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# Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanatdari</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amlak</td>
<td>Land registration department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banayi</td>
<td>The state-run enterprise in charge of public works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank-e-Melli</td>
<td>National bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribe</td>
<td>A sum of money or other inducement offered for having the state officials to act in one’s favour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribery</td>
<td>An offer or receipt of any gift, loan, fee, reward or other advantage to or from any person as an inducement to do something which is dishonest, illegal or a breach of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brishna</td>
<td>Electricity in Pashto - the state-run enterprise providing electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissionkar</td>
<td>Professional commission taker that is an intermediary between a bribe taker and a bribe giver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Abuse of entrusted authority for illicit gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court tempering</td>
<td>Attenuating court decisions in one’s favour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>Illegal use or misappropriation of money or property under one’s authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extortion</td>
<td>Is a form of blackmail where one party makes threats against another party of adverse consequences unless the demands, usually for payment, are met. Sometimes the threats may involve threats of physical harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>Unfair preferential treatment given to one person or group at the expense of another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>The act of falsifying documents for personal or group gains or interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>A domestic unit consisting of the members of a family who live together under the same roof, share food and cooking arrangement and have a common budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerib</td>
<td>Unit of land measurement roughly equal to 1/5 hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jirga/Shura</td>
<td>Gathering of elders/villagers to resolve a local question or handle issues of common concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuchis</td>
<td>Nomad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawlawi</td>
<td>Religious scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MerAb</td>
<td>Water-manager in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshrano Jirga</td>
<td>Upper house of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milli Bus</td>
<td>The state-run enterprise providing public bus transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mujahideen</td>
<td>Anti-communist armed organized groups that resisted the soviet invasion and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
remained active in Afghan politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mullah</td>
<td>Preacher of a mosque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepotism</td>
<td>Abuse of authority for according advantages to one's own family members or relatives in recruiting or promoting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashtanay Bank</td>
<td>State-run bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reshwat</td>
<td>Bribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TasadiKhanaSazi</td>
<td>The state-run enterprise that builds housing especially for civil servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulema</td>
<td>The body of Muslim scholars recognized as having specialist knowledge of Islamic sacred law and theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasseta</td>
<td>A connection, a recommendation or a relationship illegally and illicitly used for obtaining a service from the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolesi Jirga</td>
<td>Lower house of Parliament</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Afghanistan ranks as one of the most corrupt countries in the world. Despite significant pressure from the international community on the government of Afghanistan to address this issue, very little improvement has been observed in terms of public’s perception about corruption. The international community’s concerns about corruption are tied to the belief that corruption can undermine state building and security in the country. In the lead-up to transition and international troop withdrawal in 2014, there are concerns that widespread corruption could feed into uncertainties about the future and reinforce doubts about the capabilities of the Afghan security forces and the government of Afghanistan to ensure the security and safety of its citizens. The government’s efforts should be more focused on addressing corruption through formal mechanisms like laws, conventions, and institutions, but there has been little or no political will demonstrated to address the problem through such means.

This report is summary of the third nationwide survey of IWA on experiences and perceptions of Afghans regarding corruption. Although a prevalent issue in the country, the topic of corruption has not received due attention in surveys and studies. This study is the continuation of IWA’s regular surveys, the first of which was published in 2007 and the next in 2010. As such, the current study depicts trends over a five-year period and provides a more in-depth insight into and analysis of Afghan experiences of corruption.

This survey focuses on administrative corruption such as bribery, obstruction, and nepotism. Administrative corruption affects the greatest number of citizens and has the most direct impact on them. Exploring grand corruption (including political corruption and embezzlement) goes beyond the scope of this study for a number of reasons. Firstly, a practice such as political corruption cannot be observed by ordinary citizens on a regular basis or in a direct manner. Second, the topic of grand corruption is understudied and hence requires a qualitative study before it is explored in a nationwide generic survey.

The findings of the survey are presented in three parts. Part One gives a general picture of corruption in the country. Part Two discusses individuals’ and households’ perceptions and experiences of corruption. Part Three provides a detailed discussion of corruption in two selected sectors—the police and judiciary—and analyses corruption in relation to land and property.

---

2 Transparency International ranks Afghanistan in the top three most corrupt countries in the world with a score of 8/100. "The Corruption Perceptions Index ranks countries and territories based on how corrupt their public sector is perceived to be. A country or territory’s score indicates the perceived level of public sector corruption on a scale of 0 - 100, where 0 means that a country is perceived as highly corrupt and 100 means it is perceived as very clean. “http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2012/results/

3Defined as abuse of entrusted authority for personal and illicit gains

Method and research approach

This third nationwide survey was designed and the data collected by IWA in September 2011. The data collection process continued until early 2012 while the analysis took place during 2012. A total of 7560 respondents (with an equal number of men and women) were interviewed. Respondents were selected from all 34 provinces of the country. The number of respondents in each province is proportional to the population of the provinces, apart from 19 smaller provinces, which were deliberately oversampled. For a list and breakdown of the number of respondents selected in each province, please refer to the Methodology section. One quarter of respondents came from urban centers while three quarters came from rural areas in order to reflect the demography of the country. This sample was subsequently divided between remote villages and villages near cities. The survey also captures a diversity of groups based on age, marital status, socio-professional status, income, literacy, and ethnicity. The sampling method was a stratified random sampling. Additionally, the most influential strata of the society such as Mullahs and elders were interviewed in some areas to capture the opinion of this specific group of the population.

Any survey can be affected by biases, and this survey is no exception. There is a possibility that this survey is influenced by confirmation bias. Confirmation bias refers to the tendency of people to favor information that confirms their beliefs or to selectively recollect or interpret information. Hence, it is possible that respondents under-reported or over-reported their experiences of corruption.

Primacy effect is another possible source of bias. Although the surveyors were instructed not to read the responses to open ended questions, the possibility of ‘primacy effect’—where respondents have a tendency to choose the first few answers from a long list of responses—cannot be ruled out completely.

In order to ensure and strengthen reliability of the data, questions measuring different indicators of the same variable were included in the survey and the responses to such questions were closely investigated. Such analysis is discussed and reflected in the relevant sections on the findings.

Key findings from the 2012 survey

This survey explored different forms of corruption such as bribery, using/paying a professional broker in order to access public services, exchange of favors, nepotism, and using ethnic, tribal, personal or family ties and relations. Although individuals’ experiences of corruption have dropped in 2012 from prior years (from 23% in 2010 to 18% in 2012), the findings of this survey show that corruption continue to be considered as the third most important problem in the country. The total amount of money involved on average in bribery cases has increased since 2010 (16% of increase). There is a significant discrepancy between household experiences of corruption and perceptions of corruption in institutions such as the police and judiciary system. Other more prominent findings indicate that although corruption is believed to foster the expansion of the Taliban, the President is viewed as the individual best placed to address corruption. The international community is viewed as not having lived up to its international commitment and discourse to address corruption.

Transition is looming large. Approximately 42% of respondents believe that the government is not able to handle transition successfully. Despite the prevalence of experiences and perceptions of corruption, these do not appear to have any bearing on perceptions of successful transition.
List of the key findings

1. Corruption remains one of Afghans’ biggest concerns, despite a reduction in personal experience of corruption.

2. Bribery is the most common form of corruption and has increased by 16% in value since 2010.

3. Corruption, by and large, remains institutionalized and there is a high confidence in bribes to get things done.

4. Corruption is becoming monetized.

5. The police and justice sectors are considered the most corrupt despite a drop in corruption experiences of households with police and judiciary (around 5% decrease).

6. Corruption can limit access to police and to justice.

7. Corruption is not considered correct, right, or moral, but is tolerated to a certain degree.

8. Personal, ethnic and political connections matter.

9. Corruption is a heavy burden on households.

10. Corruption weakens the legitimacy of the state, aids insurgency and fuels local conflicts.

11. Fighting corruption: Expectations are high, performances are rated low.

12. The international community is not seen as an ally in the fight against corruption.

13. Individual determination to resist corruption remains relatively strong.

14. Perceptions and experiences of corruption do not affect perceptions of transition.

15. People believe addressing corruption should be a policy priority.

1. Corruption remains one of Afghans’ biggest concerns, despite a reduction in personal experience of corruption.

According to the people surveyed, corruption is regarded as the third most important problem in Afghanistan. The biggest problems were identified as security (51% of respondents), unemployment (16% of respondents), and corruption (13% of respondents).

Depending on ethnicity and province of residence, the order of these top three problems differs. For instance, while security is reported as the number one problem in all provinces, corruption surpasses lack of employment as the second largest problem in Baghlan, Balkh, Daykundi, Farah, Farayab, Jawzjan, Khost, Kunduz, Laghman, Sar-ePol and Uruzgan.

Compared to 2010, personal experiences with corruption have dropped (23% in 2010 versus 18% in 2012). This points to a discrepancy between perceptions and actual experiences of corruption. Despite a slight drop in the actual personal experiences of corruption (23% versus 18%),
the total annual amount of money paid in bribery and the number of bribes paid have both increased since 2010. People are paying more money in bribe than in the past.

2. **Bribery is the most common form of corruption and has increased by 16% in value since 2010.**

An estimated 62.6 billion Afis (62,582,667,120= 1,254,543,390USD) was paid in bribes in 2012. This in an increase of 16% (8,599,184,118Afis)since 2010, when bribes paid totaled 53,983,483,002Afis. The frequency of bribe paying has increased. While in 2010, the average number of bribes per year per person was 3.4; by 2012 this number rose to 4.05.

In 2012, among those who have experienced corruption (18% of the total sample), bribery is the most common form (85%). In general, men are more likely than women to have experienced corruption; 58% who said that they experienced corruption were men while 42% were women. Overall, 15% of adults had paid at least one bribe in the previous twelve months, which is less than the figure from 2010 (14%).

The survey also measured household experiences of bribery. 28% of households had experienced some sort of corruption in the twelve months prior to the survey. Households with an income below 30,000 Afis are more likely to have paid bribes than households earning 30,000 Afis or more. Wealthier household are more likely to rely on social networks such as family and acquaintances with high-level officials in order to get services than paying bribes.

Households that paid bribes to the police (10% of the sample) were also more likely to have paid bribes to the courts. Approximately 35% of households who have bribed the police have also paid bribes to the courts in the past twelve months.

3. **Corruption, by and large, remains institutionalized and there is a high confidence in bribes to get things done.**

Despite a decrease in the role of intermediaries, since 2010commissionkars still play a prominent role. In the 2012 survey, 31% of respondents who engaged in bribery transactions reported using a commissionkar. In 2010, this number was 44%—the highest of the three surveys conducted to date.

Urban dwellers are more likely to rely on commissionkars than rural dwellers. Men are also more likely than women to use the services of a commissionkar (58% of men versus 42% of women) and the higher the level of education, the more likely a person would be to use a commissionkar in corrupt transactions. However, there was no statistically significant association between sex and number of times that a respondent sought government services 12 months prior to the survey.

A majority of the respondents have great confidence in under-the-table transactions. The likelihood of paying a bribe increases significantly if respondents are highly certain about the result to be obtained in the exchange. Out of respondents who had paid bribes, approximately 31% stated that they were highly certain, and another 32% that they were certain, that the bribe they paid will get their objective done (27% indicated low levels of certainty). Only 10% of respondents stated that they are not confident that the bribe they are paying will help them. Confidence in the effectiveness of bribes does not differ by age, sex or place of residence (urban or rural).

For small bribes (2,500 Afis or less), respondents report low levels of confidence in the likely effectiveness of the bribe. By contrast, a high level of confidence is reported for large payments.

---

5For calculation of the estimated amount paid in bribery and the number of bribes paid in 2012, please refer to Appendix III.
6Based on cross-tabulation of Q 38 and Q 28.
7Professional commission taker that is an intermediary between a bribe taker and a bribe giver. Cf. Glossary.
For moderate sized bribes, expectations of effectiveness vary substantially across respondents.

4. Corruption is becoming monetized.
In 2012 55% while in 2010, 47% of all corruption transactions involved an exchange of money. This indicates the monetization of corruption, as non-monetary forms of corruption have traditionally been more prevalent in the country. However, since 2001, with the flood of money channeled into the country and lax accountability measures (if there existed any at all) in addition to poor capabilities in effectively spending money, bribery has become rampant, virally spreading into virtually all sectors of the country. Money has been used either independently or in conjunction with connections (waasita). 43% of respondents said in the 2010 survey that money was the most important form of corruption, compared with 48% in 2007. The rates of bribery for 2012 remain similar to those found in 2007 and 2010.

5. The police and justice sectors are considered the most corrupt despite a drop in corruption experiences of households with police and judiciary.
Despite slight variations in figures, this trend has not changed since 2007. The courts (29%), the Ministry of Interior (26%) and Ministry of Justice (26%) were identified by respondents as the most corrupt public institutions. However, corruption experiences of households with police and judiciary dropped significantly to 10% (14% in 2010) and 9% (13% in 2010) respectively. The Ministry of Education (1.3% of the overall sample) ranked as the highest in terms of improvements in addressing corruption.

