

U4 Expert Answer



How-to guide for corruption assessment tools

Query

I would like to have an overview of the various corruption measurements, with a particular focus on when to use these (their benefits), and when not to use these (their limitations).

Purpose

This will assist to provide an overview to staff of strength and weakness' of the various tools and indexes

Content

1. Corruption measurement tools
2. Good governance assessments
3. References

Caveat

This tool guide is not meant to be an exhaustive list. The tools were selected on the basis of the availability of an evaluation of their scope, strengths and weaknesses. Strengths and weaknesses will often be

relative to the intended users' needs, and as the paper is intended to serve a broad spectrum of development practitioners it cannot be comprehensive in its assessment. Moreover, this paper only presents a selection of multi-country indices. Practitioners are however also advised to explore local reports and surveys which may at times be more specific and informative.

Summary

This paper provides an overview of a number of publicly accessible tools to assess a country's level of corruption or good governance. These tools comprise qualitative and quantitative country data, and covers corruption perception, good governance legal and institutional frameworks as well as their implementation. The tools are classified by alphabetical order (organisations).

Author(s): Sofia Wickberg, Transparency International, swickberg@transparency.org

Reviewed by: Dieter Zinnbauer, Transparency International, dzinnbauer@transparency.org; Jesper Johnson, CMI, Jesper.Johnson@cmi.no

Date: 18 February 2013 Number: 365

U4 is a web-based resource centre for development practitioners who wish to effectively address corruption challenges in their work. Expert Answers are produced by the U4 Helpdesk – operated by Transparency International – as quick responses to operational and policy questions from U4 Partner Agency staff.

1 Corruption measurement tools

The tools presented in this paper were selected on the basis of the availability of an evaluation of their scope. There are many more assessment tools to be used to analyse corruption, most of which being captured in the GATEway Corruption Assessment Toolbox (<http://gateway.transparency.org/>). This database of tools offers a set of topic guides providing practical insight into the strengths and limitations of the different approaches to diagnosing and analysing corruption. Each topic guide covers a particular process, sector or assessment method, and can be accessed here: <http://gateway.transparency.org/guides>.

Afrobarometer

<http://www.afrobarometer.org/index.php>

Frequency: Every 2-3 years

Sources

The Afrobarometer is built using primary sources; data is collected through face-to-face interviews by trained interviewers in the language of the respondent's choice. Respondents are selected through national probability samples that represent an accurate cross section of the voting age population. Random selection is used at every stage of sampling and the sample is stratified to ensure that all major demographic segments of the population are covered. Sample size varies from a minimum of 1200 in each country to up to 2400 or more.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The Afrobarometer measures citizen perceptions of the social, political and economic atmosphere of Africa. Each survey collects data about individual attitudes and behaviour on eight main topics: Democracy, Governance, Livelihoods, Macroeconomics & Markets, Social Capital, Conflict & Crime, Participation and National Identity.

The questionnaire includes a series of questions on the involvement of different public officials and civil servants in corruption. It also contains a series of questions on victimisation, on the number of bribes paid and to which institutions.

Strengths

The results of the Afrobarometer can both be compared geographically and over time thanks to the standard set of questions.

Weaknesses

The Afrobarometer is a public opinion survey and lacks an assessment of the institutional framework. Moreover, the results cannot be generalized to Sub-Saharan Africa as a whole. Because it is possible to conduct survey research on public opinion only in countries that have undergone a measure of political liberalization, the sample of countries does not include authoritarian regimes or countries embroiled in civil wars.

Note: other regional public opinion surveys are available, such as the [Eurobarometer](#) the [Latinobarometer](#) and the [Asian Barometer](#).

Corruption Perceptions Index, Transparency International

<http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2012/>

Frequency: yearly

Sources

The CPI is a composite index, using data sources from independent institutions specialising in governance and business climate analysis. The sources of information used for the CPI are based on data gathered in the past 24 months. For a country to feature in the CPI, it needs at least three CPI data sources.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The CPI measures the level of perceived corruption in the public and political sectors in countries, based on surveys and expert assessments of corruption. Since 2012 and the updated methodology, the CPI uses the raw scores given to each country/territory and converts them to fit the CPI scale, from 0 (highly corrupt) to 100 (very clean). Each country/territory is then given a rank reflecting its position relative to the other countries/territories included in the index.

