



CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX 2011

MALI BELARUS GUINEA-BISSAU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC JAPAN PUERTO RICO MONTENEGRO NIGERIA TAJIKISTAN VIETNAM ITALY SINGAPORE PAKISTAN BULGARIA CONGO REPUBLIC MOZAMBIQUE PERU FINLAND KOREA (SOUTH) AZERBAIJAN JAMAICA

Transparency International is the global civil society organisation leading the fight against corruption. Through more than 90 chapters worldwide and an international secretariat in Berlin, we raise awareness of the damaging effects of corruption and work with partners in government, business and civil society to develop and implement effective measures to tackle it.

www.transparency.org

Every effort has been made to verify the accuracy of the information contained in this report. All information was believed to be correct as of November 2011. Nevertheless, Transparency International cannot accept responsibility for the consequences of its use for other purposes or in other contexts.

ISBN: 978-3-943497-18-2

Design: Sophie Everett

Printed on 100% recycled paper.

©2011 Transparency International. All rights reserved.

183 COUNTRIES
183 SCORES

HOW DOES YOUR
COUNTRY DO?

OUR COUNTRIES, OUR FUTURE

Public outcry at corruption, impunity and economic instability sent shockwaves around the world in 2011. Protests in many countries have escalated quickly from small scale action to mass demonstration, uniting people from all parts of society. Their backgrounds may be diverse, but the message is the same: more transparency and accountability from our leaders is needed.

The 2011 Corruption Perceptions Index shows that public frustration is well founded. No region or country in the world is immune to the damages of public-sector corruption, the vast majority of the 183 countries and territories assessed score below five on a scale of 0 (highly corrupt) to 10 (very clean).

New Zealand, Denmark and Finland top the list, while North Korea and Somalia are at the bottom.

“This year we have seen corruption on protestors’ banners be they rich or poor. Whether in a Europe hit by debt crisis or an Arab world starting a new political era, leaders must heed the demands for better government,” said Huguette Labelle, Chair of Transparency International.

Public-sector governance that puts the interests of its citizens first is a responsibility that is not restricted to any border. Governments must act accordingly. For their part, citizens need to continue demanding better performance from their leaders. If we work together, the situation shown by this year’s Corruption Perceptions Index can improve. These are our countries and our future.

ABOUT THE INDEX

The Corruption Perceptions Index ranks countries according to their perceived levels of public-sector corruption. The 2011 index draws on different assessments and business opinion surveys carried out by independent and reputable institutions. The surveys and assessments used to compile the index include questions relating to the bribery of public officials, kickbacks in public procurement, embezzlement of public funds, and questions that probe the strength and effectiveness of public-sector anti-corruption efforts.

Perceptions are used because corruption – whether frequency or amount – is to a great extent a hidden activity that is difficult to measure. Over time, perceptions have proved to be a reliable estimate of corruption. Measuring scandals, investigations or prosecutions, while offering ‘non-perception’ data, reflect less on the prevalence of corruption in a country and more on other factors, such as freedom of the press or the efficiency of the judicial system. The Corruption Perceptions Index complements Transparency International’s many other tools that measure corruption and integrity in the public and private sectors at global, national and local levels.


For detailed information on the 2011 Corruption Perceptions Index please visit www.transparency.org

“THIS YEAR WE HAVE SEEN
**CORRUPTION ON PROTESTORS’
BANNERS BE THEY RICH OR
POOR. WHETHER IN A EUROPE
HIT BY DEBT CRISIS OR AN
ARAB WORLD STARTING A
NEW POLITICAL ERA, LEADERS
MUST HEED THE DEMANDS FOR
BETTER GOVERNMENT”**

*Huguette Labelle
Chair, Transparency International*

CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX 2011

THE PERCEIVED LEVELS OF PUBLIC-SECTOR CORRUPTION IN 183 COUNTRIES/TERRITORIES AROUND THE WORLD



RANK	COUNTRY/TERRITORY	SCORE
1	New Zealand	9.5
2	Denmark	9.4
2	Finland	9.4
4	Sweden	9.3
5	Singapore	9.2
6	Norway	9.0
7	Netherlands	8.9
8	Australia	8.8
8	Switzerland	8.8
10	Canada	8.7
11	Luxembourg	8.5
12	Hong Kong	8.4
13	Iceland	8.3
14	Germany	8.0
14	Japan	8.0
16	Austria	7.8
16	Barbados	7.8
16	United Kingdom	7.8
19	Belgium	7.5
19	Ireland	7.5
21	Bahamas	7.3
22	Chile	7.2
22	Qatar	7.2
24	United States	7.1

25	France	7.0
25	Saint Lucia	7.0
25	Uruguay	7.0
28	United Arab Emirates	6.8
29	Estonia	6.4
30	Cyprus	6.3
31	Spain	6.2
32	Botswana	6.1
32	Portugal	6.1
32	Taiwan	6.1
35	Slovenia	5.9
36	Israel	5.8
36	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	5.8
38	Bhutan	5.7
39	Malta	5.6
39	Puerto Rico	5.6
41	Cape Verde	5.5
41	Poland	5.5
43	Korea (South)	5.4
44	Brunei	5.2
44	Dominica	5.2
46	Bahrain	5.1
46	Macau	5.1

