




**TRANSPARENCY
INTERNATIONAL**
the global coalition against corruption

PEOPLE AND CORRUPTION: ASIA PACIFIC



Global Corruption Barometer

Transparency International is a global movement with one vision: a world in which government, business, civil society and the daily lives of people are free of corruption. Through more than 100 chapters worldwide and an international secretariat in Berlin, we are leading the fight against corruption to turn this vision into reality.

www.transparency.org

Author: Coralie Pring, Research Coordinator, Global Surveys

© Cover photo: Istock/urbancow

Design: Kerstin Deinert

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 February 2017. Nevertheless, Transparency International cannot accept responsibility for the consequences of its use for other purposes or in other contexts.

ISBN: 978-3-96076-044-3


Printed on 100% recycled paper.

Except where otherwise noted, this work is licensed under CC BY-ND 4.0



CONTENT

INTRODUCTION	2
PERCEPTIONS OF CORRUPTION: GOVERNMENT ACTION	6
EXPERIENCES OF CORRUPTION: BRIBERY	12
PEOPLE SPEAKING OUT AGAINST CORRUPTION	22
CONCLUSION	27
METHODOLOGY NOTE	30
NOTES	33

A photograph capturing a tense moment inside a crowded train. In the center, a young boy with a worried expression is being held and examined by several people. A woman in a yellow and orange sari is particularly focused on him, with her hands near his face. Other passengers, including a man in a yellow plaid shirt in the upper left and a woman in a purple striped sari in the lower right, look on with concern. The train's interior is filled with people, and the lighting is somewhat dim, highlighting the claustrophobic environment.

Raxaul, India. Employees of PRAYAS, an NGO fighting against child trafficking, question a boy in the train and discover that he is being trafficked. Every Saturday at 5pm a train leaves the bordertown to reach Mumbai. Every week, the team of PRAYAS searches the entire train to rescue trafficked children. Corruption is increasingly cited as a key cause and traffickers rarely face justice. Corruption both facilitates trafficking and feeds the flow of people by destabilising democracies, weakening a country's rule of law and stalling development.

INTRODUCTION

In 2017, inclusive development is high on the agenda for governments around the world, as people voice their concerns about growing inequality, persistent poverty and the exclusion of the most vulnerable. As a diverse and rapidly developing region, it is essential that the countries in the Asia Pacific region achieve sustainable and equitable development – this can only be done by ensuring that public decision-making promotes the common good. Corruption undermines this, as it distorts democratic processes and promotes private over public interests.

As part of a regional series for the Global Corruption Barometer, this new report comes at a key moment when many governments in the region are preparing their agendas to meet the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The SDGs set out development priorities for 2030 which include, among others, reducing corruption and bribery in all their forms.

While reducing public sector bribery is a target in itself, governments should also take note that corruption presents a real barrier to achieving other SDGs such as ending poverty and hunger, ensuring inclusive education, improving health outcomes, combating climate change and achieving gender equality. This is because corruption diverts public funds, leads to inefficient service provision, and channels resources away from those most in need. To achieve development on the far reaching SDGs, tackling corruption risks will be essential for social progress.

ABOUT THE RESEARCH

In the most extensive survey of its kind, we spoke to 21,861 people in 16 countries, regions and territories across the Asia Pacific regionⁱ between July 2015 and January 2017 about their perceptions and experiences of corruption.ⁱⁱ The survey results show a great diversity in the corruption risks across the region, but in every country surveyed there is scope for improved approaches to corruption prevention.

We found that bribery affects a huge number of citizens. We estimate that over 900 millionⁱⁱⁱ people across the 16 surveyed places had paid a bribe in the past year when trying to access basic services like education or health-care. Bribery rates for countries vary considerably across the region – from 0.2 per cent in Japan to 69 per cent in India. What is clear is that public sector graft is a crime that affects men and women, young and old, and rich and poor, and must be urgently addressed in order to further social progress in the region.

The findings suggest serious problems in the provision of law and order in a number of countries. The regional results show that bribery rates for the police are the highest of all services that we asked about and additionally, the police are perceived to have the highest levels of corruption of all the key institutions. Anti-corruption efforts must address corruption risks within the police force and ensure that the police serve their communities fairly and honestly.

One way to stop corruption and to help better achieve the SDGs is to encourage victims to report corruption, so that perpetrators can be held to account. And indeed, while in theory citizens in the region thought that reporting graft was the most effective way to stop it, in practice it almost always goes unreported. The fear of retaliation was the main reason people would not come forward, with our survey demonstrating that people who had reported corruption had also at times suffered negative consequences. Some people also felt that reporting channels were ineffective, or they were not even aware of where to report an incident.

