

# Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2002



**TRANSPARENCY  
INTERNATIONAL**

the coalition against corruption

<http://www.transparency.org>

Transparency International Secretariat  
Otto-Suhr-Allee 97-99,  
10585 Berlin,  
Germany  
Tel: +49-30-3438 2010  
Fax: +49-30-3470 3912  
ti@transparency.org

**About TI:**

Transparency International, founded in 1993, is the only global non-governmental and not-for-profit organisation devoted solely to curbing corruption. TI currently has 87 national chapters around the world and TI's International Secretariat is in Berlin, Germany. For more information on TI, its national chapters and its work, please go to:

[www.transparency.org](http://www.transparency.org)



## PRESS RELEASE

### Media Contacts:

Head of Public Relations Jeff Lovitt,  
Tel: +49 30 3438 2045

Press Officer Jana Kotalik/Sarah Tyler  
Tel: +49 30 3438 2061/19, Fax: +49 30 3470 3912,  
Email: [press@transparency.org](mailto:press@transparency.org)



# TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL

the coalition against corruption

<http://www.transparency.org>

Otto-Suhr-Allee 97-99,  
10585 Berlin, Germany  
Tel: +49-30-3438 2061  
Fax: +49-30-3470 3912

**Embargoed until 15.00 CET, 28 August 2002**

## Corrupt political elites and unscrupulous investors kill sustainable growth in its tracks, highlights new index

The TI Corruption Perceptions Index 2002 ranks 102 countries, the highest number ever. Seven out of ten countries ranked score less than 5 out of a clean score of 10

**Berlin, 28 August 2002** --- "Political elites and their cronies continue to take kickbacks at every opportunity. Hand in glove with corrupt business people, they are trapping whole nations in poverty and hampering sustainable development. Corruption is perceived to be dangerously high in poor parts of the world, but also in many countries whose firms invest in developing nations," said Peter Eigen, Chairman of Transparency International, speaking today on the launch of the Corruption Perceptions Index 2002 (CPI).

"Politicians increasingly pay lip-service to the fight against corruption but they fail to act on the clear message of TI's CPI: that they must clamp down on corruption to break the vicious circle of poverty and graft. Seven out of ten countries score less than 5 out of a clean score of 10 in the CPI 2002, which reflects perceived levels of corruption among politicians and public officials."

"Corrupt political elites in the developing world, working hand-in-hand with greedy business people and unscrupulous investors, are putting private gain before the welfare of citizens and the economic development of their countries," said Peter Eigen. "From illegal logging to blood diamonds, we are seeing the plundering of the earth and its people in an unsustainable way."

The new index, published today by Transparency International (TI), the world's leading non-governmental organisation fighting corruption, ranks 102 countries. Seventy countries – including many of the world's most poverty-stricken – score less than 5 out of a clean score of 10. Corruption is perceived to be rampant in Indonesia, Kenya, Angola, Madagascar, Paraguay, Nigeria and Bangladesh, countries with a score of less than 2. Countries with a score of higher than 9, with very low levels of perceived corruption, are predominantly rich countries, namely Finland, Denmark, New Zealand, Iceland, Singapore and Sweden.

The CPI is a poll of polls, reflecting the perceptions of business people and country analysts, both resident and non-resident. First launched in 1995, this year's CPI draws on 15 surveys from nine independent institutions. A rolling survey of polls taken between 2000 and 2002, the CPI includes only those countries that feature in at least three surveys. "It is important to emphasise that the CPI, even with 102 countries, is only a snapshot and covers barely half the more than 200 sovereign nations in the world," said Peter Eigen. "There is not sufficient data on other countries, many of which are likely to be very corrupt."

The CPI 2002 complements TI's Bribe Payers Index, which addresses the propensity of companies from top exporting countries to bribe in emerging markets. The BPI 2002, published on 14 May 2002, revealed high levels of bribery by firms from Russia, China, Taiwan and South Korea, closely followed by Italy,

Hong Kong, Malaysia, Japan, USA and France – although many of these countries signed the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention, which outlaws bribery of foreign public officials.

