**Appendix 1: List of Countries and Regions with Abbreviations and sample size**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | # obs |  |  |  |  | # obs |
| Nuts  | Country/ Region name | with Exp  | no Exp |  | Nuts  | Country/ Region name | with Exp  | no Exp |
| AT | Austria | 118 | 3482 |  | ES | Spain |  | 92 | 6,08 |
| AT11 | Burgenland | 7 | 393 |  | ES11 | Galicia |  | 15 | 385 |
| AT12 | Niederöstrerreich | 13 | 387 |  | ES12 | Principado de Asturias | 3 | 397 |
| AT13 | Wien | 22 | 378 |  | ES13 | Cantabria |  | 2 | 398 |
| AT21 | Kärnten | 4 | 396 |  | ES21 | Pais Vasco |  | 2 | 398 |
| AT22 | Steiermark | 9 | 391 |  | ES22 | Comunidad Foral de Navarra | 5 | 395 |
| AT31 | Oberösterreich | 8 | 392 |  | ES23 | La Rioja |  | 3 | 397 |
| AT32 | Salzburg | 18 | 382 |  | ES24 | Aragón |  | 3 | 397 |
| AT33 | Tirol | 15 | 385 |  | ES30 | Comunidad de Madrid | 3 | 397 |
| AT34 | Voralberg | 22 | 378 |  | ES41 | Castilla y León | 3 | 397 |
| BE | Belgium | 34 | 1174 |  | ES42 | Castilla-La Mancha | 12 | 388 |
| BE1 | Brussels | 8 | 392 |  | ES43 | Extremadura | 2 | 398 |
| BE2 | Vlaams Gewest | 11 | 389 |  | ES51 | Cataluña |  | 5 | 395 |
| BE3 | Wallonie | 15 | 393 |  | ES52 | Comunidad Valenciana | 9 | 391 |
| BG | Bulgaria | 482 | 1920 |  | ES53 | Illes Balears | 3 | 397 |
| BG31 | Severozapaden | 54 | 347 |  | ES61 | Andalucia |  | 11 | 389 |
| BG32 | Severen Tsentralen | 45 | 356 |  | ES62 | Región de Murcia | 4 | 396 |
| BG33 | Severoiztochen | 106 | 294 |  | ES70 | Canarias (ES) | 7 | 393 |
| BG34 | Yugoiztochen | 61 | 339 |  | FI | Finland |  | 11 | 1989 |
| BG41 | Yugozapaden | 139 | 261 |  | FI13 | Itä-Suomi  |  | 1 | 399 |
| BG42 | Yuzhen Tsentralen | 77 | 323 |  | FI18 | Etelä-Suomi  |  | 3 | 397 |
| CZ | Czech Rep. | 190 | 3046 |  | FI19 | Länsi-Suomi |  | 2 | 398 |
| CZ01 | Praha | 27 | 379 |  | FI1A | Pohjois-Suomi |  | 3 | 397 |
| CZ02 | Stredni Cechy | 17 | 388 |  | FI20 | Åland |  | 2 | 398 |
| CZ03 | Jihozapad | 19 | 385 |  | FR | France |  | 504 | 9905 |
| CZ04 | Severozapad | 29 | 377 |  | FR10 | Ile-de-France | 27 | 373 |
| CZ05 | Severovychod | 18 | 386 |  | FR21 | Champagne-Ardenne | 13 | 387 |
| CZ06 | Jihovychod | 26 | 378 |  | FR22 | Picardie |  | 15 | 385 |
| CZ07 | Stedni Morava | 18 | 385 |  | FR23 | Haute-Normandie | 24 | 377 |
| CZ08 | Moravskoslezsko | 36 | 368 |  | FR24 | Centre |  | 10 | 390 |
| DE | Germany | 93 | 6307 |  | FR25 | Basse-Normandie | 22 | 378 |
| DE1 | Baden Wuttemberg | 4 | 396 |  | FR26 | Bourgogne |  | 23 | 377 |
| DE2 | Bavaria | 6 | 394 |  | FR30 | Nord - Pas-de-Calais | 20 | 380 |
| DE3 | Berlin | 19 | 381 |  | FR41 | Lorraine |  | 19 | 381 |
| DE4 | Brandenburg | 3 | 397 |  | FR42 | Alsace |  | 22 | 378 |
| DE5 | Bremen | 3 | 397 |  | FR43 | Franche-Comte | 26 | 374 |
| DE6 | Hamburg | 10 | 390 |  | FR51 | Pays de la Loire | 18 | 382 |
| DE7 | Hessen | 9 | 391 |  | FR52 | Bretagne |  | 11 | 389 |