We are calling for better whistleblower protection and effective reporting mechanisms so that people can feel safe reporting corruption and can have confidence that action will be taken as a result.

WHAT PEOPLE SAY ACROSS THE REGION

1. Few people think that corruption is on the decline

Only one in five people thought the level of corruption had decreased recently, while two in five thought the level of corruption had increased and a further one third had seen no change.

People in China were most likely to think the level of corruption had increased recently – nearly three quarters of people said corruption had risen. This compares with just 14 per cent in Thailand who reported corruption had increased.

2. People are divided as to whether governments are doing enough to stop corruption

A half of people in the region said that their government was doing a bad job at fighting corruption, while around two in five said that they were doing a good job.

People in India, Indonesia and Thailand were most positive about their governments' efforts, with over a half saying they were doing well. In contrast over three quarters of people in South Korea rated their government badly at addressing corruption.

3. More than one in four, or over 900 million people, paid a bribe when using a public service, in the 16 places surveyed

India had the highest bribery rate of all the countries surveyed, where nearly seven in 10 people who had accessed public services had paid a bribe. Japan had the lowest bribery rate, with 0.2 per cent of respondents reporting paying a bribe.

4. Police are seen as most corrupt

Across the region, nearly two in five said that they thought most or all police officers were corrupt, which was the highest of any group.

In addition, just under a third of people in the region who had come into contact with a police officer in the last 12 months had paid a bribe, which was the highest of any service we asked about.

5. "Standing up" and "speaking out" are seen as the best ways to fight corruption

When we asked citizens for examples of the best actions they can take to help fight corruption, the top responses were to speak out by reporting it, and to stand up by refusing to pay bribes. Worryingly, more than one in five felt completely powerless to help fight against corruption, saying that there is nothing that they can do.

6. But few people report corruption as they are afraid of the consequences

Only 7 per cent of bribe payers in the survey said that they had actually reported it to the authorities. The main reason most corruption incidents went unreported was because people were afraid of the consequences, followed by a belief that it would not make a difference and a lack of awareness of the appropriate reporting channels.

7. Malaysia and Vietnam are seen as having the most severe corruption problems

Across the different corruption issues covered in the survey, citizens in Malaysia and Vietnam were the most negative in the region across five of the key questions in the survey (see page 28 for the full details). People in Australia were the most positive.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings in this report, and our experience and knowledge in the region, Transparency International makes the following recommendations:

Make good on promises

- ▶ Heads of states must speak out and act immediately and publicly, to assert their specific and time-bound commitment under the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to substantially reduce bribery and corruption by 2030.
- ▶ Governments must deliver on their anti-corruption commitments made globally and regionally by implementing legislation and practice at the national level. For example, the social accountability (article 13) and anti-corruption agencies (articles 6 and 36) aspects of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC).

Stopping bribery in public services

- ▶ Governments should address systemic problems that allow corruption in public sector delivery:
 - ▶ Prevent corruption by promoting transparency through effective implementation of access to information legislation and open government practices, enhancing a healthy and free environment for civil society to operate, and enacting codes of conduct for public servants.
 - ▶ Punish the corrupt by immediately adopting a zero-tolerance policy for corruption in public services, pursuing prosecutions and applying appropriate sanctions.
- ▶ The police must lead by example and urgently address corruption within their ranks and act to gain public confidence because of their key role in fighting corruption.
- ▶ Governments must integrate anti-corruption targets into all SDGs including hunger, poverty, education, health, gender equality and climate action, and develop mechanisms to reduce corruption risks in these areas.

Encouraging more people to report corruption

- ▶ Legislatures must adopt and enforce comprehensive legislation to protect whistleblowers based on prevailing international standards, including those developed by Transparency International. Meanwhile, governments and the private sector must support whistleblowers and reporters of corruption and ensure appropriate follow-up to their disclosures.
- ▶ Anti-corruption agencies should engage with the large numbers of citizens willing to refuse paying bribes and those willing to report bribes. At the same time, anti-corruption agencies should implement outreach programmes to encourage people to report corruption and ensure user-friendly reporting mechanisms to empower citizens to effectively take action against corruption.

PERCEPTIONS OF CORRUPTION: GOVERNMENT ACTION



Cheonggye Plaza, South Korea, October 2016. People take to the streets calling for President Park Geun-hye to step down after she was impeached by parliament for violating her constitutional duty as leader.



Image: Creative Commons, Flickr / Teddy Cross

BBC (2017) South Korea's presidential scandal. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-37971085>

PERCEPTIONS OF CORRUPTION: GOVERNMENT ACTION

Few believe that corruption is on the decline


We asked people how they thought the level of corruption in their country had changed over the last 12 months – whether it had increased, decreased, or stayed the same.¹

Just one in five thought that corruption had decreased (22 per cent), compared with two in five who thought that the level of corruption had increased (40 per cent). A further one in three thought that there had been no change in the level of corruption (33 per cent).