Before leaving for the United Nations Johannesburg Summit on Sustainable Development, Eigen stressed that “the summit in Johannesburg must lead to action. Corruption impedes sustainable development and robs the children of today of the resources they will need to survive tomorrow. When the leaders sign the Johannesburg Declaration, they must make pledges they can keep, not raise false hopes.”

“The New Partnership for Africa’s Development has set out some bold aims, which I applaud. Good governance and transparency are essential to sustainable development,” he continued. “Just as international institutions and donor bodies must now insist on transparency and good governance, so must politicians grasp the challenge at the national level. The new CPI makes it clear that an enormous task lies ahead of them. They must set the framework for investment such that the rule of law is applied and enforced fairly, not arbitrarily, so that for instance extractive industries, such as oil-drilling, are sustainable both for the natural environment and the development of the local economy.”

Tunku Abdul Aziz, TI Vice-Chairman, speaking in Malaysia on the launch of the CPI 2002, said: “The CPI has once again confirmed that corruption is a malady afflicting not only the developing countries, but also the developed world. Corruption is neutral. It is no respecter of nations, big or small, rich or poor. It is all the more critical, therefore, that both the North and the South buckle down to confront corruption much more vigorously and decisively.”

“Developed countries have a special humanitarian responsibility,” he continued, “given the resources at their disposal, to investigate and prosecute the companies within their jurisdictions that are bribing. Their bribes and incentives to corrupt public officials and politicians are subverting the orderly development of poor nations, already trapped, as they are, in a vicious circle of crippling poverty, hunger and disease.”

Tunku Abdul Aziz said: “Corruption continues to deny the poor, the marginalised, and the least educated members of every society the social, economic and political benefits that should properly accrue to them, benefits that are taken for granted in societies that have managed to shake off the yoke of corruption.”

Some changes highlighted in the CPI were identified by Peter Eigen. “In the past year, we have seen setbacks to the credibility of democratic rule. In parts of South America, the graft and misrule of political elites have drained confidence in the democratic structures that emerged after the end of military rule. Argentina, where corruption is perceived to have soared, joins Panama, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Haiti and Paraguay with a score of 3 or less in the CPI 2002.”

While some countries in transition from communism – most notably Slovenia, which has a cleaner score than EU member countries Italy and Greece – are perceived to be increasingly less corrupt, many countries in the former Soviet Union remain ridden with corruption. “The recent steps by President Vladimir Putin to introduce tax reforms and new laws fighting money-laundering are beginning to show the prospect of a lessening in perceived corruption in Russia,” explained Peter Eigen, “but the CPI 2002 indicates that Russia has a long way to go and remains seriously corrupt, together with Uzbekistan, Georgia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Moldova and Azerbaijan, all of which score less than 3 out of 10”.

### **Press Contacts for the CPI 2002**

**Berlin:** Jeff Lovitt/Jana Kotalik/Sarah Tyler,  
Tel: +49 30 3438 2045/61/19  
Fax: +49 30 3470 3912,  
Email: [press@transparency.org](mailto:press@transparency.org)

**UK:** Jeremy Pope  
Tel: +44-207 610 1400,  
Fax: +44-207 610 1550,  
Email: [pope@transparency.org](mailto:pope@transparency.org)

### **Additional technical CPI information**

Dr Johann Graf Lambsdorff (TI Adviser and director of the statistical work on the CPI),  
Göttingen University, Tel: +49-551-397298,  
Fax: +49-551-392054, Email: [jlambsd@gwdg.de](mailto:jlambsd@gwdg.de)

Fredrik Galtung, TI Head of Research  
Tel (until 29 August): +34-96-588 9919  
Tel: +44-207 610 1400,  
Email: [galtung@transparency.org](mailto:galtung@transparency.org)