| DE8 | Mecklenburg-Vorpommen | 2 | 398 |  | FR53 | Poitou-Charentes | 10 | 391 |
| DE9 | Lower Saxony | 3 | 397 |  | FR61 | Aquitaine |  | 15 | 385 |
| DEA | North Rhine Westphalia | 11 | 389 |  | FR62 | Midi-Pyrenees | 21 | 379 |
| DEB | Rhineland-Palatinate | 2 | 398 |  | FR63 | Limousin |  | 10 | 391 |
| DEC | Saarland | 4 | 396 |  | FR71 | Rhone-Alpes | 17 | 384 |
| DED | Saxony | 4 | 396 |  | FR72 | Auvergne |  | 8 | 393 |
| DEE | Saxony-Anhalt | 3 | 397 |  | FR81 | Languedoc-Roussillon | 19 | 381 |
| DEF | Schleswig-Holstein | 9 | 394 |  | FR82 | Provence-Alpes-Cote d'Azur | 31 | 370 |
| DEG | Thuringia | 5 | 396 |  | FR83 | Corse |  | 30 | 370 |
| DK | Denmark | 3 | 2025 |  | FR91 | Guadeloupe | 23 | 377 |
| DK01 | Hovedstaden | 2 | 398 |  | FR92 | Martinique |  | 17 | 383 |
| DK02 | Sjaelland | 0 | 403 |  | FR93 | Guyane |  | 30 | 371 |
| DK03 | Syddanmark | 0 | 401 |  | FR94 | Reunion |  | 23 | 379 |
| DK04 | Midtylland | 0 | 420 |  | GR | Greece |  | 229 | 1384 |
| DK05 | Nordjylland | 1 | 403 |  | GR1 | Voreia Ellada | 43 | 362 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nuts  | Country/ Region name |  |  |  | Nuts  | Country/ Region name |  |  |
| GR2 | Kentriki Ellada | 68 | 332 |  | PL63 | Pomorskie |  | 28 | 372 |
| GR3 | Attica | 64 | 337 |  | PT | Portugal |  | 67 | 2819 |
| GR4 | Nisia Aigaiou-Kriti | 54 | 353 |  | PT11 | Norte |  | 10 | 396 |
| HR | Croatia | 67 | 737 |  | PT15 | Algarve |  | 9 | 396 |
| HR01 | Sjeverozapadna Hrvatska |  |  |  | PT16 | Centro |  | 8 | 408 |
| HR02 | Sredisnja i Istocna Hrvatska |  |  |  | PT17 | Lisboa |  | 10 | 420 |
| HR03 | Jadranska Hrvatska | 32 | 370 |  | PT18 | Alentejo |  | 5 | 398 |
| HR04 | Kontinentalna Hrvatska | 35 | 367 |  | PT20 | Região Autónoma dos Açores | 17 | 399 |
| HU | Hungary | 266 | 949 |  | PT30 | Região Autónoma da Madeira | 8 | 402 |
| HU1 | Közép-Magyarország | 96 | 304 |  | RO | Romania |  | 907 | 2293 |
| HU2 | Dunántúl | 77 | 323 |  | RO11 | Nord-Vest |  | 102 | 298 |
| HU3 | Észak és Alföld | 93 | 322 |  | RO12 | Centru |  | 92 | 308 |
| IE | Ireland | 4 | 796 |  | RO21 | Nord-Est |  | 106 | 294 |
| IE01 | Border, Midland and Western | 2 | 398 |  | RO22 | Sud-Est |  | 131 | 269 |
| IE02 | Southern and Eastern | 2 | 398 |  | RO31 | Sud-Muntenia | 98 | 302 |
| IT | Italy | 1290 | 7125 |  | RO32 | Bucuresti-Ilfov | 170 | 230 |
| ITC1 | Piemonte | 59 | 342 |  | RO41 | Sud-Vest Oltenia | 109 | 291 |
| ITC2 | Valle d'Acosta | 35 | 365 |  | RO42 | Vest |  | 99 | 301 |
| ITC3 | Ligura | 68 | 332 |  | RS | Serbia |  | 293 | 1772 |
| ITC4 | Lombardia | 55 | 348 |  | RS11 | Belgrade |  | 66 | 343 |
| ITD1 | Bolzano | 29 | 371 |  | RS21 | Šumadija and Western Serbia | 38 | 368 |
| ITD2 | Trento | 31 | 369 |  | RS22 | Vojvodina |  | 43 | 357 |
| ITD3 | Veneto | 57 | 344 |  | RS22 | Southern and Eastern Serbia | 49 | 351 |
| ITD4 | Friuli-Venezia Giulia | 46 | 354 |  | RS23 | Kosovo and Metohija | 106 | 303 |
