB 2010 survey in Armenia was conducted from June 10 to 20, 2010 by Romir holding², a well-known Russian polling and marketing research company, which is the official partner of Gallup International³ in Russia. The sample size was 1,000 households and interviews were conducted by phone. It should be also mentioned that Armenia is included in GCB for the second consecutive year, and before 2009 it has never been included.

GCB 2010 data on Armenia are presented in a brief form through tables in the Appendix of this Press Release.⁴ For regional comparisons see GCB 2010 Report, which was posted this morning (at 6 am GMT) on TI web-site (www.transparency.org).

In the opinion of the half of the Armenian respondents, in the past three years the level of corruption in Armenia increased, and only 15% of them think that it had decreased, whereas 35% think that it didn't



change (see Table 2). In general, NIS+ region is the most "optimistic" among the 8 world regions. Here, only 45% of the respondents think that in the past three years corruption increased, compared to 73% in EU+ region. Actually, the most "optimistic" country covered by GCB 2010 is also located in this region, and it Georgia. Here only 9% of respondents think that corruption level in the past three years increased, whereas 78% think that was decreased.

According to data, presented in Table 1, the most corrupt area in Armenia is perceived education system, followed by police and judiciary, which share second and third positions. Analyzing the full version of Table 1, one can find out other alarming facts, related to this sector in Armenia. First, there is almost no country covered by GCB 2010, where education system is perceived as the most corrupt one. Second, in no other country the education system received such high points (4.2) on a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 is for "absolutely non-corrupt", and 5 – as "absolutely corrupt".⁵ Another alarming signal is that while comparing data for Armenia for those sectors/institutions, which were included both in GCB 2009 and GCB 2010⁶, one can notice that almost all of them this year are perceived as more corrupt, than in 2009. The only exception is media, whose perception as corrupt sector remained unchanged.

According to Table 3, 22% of Armenian respondents paid bribes within the 12-month period, preceding the survey. Here it is worth mentioning that this is a sharp decline, compared with 2009, when this number was 43%.

The actions of the Armenian government in the fight against corruption were considered as ineffective by 53% of respondents, and as effective – only 27%. According to 27% it was neither effective, nor ineffective. In this aspect, this is a slight setback, as in 2009 48% of respondents considered the Armenian government's actions as ineffective, and 38% - as effective.

¹ 86 countries/territories covered by GCB 2010 are conditionally grouped into 8 regions. Those are EU+, where together with EU countries Norway, Iceland and Switzerland were included, North America, Sub-Saharan Africa, Western Balkans+Turkey, Latin America, Asia-Pacific, Middle East and North Africa and NIS+, where together with NIS countries Mongolia is included.

² The same company conducted opinion poll surveys for GCB 2010 also in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Latvia.

³ On behalf of TI, the GCB 2010 survey was implemented by Gallup International through its local partners.

⁴ The tables in the Appendix of the Press Release include data total for all covered countries, regions as a whole and all countries of NIS+ region, as well as Turkey, which is included in the Western Balkans and Turkey region.

⁵ Only in Turkey the education sector together with business/private sector and public officials/civil servants share the first three positions perceived as the most corrupt sectors/institutions. However, its score is 3.3, which is substantially better than the similar one for Armenia.

⁶ These sectors/institutions are political parties, parliaments, business/private sector, media, public officials/civil servants and judiciary.

Regional Classification

Asia Pacific	EU+	Latin America	Middle East&North Africa	North America	NIS+	Sub-Saharan Africa	Western Balkans + Turkey
Afghanistan	Austria	Argentina	Iraq	Canada	Armenia	Cameroon	Bosnia & Herzegovina
Australia	Bulgaria	Bolivia	Israel	United States	Azerbaijan	Ghana	Croatia
Bangladesh	Czech Republic	Brazil	Lebanon		Belarus	Kenya	FYR Macedonia
Cambodia	Denmark	Chile	Morocco		Georgia	Liberia	Kosovo
China	Finland	Colombia	Palestine		Moldova	Nigeria	Serbia
Fiji	France	El Salvador			Mongolia	Senegal	Turkey
Hong Kong	Germany	Mexico			Russia	Sierra Leone	
India	Greece	Peru			Ukraine	South Africa	
Indonesia	Hungary	Venezuela				Uganda	
Japan	Iceland					Zambia	
Korea (South)	Ireland						
Malaysia	Italy						
New Zealand	Latvia						
Pakistan	Lithuania						
Papua New Guinea	Luxembourg						
Philippines	Netherlands						
Singapore	Norway						
Solomon Islands	Poland						
Taiwan	Portugal						
Thailand	Romania						
Vanuatu	Slovenia						
Vietnam	Spain						
	Switzerland						
	United Kingdom						