Country Rank	Country	CPI 2002 score	Surveys used	Standard deviation	High-low Range
1	Finland	9.7	8	0.4	8.9 - 10.0
2	Denmark	9.5	8	0.3	8.9 - 9.9
	New Zealand	9.5	8	0.2	8.9 - 9.6
4	Iceland	9.4	6	0.4	8.8 - 10.0
5	Singapore	9.3	13	0.2	8.9 - 9.6
	Sweden	9.3	10	0.2	8.9 - 9.6
7	Canada	9.0	10	0.2	8.7 - 9.3
	Luxembourg	9.0	5	0.5	8.5 - 9.9
	Netherlands	9.0	9	0.3	8.5 - 9.3
10	United Kingdom	8.7	11	0.5	7.8 - 9.4
11	Australia	8.6	11	1.0	6.1 - 9.3
12	Norway	8.5	8	0.9	6.9 - 9.3
	Switzerland	8.5	9	0.9	6.8 - 9.4
14	Hong Kong	8.2	11	0.8	6.6 - 9.4
15	Austria	7.8	8	0.5	7.2 - 8.7
16	USA	7.7	12	0.8	5.5 - 8.7
17	Chile	7.5	10	0.9	5.6 - 8.8
18	Germany	7.3	10	1.0	5.0 - 8.1
	Israel	7.3	9	0.9	5.2 - 8.0
20	Belgium	7.1	8	0.9	5.5 - 8.7
	Japan	7.1	12	0.9	5.5 - 7.9
	Spain	7.1	10	1.0	5.2 - 8.9
23	Ireland	6.9	8	0.9	5.5 - 8.1
24	Botswana	6.4	5	1.5	5.3 - 8.9
25	France	6.3	10	0.9	4.8 - 7.8
	Portugal	6.3	9	1.0	5.5 - 8.0
27	Slovenia	6.0	9	1.4	4.7 - 8.9
28	Namibia	5.7	5	2.2	3.6 - 8.9
29	Estonia	5.6	8	0.6	5.2 - 6.6
	Taiwan	5.6	12	0.8	3.9 - 6.6
31	Italy	5.2	11	1.1	3.4 - 7.2
32	Uruguay	5.1	5	0.7	4.2 - 6.1
33	Hungary	4.9	11	0.5	4.0 - 5.6
	Malaysia	4.9	11	0.6	3.6 - 5.7
	Trinidad & Tobago	4.9	4	1.5	3.6 - 6.9
36	Belarus	4.8	3	1.3	3.3 - 5.8
	Lithuania	4.8	7	1.9	3.4 - 7.6
	South Africa	4.8	11	0.5	3.9 - 5.5
	Tunisia	4.8	5	0.8	3.6 - 5.6
40	Costa Rica	4.5	6	0.9	3.6 - 5.9
	Jordan	4.5	5	0.7	3.6 - 5.2
	Mauritius	4.5	6	0.8	3.5 - 5.5
	South Korea	4.5	12	1.3	2.1 - 7.1
44	Greece	4.2	8	0.7	3.7 - 5.5
45	Brazil	4.0	10	0.4	3.4 - 4.8
	Bulgaria	4.0	7	0.9	3.3 - 5.7
	Jamaica	4.0	3	0.4	3.6 - 4.3
	Peru	4.0	7	0.6	3.2 - 5.0
	Poland	4.0	11	1.1	2.6 - 5.5

**Explanatory notes**

*A more detailed description of the CPI 2002 methodology is available at <http://www.transparency.org/cpi/index.html#cpi> or at [www.gwdg.de/~uwwv/2002.html](http://www.gwdg.de/~uwwv/2002.html)*

**CPI 2002 Score**

relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people and risk analysts, and ranges between 10 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt).

**Surveys Used**

refers to the number of surveys that assessed a country's performance. A total of 15 surveys were used from nine independent institutions, and at least three surveys were required for a country to be included in the CPI.

**Standard Deviation**

indicates differences in the values of the sources: the greater the standard deviation, the greater the differences of perceptions of a country among the sources.

**High-Low Range**

provides the highest and lowest values of the different sources.

## Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2002

Country Rank	Country	CPI 2002 score	Surveys used	Standard deviation	High-low Range	
50	Ghana	3.9	4	1.4	2.7 - 5.9	
51	Croatia	3.8	4	0.2	3.6 - 4.0	
52	Czech Republic	3.7	10	0.8	2.6 - 5.5	
	Latvia	3.7	4	0.2	3.5 - 3.9	
	Morocco	3.7	4	1.8	1.7 - 5.5	
	Slovak Republic	3.7	8	0.6	3.0 - 4.6	
	Sri Lanka	3.7	4	0.4	3.3 - 4.3	
57	Colombia	3.6	10	0.7	2.6 - 4.6	
	Mexico	3.6	10	0.6	2.5 - 4.9	
59	China	3.5	11	1.0	2.0 - 5.6	
	Dominican Rep.	3.5	4	0.4	3.0 - 3.9	
	Ethiopia	3.5	3	0.5	3.0 - 4.0	
62	Egypt	3.4	7	1.3	1.7 - 5.3	
	El Salvador	3.4	6	0.8	2.0 - 4.2	
64	Thailand	3.2	11	0.7	1.5 - 4.1	
	Turkey	3.2	10	0.9	1.9 - 4.6	
66	Senegal	3.1	4	1.7	1.7 - 5.5	
67	Panama	3.0	5	0.8	1.7 - 3.6	
68	Malawi	2.9	4	0.9	2.0 - 4.0	
	Uzbekistan	2.9	4	1.0	2.0 - 4.1	
70	Argentina	2.8	10	0.6	1.7 - 3.8	
71	Cote d'Ivoire	2.7	4	0.8	2.0 - 3.4	
	Honduras	2.7	5	0.6	2.0 - 3.4	
	India	2.7	12	0.4	2.4 - 3.6	
	Russia	2.7	12	1.0	1.5 - 5.0	
	Tanzania	2.7	4	0.7	2.0 - 3.4	
	Zimbabwe	2.7	6	0.5	2.0 - 3.3	
	77	Pakistan	2.6	3	1.2	1.7 - 4.0
		Philippines	2.6	11	0.6	1.7 - 3.6
Romania		2.6	7	0.8	1.7 - 3.6	
Zambia		2.6	4	0.5	2.0 - 3.2	
81	Albania	2.5	3	0.8	1.7 - 3.3	
	Guatemala	2.5	6	0.6	1.7 - 3.5	
	Nicaragua	2.5	5	0.7	1.7 - 3.4	
	Venezuela	2.5	10	0.5	1.5 - 3.2	
85	Georgia	2.4	3	0.7	1.7 - 2.9	
	Ukraine	2.4	6	0.7	1.7 - 3.8	
	Vietnam	2.4	7	0.8	1.5 - 3.6	
88	Kazakhstan	2.3	4	1.1	1.7 - 3.9	
89	Bolivia	2.2	6	0.4	1.7 - 2.9	
	Cameroon	2.2	4	0.7	1.7 - 3.2	
	Ecuador	2.2	7	0.3	1.7 - 2.6	
	Haiti	2.2	3	1.7	0.8 - 4.0	
93	Moldova	2.1	4	0.6	1.7 - 3.0	
	Uganda	2.1	4	0.3	1.9 - 2.6	
95	Azerbaijan	2.0	4	0.3	1.7 - 2.4	
96	Indonesia	1.9	12	0.6	0.8 - 3.0	
	Kenya	1.9	5	0.3	1.7 - 2.5	
98	Angola	1.7	3	0.2	1.6 - 2.0	
	Madagascar	1.7	3	0.7	1.3 - 2.5	
	Paraguay	1.7	3	0.2	1.5 - 2.0	
101	Nigeria	1.6	6	0.6	0.9 - 2.5	
102	Bangladesh	1.2	5	0.7	0.3 - 2.0	

### Explanatory notes

A more detailed description of the CPI 2002 methodology is available at <http://www.transparency.org/cpi/index.html#cpi> or at [www.gwdg.de/~uwww/2002.html](http://www.gwdg.de/~uwww/2002.html)

#### CPI 2002 Score

relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people and risk analysts, and ranges between 10 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt).