The CPI is limited in scope and should be used to capture perceptions of the extent of corruption in the public sector. This index gives a sense of the level of corruption in the public sector, in comparison to the other countries/territories featured. Starting in 2013, the

country score will be comparable overtime thanks to the updated methodology.

Strengths

The CPI is a global index including a large number of countries. This index uses a comprehensive set of primary sources. The CPI has had an essential role for advocacy groups around the world.

Weaknesses

The CPI does not provide any concrete measurement of corruption; neither does it assess institutional frameworks. The CPI does not distinguish between the different types of corruption. The assessment of people's perception of corruption does not necessarily reflect the actual level of corruption in the country. Perceptions are complex measures and slow to change, so the CPI can typically not be used to assess effects of a specific reform.

Global Corruption Barometer, Transparency International

<http://gcb.transparency.org/gcb201011/>

Frequency: every other year

Sources

The GCB is a public opinion survey, based on primary sources. The survey is designed by Transparency International and is carried out by Transparency International's Chapters and specialised service providers commissioned by Transparency International.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The GCB is a worldwide public opinion survey on views and experiences of corruption. As a poll of the general public, it provides an indicator of how corruption is viewed and experienced at national level and how efforts to curb corruption around the world are judged on the ground. It also provides a measure of people's experience of corruption in the past year, in general and per institution.

The GCB should be used to get a sense of the level of petty bribery and of how citizens perceive corruption and anti-corruption efforts in their country.

Strengths

The GCB is the largest cross-country survey to collect the general public's views on, and experiences of,

corruption. The 2010/2011 edition covered 100 countries. The GCB measures experience with bribery in different sectors and institutions.

Weaknesses

The GCB only assesses in its experiential dimension the extent of bribery. The GCB gives a reference of people's experience of corruption in various institutions but does not assess the institutional frameworks. The GCB can be used to assess reform impact if there is a logical link between the intervention and the intended outcomes measured by the GCB, preferably combined with other data sources.

Bribe Payers Index, Transparency International

<http://bpi.transparency.org/bpi2011/>

Frequency: periodically, but not in regular intervals

Sources

The BPI is based on the views of business executives as captured by Transparency International's Bribe Payers Survey. This survey captures the views of more than 3,000 senior business executives in 30 countries around the world on their perceptions of the likelihood of companies, from countries they have business dealings with, to engage in bribery when doing business in their country. These 30 countries were selected as recipients of large inflows of foreign direct investment and imports, and with the additional criteria to achieve a good regional balance in countries surveyed.

The surveyed businesspeople are presented a list of 28 countries. For each instance where the respondent answered that they do have business relationships with companies headquartered in a country, the respondents were then asked: "How often do firms headquartered in (country name) engage in bribery in this country?" A country's score is an average of the scores given by all the respondents who rated that country.

The respondents are also asked how common bribery is in the sectors with which they have business relations. 19 sectors were scored and ranked in 2011.

The questionnaire was developed by Transparency International in consultation with a number of internal and external stakeholders. In 2011, the survey was carried out by Ipsos Mori (part of Ipsos Group), through

its local offices. At least 100 people were surveyed in each of the 30 countries (except China).

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The Bribe Payers Index is a tool for capturing the supply side of international bribery, specifically focussing on bribes paid by the private sector. It ranks a number of the world's largest economies according to the perceived likelihood of companies from these countries to pay bribes abroad. The BPI is based on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means that companies from that country are perceived as always paying bribes when doing business abroad, and 10 means that companies from the country are perceived as never engaging in bribery when doing business abroad.

The BPI also ranks sectors on the likelihood of bribery occurring in dealing with companies from these sectors.