6. Corruption can limit access to police and to justice.
Although only 9% of respondents stated that they or their households had faced corruption in the judiciary system, a relatively large percentage (36%) stated that corruption at the courts had a negative impact on their household. This discrepancy between experiences of corruption and perceptions of corruption might be attributed to the possibility that the negative impact of corruption extends beyond the immediate household that has experienced corruption.

32% of respondents who stated that their household experienced corruption involving the police also stated that their access to the police was hampered as a result of corruption (this is an increase from 26% in 2010). Certain groups of populations — uneducated people and people from rural areas — have a higher chance of falling victim to police corruption. The majority of respondents (74%) who experienced corruption involving the police were from rural areas, and approximately 49% were illiterate.

Perceptions about corruption in the courts can prevent respondents from seeking judicial services. 20% of respondents stated that corruption has prevented them from seeking judicial services.

7. Corruption is not considered correct, right, or moral, but is tolerated to a certain degree.
The most unacceptable form of corruption was identified as civil servants creating undue difficulty to make an indirect request for a bribe (63%), followed by asking for money from the poor (59%) and asking directly for money (58%).

Respondents were more tolerant towards civil servants who asked for bribes referring to poor salaries as a justification. Approximately 11% stated that it was acceptable for a civil servant to take

---

8Based on Q 28.
bribe if the he/she has a low salary. Also 11% stated that it was acceptable if a civil servant asks for bribes in exchange for reducing taxes and custom duties.

Perceptions that civil servants in service delivery position created undue difficulties so as to request a bribe or did not perform official tasks in an appropriate amount of time was slightly lower than in previous surveys (13% in 2007, 14% in 2010, 10% in 2012).

Around 96% of respondents stated that they would feel guilty if they paid a bribe, compared to 90% who stated so in 2010. Similarly, 91% stated that a corrupt person is detested in the society or within his or her immediate social environment. Comparatively, in 2007, 83% held such strong views against a corrupt person.

Although the majority of respondents did not tolerate any form of corrupt behavior by civil servants, when the financial interests of respondents are at stake (for instance evading taxes), respondents become more tolerant of corruption, indicating that respondents generally would not put state interests ahead of their own financial interests.

8. **Personal, ethnic and political connections matter.**

Ethnic networks and family ties can be invoked in obtaining services. Among social relationships, ethnic connections were the most common channels for corruption. 37% of households who experienced corruption, regardless of the type of corruption, reported having relied on ethnic relations when engaging in corruption. In 2010, this figure was 39%, while in 2007, only 30% stated that ethnic relations were invoked for corruption. The perception that ethnic ties are the most common means of corrupt practices was the highest in Bamyan (70%), Daikundi (69%), and Baghlan (66%), while family relations were perceived as the most common means of corruption in Zabul (16%), Paktika (15%), Nimroz (11), and Logar (10%). As it can be observed, ethnic ties are strong and used frequently to obtain state services or favors thus reinforcing the nepotism as a corrupt practice. In comparison, acquaintances with local commanders and factional affiliations as main factors in corruption have decreased significantly since 2007. In 2007, 19% reported utilizing their relationships with local commanders to get public services, compared to 9% in 2010 and 4% in 2012. This indicates a possible waning of influence of local commanders and factional affiliations.

9. **Corruption is a heavy burden on households.**

Approximately 62% of respondents who experienced corruption (around 11% of the total sample) believed that the impact of corruption on their household was considerable or extremely high. Compared to figures from 2007 and 2010, the negative impact of corruption has touched more households in 2012 than in 2007, when significantly fewer respondents stated that corruption had an impact on their household. In 2010, 33% of people, while in 2007 17% of them stated that the impact of corruption on their household was extremely high. In 2012, 20% of those who personally experienced corruption over the 12 months prior to the survey stated that the impact of corruption on their household was extremely high.

21% of households considered that corruption caused a financial impact on their household. Approximately 23% of households in this category stated that the financial burden on their household has stayed the same over the twelve months prior to the survey, while 52% stated that financial burden of corruption on their households had increased.

Any bribe in the amount of 2,500+ Afs (more than 45 USD) is considered to have a negative impact on the household. At and above this level, respondents found bribes to strain the financial abilities of the household.

---

9Based on Q13 and Q19.
Respondents who paid large amounts in bribery were more likely than other respondents to believe that the financial burden of corruption on their households has increased in the year prior to the survey. The larger the amount of bribe, the heavier the burden it imposed on the household. For instance, 71% of respondents who paid 20,000 Afs (around 380 USD) or more in bribes also stated that the financial burden on their households had increased over the twelve months prior to the survey.

10. Corruption weakens the legitimacy of the state, aids insurgency and fuels local conflicts.

Corruption in the public sector was found to undermine the legitimacy of the state. For instance, approximately 44% of respondents who experienced corruption in the judiciary turned to non-state actors such as Shuras, Jirgas and Taliban courts. This can lead to an increase in the popularity and empowerment of the Taliban.

39% of respondents believed that corruption within state institutions helps the expansion of the Taliban. More specifically, respondents believed that corruption in the central government (29%), in provincial and district government offices (26%) and at the courts and attorney general’s office (18%) would facilitate the expansion of the Taliban.

Approximately 31% of respondents stated that the presence of corruption has led to land and property disputes in their areas. However, from the survey, it cannot be ascertained whether corruption has led to violent conflict.

Around 8% of households stated that they faced corruption regarding land and property issues, varying from transferring property to paying taxes and resolving disputes. Corruption associated with the administration of land has led 26% of these households (2% of overall sample) to refer to non-state actors to resolve these issues.

An overwhelming majority of respondents (94%) believe that organized groups of people, including state officials, have at least some influence on land management, sale and distribution. Perceptions of involvement of organized networks and high-ranking officials in land issues was also correlated with the perception that corruption can facilitate the expansion of the Taliban.

Respondents were also asked if they heard the Taliban denounce corruption. Approximately 32% of respondents stated that they had heard the Taliban speak out against corruption, while around 68% stated that they had not heard the Taliban denouncing corruption. Educated male urbanites are more likely than other respondents to have heard the Taliban speak against corruption. Although it cannot be determined from this study through what means respondents heard the messages of the Taliban or the international community about corruption, it can be speculated that it may be attributed to different forms of media. Educated men who live in urban areas have more access to media than the rest of the population.

11. Fighting corruption: Expectations are high, performances are rated low.

President Karzai is believed to be the most effective person in fighting corruption in the country. However, even then, 39% of the respondents believe that he is the most efficient person in fighting corruption in Afghanistan. District governors, mayors and provincial governors were viewed as the least effective in fighting corruption in the country. Only around 23% of respondents believed that the government has done enough to address corruption.

12. The international community is not seen as an ally in the fight against corruption.

Based on Q69.
Opinions about the intentions and actions of the international community in terms of addressing corruption vary. A notable number of respondents (37%) believe that the international community does not want to fight corruption. In comparison, 29% believe that the international community wants to fight corruption while the rest of the respondents were undecided. Furthermore, 32% of respondents stated that the international community does not support the honest local officials. This lack of trust is perhaps reinforced by the perception that the international community does not speak out against the corruption. A majority of the respondents (68%) stated that they had not heard the international community speak out against corruption in Afghanistan. Those who have heard the international community speak out against corruption had a higher tendency to believe that the international community wants to fight corruption. Likewise, this group of respondents was also more likely to state that the international community does not support honest officials in their local area.

A similar perception can be observed regarding other important actors in the country. The United Nations, international organizations, the media, and religious institutions were also viewed as performing inadequately in addressing corruption.

13. Individual determination to resist corruption remains relatively strong.

An overwhelming majority of respondents (93%) stated that they would not vote for someone whom they believed was corrupt and that they do not buy products from a company that is involved in corruption (65%). According to the survey, men, urban residents, and educated respondents are more likely than women, rural inhabitants, and uneducated respondents to boycott services of corrupt companies or to avoid voting for a corrupt politician or civil servant.

14. Perceptions and experiences of corruption do not affect perceptions of transition.

Whether widespread corruption affects a smooth transition is a question that merits discussion. The end of transition is imminent. Transition is referred to the process by which the lead responsibility of Afghan security forces will be gradually transferred from NATO-led ISAF forces to Afghan National Security Forces.

Approximately 42% of respondents believe that the government is not able to perform a successful transition of security responsibilities from the international forces to Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF). Perceptions of successful transition differ by location such that urban residents are more skeptical of the ability of the government to ensure a successful transition than rural residents (51% urban versus 40% rural).

An overwhelming majority of respondents (97%) who believe that the government can ensure a successful transition also believe that the ANSF is able to maintain security in the country. Conversely, respondents who lacked confidence in a successful transition by the government identified lack of resources, capacity, morale, and the presence of corruption as the main factors that would hinder transition. However, perceptions about prevalence of corruption or experiences of corruption in the country did not have any statistically significant impact on perceptions of successful transition.

15. People believe addressing corruption should be a policy priority.

Approximately 22% of respondents named corruption as the biggest problem that the government must address. Respondents who were mainly concerned about basic social services—such as employment, health, water and electricity—expected the government to address these issues as priority. Respondents who believed that the Ministry of Justice, the courts, and the Ministry of
Interior were the most corrupt institutions tended to emphasize that the government needs to prioritize addressing corruption. There is a high correlation between perceptions of corruption being the major problem in the country and expectations of the government to address corruption as the biggest problem. Approximately 60% of respondents who stated that corruption is the biggest problem in the country (around 9% of the total sample) also stated that the government should address corruption as priority.

**Recommendations for action emerging from the survey results**

IWA has the following recommendations based on the survey findings and taking into account IWA’s research:

- Addressing corruption in the judiciary and the police should be a policy priority for the government. Administrative sanctions should accompany criminal sanctions to address corruption in the absence of an effective enforcement approach.
- The participation of civil society and the public in court hearings should be encouraged. The government should facilitate involvement of the civil society in court hearings while civil society needs to take a proactive approach in this regard.
- Simplifying administrative procedures is key to reducing petty corruption. Complex procedures and the scarcity of information can increase resorting to *commissionkar* and paying bribes.
- Government departments should provide the public with guidelines about obtaining specific services and the timeframe each service requires. A hotline that is perceived as independent and trusted should be provided so that public service users may report bribes paid to civil servants.
- Corruption regarding land issues is prevalent in the country. The government needs to clarify the roles and responsibilities of various departments and ministries involved in issues related to land. Distribution and land purchase transactions by the government should be transparent.
- When it comes to land distribution by the government, Afghan citizens and civil society organizations should have access to the relevant decision-making process, and lists of those who have benefitted from land distribution should be made public.
- The government should demand clear and measurable commitments to address corruption from those institutions perceived to be most corrupt. The High Office of Oversight should support these efforts.
- The asset and income declaration program of the High Office of Oversight should be mandatory for all public officials that are most exposed to bribery. Assets and income of these officials should be checked regularly and such information should be made public.
- The High Office of Oversight should prioritize its anti-corruption programs for state institutions, which have been identified as the most corrupt and which have the largest impact on perceptions of legitimacy of the government.

---

11The analysis is based on Q2 and Q23. The p-value is 0.000 in a cross-tabulation and observed values in corresponding categories are higher than observed. For details on the exact values please refer to Table 1, Appendix V.
• Perceptions and experiences of corruption vary in different parts of the country. The government should prioritize tackling corruption in those areas where the population perceives corruption to be the most prominent problem or where experiences of corruption are high.

• A wide range of factors such as age, education level, place of residence and so forth influences perceptions and experiences of corruption. Policies devised to address corruption need to account for this factor and address various concerns accordingly, in particular awareness raising campaigns on citizen rights and public services (especially from the Police) need to be addressed to rural people and the poor.

• Both the government and civil society groups should encourage local communities to monitor decision-making processes, track budgets at the village and district levels, and monitor the quality of the actual services delivered. Involvement of the local community not only helps reduce corruption, but also helps in building broad-based legitimacy for the government.

• The international community, in addition to supporting the fight against corruption, should work harder to convey their position and message regarding corruption to the general population. Afghan citizens need to hear the stance of the international community regarding corruption.

• All the before requires access to information and IWA’s research on corruption reconfirms that access to information is crucial to fight against corruption. The Afghan government should establish the legal foundation for citizens to access information held by the state based on article 50 of the Afghan Constitution. Both civil society and the government should raise public’s awareness in regards to their rights to accessing information.
INTRODUCTION

This report is a summary of a nationwide survey on experiences and perceptions of Afghans regarding corruption. Although a prevalent issue in the country, the topic of corruption has not been paid due attention in surveys and studies. Integrity Watch Afghanistan’s (IWA) corruption surveys, launched in 2007, were the first of their kind to measure experiences and perceptions of corruption in Afghanistan. This study is the continuation of IWA’s biannual surveys, which build upon the 2007 and 2010 waves. As such, the current study depicts trends over a five-year period and provides a more in-depth insight into and analysis of Afghan experiences of corruption.