#### Surveys Used

refers to the number of surveys that assessed a country's performance. A total of 15 surveys were used from nine independent institutions, and at least three surveys were required for a country to be included in the CPI.

#### Standard Deviation

indicates differences in the values of the sources: the greater the standard deviation, the greater the differences of perceptions of a country among the sources.

#### High-Low Range

provides the highest and lowest values of the different sources.

### ***What is the Corruption Perceptions Index?***

The TI Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) this year ranks 102 countries in terms of the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among public officials and politicians. It is a composite index, drawing on 15 different polls and surveys from nine independent institutions carried out among business people and country analysts, including surveys of residents, both local and expatriate.

### ***For the purpose of the TI indices, how is corruption defined?***

The CPI focuses on corruption in the public sector and defines corruption as the abuse of public office for private gain. The surveys used in compiling the CPI tend to ask questions in line with the misuse of public power for private benefits, with a focus, for example, on bribe-taking by public officials in public procurement. The sources do not distinguish between administrative and political corruption.

### ***Why is the Corruption Perceptions Index a valuable tool?***

Because the CPI is derived from 15 different surveys that garner the perceptions of both residents and expatriates, both business people and risk analysts, the index provides a snapshot of the views of decision-makers, who take key decisions on investment and trade. The CPI builds public awareness of the corruption issue, and it adds to pressure on governments to directly address the issue and the damaged image of their nation that low rankings in the CPI reflect.

### ***What role is played by exporters in international criminal transactions?***

On 14 May 2002, TI published the second Bribe Payers Index (BPI), which ranked exporting countries according to their propensity to offer bribes. (The first BPI was published in 1999.) This BPI is accessible on the internet at <http://www.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#bpi>. The BPI complements the CPI and underlines the point that corruption in international business transactions involves both those who take and those who give. Looking only at those who take, the CPI provides an incomplete picture.

### ***Is it right to conclude that the country with the lowest score is the world's most corrupt country?***

No. Firstly, the country with the lowest score is the one perceived to be the most corrupt of those included in the index. The CPI is based on polls, which are snapshots in time and reflect both opinions and experience. Furthermore, there are more than 200 sovereign nations in the world and the CPI 2002 ranks only 102. Although this is the highest number of countries in the history of the CPI, TI does not have sufficient reliable data for all countries.

### ***Why is the CPI based on perceptions only?***

It is difficult to base comparative statements on the levels of corruption in different countries on hard empirical data, e.g. by comparing the number of prosecutions or court cases. Such cross-country data does not reflect actual levels of corruption; rather it highlights the quality of prosecutors, courts and/or the media in exposing corruption. The only method of compiling comparative data is therefore to build on the experience and perceptions of those who are most directly confronted with the realities of corruption.

### ***Was there any change in the target groups polled for the CPI this year?***

There are changes this year, which should serve as a warning not to overstate year-on-year comparisons. This year we used 15 polls from nine institutions compared with 14 polls from seven institutions in 2001. The robustness of the CPI findings is enhanced by the fact that residents' viewpoints were found to correlate well with those of expatriates. In the past, expatriates surveyed were often western businesspeople. The viewpoint of less developed countries seemed underrepresented. This has changed. On behalf of Transparency International, Gallup International surveyed respondents from emerging market economies, asking them to assess the performance of public servants in industrial countries. The results from this survey correlate well with other sources, indicating that the CPI gathers perceptions that are invariant to cultural preconditions and represent a global perspective.