| ITD5 | Emilia-Romagna | 56 | 344 |  | SE | Sweden |  | 8 | 1287 |
| ITE1 | Toscana | 65 | 337 |  | SE1 | Östra Sverige | 4 | 405 |
| ITE2 | Umbria | 48 | 353 |  | SE2 | Södra Sverige | 2 | 484 |
| ITE3 | Marche | 40 | 360 |  | SE3 | Norra Sverige | 2 | 398 |
| ITE4 | Lazio | 80 | 323 |  | SK | Slovakia |  | 208 | 1401 |
| ITF1 | Abruzzo | 77 | 324 |  | SK01 | Bratislavský kraj | 66 | 336 |
| ITF2 | Molise | 83 | 317 |  | SK02 | Západné Slovensko | 50 | 350 |
| ITF3 | Campania | 91 | 311 |  | SK03 | Stredné Slovensko | 40 | 364 |
| ITF4 | Puglia | 67 | 333 |  | SK04 | Východné Slovensko | 52 | 351 |
| ITF5 | Basilicata | 79 | 322 |  | TR | Turkey |  | 324 | 4476 |
| ITF6 | Calabria | 78 | 322 |  | TR1 | Istanbul |  | 48 | 352 |
| ITG1 | Sicilia | 74 | 326 |  | TR2 | Bati Marmara |  | 19 | 381 |
| ITG2 | Sardegna | 72 | 328 |  | TR3 | Ege |  | 22 | 378 |
| NL | Netherlands | 78 | 4744 |  | TR4 | Dogu Marmara |  | 23 | 377 |
| NL11 | Groningen | 10 | 390 |  | TR5 | Bati Anadolu |  | 57 | 343 |
| NL12 | Friesland (NL) | 11 | 391 |  | TR6 | Akdeniz |  | 22 | 378 |
| NL13 | Drenthe | 8 | 393 |  | TR7 | Orta Anadolu |  | 24 | 376 |
| NL21 | Overijssel | 3 | 397 |  | TR8 | Bati Karadeniz |  | 15 | 385 |
| NL22 | Gelderland | 7 | 393 |  | TR9 | Dogu Karadeniz |  | 16 | 384 |
| NL23 | Flevoland | 6 | 397 |  | TRA | Kuzeydogu Anadolu |  | 13 | 387 |
| NL31 | Utrecht | 4 | 397 |  | TRB | Ortadogu Anadolu |  | 37 | 363 |
| NL32 | Noord-Holland | 5 | 395 |  | TRC | Güneydogu Anadolu |  | 28 | 372 |
| NL33 | Zuid-Holland | 2 | 398 |  | UA | Ukraine |  | 687 | 1713 |
| NL34 | Zeeland | 7 | 393 |  | UA1 | UA13-Kharkov | 103 | 297 |
| NL41 | Noord-Brabant | 10 | 405 |  | UA2 | UA15-Zakarpatt | 91 | 309 |
| NL42 | Limburg (NL) | 5 | 395 |  | UA3 | UA21-Odessa | 107 | 293 |
| PL | Poland | 528 | 5872 |  | UA4 | UA25-Crimea | 71 | 329 |
| PL11 | Lodzkie | 33 | 367 |  | UA5 | UA4-Kiev |  | 173 | 227 |
| PL12 | Mazowieckie | 40 | 360 |  | UA6 | UA7-Lviv |  | 142 | 258 |
| PL21 | Malopolskie | 47 | 353 |  | UK | United Kingdom | 65 | 4735 |
| PL22 | Slaskie | 55 | 345 |  | UKC | Northeast England | 4 | 396 |
| PL31 | Lubelskie | 48 | 352 |  | UKD | Northwest England | 3 | 397 |
| PL32 | Podkarpackie | 37 | 363 |  | UKE | Yorkshire-Humber | 4 | 396 |
| PL33 | Swietokrzyskie | 33 | 367 |  | UKF | East Midland England | 6 | 394 |
| PL34 | Podlaskie | 27 | 373 |  | UKG | West Midland England | 3 | 397 |
| PL41 | Wielkopolskie | 40 | 360 |  | UKH | East of England | 8 | 392 |
| PL42 | Zachodniopomorskie | 19 | 381 |  | UKI | London |  | 13 | 387 |
| PL43 | Lubuskie | 17 | 383 |  | UKJ | South East England | 1 | 399 |
| PL51 | Dolnoslaskie | 33 | 367 |  | UKK | South West England | 10 | 390 |
| PL52 | Opolskie | 20 | 380 |  | UKL | Wales |  | 8 | 392 |
| PL61 | Kujawsko-Pomorskie | 29 | 371 |  | UKM | Scotland |  | 4 | 396 |
| PL62 | Warminsko-Mazurskie | 22 | 378 |  | UKN | N. Ireland |  | 1 | 399 |