The results of the 2011 BPI can be compared to the ones from the 2008 edition since they are built on the same methodology.

Strengths

The Bribe Payers Index is a unique tool capturing the supply side of international bribery, specifically focussing on likelihood of paying bribes by the private sector. The Index can therefore highlight whether corruption is a significant obstacle to investments in a given country.

Weaknesses

The BPI does not assess the institutional problems that lead to the occurrence of bribery. The Index assesses frequency, not volume/causes/consequences of bribery.

Enterprise Surveys, World Bank

<http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/>

Frequency: every three/four years

Sources

The Enterprise Surveys are built on a methodology developed by the World Bank. The surveys are then conducted by private contractors on behalf of the World Bank. The Enterprise Survey is answered by business owners and top managers, as well as company accountants and human resource managers. Typically 1200-1800 interviews are conducted in larger economies, 360 interviews are conducted in medium-

sized economies and for smaller economies, 150 interviews take place.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The Enterprise Survey measure firms' perceptions of country business environments and experience with government processes, including informal payments and corruption. They capture business perceptions on the biggest obstacles to enterprise growth, the relative importance of various constraints to increasing employment and productivity, Surveys are designed to generate comparative measurements in areas such as corruption.

The Enterprise Surveys measure the percentage of firms that expect to engage in bribery to "get thing done" in general terms, and for different services (water, electricity etc.). They also give an estimation of the number of businesses that consider corruption to be a major constraint for doing business in the country. The results are comparable across countries and over time.

Strengths

The Enterprise Surveys place corruption in the larger context of doing business in a country. They cover a large number of countries (135 as of February 2013). The data is comprehensive, based on a large sample of respondents, and covers both perceptions and experiences of corruption.

Weaknesses

The instrument used to collect data has undergone modifications and the country coverage has been expanded, requiring close attention to time comparisons of specific questionnaire items.

2 Good governance assessment tools

Transformation Index, Bertelsmann Foundation

<http://www.bti-project.org/home/index.nc>

Frequency: every two years

Sources

Guided by a standardized codebook developed by the Bertelsmann Foundation, country experts for each of the 128 countries assess the extent to which a total of 17 criteria have been met and assign scores. A second country expert then reviews these assessments and scores. In a final step, consistency is then assured by subjecting each of the 49 individual scores to regional and inter-regional calibration processes.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The BTI examines and assesses whether and how developing and transformation countries manage social change toward democracy and a market economy. Within this framework, the BTI publishes two rankings, the Status Index and the Management Index. The Status Index assesses the state of political and economic transformation and locates the 128 countries on the path toward democracy under the rule of law and a market economy. The Management Index assesses the quality of governance, which encompasses the acumen with which decision makers steer political processes.

The indicators measure both the design and performance of governance and economic frameworks. Scores take into account both existing legal measures on the books and de facto realities of practical implementation in each country.

Strengths

Assessments rely on country experts' opinions. The disaggregated data help understand specific weaknesses and loopholes in legal and institutional frameworks. The BTI provides country reports with quantitative and qualitative data.

Weaknesses

The BTI takes economic institutions into account and does not only reflect the quality of governments.

Country coverage has been expanded and, therefore, appropriate time comparisons require closer attention.

Countries at Crossroads, Freedom House

<http://www.freedomhouse.org/report-types/countries-crossroads>

Frequency: yearly

Sources

Country reports are authored by prominent scholars and analysts and are reviewed by expert regional advisers. The numerical ratings are generated through consultation with report authors and academic advisers.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

Countries at Crossroads provide in-depth comparative assessments and quantitative ratings – examining government accountability, civil liberties, rule of law, and anticorruption and transparency efforts in 70 countries worldwide at a critical crossroad in determining their political future. The indicators measure both the design and performance of transparency and accountability frameworks.

A new edition of this study is published each year, with half the set of countries analysed in odd years and the other half in even years.

Strengths

Countries at Crossroads provides a comprehensive analysis of both the legal/institutional framework and its implementation.