Country/Territory	Political Parties	Parliament/Legislature	Police	Business/Private Sector	Media	Public officials/Civil Servants	Judiciary	NGOs (non governmental organizations)	Religious bodies	Military	Education system
Total	4.2	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.2	3.7	3.3	2.9	3.3	2.8	3.1
Asia Pacific	4.2	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.9	3.1	2.9	3.8	3.2	3.5
Afghanistan	2.9	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.1	3.4	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.9
Australia	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.2	2.9	2.8	3.3	2.6	2.5
Bangladesh	3.8	3.1	4.4	2.4	2.3	4.0	3.5	2.3	1.8	1.9	2.6
Cambodia	3.1	2.9	3.7	2.7	2.6	3.5	4.0	1.9	1.8	2.6	3.0
China	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	3.0
Fiji	3.4	2.7	2.8	3.2	2.3	3.0	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.2
Hong Kong	3.3	3.0	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.4	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.8
India	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.1	3.1	2.9	2.8	3.4
Indonesia	3.5	3.6	3.5	2.8	2.8	3.2	3.3	2.5	2.5	2.8	3.0
Japan	4.2	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.9	3.1	3.1	4.0	3.3	3.6
Korea, Rep.	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.6	2.7	3.0	3.3	3.5
Malaysia	4.0	3.4	4.1	3.3	2.7	3.3	3.0	2.9	2.0	2.3	2.4
New Zealand	3.5	3.2	2.7	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.5	2.6	3.1	2.2	2.4
Pakistan	4.1	4.0	4.5	3.8	3.3	4.2	3.6	3.8	2.8	3.0	3.1
Papua New Guinea	4.0	3.7	3.5	2.8	2.3	3.5	2.7	1.9	1.8	2.7	2.9
Philippines	3.6	3.5	3.6	2.9	2.0	3.5	3.1	2.4	1.9	2.9	2.7
Singapore	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.7
Solomon Islands	3.7	3.7	2.9	2.8	2.2	3.4	2.6	2.2	2.0	2.7	2.9
Taiwan	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.2	3.8	3.3	2.8	2.9	3.4	3.2
Thailand	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.2	2.8	3.7	3.0	2.5	2.4	3.5	3.3
Vanuatu	4.0	3.3	3.0	2.9	2.4	3.1	2.7	1.8	1.8	2.8	2.3
Vietnam	2.0	1.9	3.8	2.6	2.2	3.0	2.8	1.7	1.5	2.3	3.3
EU+	4.4	3.5	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	2.8	3.5	2.7	2.6
Austria	3.2	2.7	2.6	3.3	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.7	2.5	2.3
Bulgaria	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.7	2.9	3.9	4.3	2.8	2.7	2.5	3.2
Czech Republic	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.3	2.8	3.7	3.5	2.6	2.5	3.3	3.1
Denmark	2.8	2.3	2.0	2.8	2.6	2.5	1.6	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.0
Finland	3.7	2.9	1.9	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.0	2.5	2.7	2.0	2.2
France	3.6	3.1	2.7	3.3	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.1
Germany	3.7	3.1	2.3	3.3	3.0	3.2	2.4	2.6	2.9	2.6	2.3
Greece	4.6	4.3	3.7	3.6	4.3	4.0	3.9	2.8	3.5	2.9	3.2
Hungary	3.9	3.4	3.2	3.8	3.1	3.2	2.9	2.4	2.2	2.8	2.5
Iceland	4.3	3.7	2.2	4.0	3.5	3.5	2.7	2.6	3.2		2.4
Ireland	4.4	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.3	2.7	2.5	3.9	2.3	2.5
Italy	4.4	4.0	3.0	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.4	2.7	3.4	2.8	2.9
Latvia	4.0	3.7	3.3	3.0	2.5	3.6	3.2	2.1	1.8	2.3	2.6
Lithuania	4.2	4.2	3.7	3.5	2.9	3.8	4.0	2.6	2.5	2.4	3.0
Luxembourg	2.9	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.3	2.7	2.3	2.3
Netherlands	3.0	2.7	2.6	3.1	2.9	3.0	2.6	2.5	2.9	2.5	2.3
Norway	3.0	2.2	2.1	3.2	2.9	2.8	1.9	2.7	3.2	2.4	2.4
Poland	3.6	3.4	3.2	3.5	2.8	3.4	3.3	2.6	2.7	2.4	2.6
Portugal	4.2	3.7	3.2	3.6	2.8	3.2	3.4	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.5
Romania	4.5	4.5	3.9	3.6	3.1	3.8	4.0	2.9	2.3	2.4	3.1
Slovenia	4.3	3.7	3.2	3.7	3.1	3.6	3.5	2.7	3.2	2.8	2.9
Spain	4.4	3.5	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	2.8	3.5	2.7	2.6
Switzerland	2.9	2.6	2.1	3.3	3.0	2.6	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.2	1.8
United Kingdom	4.0	3.8	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.4	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.5	2.5