The focus of this study is corrupt practices associated with the provision of basic public and social services and how perceptions and experiences of corruption affect and shape the relationship of citizens to the state. The main objective of undertaking these studies is to gauge the negative impact of corruption on state-building efforts and conflict.

This survey focuses on administrative corruption such as bribery, obstruction, and nepotism. Nepotism is defined as abuse of authority for gaining advantages to one’s own family members or relatives in recruiting or promoting. Bribery is defined as giving or taking a sum of money or other inducement offered for having the state officials to act in one’s favour. Administrative corruption affects the greatest number of citizens and has the most direct impact on them. Exploring grand corruption is not addressed in any depth for a number of reasons. Firstly, a practice such as political corruption may not affect the lives of ordinary citizens on a regular basis or in a direct manner. Second, the topic of grand corruption is understudied and hence requires research tools devised to capture this less explored area.

Perceptions and experiences of corruption associated with the private sector and international assistance-related practices have not been the focus of this study since the main concern has been the public sector for reasons stated above. Nonetheless, the findings underline the interconnectedness of administrative corruption to grand corruption.

The key questions that this survey sets to answer are:

- How prevalent are Afghans’ perceptions and experiences of corruption and what impacts do these perceptions and experiences of corruption have on Afghans?
- Which public sector is viewed more corrupt and who (the government, international community or the Taliban) is responsible for tackling corruption?
- What impact does corruption have on perceptions of effectiveness, performance, and support of the government?
- Have perceptions and experiences of corruption changed over time (since 2007)?

The findings are presented in three parts. Part One gives a general picture of corruption in the country. Part Two discusses perceptions and experiences of corruption. Part Three provides a detailed discussion of corruption in two selected sectors—the police and the judiciary—and analyses corruption in relation to land and property. The findings of these sections point to a perception of a systematic nature of corruption which is embedded in both the perceptions and prevalence of corruption, personal and household experiences of corruption, and the rise of petty corruption. A significant number of Afghans believe that those who control the economy also have a great influence over state policies—suggesting the collusion of political and economic elites.

12Especially political corruption.
Although the survey did not venture into the topic of grand corruption, issues such as land grabbing, distribution, and selling of land are controlled by groups of individuals who share common interests, disregarding the welfare and needs of the population, which has been discussed briefly.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

Methodology

The survey was conducted among 8316 respondents (7560 individual randomly selected and 756 elder and Mullahs treated as a different database) in all 34 Afghan provinces in a single wave in 2011 and early 2012. It was designed and implemented by IWA. A total of 72 surveyors (36 men and 36 women) were trained to conduct the in-person interviews. Only Afghan citizens aged 18 or above and residing in Afghanistan were interviewed. The sample margin of error is +/-1% at a 95% confidence interval. This means that the probability that the sample includes the “true” figures (true figure is the actual population) is 95% and that the value of random sampling error is either -1% or +1%.

Respondents were selected using stratified random sampling of the Afghan population in 34 provinces. A multi-stage procedure was used to select the sample. The first stage involved the stratification of the sample according to provincial population over 18 years old, the rural/urban divide, and sex. The second stage involved the random selection of rural districts. The third stage involved the random selection, within districts and cities, of settlements and households. In addition, the most influential Mullahs and elders were interviewed in each settlement to be able to analyse the opinion of a specific category of the population.

After the questionnaires had been completed and returned to Kabul, all provinces were divided into four zones for verification purposes. IWA’s monitors crosschecked both the sampling and the proper filling of the questionnaires. At least two districts per province surveyed were selected. For each, a random sample of questionnaires was verified. 12% of the total interviews were crosschecked in this way. Furthermore, a different team of men and women controlled the quality of the interviews by a similar procedure, but over the phone from Kabul.

The survey aimed to capture a general overview of perceptions and experiences of corruption. Hence, a major limitation of this survey is that the links with organized crime, grand corruption and the drug economy have not been explored.

Analysis

Association between variables are statistically significant at the level of p=0.05. Any probabilities higher than 5% are not reported. Where there is no statistically significant association between variables, at the level of probability of an association happening by chance in 5% of the cases or in less than 5% of the cases the association has not been reported. Conversely, when there is a mention of a ‘correlation’, ‘association’ or ‘chances of increases or decreases in the effect of one variable on another’, these associations are statistically significant, although the value of p is not reported.

All the maps presented in this report are based on 2012 data, unless it is stated otherwise.

---

13 The data collected from the sample of elders and Mullahs will be published in a different report, which can give a detailed analysis of a particular and highly influential segment of society’s perceptions and experiences of corruption.
PART ONE: GENERAL TRENDS

This section explores common trends in public service corruption experienced by Afghans. The section reports the frequency, size, channels, and usage of bribes and describes how the general public perceives corruption and Afghans’ attitudes towards corruption.

Corruption is perceived to be the third biggest problem in Afghanistan, following security and lack of employment. Despite slight variations in figures, this trend has not changed since 2007. Nonetheless, Afghans’ perceptions of corruption have evolved since 2007 when IWA produced its first nationwide survey of corruption. More people experienced corruption in 2012 than in 2007. Heightened experiences of corruption have led to lower levels of satisfaction with government performance and increased criticism of the government’s reaction to addressing the issue. Compared to 2007, not only has the rate of corruption experienced by Afghans increased, but also corruption has become rampant and has infiltrated a wider range of activities and services.

State institutions remain the prime source of corruption despite modest improvements in some sectors. The Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Interior are considered to be the most corrupt public institutions, while the Ministry of Education and the National Directorate of Security (NDS) have ranked the highest in terms of improvements.

Although bribery remains the most common form of corruption, perceptions of corruption, its causes, and consequences are complex. Corruption is considered to be a problem rooted in poor governance. Despite denouncing corruption, the majority of respondents have experienced bribery. This indicates that in order to get public services, respondents have to resort to corruption.

I.1 Corruption: a common occurrence and the third biggest problem

The findings of the IWA survey in 2012 showed that corruption was perceived to be a common occurrence in the country.

Please refer to Maps 1 and 2 below. Opinions varied by province.

Similar to 2007 and 2010 surveys, corruption is perceived to be the third biggest problem in the country in the 2012 survey. This trend is confirmed by other major nationwide surveys (TAF 2007, 2008, 2009; ABC, BBC and ARD2007, 2009).14

This finding varies according to other factors such as age, sex, education, and whether a respondent lives in a rural or urban area. In general, women and rural residents are slightly more likely than men and urban residents to believe that corruption is a common occurrence in the country. Respondents between the ages 26 and 45 are more likely than younger or older respondents to believe that corruption is a common occurrence in the country. Likewise, people with a middle

---

14 Only the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime survey 2010 puts corruption as the biggest problem in Afghanistan. According to this survey 59% of Afghans view public dishonesty as a bigger concern than insecurity (54%) and unemployment (52%).

In the latest UNODC survey from December 2012, the corruption is now the second problem of Afghan people, after the insecurity.
income are more likely than lower- or higher- income people to view corruption as a common occurrence. People with higher education are more likely to believe in corruption as a common occurrence than less educated people.

**What is the biggest problem in Afghanistan? (Q1)**

In general, 13% of Afghans perceive corruption to be the third biggest problem facing Afghanistan—the first being security (51%) followed by unemployment (16%). Compared with figures from 2007 and 2010, perceptions of security and employment have deteriorated. However, depending on ethnicity and provincial residence, the order of the top three problems, namely—insecurity, corruption and unemployment — differs. For instance, while insecurity remains the number one problem for all provinces, corruption surpasses lack of employment as the second largest problem in Baghlan, Balkh, Daykundi, Farah, Farayab, Jawzjan, Khost, Kunduz, Laghman, Sar-e-Pol and Uruzgan.

In provinces where security challenges are more prominent, people tend to be less concerned about corruption. A possible explanation for this is that lack of security hampers employment opportunities. In more secure provinces, it is not employment but corruption that is viewed as a bigger problem, as can be observed from the following maps and the above list.
Map 1: Corruption the biggest problem in Afghanistan

Map 2: Insecurity as the biggest problem in Afghanistan
Daikundi and Parwan had the highest rates of perception of corruption being the biggest problem in the country, while Bamyan and Herat had the lowest. Perceptions of corruption are further influenced by the type of residential area. A higher percentage of urban dwellers view corruption as the biggest problem in the country while rural residents are more concerned with insecurity. The observed values for perceptions about corruption and unemployment are higher than expected values among urban residents while the observed value for concerns over security is higher than expected value among rural residents (Figure 2).

\[15\] This relationship is statistically significant (p=0.026).
In Laghman and Daikundi, corruption was identified as the single biggest problem that should be addressed by the government. Bamyan, Helmand and Herat had one of the lowest rankings on this issue.

Perceptions of corruption as an issue in the country are highly correlated with perceptions of corruption associated with particular actors. In other words, the rampant corruption rates are attributed to the corruption within the state sector rather than private sector or NGO community. Similar results were observed in 2007 and 2010. In the 2007 survey, 77% (versus 72% in 2010) considered the public sector to be the most corrupt actor. In 2007, 14% of all respondents considered non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations as corrupt. This figure fell to less than 5% in 2010, but rose to 6% in 2012. Although perceptions of corruption of state institutions has fallen since 2007, such that now 55% believe in state corruption, the perception that state is corrupt remains dominant. Government officials have frequently tried to
challenge the notion of rampant corruption in the public institutions by asserting that 80% of corruption lies outside the government\textsuperscript{16} in NGOs and individuals are responsible for corruption. However, this survey shows public opinion points to the contrary. The NGOs and private sector are considered by Afghans to be performing less corrupt than the state. The fact that the focus of this research is on petty corruption compared to other forms of corruption such as embezzlement—which can be more sector-dependant, might bias these results more towards state institutions.

I.2 Addressing Corruption: Government, International Community and the Taliban

Government

![Bar chart showing the biggest problem in Afghanistan that the government has to address](image)

Corresponding to the perception of corruption and the order of issues facing the country, approximately 17% of respondents believe that corruption is the biggest problem the government must address (Figure 3). Insecurity and unemployment still exceed corruption as the top issues to be addressed by the government. Expectations for the government to address corruption are high since a relatively small percentage of respondents (23%) believe that the government has done enough to address corruption.

Further inspection of this data shows that men are more critical of the government’s job in addressing corruption than women. Comparatively, a higher proportion of women (52% women versus 48% men) believe that the government has done enough to address corruption. This is while there is no association between gender and seeking government services—for instance 676 women versus 735 men sought government services once in the twelve months prior to the survey.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16} Government officials have been repeatedly hammering out this message since 2008. For instance, President Karzai and the Director-General of the High Office of Oversight made such statements in April and May 2010 in radio and television broadcasts.

\textsuperscript{17} Based on Q12 and Q85.
However, men are more likely than women to have experienced corruption (58% men versus 42% women).18

Not surprisingly, perceptions of the biggest issue in the country that the government needs to address are highly correlated to perceptions of the biggest problem facing the country. Respondents who are mainly concerned about basic social services such as employment, health, water and electricity expect the government to prioritize these issues rather than corruption. Moreover, respondents who believed that Ministry of Justice, the courts and the Ministry of Interior are the most corrupt institutions tended to emphasize that the government needs to prioritize addressing corruption. This indicates to the perception of importance of law enforcement bodies in tackling issues and corruption in the country.

While levels of satisfaction with the performance of government in addressing the issues of unemployment and corruption are relatively similar, respondents are more satisfied with the government’s performance in addressing insecurity.

![Figure 4: Government's performance in addressing the biggest identified problems (%)](image)

In general, satisfaction with the performance of the government in addressing security and unemployment has improved since 2010. In 2010, 23% stated that the government has done enough to address security issues, while in 2012, 27% were satisfied with the government’s performance. Levels of satisfaction with the government’s performance in addressing unemployment issues have risen from 14% in 2010 to 20% in 2012. However, level of satisfaction with the performance of the government in addressing corruption has not improved.

---

18 Based on Q13 and Q85. The relationship is statistically significant.
International community

Opinions about the intentions and actions of the international community in terms of addressing corruption vary. A significant percentage of respondents (37%) believe that the international community does not want to fight corruption. In comparison, 29% believe that the international community wants to fight corruption while the rest of the respondents were undecided. Furthermore, 32% of respondents stated that the international community does not support the honest local officials. This lack of trust is perhaps reinforced by the perception that the international community does not speak out against corruption. A majority of the respondents (68%) stated that they have not heard the international community speak out against corruption in Afghanistan. Those who have heard the international community speak out against corruption were more likely to believe that the international community wants to fight corruption. Likewise, this group of respondents is also more likely to state that the international community does not support honest officials in their local area.