### ***What are the criteria in determining which surveys are used?***

TI seeks excellent data for the CPI and, to qualify, the data has to be well documented, and it has to be sufficient to permit a judgement on its reliability. TI strives to ensure that the sources used are of the highest quality, that the survey work is performed with complete integrity and that the methodologies used to analyse findings are first class. TI is confident that these criteria apply to the CPI. A more detailed description of the underlying methodology has been written for the 2002 index and is available at <http://www.transparency.org/cpi/index.html#cpi> or at [www.gwdg.de/~uwwv/2002.html](http://www.gwdg.de/~uwwv/2002.html). The methodology used is reviewed by a Steering Committee consisting of leading international experts in the fields of corruption, econometrics and statistics. Members of the Steering Committee make suggestions for improving the CPI, but the management of TI takes the final decisions on the methodology.

used. Consequently, neither the CPI methodology nor its presentation modality ought to be interpreted as necessarily constituting endorsement by the Steering Committee or its individual members.

***Which countries are included in the CPI 2002?***

TI requires at least three sources to be available for a country before considering the database sufficiently robust for that country to be ranked in the CPI. Countries for which there might be only one or two data sources available are not included in the CPI. Albania, Angola, Belarus, Ethiopia, Georgia, Haiti, Jamaica, Madagascar, Morocco, Paraguay and Sri Lanka have been included because three sources are now available, but were not in 2001.

***Were there any countries that were included in the CPI 2001, but not in the CPI 2002?***

No. All countries included in the CPI 2001 are also included in this year's CPI.

***Is the country score a reliable measure of a country's perceived level of corruption?***

In terms of perceptions of corruption, the CPI is a solid measurement tool. The reliability differs, however, between countries. Countries with a low number of sources and large differences in the values provided by the sources (indicated by a large Standard Deviation) convey less reliability as to their score and ranking.

***Are old surveys used in the CPI?***

The CPI is based on 2000-2002 data. Since fundamental changes in the levels of corruption in a country evolve only slowly, while public perceptions may change more swiftly and be influenced to some extent by short-term events, TI determined to base the CPI on a three-year rolling average. Hence, this year's CPI is based on survey data collected exclusively between 2000 and 2002.

***Which sources have contributed to the assessment of each individual country?***

A list of sources and surveys from which the CPI is derived follows at the end of the press release. A list of the sources that contributed to the assessment of each country is available on the Internet as an Excel sheet (<http://www.transparency.org/cpi/index.html#cpi> or [www.gwdg.de/~uwwv/2002.html](http://www.gwdg.de/~uwwv/2002.html)). This list also provides further information on standard errors and confidence intervals for each country.

***Can data from one year be compared with that from a previous year?***

Comparisons to the results from previous years should be based on a country's score, not its rank. A country's rank can change simply because new countries enter the index and others drop out. A higher score is an indicator that respondents provided better ratings, while a lower score suggests that respondents revised their perception downwards. However, year-to-year comparisons of a country's score do not only result from a changing perception of a country's performance but also from a changing sample and methodology. With differing respondents and slightly differing methodologies, a change in a country's score may also relate to the fact that different viewpoints have been collected and different questions been asked.

As compared with the CPI 2001, in 2002 Bangladesh's score has improved by 0.8 points. However, this change was due solely to methodological changes: the new standardisation technique avoids negative numbers. For example, last year the worst individual score provided to Bangladesh was -1.7. This year the worst standardised score is 0.3 due to the methodological changes. Bangladesh's original values had remained largely constant. As a consequence, the higher score in 2002 in no way reflects actual improvements. Quite the contrary: the results obtained in 2001 were corroborated by this year's CPI. There is now even much more agreement (that is, a low standard deviation of the data) that Bangladesh is perceived to have outstanding problems with corruption. For the expert, maybe the following additional piece of data might be relevant. Had we used our former methodology, in 2002 Bangladesh would have obtained a score of 0.2, with a standard deviation of 1.4. The High-Low range would have been from -1.4 to 1.8.

***Which countries' scores deteriorated most between 2001 and 2002?***

Making comparisons from one year to another is problematic. However, to the extent that changes can be traced back to a change in the results from individual sources, trends can be cautiously identified. Noteworthy examples of a downward trend are Argentina, Ireland and Moldova. The considerable decline in their scores does not result from technical factors - actual changes in perceptions are therefore likely.

***Which countries improved most compared with last year?***

With the same caveats applied, on the basis of data from sources that have been consistently used for the index, improvements can be observed for Hong Kong, Slovenia, South Korea, Dominican Republic and Russia.