The picture is very different across the region. In China, where the question asked about change in the level of corruption over the last three years, nearly three quarters of people said that they thought the level of corruption had worsened (73 per cent). This was the highest of any country surveyed. This was followed by Indonesia and Malaysia, where around six in 10 thought that corruption had increased (65 per cent and 59 per cent respectively).


In contrast, less than a quarter of people in Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand said that corruption had increased over the last 12 months (from 22 per cent to 14 per cent).

HOW HAS THE LEVEL OF CORRUPTION CHANGED RECENTLY? – REGIONAL RESULTS



¹ This question was not asked in Mongolia. The question in China asked about whether the level of corruption had changed over the last three years.

PERCENTAGE WHO THINK THE LEVEL OF CORRUPTION HAS INCREASED – RESULTS BY COUNTRY



For this report, Transparency International were given access to the results from a shortened module on corruption as asked in China, provided by the Asian Barometer Surveys organisation. Comparable questions were asked in China on the change in level of corruption, the perceptions of the level of corruption in various institutions, and bribery. As not all of the Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer questions were asked in China, footnotes in this report mention when the results do not include that country.

Q. In your opinion, over the past year, has the level of corruption in this country increased, decreased, or stayed the same? Base: all adults. Results presented combine those who said “Increased a lot” and “Increased somewhat”. “Stayed the same”, “Decreased somewhat”, “Decreased a lot” and “Don’t know” responses not shown for ease of comparison. This question was not asked in Mongolia.

* In China the question wording asked about change in the level of corruption over the last three years.

The police are seen as the most corrupt

We asked people how corrupt they thought nine of the most powerful groups in their society were, so that we could find out who were perceived as the most and least corrupt.


The results from across the region show that it is a key law and order institution – the police – that was thought to suffer most from corruption. Nearly two in five said that the police were mostly or entirely corrupt (39 per cent).

Many people in the region also perceived political decision-makers at both the national and local level to be highly corrupt. Over a third said that their legislative representatives (such as members of parliament or senators), government officials and local government councillors were highly corrupt (from 35 to 37 per cent). By contrast religious leaders were seen as far cleaner, with less than one in five saying they were highly corrupt (18 per cent).

People in Thailand and Pakistan were particularly likely to think that the police were highly corrupt, with over three quarters saying most or all police officers in their country were corrupt (78 per cent and 76 per cent). In Australia and Japan, the police were seen as far cleaner with less than one in 10 saying they were highly corrupt (5 and 8 per cent).

HOW CORRUPT ARE DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS AND GROUPS IN SOCIETY? – REGIONAL RESULTS

% SAYING MOST OR ALL ARE CORRUPT



Q. How many of the following people do you think are involved in corruption, or haven't you heard enough about them to say? Base: all respondents, excluding missing responses. Chart shows percentage of respondents who answered that either "Most" or "All" of them are corrupt. "None", "Some" and "Don't know" responses not shown for ease of comparison. The result for prime minister/ president and religious leaders excludes China where these questions were not asked.

People are divided over how well governments are doing at tackling corruption

✘ 50%

say their government is doing badly

✔ 41%


say their government is doing well

We asked people to rate their own government in terms of how it was performing in fighting public sector corruption.² We found that people were fairly divided – around two in five rated their government as doing a good job (41 per cent), while a half rated their government as doing a bad job (50 per cent).

People in South Korea were most likely to rate their government as doing badly at stopping graft. Over three quarters rated their government badly (76 per cent). Governments in Hong Kong, Vietnam, Japan, Mongolia, and Malaysia were perceived to be doing badly at fighting corruption by six in 10 of their citizens (from 60 per cent to 62 per cent).

In contrast, around a half or more of people living in India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Thailand said that their government was doing a good job (from 49 per cent to 72 per cent).


IS THE GOVERNMENT DOING WELL OR BADLY IN FIGHTING CORRUPTION? – RESULTS BY COUNTRY



Q. How well or badly would you say the current government is handling the following matters, or haven't you heard enough to say? "Fighting corruption in government". Base: all respondents, excluding missing responses. Response categories "Very badly" and "Fairly badly" are combined into "Badly"; and response categories "Very well" and "Fairly well" are combined into "Well". "Don't know" responses not shown for ease of comparison.

² This question was not asked in China.