Respondents’ perceptions of the position of the international community regarding corruption are correlated with factors such as sex and residence. Women and rural dwellers are less likely than men and urban dwellers to say that they have heard the international community speak out against corruption. It seems that anti-corruption messages do not reach the population evenly. Those respondents who heard the international community denounce corruption heard it from United Nations officials (36%), the US government (19%), and officials of international organizations (12%) as the top three sources.

Respondents were also asked if they heard the Taliban denounce corruption. Approximately 32% of respondents stated that they had heard the Taliban speak out against corruption while around 68% stated that they had not heard the Taliban denouncing corruption.

In general, the findings in this section indicate the prevalence of corruption in the public sector and a high demand for the government to address corruption. What determines people’s attitudes towards corruption and how and where people experience corruption will be discussed in the section that follows.

Figure 5: Trust in international community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q73. Do you believe the international community wants to fight corruption?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q71. Have you heard any member of the international community speaking against corruption in Afghanistan over the last twelve months?
Yes, n=(33 OS)

Figure 6: International community speaking against corruption
PART TWO: PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES ABOUT CORRUPTION WITHIN STATE INSTITUTIONS

This section provides a more detailed analysis of perceived corruption regarding state institutions and actual experiences of corruption and the impact of this on the household and individuals. 39% of respondents in 2012 report the public sector to be the most corrupt. Perceptions of corruption in the private sector, among political parties, and in foreign militaries have increased slightly (Figure 7). In fact, this rather great drop down in the perception of corruption in the public sector in 2012 might be attributed to the availability of “I do not know” as a response in the 2012 which was not available in 2007 or 2010 surveys. Improvements, although small, in different public sectors can partially explain this. In fact, as will be discussed in this chapter, some sectors, such as the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Defence are perceived to have made significant improvements in addressing corruption (Figure 8).
II.1 Perceptions of corruption according to the institutions and the citizens

As shown in the figure above, despite some improvements, the public sector is still perceived as the sector with the most corruption (38%) compared to the private sector (7%), aid community (6%), media (4%), political parties (3%), and foreign military (2%). The presence of the government in an area increases the perceptions of corruption. An overwhelming majority of respondents (87%) who stated that corruption was the biggest issue in the country, also stated that the government was present in their area, compared to 12% who stated that the government was not present in their area.
In general, three public sector institutions—the courts (29%), the Ministry of Interior (26%) and the Ministry of Justice (26%)—are identified by respondents as the most corrupt public sectors. Based on perceptions of Afghans, both the courts and the Ministry of Interior show significant improvements since 2007 (Figure 10). However, they still remain as the top three corrupt institutions. It should be mentioned that these figures show perceptions of corruption and not actual experiences of corruption. Since the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Justice play a significant role in the country, it is possible that the sheer importance of these institutions influences perceptions of corruption more so than any other institution. For more discussion of these points and a comparison of experiences of corruption versus perceptions of corruption with the police and courts, please refer to Part Three of this report.  

19Although the surveyors were instructed not to read the responses for this open-ended question (Which public institution do you consider the most corrupt?), the possibility of ‘primacy effect’—wherein respondents have a tendency to choose the first few answers from a long list of response, cannot be ruled out completely. In other words, since Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Interior appear at the top
Improvements in perceptions can also be observed in the Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD), the Ministry of Higher Education, the Ministry of Finance, and Municipalities. In comparison, slightly more respondents in this wave of survey than in the last two (2010 and 2007) identified the Parliament and the Ministry of Health as the most corrupt institutions.

The perception of corruption in public services was not associated with background characteristics such as area of residence, sex, or marital status. However, education and age have an impact on which public sector is perceived to be more corrupt.

The following discussion indicates to the complexity of factors associated with formation of perceptions about corruption. Two prominent trends can be observed from this analysis. First, younger people are more critical of the performance and levels of corruption at the Ministry of Education. Second, respondents with lower levels of education show less satisfaction with public services and are more likely than more educated respondents to name significantly more public services as being corrupt. As one can observe from the description above, university educated respondents have named fewer organizations as being more corrupt than the rest of the respondents. The following gives a brief overview of the perception differences among age groups:

- **Age Group 18-25**: This age group is more likely than the other age groups to believe that the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Energy, the courts, and Election Commission are the more corrupt public sectors.

- **Age Group 26-35**: This age group tends to state that the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Health, MRRD (Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development) and Ministry of Agriculture are the most corrupt public sectors.

- **Age Group 36-45**: This age group identified the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Public Health, and President’s Office as the most corrupt.

- **Age Group 45+**: In general, this age group is more likely to be critical of the security forces and hence names the Ministry of Defense, National Directorate of Security, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Labour, and Ministry of Justice to be the most corrupt.

Education level also influences how the performances of different public sectors are perceived:

- **Respondents with no literacy** are more likely than other respondents to state that the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Public Health, Ministry of Commerce, Municipalities, President’s Office, Parliament, and Election Commission are the most corrupt institutions in the country.


- **Respondents with high school education** tend to believe more than other respondents that the National Directorate of Security, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD), courts are the most corrupt organizations.

- **Respondents with university education** believe that Afghanistan National Directorate of Security (ANDS) and the courts are more corrupt than other public sectors.

As the above analysis a wide range of factors, such as age, sex and education, influences shows perceptions of corruption. It should be noted that perceptions of the most corrupt institutions do not necessarily indicate direct household or personal experiences of bribery with those institutions. For instance, only 32% of respondents who believed that the Ministry of Interior was the most corrupt had a personal experience of corruption. Similarly, 90% of respondents who identified Ministry of Interior as the most corrupt institution came from households that had experienced

---

of the list of answers, their likelihood of being selected by the respondents becomes higher. Primacy effect as a source of bias is more likely in a mailed survey questionnaire rather than an interviewer administered questionnaire, which is the case for this study.
corruption in receiving services by the police. Likewise, 86% of respondents who considered the courts to be the most corrupt institutions did not pay any bribes in exchange for the services that they received from the courts. Finally, the largest number of households that said corruption deprived them of the benefits of services said that the police and the courts had the most negative perceived impact, after electricity provided by the government.

Despite the fact that compared to previous years, perceptions of corruption in some institutions have dropped; a very small number of respondents (approximately 10%) stated that some improvements in terms of corruption have occurred, while 64% of respondents say that no improvement has taken place (Figure 9). Comparatively, in 2010, 12% of respondents stated that they had observed some improvements in public services.
Figure 10 shows a breakdown by sector of improvements made in the last year according to the 10% respondents who believe some improvement has occurred:

**If some improvements, in which public institutions do you consider there was more progress?**
(Total of up to 3 choices)
(Q11, n=9.9% of original sample)

- Other: 2.0 (2012), 2.0 (2010)

Figure 10: Public institutions that show the most progress 2010 and 2012
A higher number of respondents believe that the Ministry of Defense and Ministry of Education have made improvements in the last twelve months. Other sectors with significant improvements are the courts, the Ministry of Finance, and the banks.

The private sector is not perceived to be devoid of corrupt practices. Approximately 7% of respondents identified private sector to be the most corrupt. A prominent example of private enterprises in the country is the private banks. Respondents were asked whether they trusted private banks. Approximately 50% of the respondents stated that they did not trust private banks with their money and the reasons they provided are captured in the following graph.

**Q51. Do you trust private banks in Afghanistan to put your money (No) n=50% OS**

- Risk of loss of money: 37%
- Lack of Islamic banking: 27%
- Banks involved in corruption: 23%
- Other: 9%
- Weak financial management and leadership: 4%

As it can be observed from Figure 9, 27% of respondents who stated they did not trust the private banks with their money stated the reason for this lack of trust was corruption within the private banks.
II.2 Personal experiences of Corruption

This section analyses personal experiences of corruption according to the respondents, as prevalence and frequency of bribery. Compared to 2010, personal experiences of corruption have dropped (23% in 2010 versus 18% in 2012). Despite this, corruption is still perceived as the third biggest problem in the country. Notwithstanding a drop in the actual personal experiences of corruption, people still believe that corruption remains a major issue and that improvements that have been made are not significant.

![Chart showing personal experiences of corruption over the last twelve months, comparing 2010 and 2012.](chart)

**Have you personally experienced corruption over the last twelve months?**
(Q13)

- **No**
  - 2010: 72
  - 2012: 65

- **Yes**
  - 2010: 18
  - 2012: 23

- **Refused to answer**
  - 2010: 10
  - 2012: 12

*Figure 12: Personal experiences of corruption*
Furthermore, the majority of respondents who experienced corruption in the last twelve months tended to be illiterate or have only elementary schooling. Respondents who have high school or university education are less likely to have experienced corruption in the last twelve months. This might be due to lack of awareness about the administration procedures and access to information that can come with education.

People who have experienced corruption are more likely to have paid bribes in form of cash payment (55%) than any other forms of corruption (Figure 14). The other most commonly experienced form of corruption is offering a gift or *sherenee* (12%). Furthermore, the findings show that men are more likely than women to have experienced corruption. 58% of respondents who have said that they faced corruption were men, while 42% were women.

---

20 *Sherenee* literally translated means sweets, but in this case it can be any goods as gifts.
The following chart gives a detailed breakdown on forms of corruption and gender. Although men and women differ on what forms of corruption they had experienced, this difference is not statistically significant.21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Corruption</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid a sum of money</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered a gift or Sherenee</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid a professional commission-taker or</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid in livestock such as goats, sheep,</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid in harvest such as wheat etc.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of favour or service</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepotism</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used ethnic, tribal, personal or family</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21Figure 14 is based on Q15 which includes only the respondents who personally experienced corruption in the twelve months prior to the survey.
Overall, 15% of adults (out of the overall sample) have experienced bribery over the previous year, which is slightly more than in 2010 (14%). Bribery herein is defined as paying money, paying in harvest and or livestock, sherenee, offering a gift or paying to commissionkars. Defined as such, bribery constitutes 84% of all forms of corrupt practices experienced by the respondents. In other words, 84% of adults (15% of the overall sample), who have experienced corruption in the twelve months leading to the survey, paid bribes.

Perceptions of corruption within state institution are correlated with experiences of corruption. Respondents who stated that they experienced corruption in the last twelve months are more likely to identify NDS, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Higher Education, Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Energy and Courts, Municipalities and Ministry of Labour as more corrupt institutions. It must be noted here that this association does not necessarily mean that respondents experienced corruption at these institutions; however, the correlation is statistically significant.

55% of all corruption transactions had involved exchange of money. This indicates the monetization of corruption, as non-monetary forms of corruption have traditionally been more prevalent in the country. However, since 2001 with the flood of money channelled into the country and lax if any accountability measures, plus poor capabilities in effectively spending money, bribery has become rampant, virally spreading into virtually all sectors of the country. Money has been used either independently or in conjunction with connections (waasita). 43% of respondents said in the 2010 survey that money was the most important form of corruption, compared with 48% in 2007. The rates of bribery for 2012 remain similar to those found in 2007 and 2010. The prevalence of corruption experiences is quite significant given that 55% of respondents never sought any government services during 2012.

---

22 The variable bribery is constructed based on Q15 which asks: If yes (you have experienced corruption), which form of corruption have you experienced?
Approximately 40% of respondents who experienced bribery over the previous year had paid at least one bribe within three months prior to the interviews (Figure 16).

In the 12 month period prior to the survey, 51% experienced corruption once, 28% paid bribes twice, and 12% paid bribes three times.
The survey also measured household experiences of bribery. Generally, 28% of households who were interviewed had experienced some sort of bribery twelve months prior to the survey. The average number of bribes per household who had experienced bribery is almost two, (1.8 times) per year.

However, it should be noted that this survey—like any other survey—is not immune to ‘confirmation bias’. Confirmation bias is referred to the tendency of people to favour information that confirms their beliefs or when they recollect information selectively or interpret information. Hence, it is possible that respondents under-reported or over-reported their experiences of corruption. Furthermore, it is possible that the interviewee may not recall or even know about all bribery experiences of all household members.
Respondents were also asked whether their households had paid a bribe for any of the 17 specific public service sectors listed (Figure 18). As can be observed from the figure above, the highest amount of bribes has been paid to the courts and the police.

Figure 18: Percentage of households paying a bribe, by the amounts exchanged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Not paid</th>
<th>Less than 500 Afs</th>
<th>Between 501 Afs and 2,000 Afs</th>
<th>Between 2,001 Afs and 10,000 Afs</th>
<th>More than 10,000 Afs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice by Courts</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID cards &amp; passport</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security by Police</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport services including driving license</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals or health services</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbab of village or wakil-e-guzar of town</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of taxes to Ministry of Finance or tax...</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of duties to Customs</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and social affairs</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity provided by the government</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and property registry, sale and purchase</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary and secondary education</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haj services</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrs and disabled services</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction permit</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing or resettlement service</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bribery payment is as likely to be made by a breadwinner of the household as by a non-breadwinner. From the figure above, households in urban areas are slightly more likely to pay bribes than households in rural areas. The same trend was observed in 2010 survey. Households with an income below 30,000 Afs are more likely to have paid bribes than households with income reaching 30,000 Afs or more. Wealthier household are more likely to rely on social networks such as family and acquaintances with high level officials in order to get services than paying bribes.