## Survey sources for the TI Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2002

Number	1	2	3
Source	Columbia University (CU)	Political & Economic Risk Consultancy	
Name	State Capacity Survey	Asian Intelligence Issue	
Year	2001	2000	2001
Internet address		<a href="http://www.asiarisk.com/">http://www.asiarisk.com/</a>	
Who was surveyed?	US-resident country experts (policy analysts, academics and journalists)	Expatriate business executives	
Subject asked	Severity of corruption within the state	Extent of corruption in a way that detracts from the business environment for foreign companies	How do you rate corruption in terms of its quality or contribution to the overall living/working environment?
Number of replies	251	1,027	ca. 1,000
Coverage	121 countries	14 countries	
Number	4	5	6
Source	Institute for Management Development, IMD, Switzerland		
Name	World Competitiveness Yearbook		
Year	2000	2001	2002
Internet address	<a href="http://www.imd.ch/wcy">www.imd.ch/wcy</a>		
Who was surveyed?	Executives in top and middle management; domestic and international companies		
Subject asked	Bribing and corruption exist in the public sphere	Bribing and corruption exist in the economy	
Number of replies	4,160	3,678	3,532
Coverage	47 countries	49 countries	
Number	7	8	9
Source	World Bank	PricewaterhouseCoopers	Gallup International on behalf of Transparency International
Name	World Business Environment Survey	Opacity Index	Bribe Payers Index
Year	2001	2001	2002
Internet address	<a href="http://www1.worldbank.org/beext/resources/assess-wbessurvey-alt.htm">www1.worldbank.org/beext/resources/assess-wbessurvey-alt.htm</a>	<a href="http://www.opacityindex.com/">www.opacityindex.com/</a>	<a href="http://www.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#bj">http://www.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#bj</a>
Who was surveyed?	Senior managers	CFOs, equity analysts, bankers and PwC staff	Senior businesspeople from 15 emerging market economies
Subject asked	"Frequency of bribing" and "corruption as a constraint to business"	Frequency of corruption in various contexts (e.g. obtaining import/export permits or subsidies, avoiding taxes)	How common are bribes to politicians, senior civil servants, and judges and how significant of an obstacle are the costs associated with such payments for doing business?
Number of replies	10,090	1,357	835
Coverage	79 countries <sup>1</sup>	34 countries	21 countries
Number	10	11	12
Source	Economist Intelligence Unit	Freedom House	World Economic Forum
Name	Country Risk Service and Country Forecast	Nations in Transit	Africa Competitiveness Report
Year	2002	2002	2000
Internet address	<a href="http://www.eiu.com">www.eiu.com</a>	<a href="http://www.freedomhouse.org">www.freedomhouse.org</a>	<a href="http://www.weforum.org">www.weforum.org</a>
Who was surveyed?	Expert staff assessment (expatriate)	Assessment by US academic experts and FH staff	Senior business leaders; domestic and international companies
Subject asked	Assessment of the pervasiveness of corruption (the misuse of public office for private or political party gain) among public officials (politicians and civil servants)	Levels of corruption	How problematic is corruption? Are irregular, additional payments required? In large amounts?
Number of replies	Not applicable	Not applicable	1,800
Coverage	115 countries	27 transition economies	26 countries
Number	13	14	15
Source	World Economic Forum		
Name	Global Competitiveness Report		
Year	2000	2001	2002
Internet address	<a href="http://www.weforum.org">www.weforum.org</a>		
Who was surveyed?	Senior business leaders; domestic and international companies		
Subject asked	Undocumented extra payments connected with import and export permits, public utilities and contracts, business licenses, tax payments or loan applications are common/not common.	Questions (in addition to those mentioned left) refer to payments connected to favourable regulations and judicial decisions	
Number of replies	4,022	ca. 4,600	ca. 4,700
Coverage	59 countries	76 countries	80 countries

<sup>1</sup> The survey was carried out in 81 countries, but data for two countries was insufficient.