EXPERIENCES OF CORRUPTION: BRIBERY



“John is from Chin state, Myanmar and this is his second job. He says he is 19 but he does not look it. Under-age work is common in Myanmar. John dreams of going to work in Malaysia for 10 years – not longer – to save money to buy a small fishing boat and start a fishing business. Everything that happens in Myanmar is related to politics. After 52 years in power, the military regime still holds a strong hand over everything that happens in the country. Corruption is the top concern for businesses. This construction site pays a measly US\$2.50 a day for 12 hours of hard labour. When I tried to discuss the issue with the foreman he shrugged his shoulders and said ‘no money, all money stays up’ pointing his index finger towards the sky.” – Dejan Petrovic



By D. Petrovic (2015) Capture Corruption Photo Competition 31+ Age Group Winner
http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/photo_competition_31_plus_age_group_winners

EXPERIENCES OF CORRUPTION: BRIBERY

**900 million people
have paid a bribe
across the 16 places
surveyed**

We asked people whether they had come into contact with six key public services during the previous 12 months: public schools, public clinics or hospitals, official documents, utility services, the police and the courts.^v Of those who had contact,^v we asked whether they had paid a bribe, given a gift or done a favour in order to receive the services they needed.

We found that more than one in four people in the 16 places surveyed had paid a bribe in the last 12 months when they used a public service (28 per cent). Based on the bribery rates for each country/territory and its adult population size, this is equivalent to over 900 million people across the 16 places surveyed.

Bribery rates vary considerably between countries. Bribery was highest in India where nearly seven in 10 people who had accessed public services had to pay a bribe (69 per cent). This was followed closely by Vietnam where around two thirds had paid a bribe when accessing services (65 per cent).

Bribery was far lower in Australia, Hong Kong, Japan and South Korea where fewer than 5 per cent of respondents said that they had paid a bribe when they accessed public services (from 0.2 per cent to 4 per cent).

See all results on the map on page 16.


Police are most likely to take bribes

Just under one third of people who came into contact with the police in the previous 12 months had to pay a bribe (30 per cent) either to get the assistance that they needed or to avoid a fine. This was the highest of the six services we asked about. Bribery for healthcare services had the lowest bribery rates, but still nearly one in five had to pay a bribe to get access (18 per cent).

The law and order institutions in Pakistan were the most likely of any country that we surveyed to accept bribes – around seven in 10 people who came into contact with either the police or the courts had to pay a bribe (75 per cent and 68 per cent respectively).

Vietnam and India had the highest bribery rates of all the countries surveyed for public schools (57 and 58 per cent) and healthcare (both 59 per cent), suggesting serious corruption risks when people try to access these basic services.

SERVICE USERS WHO SAID THAT THEY HAD PAID A BRIBE



Q. And how often, if ever, did you have to pay a bribe, give a gift, or do a favour for: a teacher or school official; a health worker or clinic or hospital staff; a government official in order to get the document; a government official in order to get the [Utilities] services; a police officer; a judge or court official.
Base: pooled responses from across all 16 countries, territories and regions; respondents who had contact with each service in the previous 12 months, excluding missing responses.

The results for "utilities services" exclude China and Mongolia as this question was not asked there. Results from Malaysia are excluded due to a difference in the way the bribery questions were implemented during fieldwork.

BRIBERY RATES ACROSS THE ASIA PACIFIC REGION

MONGOLIA 20%*

PAKISTAN 40%

INDIA 69%

SRI LANKA 15%


SCALE:
% of people who had paid a bribe when accessing basic services




0-10% 11-20% 21-30% 31-40% 41-50% 51-60% 61%+

Q. And how often, if ever, did you have to pay a bribe, give a gift, or do a favour for: a teacher or school official; a health worker or clinic or hospital staff; a government official in order to get the document, a government official in order to get the [Utilities] services; a police officer; a judge or court official.
Base: Respondents who had contact with at least one service in the past 12 months, excluding missing responses. An * denotes countries where the bribery rate is based on a revised wording. Please see end notes for more details.

The results from Malaysia are based on the total population due to differences in the way the bribery questions were implemented during fieldwork.





WHICH SERVICES DO PEOPLE PAY BRIBES FOR?



Percentage of service users who had paid a bribe in the past 12 months.

The size of the circle corresponds to the proportion of service users who had paid a bribe.




Q. And how often, if ever, did you have to pay a bribe, give a gift, or do a favour for: a teacher or school official; a health worker or clinic or hospital staff; a government official in order to get the document, a government official in order to get the [Utilities] services; a police officer; a judge or court official.
 Base: Respondents who had contact with at least one service in the past 12 months, excluding missing responses. An * denotes places where the service was not asked, or where the service had a base size of fewer than 60 respondents.

The results from Malaysia are based on the total population due to differences in the way the bribery questions were implemented during fieldwork.

WHO HAS TO PAY BRIBES?