Weaknesses

The instrument used to collect data as well as country coverage have undergone modifications, requiring close attention to time comparisons of specific questionnaire items.

Global Integrity Index, Global Integrity

<http://www.globalintegrity.org/report>

Frequency: yearly (note that the methodology will change in 2013)

Sources

The Global Integrity Index is a compilation of country-specific expert assessments backed up by standardized scoring criteria, sourcing requirements, and a blind peer review process. Data are scored by a lead in-country researcher and blindly reviewed by a panel of peer reviewers, a mix of other in-country experts as well as outside experts.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The indicators scorecard assesses the existence, effectiveness, and citizen access to key governance and anti-corruption mechanisms. It examines issues such as transparency of the public procurement process, media freedom, asset disclosure requirements, and conflicts of interest regulations. Scorecards take into account both existing legal measures on the books and de facto realities of practical implementation in each country.

The Global Integrity Index does not measure corruption or perception of corruption. It is a tool to understand the anti-corruption and good governance safeguards in place in a country.

Strengths

The disaggregated data help to understand which institutions or government branches are the strongest and the weakest in preventing corruption. This index is both qualitative and quantitative and involves regional experts as peer reviewers.

Weaknesses

The coverage is not global and the index focusses only on public institutions. It does not measure corruption.

Open Budget Index, International Budget Partnership

<http://internationalbudget.org/what-we-do/open-budget-survey/>

Frequency: every two years

Sources

The results of the Open Budget Index are based on the comprehensive questionnaire completed by a local researcher or group of researchers. Almost all of the researchers responsible for completing the Open Budget Questionnaire belong to either academic institutions or civil society organizations. All responses

to the survey questions are supported by evidence, such as citations from budget documents; the country's laws; or interviews with government officials, legislators, or experts on the country's budget process.

The answers are also cross-checked against published budget documents and reports on fiscal transparency issued by international institutions (IMF, World Bank, OECD), and peer reviewed.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The Open Budget Survey assesses the public availability of budget information and other budgeting practices that contribute to an accountable and responsive public finance system in countries around the world. The majority of the survey questions assess what occurs in practice, rather than what is required by law. The Survey assesses the contents and timely release of eight key budget documents that all countries should issue at different points in the budget process, according to generally accepted good practice criteria for public financial management. The Open Budget Survey covers additional topics of importance to civil society and proponents of good governance, including the extent to which the public can participate during each phase of the budget process, factors related to legislative strength and the role of the country's independent national audit office (also known as the "supreme audit institution").

A country's Open Budget Index (OBI) score reflects the timeliness and comprehensiveness of publicly available budget information in the eight key budget documents. The OBI assigns each country a score from 0 to 100, where 81-100 means that the country provides extensive budget information, and 0-20 scant or no information.

Strengths

The OBI is a unique tool to assess the availability and the quality of a country's budget information.

Weaknesses

Country coverage has been expanded, and as a result, appropriate time comparisons would need to make use of a constant country set, particularly if aggregation of indicators is performed for regional comparisons or indexes (World Bank).

Ibrahim Index of African Governance, Mo Ibrahim Foundation

<http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/interact/>

Frequency: yearly

Sources

The Ibrahim Index of African Governance is a composite index built on the basis of data collected by 23 independent data providers, including multilateral development banks, think tanks, business risk rating agencies and UN agencies.

Besides sharing the same understanding of governance as the Mo Ibrahim Foundation, an included indicator should cover at least two thirds of the countries on the continent (35 or more) and should provide at least two years' worth of data between 2000 and 2011. The latest available data should not be more than three years old and new data releases should be regular (at least every three years).

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The Ibrahim Index of African Governance measures the level of good governance in 52 African countries, based on four categories: Safety & Rule of Law, Participation & Human Rights, Sustainable Economic Opportunity, and Human Development. The index uses a scale from 0 to 100 where 0–100, where 100 is always the best possible score.

Governance is understood from the viewpoint of the citizen and its definition is intentionally broad to capture the most comprehensive image of the state and its responsibilities.