Households who paid bribes to the police were also more likely to have paid bribes the courts.

---

23Based on Q24.
II.3 Reliability of bribery transactions

A majority of respondents who paid a bribe have great confidence in under the table transactions. Only 10% of such respondents state that they are not confident that the bribe they are paying will help them, while 31% of respondents whose households had paid a bribe said they were highly certain that the bribe was going to help them benefit from the public service in question (Figure 20). Confidence in the effectiveness of bribes does not differ by age, sex or residence.

![Bar graph showing the level of certainty of bribe success](image)

The likelihood of paying a bribe increases significantly if respondents are highly certain about the result to be obtained in the exchange. Out of respondents who had paid bribes, approximately 31% stated that they were highly certain and another 32% stated that they were certain that the bribe they paid will get things done (27% indicated low levels of certainty). Although there is a significant correlation between the level of confidence in the outcome of the bribe exchanged and the amount of money paid, this relationship is not strictly linear. At very low levels of bribery (2,500 Afs) certainty is also low, and if the money paid is a high (20,000+ Afs), levels of certainty are also high. However, in the middle range the level of certainty varies.

For example, with bribes of less than 500 Afs in the courts, levels of certainty that the bribe will be effective are very low. Once the amount of bribery goes beyond 2,000 Afs, the level of certainty increases. A similar pattern can be observed in the payment of taxes and duties. Higher certainty comes at higher price, such that only levels of bribery above 10,000 Afs can ensure high certainty of the effectiveness of the bribery. In comparison, in the “housing and settlement sector,” with an increase in the level of bribes, the level of certainty with the outcome of bribery increases. Following a similar pattern, if the recipient of the bribery transaction is a state electricity office, then chances of receiving efficient services worth the higher bribes paid are very high. Likewise, higher bribery (2,000+ Afs) is perceived to ensure the receipt of services such as ID cards or passports. In contrast, levels of bribery at the police and the Ministry of Higher Education can be unpredictable in regards to the outcomes.
While the analysis above indicates what level of bribery is perceived to ensure an outcome at a specific office (with the customs office requiring the highest level of bribery before one can be certain of receiving the services), it also has another important implication. High levels of certainty can indicate institutionalization of corruption in some public services such that bribe payers can predict that they will receive services if they pay a certain amount of money. However, in some public sectors where certainty over the outcome is low, a lower degree of predictability exists, which also point to the arbitrariness characterizing corruption experiences there.

II.4 Factors and the social relationships that sustain corruption

Despite some changes in the public’s attitudes towards the level of corruption in various institutions in 2012, the factors perceived to cause corruption have not changed much. Respondents identified weak law enforcement, low salaries of civil servant, large influx of donor money, and lack of discipline and oversight of civil services as the top factors causing corruption in the country. These four factors were also identified in 2007 and 2010 as main causes of corruption.

Although perceptions of law enforcement as weak have dropped from 63% in 2007 to 51% in 2012, nonetheless, it is seen as the predominant cause of corruption in the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q56. On a scale of one to three where one is the least important factor in causing corruption, how do you assess the following factors?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>More important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large influx of donor money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration is not monitored by civil society and the Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No objection of the state beneficiaries of state services to corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of political will at the highest level of the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil servants feel protected and are indeed supported by superiors or political leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low salary of civil servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sanctions and discipline of civil servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak law enforcement and government control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21: Important causes of corruption
Although bribery remains the most common form of corruption, ethnicity and personal and family relationships are slowly becoming more prominent (Figure 22). Corruption in the form of ethnic relations and family connections can severely undermine the legitimacy of the state. The currency exchanged here is not money but favouritism based on social relations.

The actual experiences of households confirmed that among social relationships, ethnic connections were the most common basis for corruption. A significant number of respondents (15%) stated that they have been victims of nepotism. However, 65% of respondents stated that they would not use nepotism to secure jobs for themselves while 16% stated that they would use nepotism to secure a job.

---

24Nepotism was defined in the survey as abuse of authority for according advantages to one's own family members or relatives in recruiting or promoting.
Compared to other forms of corruption, nepotism was much more acceptable among the respondents. In general, 37% of households reported that they had relied on ethnic relations when engaging in corruption. This number has increased since 2007 (30%). Acquaintances with local commanders and factional affiliations as a main means of corruption have decreased significantly since 2007. In 2007, 19% reported invoking their relationships with local commanders to receive services, compared to 9% in 2010 and 3.9% in 2012. More significant differences are observed in relying on party and faction alliances as a means of obtaining services. In 2007, this figure was 21%, but it has dropped to 1.4% in 2012.

Using ethnic connections for corrupt practices is not a new phenomenon in the country and hence, it cannot be attributed to the Karzai government. In the periods when Afghanistan was controlled by the Taliban and the Mujahidin, there was also wide criticism of the predominance of ethnic relationships as a means of connecting citizens with the state. Nonetheless, a prominent difference between the Karzai government and his predecessors is the extent of the monetization of corruption.

Perceptions of the importance of different types of relationships to corruption under the Karzai government compared to previous regimes are highly correlated with ethnicity. Pashtuns and Baluchs are more likely than any other ethnic groups to believe that family relations are the most common type of relationship relied upon in corrupt transactions. Uzbeks, Turkmen and Aimaqshave a higher tendency to believe that a reliance on ethnic connections is a more prominent form of exploited relationships. A significantly higher number of Pashtuns than other ethnic groups believe that party connections are the most common relationship used in corruption. Pashtuns and Tajiks view personal connections to be a prominent form of corruption under the Karzai government.
These perceptions also have a provincial dimension. The perception that ethnic relations are the most common relationships used in corrupt practices is the highest in Bamyan (70%), Daikundi (69%), and Baghlan (66%), while family relations are viewed as the most common in Zabul (16%), Paktika (15%), Nimroz (11), Logar (10%).
A similar pattern of relationships between household experiences of corruption, ethnicity, and provincial location can be observed. Households that experienced corruption and relied on their ethnic connections were the highest in Bamyan (77%), Daikundi (71%), Kunduz (66%), and Baghlan (67%).

At the national level, households’ reliance on different types of relationships is highly correlated with their perceptions of importance of those relationships. For instance, households that relied on ethnic relations were significantly more likely to state that ethnic relations are the most common forms of corruption under the Karzai government. This indicates that personal and household experiences are projected in forming perceptions about national-level practices and issues. In other words, if one believed that their personal relations were important in getting things done, they would also state that at the national level, personal relations play a role in corruption.

A corruption transaction often involves more than the conventional actors of the corrupt official at the receiving end and a citizen who has no option but to pay for the service he gets. Corrupt transactions are often facilitated by intermediaries more commonly known as “waseeta” or “comissionkaars”. The comissionkaars is the most often used intermediary—so much so that it has turned into a semi-formal full-time job for some, which will be discussed in the following section.
II.5 Facilitating bribery: the consolidation of the role of commissionkars

A commissionkar – literally a broker taking a commission (the Afghan kamissionkar or commissionkar comes from the English “commissioner” and refers to a person who acts as a broker between two parties and who aims at profiting from a transaction in a dispute) – is an intermediary between a state official and a public service user. The job, which is informal and virtually always performed by men, involves facilitating the exchange between officials and the bribe-givers. Generally, commissionkars are active in public services where the procedures are complex and access to information is difficult. Given the relatively popular reliance on commissionkars, the role of commissionkar is highly institutionalized, allowing for a relationship of trust to be created between state officials and citizens who seek state services and usually appears as a normal and natural way of accomplishing goals.

Despite a decrease in the use of commissionkars since 2010, they still play a prominent role as intermediaries. In general, 31% of respondents who engaged in bribery transactions used a commissionkar. In 2010, this number was 44%—the highest in the three waves of surveys conducted (Figure 24). Although commissionkars are used in both rural and urban areas, urbanites are more likely to rely on commissionkars than rural dwellers. Men are also more likely than women to use the services of a commissionkar (57% men versus 43% women) and the higher the level of education, the more likely that a person would use a commissionkar in corrupt transactions. Hence, commissionkars are more likely to be utilized in urban centres where the majority of the civil services are located, and they are more popular among educated men than less educated. Civil servants, self-employed individuals, and employees of NGOs and UN organizations were more likely than farmers and labourers to use a commissionkar. From the survey questionnaire, it cannot be determined whether these respondents referred to national or international employees of NGOs and UN organizations.25

25This finding is based on cross-tabulation of Q58 (using Commissionkar) and Q88 (type of employment). The p-value is 0.000 for this analysis and, in the category of using commissionkar the observed values for the civil servants, self-employed and NGO, UN, and other international organization employees are higher than expected.
Figure 24: Individuals who are most often intermediaries in bribe taking
Q57. From your or your household’s experience, what kind of relationships is most often used for corrupting?

(n 2007=1250)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance with high-level officials</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance with local commanders</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance or faction</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25: Individuals intermediating in bribery
Map 6: Civil servants as intermediaries in bribe taking

Q58. From your or your household’s experience, which type of individuals are most often intermediaries in bribe taking?

- Civil Servant

Map 7: Professional commission takers as intermediaries in bribe taking

Q58. From your or your household’s experience, which type of individuals are most often intermediaries in bribe taking?

- Intermediary or commission takers
Customers with prior experiences of using the same services were the second most important category (19%) of intermediaries in facilitating and setting up a relationship between bribing parties. Respondents with education levels of high school and above were more likely than respondents with no education to use experienced customers as intermediaries. Women and urban residents were also more likely than men to use this category of intermediaries. Likewise, civil servants, employees of NGOs and UN, and respondents who are self-employed are more likely than farmers, and farm labourers to refer to experienced customers.

The analysis above shows that more-educated respondents and respondents with jobs at the higher level of social strata are more likely to use *commissionkars* or customers with experiences than to use their own circle of relatives or acquaintances.

### II.6 Tolerance and attitudes toward corruption

Before asking respondents about their level of tolerance toward different forms of corruption, they were asked what they perceived to be the most common form of corruption in the country. The following figure summarizes their views.

The most common form of corruption was believed to be bribery (55%), followed by favouritism (39%) and misuse of government property (32%). Levels of tolerance toward corruption follow a similar pattern.
The most unacceptable form of corruption is a civil servant creating undue difficulties as an indirect request for bribe (63%), followed by asking for money from the poor (59%) and asking directly for money (58%). Approximately 46% of respondents viewed bribery acceptable given that the income of the civil servant is very low. 46% of respondents stated that bribery is acceptable if it is for the purpose of reduction in taxes and customs. The tolerance toward the attitudes of civil servants who created undue difficulties so as to request a bribe or who did not perform official tasks in an appropriate amount of time was slightly lower relative to 2007 (13% in 2007, 14% in 2010 versus 10% in 2012).

In general an overwhelming majority of respondents did not accept any form of corrupt behaviour from civil servants. However, when the financial interests of respondents are at stake, for instance paying civil servants in order to evade taxes, respondents become more tolerant of corruption—indicating that respondents would not put State interests ahead of their own financial interests.

**Figure 27: Acceptance of corrupt behavior of civil servants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Most acceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Relatively acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Most unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing taxes and customs duties in exchange for taking a percentage of them</td>
<td>23 6 22 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil servants’ taking money with the excuse that they don’t have enough income</td>
<td>23 7 27 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not performing official task in an appropriate time while expecting to be offered a bribe</td>
<td>23 7 26 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for gift against small services</td>
<td>10 4 10 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking money from the poor</td>
<td>8 32 5 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking directly for money</td>
<td>7 4 6 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating unduly difficulties as indirect request for bribe</td>
<td>8 5 23 19 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 28: Self-interest and bribery experiences

Relation between self interest and household experience of bribery for saving their main source of income.
(Q49 by Q41)

- Household paid a bribe
- Household didn’t pay a bribe
- Don’t know
- Refused to answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q49: Would you protect your interest through bribing if you have an opportunity to do so?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Refused to Answer</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household paid a bribe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household didn’t pay a bribe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, negative attitudes towards corruption do not necessarily translate into corresponding behaviour. While the majority of respondents 26 condemned corruption on moral grounds, 16% of respondents stated that they would protect their interests through bribes if they had an opportunity. This number has fallen since 2010 (25%). Respondents who stated that they would secure their interests through corruption were less likely to name corruption as the major problem in the country and they are less likely to have sought government services in the twelve months prior to the survey. These respondents had a higher tendency to have experienced paying bribes to government officials either personally or within their households in order to secure the main source of income of the household.