**Appendix 2: List of Variables, Summary Statistics and Sources**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Regional Level** |  obs |  mean |  St. dev. |  range |   |
| Corruption Perceptions  | 212 | 3.75 | 1.08 | 1.18 - 7.8 | Charron, Lapuente and Rothstein (2013) |
| Corruption Experience | 212 | 0.078 | 0.08 | 0 - .433 | Charron, Lapuente and Rothstein (2013) |
| Corruption Experience (log) | 212 | 1.41 | 1.25 | -1.39 - 3.77 | Charron, Lapuente and Rothstein (2013) |
| Pop. Density (log) | 189 | 2.5 | 1.64 | -.02 - 8.49 | Eurostat, 2011 |
| GDP p.c. (log) | 189 | 9.88 | 0.63 | 7.95 - 11.01 | Eurostat, ave 2008-2011 |
| Unemployment rate | 212 | 10.4 | 5.76 | 2.5 - 35.1 | Eurostat, ave 2010-2012 |
| gender employment gap | 182 | 15.1 | 6.3 | .5 - 36.6 | Eurostat, 2009 |
| % non-EU born | 183 | 5.63 | 5.4 | 0 - 30.1 | Eurostat, 2010 |
| Party fractionalization | 116 | 0.65 | 0.12 | .367 - .865 | Author created, 1-Herfindahl index, ave. 1990-present |
| social trust |  | 212 | 0.43 | 0.19 | .057 - .798 | Charron, Lapuente and Rothstein (2013) |
| captial region | 212 | 0.11 | 0.32 | dichotomous | Author created |
| autonomous | 212 | 0.08 | 0.28 | dichotomous | Author created |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **National Level** |   |   |   |   |   |
| Corruption Perceptions  | 24 | 3.93 | 1.3 | 1.84 - 6.64 | Charron, Lapuente and Rothstein (2013) |
| Corruption Experience% | 24 | 0.08 | 0.09 | .1 - 28.9 | Charron, Lapuente and Rothstein (2013) |
| Corruption Experience (log) | 24 | 1.39 | 1.44 | -1.91 - 3.35 | Charron, Lapuente and Rothstein (2013) |
| Pop. Density (log) | 24 | 4.64 | 0.73 | 2.74 - 5.99 | Eurostat, 2011 |
| GDP p.c. (log) | 24 | 9.83 | 0.6 | 8.74 - 10.47 | Eurostat, ave 2008-2011 |
| Unemployment rate | 24 | 9.45 | 5.09 | 2.6 - 19.9 | Eurostat, ave 2010-2012 |
| Gini Index |  | 24 | 31.15 | 4.6 | 24.7 - 42.7 | World Development Indicators |
| Press Freedom | 24 | 24 | 14.3 | 8 - 67 | Freedom House |
| Civil Liberites | 24 | 1.63 | 0.88 | 1 - 4 | Freedom House |
| Ethnic Fractionaliztion | 24 | 0.22 | 0.15 | .05 - .55 | Alesina, 2003 |
| Government Consumption | 24 | 19.80 | 4.19 | 6.82 – 26.97 | World Development Indicators |
| state origins | 24 | 0.333 | 0.48 | dichotomous | Charron, Dahlström and Lapuente, 2012 |
| trade openness | 24 | 75.07 | 14.2 | 51.5 - 95.4 | Dreher et al 2008 |
| social trust |  | 24 | 1.69 | 0.16 | 1.33 - 1.87 | World Value Survey, most recent |