The index's dataset is updated every year and the addition of indicators implies retrospective revision of the scores from previous years. Comparisons between years should therefore be performed entirely on the latest IAG data set.

Comparisons between sub-categories should only be made on the basis of rank. These comparisons are relative (not absolute) for each country.

Strengths

The Ibrahim Index of African Governance covers most of the countries of the continent making it a

comprehensive tool. It assesses a wide range of components of good governance and provides targeted and specific indicators.

Weaknesses

Some datasets are out of date and contain gaps. Given the measurement imprecision, the Foundation advises users of the IAG to avoid the over-interpretation of small score differences.

Worldwide Governance Indicators, World Bank

http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/sc_country.asp

Frequency: yearly

Sources

The WGI are composite governance indicators based on 30 underlying data sources (survey institutes, think tanks, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, and private sector firms). These data sources are rescaled and combined to create the six aggregate indicators using a statistical methodology known as an unobserved components model. A key feature of the methodology is that it generates margins of error for each governance estimate. These margins of error need to be taken into account when making comparisons across countries and over time.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) are a research dataset summarizing the views on the quality of governance provided by a large number of enterprise, citizen and expert survey respondents in industrial and developing countries. There are six indicators measuring respectively: Voice and Accountability; Political Stability and Absence of Violence; Government Effectiveness; Regulatory Quality; Rule of Law; and Control of Corruption. The indicators are reported in two ways: (1) in their score, ranging from -2.5 to 2.5, and (2) in percentile rank terms from 0 to 100, with higher values corresponding to better outcomes.

The WGI measures the quality of governance over the period 1996-2011, and should be used to observe trends over longer periods of time. The changes from year to year are harder to measure.

The WGI also serve for cross-country comparison, thanks to the standard errors accompanying the scores that reflect the number of sources available for a country and the extent to which these sources agree with each other.

Strengths

The WGI provide a comprehensive assessment from various data sources, including household/company surveys. They include an assessment of various institutions and provide an idea of trends over the last two decades.

Weaknesses

A reservation expressed about the WGI is their lack of transparency. The large number of indicators used to produce the WGI makes it harder to understand how a country get a specific score and some of these indicators are not publicly available. The definition of the six primary indicators is unclear. The Control of Corruption indicator is based on perceptions-based data.

Country policy and institutional assessment (CPIA), World Bank

<http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/CPIA>

Frequency: yearly

Sources

Data is collected through surveys of World Bank country experts, using quantitative and qualitative country data to guide ratings. The process of preparing the ratings involves two phases: (a) the benchmarking phase, in which a small, representative, sample of countries is rated in an intensive Bank-wide process; and (b) a second phase, in which the remaining countries are rated using the derived benchmark ratings as guideposts.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The CPIA is a diagnostic tool that is intended to capture the quality of a country's policies and institutional arrangements. The CPIA measures the extent to which a country's policy and institutional framework supports sustainable growth and poverty reduction, and consequently the effective use of development assistance.

The CPIA consists of 16 criteria, among which "Transparency, Accountability, and Corruption in the Public Sector", grouped in four equally weighted clusters: Economic Management, Structural Policies, Policies for Social Inclusion and Equity, and Public Sector Management and Institutions. For each of the 16 criteria, countries are rated on a scale of 1 (low) to 6 (high). The scores depend on the level of performance in a given year assessed against the criteria, rather than on changes in performance compared to the previous year.

Strengths

The CPIA gives an in-depth account of how well budgets are linked with policies, and a general overview of a country's policy/institutional framework.

Weaknesses

Due to the sensitive nature of the data, detailed explanations of the rating process are not available to the public. The scores are not comparable over time.

Public Accountability Mechanisms, World Bank

<http://www.agidata.org/pam/>

Frequency: every two years

Sources

The Public Accountability Mechanisms comprise two sets of indicators: Legal Framework and Implementation.

Data sources for legislative indicators consist of laws, decrees, codes of conduct, and court decisions that relate to the mechanism under study. The World Bank works with local technical experts to provide and analyse the data.