RANK	COUNTRY/TERRITORY	SCORE
46	Mauritius	5.1
49	Rwanda	5.0
50	Costa Rica	4.8
50	Lithuania	4.8
50	Oman	4.8
50	Seychelles	4.8
54	Hungary	4.6
54	Kuwait	4.6
56	Jordan	4.5
57	Czech Republic	4.4
57	Namibia	4.4
57	Saudi Arabia	4.4
60	Malaysia	4.3
61	Cuba	4.2
61	Latvia	4.2
61	Turkey	4.2
64	Georgia	4.1
64	South Africa	4.1
66	Croatia	4.0
66	Montenegro	4.0
66	Slovakia	4.0
69	Ghana	3.9
69	Italy	3.9
69	FYR Macedonia	3.9

69	Samoa	3.9
73	Brazil	3.8
73	Tunisia	3.8
75	China	3.6
75	Romania	3.6
77	Gambia	3.5
77	Lesotho	3.5
77	Vanuatu	3.5
80	Colombia	3.4
80	El Salvador	3.4
80	Greece	3.4
80	Morocco	3.4
80	Peru	3.4
80	Thailand	3.4
86	Bulgaria	3.3
86	Jamaica	3.3
86	Panama	3.3
86	Serbia	3.3
86	Sri Lanka	3.3
91	Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.2
91	Liberia	3.2
91	Trinidad and Tobago	3.2
91	Zambia	3.2
95	Albania	3.1

95	India	3.1
95	Kiribati	3.1
95	Swaziland	3.1
95	Tonga	3.1
100	Argentina	3.0
100	Benin	3.0
100	Burkina Faso	3.0
100	Djibouti	3.0
100	Gabon	3.0
100	Indonesia	3.0
100	Madagascar	3.0
100	Malawi	3.0
100	Mexico	3.0
100	Sao Tome and Principe	3.0
100	Suriname	3.0
100	Tanzania	3.0
112	Algeria	2.9
112	Egypt	2.9
112	Kosovo	2.9
112	Moldova	2.9
112	Nicaragua	2.9
112	Nigeria	2.9
112	Vietnam	2.9
118	Bolivia	2.8
118	Mali	2.8


120	Bangladesh	2.7
120	Ecuador	2.7
120	Ethiopia	2.7
120	Guatemala	2.7
120	Iran	2.7
120	Kazakhstan	2.7
120	Mongolia	2.7
120	Mozambique	2.7
120	Solomon Islands	2.7
129	Armenia	2.6
129	Dominican Republic	2.6
129	Honduras	2.6
129	Philippines	2.6
129	Syria	2.6
134	Cameroon	2.5
134	Eritrea	2.5
134	Guyana	2.5
134	Lebanon	2.5
134	Maldives	2.5
134	Nicaragua	2.5
134	Niger	2.5
134	Pakistan	2.5
134	Sierra Leone	2.5
143	Azerbaijan	2.4

143	Belarus	2.4
143	Comoros	2.4
143	Mauritania	2.4
143	Nigeria	2.4
143	Russia	2.4
143	Timor-Leste	2.4
143	Togo	2.4
143	Uganda	2.4
152	Tajikistan	2.3
152	Ukraine	2.3
154	Central African Republic	2.2
154	Congo Republic	2.2
154	Côte d'Ivoire	2.2
154	Guinea-Bissau	2.2
154	Kenya	2.2
154	Laos	2.2
154	Nepal	2.2
154	Papua New Guinea	2.2
154	Paraguay	2.2
154	Zimbabwe	2.2
164	Cambodia	2.1
164	Guinea	2.1
164	Kyrgyzstan	2.1
164	Yemen	2.1

168	Angola	2.0
168	Chad	2.0
168	Democratic Republic of the Congo	2.0
168	Libya	2.0
172	Burundi	1.9
172	Equatorial Guinea	1.9
172	Venezuela	1.9
175	Haiti	1.8
175	Iraq	1.8
177	Sudan	1.6
177	Turkmenistan	1.6
177	Uzbekistan	1.6
180	Afghanistan	1.5
180	Myanmar	1.5
182	Korea (North)	1.0
182	Somalia	1.0

CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX 2011

NUMBER OF COUNTRIES ACCORDING TO PERCEIVED LEVELS OF PUBLIC-SECTOR CORRUPTION



BEST

NEW ZEALAND
DENMARK
FINLAND

WORST

AFGHANISTAN
MYANMAR
NORTH KOREA
SOMALIA

AMERICAS



ASIA PACIFIC



EASTERN EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA



EU & WESTERN EUROPE



MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA



SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA



KEEP IN TOUCH AND GET INVOLVED.



[FACEBOOK.COM/TRANSPARENCYINTERNATIONAL](https://www.facebook.com/transparencyinternational)



[TWITTER.COM/ANTICORRUPTION](https://twitter.com/anticorruption)

Acknowledgements

Generous support for the 2011 Corruption Perceptions Index was provided by Ernst & Young.

We are grateful for the contributions to our core activities, including this publication, from the Canadian Agency for International Development; the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Danida); the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland; Irish Aid; the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands; the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation; Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida); the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation; and the UK Department for International Development. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the views of these donors.

For a full list of all contributors and to find out how you can support our work please visit www.transparency.org