MORE THAN 900 MILLION PEOPLE

in the 16 Asia Pacific places surveyed have paid a bribe in the last year, or more than **1 in 4 people**, when accessing basic services like medicine, education or water.



YOUNGER PEOPLE ARE BEING HIT HARDER

People aged under 35 are **more likely** to have to pay a bribe to access a public service.



WOMEN ARE JUST AS LIKELY AS MEN TO PAY BRIBES



30% OF MEN PAID A BRIBE




27% OF WOMEN PAID A BRIBE

Similar proportions of both men and women have paid a bribe in the last 12 months


BRIBERY OFTEN HURTS THE POOREST MOST... BUT THIS CAN DIFFER BETWEEN COUNTRIES

When looking at the overall regional results, **38 per cent of the poorest people** have paid a bribe, which was **the highest of any income group**.^{vi} This may be because they have **fewer alternative options available** to them, or because they have **less power or influence** to avoid paying bribes.

In these countries, the poorest people are far more likely than richer people to pay a bribe:



However, in some countries the reverse trend was found, where it was the richest people who were more likely to pay. This may be because they have more resources to pay bribes when asked, or because they want to get a quicker or better quality service.



Results are based on those who have come into contact with at least one of the six public services in the past 12 months. The demographic analysis excludes Mongolia due to question wording differences and Malaysia due to differences in how the bribery questions were implemented during fieldwork.

PEOPLE SPEAKING OUT AGAINST CORRUPTION



Student protestors gather in Taiwan to express their concerns that a trade accord with mainland China had not been properly debated or deliberated by the legislature, and demanding adherence to due process.



Image: Creative Commons, Flickr / tomscy2000 (2014)

PEOPLE SPEAKING OUT AGAINST CORRUPTION


People can make a difference

We asked people whether they felt they could make a difference in the fight against corruption. Positively, based on the 16 places surveyed, a majority of citizens across the Asia Pacific region agreed that they felt empowered (63 per cent).³

People in Australia, Taiwan and Indonesia felt most empowered to fight against corruption, with over three quarters of people agreeing (from 78 per cent to 80 per cent). Citizens in Pakistan felt least empowered with only a third agreeing that people can make a difference (33 per cent). This was substantially lower than in any other country that we surveyed.

CAN ORDINARY PEOPLE MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION? – RESULTS BY COUNTRY

AGREE



Q. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Ordinary people can make a difference in the fight against corruption”. Base: all respondents, excluding missing responses. “Strongly disagree”, “Disagree”, “Neither” and “Don’t know” answers are not displayed for ease of comparison.


³ This question was not asked in China.

What actions can people take

We wanted to find out the best ways people thought they could tackle corruption in their own countries.⁴ Across the region, people thought that reporting corruption (22 per cent) followed by refusing to pay bribes (21 per cent) were most effective. This was followed by voting for clean parties or candidates, or those saying that they would reduce corruption (6 per cent). All other positive actions were mentioned by fewer than 5 per cent.

Even so there was a large minority (21 per cent) who felt completely pessimistic about the effect that ordinary people can have on corruption in their country.

VIEWS ON THE MOST EFFECTIVE ACTIONS PEOPLE CAN TAKE AGAINST CORRUPTION – REGIONAL RESULTS



Q. What is the most effective thing that an ordinary person like you can do to help combat corruption in this country? Base: all respondents, excluding missing responses. "Don't know" responses are not shown.

⁴ This question was not asked in China.

Why don't people report?

While in theory people thought that reporting corruption was the most effective action they could take, we found that in practice few people actually reported it. Only 7 per cent of people living in the Asia Pacific region who had paid a bribe said that they had reported it to the authorities.⁵

When we asked why more people don't report corruption, the main reason given by people across the entire region was that they were afraid of the consequences (36 per cent).⁶ A further 15 per cent said that they wouldn't report because they think that it wouldn't make any difference, and 13 per cent said that they don't report because they are not aware of how or where to report. All other responses were given by 5 per cent or fewer respondents.

The lack of confidence in official reporting channels seems to be justified. Of those who said that they had reported a bribery incident to the authorities less than a quarter (23 per cent) said that the authorities had taken action as a result, while 26 per cent said that they had suffered some form of negative repercussion.

WHY PEOPLE DO NOT REPORT INCIDENTS OF CORRUPTION – TOP THREE RESPONSES



Q. Some people say that many incidents of corruption are never reported. Based on your experience, what do you think the main reason is why many people do not report corruption when it occurs? Base: all respondents, excluding missing responses. Full results available in the excel tables of results.

⁵ This question was not asked in China or Mongolia. Weighted N: 3,825 respondents who had paid a bribe and answered the question on whether they had reported the incident. Weighted N: 275 respondents who had reported an incident to the authorities.