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2010. Figures are weighted. Shaded scores are the highest for that particular country.

Table 3: Percentage of users paying a bribe to receive attention from at last one of nine different service providers in the past 12 months

	Percentage
Total	27%
Asia Pacific	18%
Afghanistan	61%
Australia	2%
Bangladesh	70%
Cambodia	84%
China	9%
Fiji	12%
Hong Kong	5%
India	54%
Indonesia	18%
Japan	9%
Korea (South)	2%
Malaysia	9%
New Zealand	4%
Pakistan	49%
Papua New Guinea	26%
Philippines	16%
Singapore	9%
Solomon Islands	20%
Taiwan	7%
Thailand	23%
Vanuatu	16%
Vietnam	44%
EU+	5%
Austria	9%
Bulgaria	8%
Czech Republic	14%
Denmark	0%
Finland	2%
France	7%
Germany	2%
Greece	18%
Hungary	24%
Iceland	3%
Ireland	4%
Italy	13%
Latvia	15%
Lithuania	34%
Luxembourg	16%
Netherlands	2%
Norway	1%
Poland	15%
Portugal	3%
Romania	28%
Slovenia	4%
Spain	5%
Switzerland	2%
United Kingdom	1%

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2010. Percentages are weighted. Figures are calculated for those respondents who came in contact with the services listed and paid a bribe to any of the providers. Groups were defined using cluster analysis. The result for Malaysia was calculated for 8 services instead of 9 because the question about tax administration was not included in the survey. Morocco is not included in the table due to their low reported contact rate with most services and South Africa was not included because of data validity concerns regarding this question.

Table 3: Percentage of users paying a bribe to receive attention from at least one of nine different service providers in the past 12 months (cont'd)

	Percentage
Total	27%
Latin America	23%
Argentina	12%
Bolivia	30%
Brazil	4%
Chile	21%
Colombia	24%
El Salvador	31%
Mexico	31%
Peru	22%
Venezuela	20%
Middle East and North Africa	36%
Iraq	56%
Israel	4%
Lebanon	34%
Palestine	51%
NIS+	32%
Armenia	22%
Azerbaijan	47%
Belarus	27%
Georgia	3%
Moldova	37%
Mongolia	48%
Russia	26%
Ukraine	34%
North America	5%
Canada	4%
United States	5%
Sub-Saharan Africa	56%
Cameroon	54%
Ghana	37%
Kenya	45%
Liberia	89%
Nigeria	63%
Senegal	56%
Sierra Leone	71%
Uganda	86%
Zambia	42%
Western Balkans + Turkey	19%
Bosnia & Herzegovina	23%
Croatia	5%
FYR Macedonia	21%
Kosovo	16%
Serbia	17%
Turkey	33%

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2010. Percentages are weighted. Figures are calculated for those respondents who came in contact with the services listed and paid a bribe to any of the providers. Groups were defined using cluster analysis. The result for Malaysia was calculated for 8 services instead of 9 because the question about tax administration was not included in the survey. Morocco is not included in the table due to their low reported contact rate with most services and South Africa was not included because of data validity concerns regarding this question.