**Appendix 3: Background and Methodology of the Survey**

The surveys began during the month of February, 2013 and were conducted in the local majority language in each country/region. The results were returned to the Quality of Government Institute in April, 2013.

This project consists of a large international survey via telephone interviews, each approximately 10 minutes in length, during which 32 questions were posed. The sample size of citizens in the survey was over 85,000, European wide. Moreover, the focus of the final data that was collected was aimed at the regional level. The survey selectively sampled 400-plus citizens per region, and thus the sample size per country will vary depending on the number of regions. The regional level for each country in the survey is based on the European Union’s NUTS[[1]](#footnote-1) statistical regional level and is as follows for the countries in the survey. The NUTS level for each country was selected with two factors in mind – the extent to which elected political authorities have administrative, fiscal or political control over one or more of the public services in question, and two, the price. In direct consultation with the EU Commission, the NUTS regions, shown in the previous section in each country, were selected on these bases.

To maximize regional variation on the QoG-oriented question in the survey, the services in question (education, health care and law enforcement) were selected instead of public services such as immigration, customs, military or courts, which are administered at the national level.

Two issues in the preparation of this study are worthy of mention here. First, in some areas, such as immigration, customs, defence or the judicial arena, much variation was not expected at all from region to region within countries. Thus to maximize regional variation on the QoG-oriented question in the survey, the questions were limited in the survey to only those policy areas that are most often either governed or administered by sub-national bodies. In the end, three policy areas were selected – health care, education and law enforcement.

The second issue to deal with is the fact that in some countries – such as Germany, Belgium, Italy or Spain – the regions that were targeted in the questions were both politically and administratively meaningful. That is to say that these regional governments are elected by their local constituents, have their own autonomous revenues (either from directly taxing citizens, or central government transfers or both) and also have a degree of autonomy with which to redistribute resources in the form of public services. However, in more politically centralized countries, such as Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia or Portugal, this issue becomes more challenging. The regions that were targeted (NUTS 1 or NUTS 2) while meaningful in the sense that EU development funds are targeted directly to them and that Eurostat reports annual data on them, they have in some cases been mainly an invention for EU statistical purposes, yet not *politically* meaningful. Therefore asking a respondent in some cases ‘how would you rate the quality ‘X’ service in your region of ‘Y’’ might be very confusing, since respondents from countries like Hungary or Romania might not recognize that they are even living in region ‘Y’. It can, therefore, be argued that the administrative and political responsibility of the regions in these three public services varies in different countries and thus this may be problematic for this data gathering. However this study argues otherwise, in that the study attempts to capture all regional variations within a country and, as several other scholars have noted (e.g. Tabellini 2005), there are numerous empirical indications and anecdotal evidence pointing out that the provision and quality of public services controlled by a powerful central government can, nonetheless, largely vary across different regions.

Thus to synthesize the survey and make the results as comparable between and within countries as possible, respondents were asked about questions focusing around three key concepts of QoG – the ‘quality’ of the services themselves, the extent to which they are administered ‘impartiality’ and extent to which ‘corruption’ exists *in their area*.

The E.U. regional survey was undertaken between 20 February, 2013, and 6 April, 2013 by Efficience 3 (E3), a French market-research, survey company specializing in public opinion throughout Europe for researchers, politicians and advertising firms. E3 conducted the interviews themselves in several countries and used sub-contracting partners in others[[2]](#footnote-2). The respondents, from 18 years of age or older, were contacted randomly via telephone in the local language. Telephone interviews were conducted via both landlines and mobile phones, with both methods being used in most countries. Decisions about whether to contact residents more often via land or mobile lines was based on the local expertise of market research firms in each country. For purposes of regional placement, respondents were asked the post code of their address to verify the area/ region of residence if mobile phones were used.