⁶ This question was not asked in China.

CONCLUSION

This regional report from the Global Corruption Barometer focuses on the results in the Asia Pacific region derived from interviews with nearly 22,000 people living in 16 countries, regions or territories. Our scorecard on the following page summarises the anti-corruption performance of these places as reported by their own citizens. It is based on the responses to the survey on the key indicators of (1) the extent to which the level of corruption is perceived to have increased, (2) the perceived performance of governments in addressing corruption, (3) the perceived levels of corruption among the police, (4) the experience of bribery and (5) the extent to which people think that ordinary people can make a difference in the fight against corruption.

According to the results from the survey, Australia followed by Sri Lanka and Taiwan did the best, with the most positive ratings overall across the key corruption questions in the survey. In these countries, few people felt that corruption was increasing, many people felt empowered to help fight against corruption and bribery rates were very or fairly low. However, even in these well performing countries, there were still areas for improvement such as poor ratings of government efforts to fight corruption (Australia and Taiwan) or a substantial minority of people who thought that the police were highly corrupt (Sri Lanka).

At the other end of the scale, Malaysia and Vietnam performed the worst with not a single positive rating, according to their own citizens. In these countries, the governments were rated poorly in their efforts to fight corruption, people saw widespread corruption among the police, and many people thought that corruption was on the rise. In Vietnam too, bribery was very high.

The survey suggests real and serious corruption challenges in these countries, which urgently need to be addressed.


The results from other countries show a mixed picture of positive, mediocre and negative ratings – which in part reflect the varied nature of the corruption challenges across the region. In some of these countries, like India, the bribery rate was very high, but citizens were fairly positive about government efforts to fight corruption and a clear majority felt they could make a difference in the fight against corruption. South Korea, by contrast, had a very low bribery rate, but citizens were critical of government efforts to fight corruption.

The scorecard clearly demonstrates diversity in the corruption challenges across the region; 30 of the 77 ratings were positive, 19 were mediocre and 28 were negative. With high bribery risks for public services found in a number of countries in the region, government progress against the SDGs will remain unachievable unless mechanisms are introduced to clean up public service delivery. Citizen engagement will be key but there are a number of barriers to this including poor whistleblower protection, impunity for the corrupt and a lack of awareness of existing effective reporting channels.

Addressing the corruption challenges in the region and furthering progress on the SDGs will require all levels of government, the private sector and civil society working together to achieve this.


OVERVIEW OF CORRUPTION – A CITIZEN SCORECARD

The anti-corruption performance of the government and the corruption risks are rated by citizens as:



These groupings are meant to be indicative, and regionally contextual. It is important to keep in mind that they are based on the subjective perceptions and experiences of citizens in each country rather than on an assessment against a common objective benchmark. * is used when the question was not asked in that country.

This infographic summarises the results for five key corruption questions presented in this report. For each question, countries/territories/regions are categorised as either red, amber or green depending on how positively or negatively respondents from that place responded. Places are ordered from those who score the best according to their citizens to those who score the worst. See the methodology note for the full description of how the colours are assigned.



METHODOLOGY NOTE

The Global Corruption Barometer 2017 question module was conducted via face to face or telephone survey in the Asia Pacific region, with a random selection of adults in all 16 surveyed countries, territories and regions.

Face to face household interviews were conducted either with Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) or Paper-and-Pencil Interviewing (PAPI). A random probability stratified clustered sample was designed in each project country. The sample was stratified by regions and by level of urbanisation. Households were selected at random, using a random walk, or using existing registers. The respondent was selected at random from all adults in the household.

Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews (CATI) were used in some project countries. Random digital dialling was used to randomly select households and respondents were selected at random from all adults in the household. Both landline telephones and mobile phones were selected for interviewing. Samples were stratified across all regions in the country according to population size.

MODE EFFECTS

The report presents the results obtained using two different modes of data collection and may be prone to mode effects, in terms of sampling, the selection of respondents and the propensity to respond using different modes of data collection.

WEIGHTING

The survey samples were selected and, if necessary, weighted to be nationally representative of all adults living in each country/territory. The results have margins of sampling error of a maximum ± 3.1 percentage points (for a sample of 1,000) for dichotomous questions (for example, yes or no) at a 95 per cent confidence level.

In addition, an extra weight was applied so that the sample sizes for each country/territory are equalised. The overall results for the Asia Pacific region are equivalent to an average of the countries surveyed.

POPULATION ESTIMATES

Population estimates have been made using available recent population data from the CIA Factbook. To calculate the total number of bribe payers in the Asia Pacific region, we used the national bribery rates (the percentage of all adults who had paid a bribe) to calculate the number of bribe payers in each country/territory/region. We then added the projected number of bribe payers across all 16 countries/territories, which gives a total number of 919,998,712. For ease of reporting we rounded this figure to 900 million.