Data on implementation efforts is collected through collaboration with country governments, World Bank country offices, and civil society organizations. In most cases, data is collected through interviews with relevant government officials and civil society representatives and through site visits to government offices.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The Public Accountability Mechanisms provide qualitative data on legal frameworks and implementation systems and aim to develop actionable

governance indicators (AGIs) that provide insight into how governance sub-systems function and which actions may produce better outcomes. The mechanisms under study are asset disclosure, conflict of interest, freedom of information, immunity protections, and ethics training.

Legislative data is framed as both yes/no and a qualitative summary of the provisions. Implementation data contains either quantitative or qualitative data, along with explanatory comments.

Strengths

The Public Accountability Mechanisms provide a comprehensive overview of a country's legal and institutional safeguards against political and bureaucratic corruption.

Weaknesses

Legislative and implementation environments differ by country context; therefore, cross-country comparisons of data must be interpreted carefully. Implementation indicators require government/agency involvement and can be difficult to collect (World Bank).

Rule of Law Index, World Justice Project

<http://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index>

Frequency: yearly

Sources

Findings are based on data derived from a poll of the general public and detailed questionnaires presented to local experts. A set of five questionnaires are developed based on the Index's conceptual framework. More than 300 potential local experts per country respond to the questionnaires, and engage the services of leading local polling companies. In 2012 the Index team collected and mapped the data onto the 48 sub-factors which are aggregated into 9 factors of rule of law.

What does it measure? How to use the results?

The Rule of Law Index looks at a nation's adherence to the rule of law from the bottom up, from the perspective of ordinary people who are directly affected by the degree of rule of law in their societies. It offers a detailed and comprehensive picture, looking at nine

dimensions of the rule of law: limited government powers; absence of corruption; order and security; fundamental rights; open government; regulatory enforcement; access to civil justice; effective criminal justice; and informal justice.

0 represents the lowest score and it reflects a country's weak performance in practice rule of law. 1 represents the highest score possible.

Strengths

The multiple dimensions of the rule of law examined in this index give a comprehensive overview of the practice of the rule of law in surveyed countries.

Weaknesses

The index does not reflect the actual legal framework but only how components of the rule of law are practiced based on the views of public opinion and experts.

3 REFERENCES

Bertelsmann Foundation, *Transformation Index*, <http://www.bti-project.de/home/>

Freedom House, *Countries at Crossroads*, <http://www.freedomhouse.org/report-types/countries-crossroads>

Global Integrity, *Global Integrity Report*, <http://www.globalintegrity.org/report>

International Budget partnership, *Open Budget Index*, <http://internationalbudget.org/what-we-do/open-budget-survey/>

Mo Ibrahim Foundation, *Ibrahim Index of African Governance (IIAG)*, <http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/interact/>

OECD, *Uses and Abuses of Governance Indicators* (2006), http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/governance/oman_arndt_paper.pdf

Transparency International, *Corruption perceptions Index*, <http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2012/>

Transparency International, *Bribe Payers Index*, <http://bpi.transparency.org/bpi2011/>

Transparency International, *Global Corruption Barometer*, <http://gcb.transparency.org/gcb201011/>

UNDP, *A Users' Guide to measuring corruption* (2008), http://www.agora-parl.org/sites/default/files/undp_users_guide_to_measuring_corruption.pdf

World Bank, *Actionable Governance Data Portal*, <http://www.agidata.org/Site/Sources.aspx>

World Bank, *Public Accountability Mechanisms*,
<https://www.agidata.org/Pam/Methodology.aspx>

World Bank, *Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA)*,
<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/IDA/0,,contentMDK:21378540~menuPK:2626968~pagePK:51236175~piPK:437394~theSitePK:73154,00.html>

World Bank, *Worldwide Governance Indicators*,
http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/sc_country.asp

World Bank, *Enterprise Surveys*,
<http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/>

World Justice Project, *Rule of Law Index*,
<http://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index>