Table 4: How would you assess your current government's actions in the fight against corruption?

Country/Territory	Ineffective	Neither	Effective
Total	50%	21%	29%
Asia Pacific	44%	33%	23%
Afghanistan	39%	26%	35%
Australia	21%	43%	36%
Bangladesh	22%	17%	61%
Cambodia	15%	14%	72%
China	35%	30%	36%
Fiji	9%	3%	88%
Hong Kong	43%	30%	27%
India	44%	31%	25%
Indonesia	35%	32%	33%
Japan	45%	35%	20%
Korea, Rep.	54%	20%	26%
Malaysia	20%	32%	48%
New Zealand	12%	34%	54%
Pakistan	73%	15%	12%
Papua New Guinea	65%	11%	24%
Philippines	48%	24%	28%
Singapore	31%	40%	29%
Solomon Islands	55%	20%	25%
Taiwan	28%	35%	37%
Thailand	47%	31%	22%
Vanuatu	49%	19%	32%
Vietnam	34%	29%	37%
EU+	74%	0%	26%
Austria	34%	37%	28%
Bulgaria	26%	26%	48%
Czech Republic	59%	29%	12%
Denmark	44%	0%	56%
Finland	65%	0%	35%
France	68%	5%	27%
Germany	76%	3%	21%
Greece	66%	10%	24%
Hungary	51%	7%	42%
Iceland	78%	0%	22%
Ireland	82%	0%	18%
Italy	64%	17%	19%
Latvia	73%	15%	11%
Lithuania	78%	16%	6%
Luxembourg	30%	2%	68%
Netherlands	43%	0%	57%
Norway	61%	0%	39%
Poland	57%	27%	16%
Portugal	75%	16%	10%
Romania	83%	10%	7%
Slovenia	78%	0%	22%
Spain	74%	0%	26%
Switzerland	54%	9%	37%
United Kingdom	66%	0%	34%

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2010. Figures are weighted. Percentages may not add up to 100 per cent due to rounding.

Table 4: How would you assess your current government's actions in the fight against corruption?

Country/Territory	Ineffective	Neither	Effective
Total	50%	21%	29%
Latin America	32%	28%	40%
Argentina	77%	11%	12%
Bolivia	27%	26%	47%
Brazil	54%	17%	29%
Chile	33%	28%	38%
Colombia	46%	20%	35%
El Salvador	32%	53%	15%
Mexico	52%	26%	22%
Peru	85%	8%	8%
Venezuela	65%	28%	7%
Middle East and North Africa	50%	22%	28%
Iraq	63%	19%	18%
Israel	82%	0%	18%
Lebanon	56%	12%	32%
Morocco	17%	65%	18%
Palestine	24%	16%	59%
NIS+	46%	23%	31%
Armenia	53%	20%	27%
Azerbaijan	26%	9%	66%
Belarus	26%	35%	39%
Georgia	12%	11%	77%
Moldova	52%	30%	18%
Mongolia	53%	28%	19%
Russia	52%	22%	26%
Ukraine	59%	24%	16%
North America	73%	0%	27%
Canada	74%	0%	26%
United States	71%	0%	29%
Sub-Saharan Africa	45%	11%	44%
Cameroon	48%	25%	28%
Ghana	36%	8%	55%
Kenya	30%	0%	70%
Liberia	47%	6%	46%
Nigeria	40%	14%	46%
Senegal	61%	17%	22%
Sierra Leone	12%	15%	73%
South Africa	45%	11%	44%
Uganda	24%	18%	58%
Zambia	48%	12%	40%
Western Balkans + Turkey	54%	11%	35%
Bosnia & Herzegovina	71%	7%	23%
Croatia	56%	15%	28%
FYR Macedonia	34%	13%	53%
Kosovo	61%	7%	32%
Serbia	61%	25%	14%
Turkey	40%	1%	59%

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2010. Figures are weighted. Percentages may not add up to 100 per cent due to rounding.

Source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2010. Figures are weighted