PLACE	ORGANISATION	METHODOLOGY	FIELDWORK	SAMPLE SIZE
AUSTRALIA	Efficiencie3	CATI	06.09.2016 - 12.10.2016	1002
CAMBODIA	Efficiencie3	Face to face	28.04.2016 - 19.04.2016	1003
CHINA	Asian Barometer Surveys	Face to face	01.07.2015 - 06.03.2016	4068
HONG KONG	Efficiencie3	CATI	15.01.2016 - 03.02.2016	1000
INDIA	Cvoter International	Face to face	01.03.2016 - 11.04.2016	2802
INDONESIA	Efficiencie3	Face to face	26.04.2016 - 27.06.2016	1000
JAPAN	Efficiencie3	CATI	06.12.2016 - 21.01.2017	1000
MALAYSIA	Efficiencie3	Face to face	21.11.2016 – 31.01.2017	1009
MONGOLIA	TNS	Face to face	25.11.2015 - 02.01.2016	1500
MYANMAR	Cvoter International	Face to face	24.02.2016 - 09.03.2016	1224
PAKISTAN	Cvoter International	Face to face	13.03.2016 - 30.03.2016	1078
SOUTH KOREA	Efficiencie3	CATI	12.09.2016 - 03.11.2016	1000
SRI LANKA	Business Insights & Solutions	Face to face	06.07.2016 - 06.10.2016	1073
TAIWAN	Taiwan Real Survey Co., Ltd	CATI	23.09.2016 - 02.10.2016	1082
THAILAND	Efficiencie3	Face to face	10.04.2016 - 27.05.2016	1020
VIETNAM	Efficiencie3	Face to face	26.05.2016 - 20.06.2016	1000

Citizens' corruption scorecard ratings

1. Change in level of corruption over previous 12 months

The scores are based on the percentage of respondents in each country/territory who say that corruption has either increased a little or increased a lot over the 12 months prior to when the survey was conducted.⁷

- ▶ Green: fewer than 40 per cent say corruption had increased either somewhat or a lot in the preceding 12 months.
- ▶ Amber: from 40 per cent up to 60 per cent say corruption had increased either somewhat or a lot in the past 12 months.
- ▶ Red: 60 per cent or more say corruption had increased either somewhat or a lot in the past 12 months.

2. How the government is handling the fight against corruption

The scores are based on the percentage of respondents who rate their government as doing either “very badly” or “fairly badly” at fighting corruption in government. The results were rebased to exclude don't know responses.

- ▶ Green: fewer than 40 per cent say “very badly” or “fairly badly”.
- ▶ Amber: from 40 per cent up to 60 per cent say “very badly” or “fairly badly”.
- ▶ Red: 60 per cent or more say “very badly” or “fairly badly”.

3. How corrupt the police are perceived to be

Each score is based on a simple average of the percentage of the population who say that “most” or “all” police are corrupt. The results were rebased to exclude don't know responses.

- ▶ Green: fewer than 20 per cent say that “most” or “all” police are corrupt.
- ▶ Amber: from 20 per cent up to 40 per cent say that “most” or “all” police are corrupt.
- ▶ Red: 40 per cent or more say that “most” or “all” police are corrupt.

4. Bribery rate

The scores are based on the percentage of people who say that they had paid a bribe to at least one of the six public services mentioned in the 12 months prior to the survey: public medical care; public schools (either vocational, or primary and secondary); official documents; unemployment benefits; other social security benefits; the police; or the courts. The results exclude those who say that they did not come into contact with any of these services in the previous 12 months.

- ▶ Green: fewer than 10 per cent paid a bribe.
- ▶ Amber: from 10 per cent up to 30 per cent paid a bribe.
- ▶ Red: 30 per cent or more paid a bribe.

5. Ordinary people can make a difference

The results are based on the percentage of people who either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement “Ordinary people can make a difference in the fight against corruption”. The results were rebased to exclude don't know responses.

- ▶ Green: 60 per cent or more “strongly agree” or “agree”.
- ▶ Amber: from 40 per cent up to 60 per cent “strongly agree” or “agree”.
- ▶ Red: fewer than 40 per cent “strongly agree” or “agree”.

⁷ In China the results are based on change in the level of corruption over the previous 3 years.