26Around 96% of respondents stated that they would feel guilty if they paid a bribe compared to 90% who stated so in 2010. Similarly, 91% stated that a corrupt person is detested in the society or within his or her immediate social environment. Comparatively, in 2007, 83% held such strong views against a corrupt person.
II.7 Cynical Perceptions

Perceptions of widespread corruption coupled with the belief that the government has not done enough to address corruption have led to cynical attitudes towards corruption in the country. “Cynical attitudes” is an overarching term used to refer to the attitudes and believes that particular officials, organization and individuals are interested in pursuing their own interests and work for their own benefits rather than for the greater good and for the people.

A significant number of respondents believe that the government officials are concerned about their own benefits. As the graph above shows, perceptions vary by actors and state sector. The perceptions of cynicism are the weakest in regards to the Afghan National Army (11%) and the strongest about the NATO/ISAF and the Taliban (46% and 49% respectively).

Figure 29: Cynicism
Q5. In your view, do the following people, work for the benefit of all the people, for the benefit of some, or only for their own benefit?
- Taliban (For the benefit of all the people)

Map 8: Are the Taliban working for the benefit of all Afghans?

Q5. In your view, do the following people, work for the benefit of all the people, for the benefit of some, or only for their own benefit?
- President (For the benefit of all the people)

Map 9: Is the current President working for benefit of all Afghans?
This cynicism in turn can lead people to engage in corruption despite believing that it is a wrong or feeling guilty about it. Respondents who stated that they would not secure their financial interests through corruption yet stated in an earlier question that they had experienced corruption in the twelve months prior to the survey were separated for further investigation. This group constitutes approximately 10% of the survey population and accounts for 16% of respondents who stated that they would not pursue their personal interests through corrupt means. Cynicism with respect to bribery was dominant among males (58% compared to 42% among women).

Feelings of guilt are mixed with the perceived unavoidability of paying a bribe. Approximately one-fifth of the respondents (21%) stated that they would buy the products offered at prices slightly below market prices even if the business or company was corrupt. Women (52% women compared to 48% men) and uneducated respondents or respondents with lower levels of education are more likely to state such opinions. Around 96% of respondents stated that they would feel guilty if they paid a bribe compared to 90% who stated so in 2010. This finding indicates that despite the prevalence of corruption in the country, bribery is not an acceptable norm.

Similarly, an overwhelming majority of respondents (91%) stated that a corrupt person is detested in the society or within his or her immediate social environment. Comparatively, in 2007, 83% held such strong views against a corrupt person. Personal and household experiences of corruption are positively associated with the negative image of the a corrupt person in the society such that respondents who had personally experienced corruption personally or someone in within their household had experienced corruption were more likely than the rest of the respondents to believe that a corrupt person was disliked by the society.

The findings of this section point to the perception of a systematic nature of corruption embedded in both the perceptions of prevalence of corruption, personal and household experiences of corruption, and the rise of petty corruption. A significant number of Afghans believe that those who control the economy also have a great influence over state policies—pointing to the collusion of political and economic elites. Although the survey did not cover the topic of grand corruption, issues such as land grabbing, distribution, and the sale of land are controlled by groups of individuals who share common interests and generally disregard the welfare and needs of the population in need, which has been discussed briefly.
PART THREE: ACCESS AND CORRUPTION IN PUBLIC SERVICES: SECTOR-BASED ANALYSIS

The results of this survey illustrate that there is not so simple linear relationship between corruption and access to services. Despite widespread corruption, approximately 88% of respondents stated that they had access to at least one public service—the most accessible being access to primary and secondary education (88%), followed by access to police (83%). In comparison, 74% (compared to 96% in 2010) stated that their households have suffered negatively from corruption.

Household experiences of corruption are significantly related to the perceived financial burden of corruption on the household. Any bribe in the amount of 2,500+ Afs is considered to have a negative impact on the household, and respondents found bribes of this amount to strain the financial abilities of the household.

However, the frequency and amount of bribes paid differ from institution to institution. For instance, the number of bribes paid to the police and the courts are higher than the number of bribes paid for primary and secondary education. On the other hand, the value of bribes paid to the police is generally smaller than those of bribes paid for other services, including courts. Bribery to the police and the judiciary not only has a negative financial impact on households, but also limits access to security and justice while increases the perception of insecurity and harassment by the state officials. However, bribery in the judicial system and the police can lead to the fear of police and extortion and, hence, can hinder serving justice. Bribes paid to the education and health sector mainly affect the rural population, which means they impact a large part of population. This can have an additional negative effect on development.

III.1 Presence of the state and access to the main public services

The government was perceived to have quite a strong presence in the districts surveyed. Approximately 81% of the respondents stated that the government was present in their area (Map 10). Perceptions of state presence varied by location. In general, the provinces of Parwan, Sar-i Pol and Wardak were among the provinces with the lowest perceptions of state’s presence. In comparison, approximately 90% of respondents from Baghlan, Kapisa, Farah, Paktika, and Panjshir stated that the government was present in their villages, cities or districts—which would suggest that these provinces have the most visible government presence.

Although perceptions of government presence did not correlate with age, sex, or marital status of respondents, education and ethnicity did hold influence on the perceptions of the presence of the state. Respondents with more education are more likely to state that the government is present in their area than respondents with less education. Education might increase awareness of the

27 This is based on Q4, which asks “In your opinion, is the government present in your village or town?” The question does not make any distinctions on the level of government.
28 These findings are consistent with other surveys. For instance, the study by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (Cordesman 2009), using data from a ABC, BBC and ARD poll that had relatively similar categories, found that the presence of the central government was fairly strong to very strong according to 67% of all respondents (the figure was 27% in the case of provincial government presence), while 27% of respondents (31% for provincial government) reported a weak presence.
presence of the government and contact with the government; attending school in itself could be perceived as an indicator of the presence of the government.

Furthermore, Pashtuns, Tajiks, Aimaqs, Pashai and Nooristani people were more likely than other ethnic groups to perceive a government presence, while Hazaras, Uzbek, Turkmen, Baluchs, and Arabs were less likely to perceive a government presence in their areas.

Perceptions about presence of government are also influenced by perceptions of corruption as a common occurrence in the country. Respondents who believe that the government is present in their village or city are also more likely to believe that corruption is a common occurrence in the country. This indicates that there is an association between corruption and government institutions. Similarly, personal and household experiences of corruption were linked to perceptions of government presence.
According to the respondents, the most accessible public sectors are primary and secondary educational institutions (88%) and the police (83%). Hospitals, courts, and National Solidarity Program (NSP) offices are also state sectors frequently reported as accessible.

**Figure 30: Access to government services**

To which of the following government services does your household have access from the village or the town you live in?

- Primary and secondary education: 88% (2012), 88% (2010)
- Police: 83% (2012), 76% (2010)
- ID cards, passports: 75% (2012), 58% (2010)
- Hospitals or health services: 76% (2012), 74% (2010)
- National Solidarity Program: 67% (2012), 59% (2010)
- Haj services: 51% (2012), 51% (2010)
- Transport services and traffic department: 48% (2012), 46% (2010)
- Employment, social affairs, martyrs and disabled: 43% (2012), 44% (2010)
- Electricity provided by the government: 35% (2012), 30% (2010)

Figure 30: Access to government services
Figure 31: Access to service as a function of the place of residence
Depending on the location of the household, access to public services varied. In 2010, access to all services (with the exception of National Solidarity Program) was higher in urban than in rural areas. In 2012, however, while the National Solidarity Program and the police remain equally accessible to urban and rural populations, rural populations have reported higher accessibility to primary and secondary schooling than urban populations. In comparison, urban residents reported greater access to transport services and line ministries such as the Ministry of Employment, Social Affairs and Martyrs. In general, rural residents seemed to have an advantage in access to public services compared to urban residents.

This finding would appear to be somewhat counterintuitive. A possible explanation could be that perceptions of accessibility differ in urban and rural areas. Likewise, rural residents have more access to health care and ID card services than urban residents. For instance, households in urban or households at the fringes of the urban areas might view the distance to school as significant and hence a school inaccessible, while the same distance for rural population might not be perceived as inaccessible. However, from this survey, it is not possible to determine the exact reason for the difference.

Access to public services also varied by province and ethnic affiliation of households. Without exception, Arabs had less access to public services than any other ethnic group, while Hazaras, Aimaq, Uzbek and Turkmen had some of the lowest access to state services.

III.2 Perceived and actual negative impacts on households

Approximately 62% \(^ {29}\) of respondents who experienced corruption (around 11% of the total sample) believed that the impact of corruption on their household was considerable or extremely high. Compared to figures from 2007 and 2010, the negative impact of corruption has touched more households in 2012 than in 2007, when significantly fewer respondents stated that corruption had an impact on their household. In 2010, 33% and in 2007 17% stated that the impact of corruption on their household was extremely high while in 2012, 21% stated that the impact of corruption on their household was extremely high.

\(^ {29}\)Based on Q13 and Q19.
Approximately 23% of respondents stated that the financial burden on their household from corruption remained the same over the twelve months prior to the survey, while a significant number of respondents (52%) stated that financial burden on their households had increased (Figure 33). Respondents who experienced high amounts of bribery were more likely than other
respondents to believe that the financial burden of corruption on their households had increased in the twelve months prior to the survey.

The higher the amount of bribe, the heavier the burden it imposed on the household. For instance, 55% of those who had paid between 2001-10,000 in bribes; 66% of those who had paid between 10,001-20,000, and 71% of those who had paid 20,001+ in bribes, stated that the financial burden of corruption has increased on their households.30 Respondents who stated that the financial burden of corruption on their household had decreased in the past twelve months also stated that the general impact of corruption on their household was small.

Compared to rural respondents, urban respondents were more likely to state that the financial burden of corruption on their households has increased in the past twelve months. This corresponds with the higher perception among the urban population that corruption is a major problem in the country. Pashtuns, Tajiks and Uzbeks were more likely than other ethnic groups to state that the financial burden of corruption on their households had increased. As theorized, the higher the amount of bribes paid to officials, the more likely the household was to have felt the financial burden of corruption (Figure 34).

Virtually all respondents stated that corruption in public services had a negative impact on their household. It should be noted that the existence of corruption does not necessarily correspond to personal or household experiences of corruption. As it was stated earlier, only 28% of respondents

30Based on cross tabulation of Q18 and Q20. Figure 34.
stated that they or their households had experienced corruption in the twelve months prior to the survey. The question remains if personal experiences of corruption were only 28%, why did virtually all respondents report some degree of negative impact of corruption on their household? There are two possible explanations.

1) Respondents might have experienced corruption prior to the twelve month period covered in the survey and still believed that existence of corruption in the public service had a negative impact on their household.

2) Experiences of corruption among non-household members or perceptions of the prevalence of corruption in the country could have reinforced the feeling among respondents that existence of corruption has had a negative impact on their household.

Although the perception of negative impact does not necessarily correspond to experiences of bribery or corruption in general, it is possible that the perceived existence of corruption prevented respondents from seeking help or services. In fact, the frequency of seeking state services and the perception of the “existence” of corruption having a negative impact on the household’s well-being are highly correlated and are service-specific. Perceptions of corruption in sectors such as the police, healthcare, and primary and secondary education had a negative impact on the households that had not even sought state services in the twelve months prior to the survey.

Without exception, experiences of corruption within a specific public sector have been perceived to have a negative impact on the household.
As shown in the figure above, among those respondents who stated that corruption had a negative impact on their household, the highest number of small amounts of bribes (less than 2500 Afs) have been paid for ID cards. Bribes of more than 10,000 Afs have been more frequently paid to National Solidarity Program. Payments of duties and taxes and land and property registry are the most frequently reported (percentage wise 13%) for bribes ranging from 2501-10,000.

Figure 35: Bribe paid by those who considered corruption had a negative impact on their household (Q23 by Q24) (n= see for each responses)
As it can be observed from the above figure, the presence of corruption in the police and the courts is perceived to have a negative impact on the wellbeing of a household. These points will be discussed further in a later section addressing the presence of corruption in these two sectors.
Experiencing corruption does not necessarily lead to reduced access to services. However, corruption in some sectors—either experienced or perceived—can be more detrimental than in other sectors. For instance, around 56% of the households have access to state-provided electricity. While only 5% of households have paid bribes for electricity, 26% of respondents believe that they are being deprived of electricity because of corruption. Hence, it is not only the experience of corruption, but also perceptions of corruption in electricity services that might deprive households of these services. The perceived presence of corruption in the justice sector can also prevent people from using it. In comparison, corruption in the other sectors as shown above does not necessarily translate into prevention of using those services. The lower the gap between the value for “deprived of service” and the value for “not deprived of service”, the higher the negative impact of corruption on preventing access.