Ideally, a survey would be a mirror image of actual societal demographics – gender, income, education, rural-urban, etc. However, we are not privy to exact demographic distributions, in particular at the regional level in most cases. Thus imposing artificial demographic lines might lead to even more problems than benefits. We thus sought the next best solution. Based on their expert advice, to achieve a random sample, we used what was known in survey-research as the ‘next birthday method’. The next birthday method is an alternative to the so-called quotas method. When using the quota method for instance, one obtains a (near) perfectly representative sample – e.g. a near exact proportion of the amount of men, women, certain minority groups, people of a certain age, income, etc. However, as one searches for certain demographics within the population, one might end up with only ‘available’ respondents, or those that are more ‘eager’ to respond to surveys, which can lead to less variation in the responses, or even bias in the results. The ‘next-birthday’ method, which simply requires the interviewer to ask the person who answers the phone who in their household will have the next birthday, still obtains a reasonably representative sample of the population. The interviewer must take the person who has the next coming birthday in the household (if this person is not available, the interviewer makes an appointment), thus not relying on whomever might simply be available to respond in the household. So, where the quota method is stronger in terms of a more even demographic spread in the sample, the next-birthday method is stronger at ensuring a better range of opinion. The next-birthday method was thus chosen because we felt that what we might have lost in demographic representation in the sample would be made up for by a better distribution of opinion. In the end, we find variation in response and refusal rates by country, which could have to do with many factors including the sensitivity of one of the primary the topics at hand – corruption. A breakdown of the sample response rate, land line vs. mobile phone use, etc. is listed in the table below by country.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | Interviewer selection | Selection procedure of respondent | Mobiles rate | Landlines rate | Completes (number of respondents) | Response rate | Refusal rate | Non response rate |
| **Austria** | Native Speaker for each country with at least 1 year experience in B2C CATI interviewing (opinion polls) | Next Birthday in household method (18+); 5 attempts per "address" (different times and days) - on mobile phones has to be someone over 18 years old (individual randomly called - no birthday method on mobile phones) | 53% | 47% | 3600 | 11% | 63% | 51% |
| **Belgium** | 43% | 57% | 1208 | 23% | 31% | 43% |
| **Bulgaria** | 76% | 24% | 2402 | 40% | 14% | 28% |
| **Croatia** | 17% | 83% | 804 | 11% | 19% | 14% |
| **Czech Rep.** | 100% | 0% | 3236 | 41% | 23% | 37% |
| **Denmark** | 96% | 4% | 2028 | 26% | 28% | 46% |
| **Finland** | 91% | 9% | 2000 | 17% | 40% | 31% |
| **France** | 35% | 65% | 10409 | 15% | 21% | 30% |
| **Germany** | 23% | 77% | 6400 | 11% | 64% | 52% |
| **Greece** | 58% | 42% | 1613 | 23% | 57% | 21% |
| **Hungary** | 100% | 0% | 1215 | 35% | 24% | 45% |
| **Ireland** | 39% | 61% | 800 | 12% | 62% | 48% |
| **Italy** | 35% | 65% | 8425 | 14% | 30% | 15% |
| **Kosovo** | 100% | 0% | 400 | 27% | 16% | 58% |
| **Netherlands** | 0% | 100% | 4822 | 20% | 80% | 34% |
| **Poland** | 59% | 41% | 6400 | 6% | 30% | 39% |
| **Portugal** | 41% | 59% | 2886 | 15% | 35% | 50% |
| **Romania** | 57% | 43% | 3200 | 10% | 51% | 40% |
| **Serbia** | 2% | 98% | 1615 | 9% | 27% | 14% |
| **Slovakia** | 100% | 0% | 1609 | 27% | 57% | 12% |
| **Spain** | 58% | 42% | 6800 | 7% | 18% | 65% |
| **Sweden** | 33% | 67% | 1295 | 26% | 36% | 38% |
| **Turkey** | 83% | 17% | 4800 | 42% | 8% | 11% |
| **UK** | 26% | 74% | 4800 | 10% | 66% | 55% |
| **Ukraine** | 0% | 100% | 2400 | 46% | 54% | 35% |

**Appendix 4: ranking of countries by corruption measure**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| country | CitizenPrsnk | CPIrank | WGIrank | ICRGrank | CitiznExprank |
| Denmark | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Finland | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Ireland | 3 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Netherlands | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| U.K | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| Sweden | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Germany | 7 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 7 |
| Austria | 8 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 10 |
| Poland | 9 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 15 |
| Turkey | 10 | 16 | 17 | 21 | 14 |
| Belgium | 11 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 11 |
| Spain | 12 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 5 |
| France | 13 | 8 | 9 | 15 | 12 |
| Italy | 14 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 19 |
| Hungary | 15 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 22 |
| Czech Republic | 16 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 13 |
| Portugal | 17 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 9 |
| Bulgaria | 18 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 21 |
| Romania | 19 | 19 | 23 | 23 | 24 |
| Greece | 20 | 23 | 20 | 19 | 20 |
| Slovakia | 21 | 18 | 16 | 16 | 17 |
| Croatia | 22 | 17 | 18 | 13 | 16 |
| Serbia | 23 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 18 |
| Ukraine | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 23 |

1. For more information on the NUTS system, please see: <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/nuts_nomenclature/introduction> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.efficience3.com/en/accueil/index.html>. For names of the specific firms to which Efficience 3 sub-contracted in individual countries, please write cati@efficience3.com [↑](#footnote-ref-2)