NOTES

- i For the sake of readability, we use the term “region” even though the report includes 16 countries, territories or regions in the Asia Pacific region. In this report, China refers to respondents from mainland China.
- ii The survey was conducted either face to face or by telephone, with nationally representative samples in place. Please see the Methodology section on page 31 for a full explanation.
- iii This estimate is made on the basis of the approximate total number of adults living in each of the surveyed places according to available population data, which gives a figure of 919,998,712. See Methodology section for full details.
- iv The bribery module was implemented with amended wording in Mongolia as the questions were implemented as part of a longer existing survey. In Mongolia the questions asked about household rather than individual level bribery.
- v 83 per cent of the respondents said that they came into contact with at least one of the public services. Bribery rates are based on those who came into contact with at least one of the services (unweighted N = 17,119). For China and Mongolia the base is based on those who came into contact with 5 services, as utility services was not asked there. In Malaysia, the bribery results are based on the total population due to differences in how the bribery question module was implemented during fieldwork.
- vi Income calculations are based on available subjective income measures as asked by the respective surveying organisations.

Acknowledgements

Generous support for the People and Corruption: Asia Pacific / Global Corruption Barometer was provided by EY, The Asia House Foundation, The Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, The Belgium Development Cooperation, Irish Aid, The Hong Kong ICAC, Transparency International Sri Lanka and Transparency International Cambodia.

We gratefully acknowledge these contributions. Responsibility for the content lies entirely with the author. The contributors do not necessarily share the expressed views and interpretations. For a full list of all contributors and to find out how you can support our work please visit www.transparency.org



Australian Government
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade



CREATE CHANGE WITH US

ENGAGE

More and more people are joining the fight against corruption, and the discussion is growing. Stay informed and share your views on our website and blog, and social media.

VOLUNTEER

With an active presence in more than 100 countries around the world, we're always looking for passionate volunteers to help us increase our impact. Check out our website for the contact details for your local organisation.

DONATE

Your donation will help us provide support to thousands of victims of corruption, develop new tools and research, and hold governments and businesses to their promises. We want to build a fairer, more just world. With your help, we can. Find out more at:

www.transparency.org/getinvolved

And join the conversation:

 [transparencyinternational](#)

 [anticorruption](#)

Transparency International
International Secretariat
Alt-Moabit 96, 10559 Berlin, Germany

Phone: +49 30 34 38 200

Fax: +49 30 34 70 39 12

ti@transparency.org

www.transparency.org

blog.transparency.org

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

twitter.com/anticorruption

แบบฟอร์มการขอเผยแพร่ข้อมูลผ่านเว็บไซต์ของหน่วยงานในราชการบริหารส่วนกลาง
สำนักงานปลัดกระทรวงสาธารณสุข
ตามประกาศสำนักงานปลัดกระทรวงสาธารณสุข
เรื่อง แนวทางการเผยแพร่ข้อมูลต่อสาธารณะผ่านเว็บไซต์ของหน่วยงาน พ.ศ. ๒๕๖๑
สำหรับหน่วยงานในราชการบริหารส่วนกลางสำนักงานปลัดกระทรวงสาธารณสุข

แบบฟอร์มการขอเผยแพร่ข้อมูลผ่านเว็บไซต์ของหน่วยงานในสังกัดสำนักงานปลัดกระทรวงสาธารณสุข

ชื่อหน่วยงาน : ศูนย์ปฏิบัติการต่อต้านการทุจริต กระทรวงสาธารณสุข

วัน/เดือน/ปี : ๓ กุมภาพันธ์ ๒๕๖๔

หัวข้อ: People and corruption : Asia Pacific (Global Corruption Barometer) by Transparency International

รายละเอียดข้อมูล (โดยสรุปหรือเอกสารแนบ)

People and corruption : Asia Pacific (Global Corruption Barometer) by Transparency International

Link ภายนอก: ไม่มี

หมายเหตุ:

ผู้รับผิดชอบการให้ข้อมูล

สุชาภา วรินทร์เวช

(นางสาวสุชาภา วรินทร์เวช)

ตำแหน่ง นักวิเคราะห์นโยบายและแผนชำนาญการพิเศษ

วันที่ ๓ เดือน กุมภาพันธ์ พ.ศ. ๒๕๖๔

ผู้อนุมัติรับรอง

สุชาภา วรินทร์เวช

(นางสาวสุชาภา วรินทร์เวช)

ตำแหน่ง นักวิเคราะห์นโยบายและแผนชำนาญการพิเศษ (หัวหน้า)

วันที่ ๓ เดือน กุมภาพันธ์ พ.ศ. ๒๕๖๔

ผู้รับผิดชอบการนำข้อมูลขึ้นเผยแพร่

พศวีร์ วัชรบุตร

(นายพศวีร์ วัชรบุตร)

นักทรัพยากรบุคคลปฏิบัติการ

วันที่ ๓ เดือน กุมภาพันธ์ พ.ศ. ๒๕๖๔