Corruption can also possibly deter people from using services, as the example of electricity elucidated above. This impacts everybody equally regardless of education, age or income. Respondents who are breadwinners in the household were more likely than other respondents (52% versus 48%) to state that the presence of corruption in a specific service has prevented them from using that service. However, factors such as ethnicity and location (i.e. province) have an influence on whether or not corruption prevents the use of services. Minority groups such as...
Turkmen, Aimaq and Pashai were more likely to be negatively influenced. Likewise, provinces such as Badakhshan, Faryab, Laghman, Kunar and Khost were more likely to be negatively influenced than other provinces.

Generally, household experiences of corruption and perceptions of corruption were also associated with service deprivation. Respondents who had personally experienced corruption were more likely (72%) to state that presence of corruption has prevented them from seeking services. Households that reported considerable or extremely high negative impact of corruption are more likely to report to have limited access to services than other respondents. In addition to the direct impact of experiences of corruption, perceptions of the prevalence of corruption both in general and within a specific sector can also lead to perceptions of deprivation of services.

III.3 Harassment to facilitate bribery

One does not need to seek government services to fall victim to corruption. 72% percentage of respondents who have never sought any government services (131 individuals, which makes 1.7% of the total sample) state that they have paid bribes in the twelve months prior to the survey. Bribery here includes monetary and non-monetary (i.e. gifts, sherenee, harvest products, livestock etc.) transfers. Having to pay bribes without seeking government services is a possible indication of harassment by government officials who do not only ask for bribes from people who seek government services but also from people who happen to come into contact with them regardless. Harassment includes the sort of extortion that can occur on the streets from the police, who sometimes use the threat of jail or violence to demand bribes.

Furthermore, the findings indicate that when faced corruption, conceding is virtually inevitable. There is a high correlation between the number of times that a respondent faced corruption and the number of times that a respondent was forced by a corrupt official to give in to corruption.
III.4 Bribes paid for basic services

28% of the households paid a bribe to obtain at least one of the seventeen basic services listed. The following table shows a breakdown of the amount of bribes paid per year by households.

Table 1: Average amounts of bribes paid per year among 28% among households that had paid bribes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Average paid in Afs</th>
<th>Average Paid in USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice by Courts</td>
<td>9,013</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and property registry, sale and purchase</td>
<td>7,141</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and social affairs</td>
<td>6,963</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haj services</td>
<td>5,915</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security by Police</td>
<td>5,867</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction permit</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of taxes to Ministry of Finance or tax authorities</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of duties to Customs</td>
<td>5,079</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport services including issuing driving license</td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity provided by the government</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrs and disabled services</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbab of village or wakil-e-guzar of town</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary and secondary education</td>
<td>3,769</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing or resettlement service</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals or health services</td>
<td>2,437</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID cards &amp; passport</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the above table, the highest amount of money was paid to the justice sector, followed by payments to land and property registry, employment, and social affairs.

As it can be observed from the table below, an estimated 62.6 billion Afs (62,582,667,120Afs = 1,254,543,390USD) were paid in bribes in 2012. Compared to the year 2010, this number shows an increase of 16% (8,599,184,118Afs of increase in total, 53,983,483,002Afs in 2010). While in 2010,

31 These are not average annual amounts per typical Afghan households, but refer only to those households that paid a bribe during the previous year.
the average number of bribes per year was 3.4, in 2012 this number rose to 4.0. Furthermore, in 2012, less adults (55,519) paid bribes compared to 2010. This is a 3.4% decrease in the number of Afghan adults who paid bribes in 2012 compared to 2010.32

Table 2: Estimated amount of money paid in bribes per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Afghan adults who paid bribe</th>
<th>Average paid bribe (AFS)</th>
<th>Average number of bribe paid per year</th>
<th>Total amount of Afghan paid in bribes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,677,319</td>
<td>9,582</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>53,983,483,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,621,800</td>
<td>9,528</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>62,582,667,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EQUIVILANT IN USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Afghan adults who paid bribe</th>
<th>Average paid bribe</th>
<th>Total Average of bribe paid once</th>
<th>Average Number of bribes per year</th>
<th>Total amount of paid in bribes in 2011 (AFN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,677,319</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1,079,669,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,621,800</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1,254,543,390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table provides a breakdown of these figures in according to rural-urban divide.

Table 3: Urban-rural divide in bribes paid in 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Afghan adults who paid bribe</th>
<th>Average paid bribe</th>
<th>Total Average of bribe paid once</th>
<th>Average Number of bribes per year</th>
<th>Total amount of paid in bribes in 2011 (AFN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban (AFN)</td>
<td>363,880</td>
<td>9,942</td>
<td>3,617,694,960</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15,304,790,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (AFN)</td>
<td>1,257,920</td>
<td>9,412</td>
<td>11,839,543,040</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>47,268,237,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (AFN)</td>
<td>1,621,800</td>
<td>9,528</td>
<td>15,452,510,400</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>62,582,667,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (USD)</td>
<td>363,880</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>72,353,899</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>306,095,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural(USD)</td>
<td>1,257,920</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>236,790,861</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>945,364,741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 Please note that the population estimates in 2010 came from National Risk and Vulnerability Assessment 2007-08 while in 2012 we used the estimates from the Central Statistics Office (CSO). There is also a population growth factor that increases in theory the number of adults paying a bribe. CSO is using an increase of 2.041% for the total population from one year to another.
There is a significant geographic correlation to experiences of bribery. Households in Kabul, Ghor, Kandahar and Kunduz report the highest percentages of bribery incidents. Furthermore, an urban-rural divide can be observed in the experiences of corruption in different sectors. Rural households were more likely than urban households to pay a bribe to the police regardless of the amount. Furthermore, rural households were more likely to face corruption when seeking health services and government provided electricity than their urban counterparts.
III.5 Corruption in selected sectors

This section analyses corruption in specific sectors such as the police, and the judiciary regarding land issues. As discussed earlier, the Ministry of Justice and the police are the sectors most commonly perceived as corrupt in the country. A common form of corruption within these two sectors is bribery, as discussed earlier in this report. However, the impact of corruption in these two sectors has larger implications for state-building and security. Police corruption is closely linked with perceptions of lack of security. A significant number of respondents who have not personally experienced corruption within the police believed that the police are corrupt. Given the importance of the role the police play in society, it is not surprising that word about police conduct spreads beyond personal experiences to affect overall perceptions. The presence of corruption in the police and judiciary sectors has also led to the popularity and referring to non-state and de facto structures for conflict resolution and disputes over issues such as land.

III.6 Access and corruption within the police

Perceptions of corruption in the police sector and experiences of corruption with the police are rather complex topics. The police are viewed as the third most corrupt institution in the country, after the Ministry of Justice and the courts. However, the presence of corruption in the security sector compared to any other state sector appeared to have the most negative impact on households. Hence, police corruption can limit access to security services. Approximately 32% of respondents who stated that their household experienced corruption with the police also stated that as a result, their access to the police was hindered. This data shows a slight increase compared to the 2010 survey, which indicated that 26% of households said that they were deprived of security services provided by the police because of corruption. Perceptions of the presence of corruption in the police do not necessarily correspond to actual experiences of corruption. In fact, only 6% of respondents who stated that their household experienced corruption with the police stated that their household paid bribes to the police, and 12% named the Ministry of Interior as the most corrupt institution in the country. What explains this discrepancy between experiences of corruption and the perceptions of corruption with the police? A possible explanation might be that the relationship between citizens and the police extends beyond direct contact and interaction with the police. People are concerned not only with the behaviour of the police regarding themselves but also with other people. Hence, corruption within the police can affect everyone, not only the immediate victims. Police forces are more feared by the Afghan citizens, whom don’t feel really protected by them.

It is also possible that the highly negative views of the police are due to the prevalence of harassment by the police. In fact, 28% of respondents who experienced corruption with the police had never sought any services from the government. Though this may be due to extortion by the police, this survey did not cover this area.

Furthermore, corruption within the police may increase worries and concerns about security in the country. Approximately 63% of respondents who experienced corruption with the police also stated that security was the biggest problem in the country, compared to 21% of the same sample stating that corruption is the biggest problem in the country. This underlines the possible interconnectedness of corruption within the police and perceptions about security.

Certain strata of the population—uneducated people and people from rural areas—have a higher chance of falling victim to police corruption. The majority of respondents (74%) who experienced corruption by the police were from rural areas and approximately 49% were illiterate. An encounter
with the police happened for a variety of reasons, from being taken for verification of ID cards and licenses to robbery and rape. The following figure shows a breakdown of these encounters:

![Figure 38: The purpose of interaction with the police](image)

Figure 38 shows that women’s and men’s nature of interaction with the police differs. The acts of corruption by the police occurred in a number of places. However, the most often-cited place was police headquarters. Women and men have different experiences of corruption with the police. For instance, women have a higher likelihood of encountering corrupt police at police headquarters and at home than men. The following figure shows a breakdown of these differences.
Figure 39: Places where corruption by the police was experienced

The gender differences may be due to the fact that the roles of men and women in society are often strictly defined between domestic and public spheres. Therefore, the nature and location of interaction with the police differ. For instance, if a male member of the family is present, he would attend to issues such as verification of ID or obtaining a driving license, and as such would be the one to encounter the corrupt police. Experiences of corruption also differ by province. Corruption within the police appears to be relatively more prevalent in Kabul (12%), Herat (12%) and Ghazni (7%). The following map shows an overall picture of the country:
Approximately 11% of respondents who believed that there have been some improvements in addressing corruption in the country (1% of the total sample) stated that this improvement has happened in the Ministry of Interior. However, as perceptions of corruption within the police are highly correlated with the perceptions of security, addressing corruption within the police should be a policy priority. In fact, 44% of respondents who experienced corruption with the police believed that corruption within the state could help expansion of the Taliban; 14% stated the contrary and 41% were undecided.
III.7 Access and corruption in the judiciary System

The Ministry of Justice was identified as the most corrupt state institution in the country. Approximately 15% of respondents (compared to 13% in 2010), named the Ministry of Justice as the most corrupt institution. A significant number of respondents (13%) identified the courts as the most corrupt. Perceptions of corruption in courts can prevent respondents from seeking services. For instance, 20% of respondents (=1,529 respondents out of the total sample) stated that corruption has prevented them from seeking judicial services.

Although only 9% of respondents stated that they or their households had faced corruption in the judiciary system\(^{33}\), a relatively high percentage (36%) stated that corruption at the courts had a negative impact on their household. Hence, the negative impact of corruption in the courts extends beyond the household that has experienced corruption.

Only 1% of respondents stated that they have observed some improvements in the Ministry of Justice. Whether or not this number reflects the actual developments and improvements taking place and the efforts to address corruption issues within the Ministry cannot be determined. However, what can be said from these findings is that the respondents have not observed improvements in the sector.

In general, 9% of respondents stated that they had faced corruption in the judicial system. Although this number may seem small, given that requiring services of the Ministry of Justice is infrequent, encountering corruption even at this rate indicates the prevalence of corruption within the Ministry. Within this seemingly small number, 76% have sought services at the Ministry at least once in the twelve-month period prior to the survey.

The majority of respondents (51%) who encountered corruption were complainants. Furthermore, the accused and witnesses were subject to corrupt practices. The following graph depicts this point:

**Q29. If faced corruption in the judiciary you or your household were...?**

(n=9% of the original sample)

- As a complainant: 51
- As an accused: 20
- As a witness: 19
- Other: 10

*Figure 40: Status of the household when experiencing corruption in the judicial*

Although corruption happens at all stages, some stages are more prone to corrupt practices than others. The survey questionnaire does not allow for further in-depth analysis of what it means to be involved in corruption as a witness for instance. Due to limited scope of the survey, no follow up questions were posed.

\(^{33}\)Based on Q 28.
Corruption in the judiciary can lead people to seek help or attempt to obtain services from other actors—state and non-state. Approximately 44% of respondents (around 4% of the total sample) who experienced corruption in the judiciary turned to non-state actors such as shuras, jirgas and Taliban courts, who in essence become the de facto jurors.
Furthermore, actors such as district governors, chiefs of police, provincial governors, provincial council members and MPs have been reported to try to resolve problems. Although the nature of their interference cannot be determined, it can be speculated that such networks are invoked to either resolve the problem before it reaches the courts or to exert some pressure on the courts for a resolution.
As can be observed from the above map, referring to non-state actors is more common in some provinces than others. In general, turning to non-state actors for the provision of justice is a good indicator of the negative impact of corruption on trust and confidence in government institutions. Lack of trust can possibly in turn empower non-state de facto institutions and entities such as Taliban’s shadow courts.

III.8 Land and property-related corruption

Registering land and property is not a common practice in Afghanistan. Issues concerning land and property are often resolved through customary laws and regulations. However, once such concerns are taken to legal channels, corruption can influence the process and outcome. Approximately 8% of households (579 in total) stated that they faced corruption in dealing with land and property issues. Issues related to land and property varied from transferring property to paying tax and resolving disputes.

The following Figure shows a breakdown of issues and transactions related to land and property.
As can be observed, issues such as determining the boundaries of land and resolving land disputes with neighbours are the most often-cited issues that respondents needed help with. Corruption happens at various offices involved in dealing with issues related to land and property. The following figure shows the details.
District offices are the most often-cited venues where corruption occurs. Other places such as district court offices and provincial court offices are also notorious for corrupt practices. When facing corruption and in the absence of getting effective assistance, respondents would turn to non-state actors such as the Taliban, local shuras and local commanders. There are no urban/rural differences in terms of referring to non-state actors.
Existence of corruption in the public sector\textsuperscript{34} in general can trigger conflict over land and property. Approximately 31\% of respondents stated that corruption in the public sector has led to local conflicts and disputes over land.

To own land in Afghanistan is a limited privilege. With the expansion of cities and an increasing concentration of population in urban areas and their surroundings, the price of land has increased tremendously since 2001. As such, the topic of land grabbing and involvement of state officials in the process has been debated lately in the national media. In this survey, the majority of respondents believed that organized groups and high ranking officials had a hand in the distribution, selling, and management of land.

\textsuperscript{34}Based on Q69 which asks "Has the existence of corruption in the public sector caused land or property disputes in your area over the last twelve months?".
An overwhelming majority of respondents (94%) believed that organized groups of people, including the state officials, have at least some influence on land management, selling, and distribution. The above graph shows a further breakdown of this group according to the place of residence (urban versus rural). This perception was common among both urban and rural dwellers. However, respondents with higher levels of education were more likely to believe in the involvement of high ranking officials and organized networks in land issues than respondents with lower levels of education.

Perceptions of involvement of organized networks and high-ranking officials in land issues are also correlated with the perception that corruption can facilitate expansion of the Taliban.

---

35The survey questionnaire does not differentiate between legitimate and illegitimate influence.
III.9 Irrigation and Corruption

Water is a scarce resource in the country. Given that above 70% of the Afghan population lives in rural area, for this population, agriculture is the main source of income and access to irrigation channels is very important. Limited access to water can also lead to disputes over water. In general, 6% of disputes over water lead to corruption.

![Figure 47: Dispute over access to irrigation water](image)

Q70. Have your household has experience any dispute over access to irrigation water that has resulted in corruption or paying a bribe over the last twelve months?

III.10 Fighting Corruption

Despite the efforts of the Afghan government and pressure from the international community to fight corruption, there has been little success in this regard. In general, respondents considered the anti-corruption performance of all state institutions as ineffective and insufficient. However, confidence in the ability of individuals heading state institutions to curb corruption remains high. This would imply that respondents believe not enough is being done or that the politicians deal with corruption half-heartedly, if they are willing to at all.

A similar perception can be observed regarding other important actors in the country. The United Nations, international organizations, the media, and religious institutions were also viewed as performing inadequately in addressing corruption. A relatively small number of respondents stated that they have heard the international community denouncing corruption. The message of the international community regarding corruption reaches a limited and particular segment of the population, namely the educated male urban residents, who are comparatively more critical of the performance of the government and the international community to begin with. A similar pattern can be observed regarding perceptions of the Taliban’s stance on corruption. Educated male urbanites are more likely than other respondents to have heard the Taliban speak against corruption. Although it cannot be determined from this study how respondents heard the messages of the Taliban or the international community about corruption were communicated. Educated men who live in urban areas have more access to media than the rest of the population.
III.11 Filing a complaint

Though experiencing corruption is a rather common practice in Afghanistan, filing a formal complaint about corruption is uncommon. In 2012, only 5% of the total sample had filed a complaint related to the experiences of corruption. In 2010, this figure was 12%. The prevalence of corruption in law enforcement bodies and the judicial system may be the reason for this inaction and lack of interest in filing formal complaints. In fact, respondents who believed that the public sector in general is corrupt were also less likely to file a formal complaint against a corrupt civil servant.

Almost a third of the complaints, oral or written, were made at the level of the governor’s office or at the district level. The following figure shows a breakdown:

Q46. If you or a member of your household filed a complaint, what were the channels used for filing the complaint? (n=5% of OS)

![Diagram showing channels of complaint]

Whether or not a complaint is launched at the courts, the attorney’s office, or a special commission on corruption largely depends on urban or rural residence. Households in remote rural areas are more likely to take their complaints to the district governor or the provincial governor. In comparison, if households in urban areas were to launch a formal complaint, they would take it to the courts or attorney’s offices. Education level and the amount of bribery did not show any impact on where a complaint is taken. This would indicate the traditional role the governors have played—
listening to and receiving complaints from the population directly. It was not clear what percentage of the respondents who filed a complaint received a satisfactory response.

III.12 Government anti-corruption performance

The government’s performance in fighting corruption was rated considerably low. This applies to key figures within the government, such as President Karzai and the Attorney General, governors, mayors and MPs. The following figure illustrates these statistics:

![Figure 49: Government’s anti-corruption performance](image)

As can be observed from the figure above, comparatively, President Karzai is believed to be the most effective individual in fighting corruption. However, even then, only 39% of respondents believed that he is the most effective person in fighting corruption in Afghanistan. District governors, mayors and provincial governors were viewed as the least effective in fighting corruption. As the closest state officials to the respondents, district and provincial governors are expected to do more in terms of fighting corruption in the country. One suggestion could be therefore that policymakers should pay special attention to the position of district and provincial governors, as well as mayors, in designing anti-corruption policies.

Although in the previous survey the High Office of Oversight was viewed as the least effective in fighting corruption, the results of this survey do not place this office at the bottom of the list. This would indicate that the High Office of Oversight as an institution and its the roles and responsibilities are better known in 2012 than in 2010, one year after it was just established.
If the government is ineffective in fighting corruption, do people lose hope? Who do they expect to fight corruption in Afghanistan? Although the majority of respondents stated that President Karzai is not effective in fighting corruption, they also believe that the President is the most able in theory to fight corruption. These perceptions indicate a higher expectation of the President held by the population. Respondents believe that the President is able to address corruption; nonetheless, he has been seen as ineffective.

Figure 50: Perceptions of officials’ ability to reduce corruption
III.13 Trust in the officials and institutions fighting corruption

Trust in the ability of individuals to fight corruption is rather high. However, this trust does not necessarily correspond to trust in the systems and state institutions headed by or represented by these individuals.

![Graph showing diversity of actors believed to fight corruption. Female respondents are more likely than male respondents to express less confidence in individuals fighting corruption.]

The above graph shows an important finding—the diversity of actors believed to be able to fight corruption. In general, female respondents are more likely than male respondents to express less confidence in individuals fighting corruption.

Q65. When you think about people in combating corruption, who is the one person in Afghanistan that you view most favorably? [List up to three spontaneous answers]

III.14 The international community’s anti-corruption discourse and its support

The international community plays a prominent role in Afghanistan. Karzai’s government is often under significant pressure from the international community to fight corruption. However, the question remains of whether the Afghan public knows about the stance of the international community in fighting corruption. Respondents were asked if they had heard the international community speaking against corruption. A significant number of respondents (68%) stated that they had not heard the international community speak against corruption.

Male educated respondents living in urban areas are more likely than the rest of the population to have heard the international community speak against corruption.
More than one third of respondents (approximately 37%) stated that United Nations officials had spoken against corruption, while around 19% stated that they had heard United States government officials speaking against corruption. NGOs, the military and other foreign government officials accounted for the remainder.

Belief in the intentions of the international community in fighting corruption in Afghanistan is rather low. Only 29% of respondents believed that the international community wants to fight corruption. The number of respondents who believe otherwise is higher (37%) while the remainder stated that they did not know whether the international community wanted to fight corruption. On what basis do respondents form such beliefs? Respondents were asked whether they believed that the international community was supporting honest government officials in their areas. Responses show similar patterns of distribution; approximately 29% of respondents believed that the international community supports honest local officials, 32% believed otherwise, and the rest were undecided.

Confidence in the international community’s willingness to fight corruption is a factor of residence, gender and education. Urban residents, men and educated people are more likely than the rest to believe that the international community supports honest politicians at the local level. In comparison, rural residents, women and uneducated people are more sceptical of the willingness of the international community to support honest local officials. Perceptions of the efficiency of the international community (the United Nations, NGOs, and the military) increased when respondents believed in the willingness of the international community to fight corruption at the provincial and national levels.

Map 13: The international community’s perceived desire to fight corruption
III.15 Corruption and the Taliban

One assumption is that the prevalence of corruption in the country could help push the expansion of the Taliban. A significant number of respondents with an opinion on this topic (4,207, 38% of the total sample) believed that corruption would facilitate expansion of the Taliban. The following figure illustrates this point:

Educated men living in urban areas are more likely than any other category of respondents to believe that corruption can facilitate the expansion of the Taliban. With an increase in years of schooling the belief that state corruption will facilitate the Taliban’s expansion increases. Men and those from urban areas are more likely to believe this than women and the rural population. Furthermore, the perception that state corruption can lead to the expansion of the Taliban is the strongest in provinces where security conditions are volatile and the Taliban already have a stronger presence. For instance, the respondents who believed that the prevalence of corruption could facilitate the Taliban’s expansion were concentrated, in comparative terms, in Ururzgan, Paktya, Paktika, Kandahar, and Daykundi. However, exceptions to this pattern are Kabul, Herat and Bamyan, where a significant number of people believe that state corruption will pave the way for Taliban’s expansion.

How are these perceptions formed? The Taliban has been able to reach the population with messages denouncing and disapproving of state corruption. Approximately one-third of respondents stated that they heard the Taliban denounce corruption in Afghanistan. Respondents
who have heard the Taliban denounce state corruption are essentially twice as likely to believe that corruption helps the expansion of the Taliban (68% versus 32%). It is also interesting to observe who receives Taliban’s message about state corruption. Men were more likely than women to have heard the Taliban denounce corruption. Educated people, female or male, were more likely than illiterate respondents to have learned about Taliban’s position on state corruption. Although from this research it cannot be determined by what means the Taliban’s messages reach the population, the urban population has a higher degree of accessibility to these sources. Although there are no urban rural differences in receiving Taliban’s messages denouncing state corruption, urban residents tend to be more likely than rural residents to believe that state corruption can help the expansion of the Taliban. This may result from a fear of corruption undermining the state’s ability to fight the Taliban.

Map 15: Exposure to the Taliban denouncing corruption in the state

Q59. Have you heard the Taliban denouncing the corruption of the Afghan state?
- Yes

Map 15: Exposure to the Taliban denouncing corruption in the state
To form a better understanding of the link between corruption and the expansion of the Taliban, respondents were asked in which state organization they believed corruption would help the Taliban the most:

As can be seen in the figure above, a majority of the respondents believed that corruption in the central government (27%) and corruption in the provincial and district government offices (28%) will lead to the expansion of the Taliban. This analysis shows that perceptions of state corruption and its correlations with the expansion of the Taliban are not necessarily concerned with Afghan National Security Forces, (ANSF). Respondents did not name corruption within ANSF\(^3\) (composed of the police, army and NDS) as having an influence on the expansion of the Taliban.

To further place the Taliban as an actor in the grand scheme of corruption, respondents were asked if they believed the Taliban were efficient in fighting corruption.

---

\(^3\)In Q76 and Q77, respondents are asked about “Afghan security forces” and no distinction between the Police, Army, and the National Directorate of Security has been made.
Respondents who had heard the Taliban denouncing state corruption were more likely than the rest to believe that the Taliban are efficient in addressing corruption. It should be noted that this point does not necessarily translate into support for the Taliban. As discussed earlier, the current rampant corruption was not experienced under the Taliban regime; hence, the Taliban are not perceived as being associated with corrupt practices.
III.16 Individuals’ way of fighting corruption

An overwhelming majority of respondents (93%) stated that they would not vote for someone who they believed was corrupt and that they do not buy products from a company that is involved in corruption (65%). Men, urban residents and educated respondents were more likely than women, rural inhabitants and uneducated respondents to boycott services of corrupt companies or to sanction voting for a corrupt politician/civil servant.

Furthermore, a significant number of respondents (63%) stated that they would not bribe an official or civil servant in order to maintain their interests. Although this number portrays a promising picture, it should be taken into consideration that it is possible that respondents merely stated that they would not bribe in order to secure their interest because they felt it was the appropriate and socially acceptable response. Socially desirable response can skew the results of a survey.

However, the prevalence of corruption and the difficulty of getting services and being caught in the complicated bureaucracy of the country might inevitably force individuals to resort to bribery in order to get things done. In the grand scheme of corruption, the ineffectiveness of the government, and the actors involved in fighting corruption, individuals’ efforts to fight corruption may not have a significant effect.

III.17 Corruption and Afghanistan’s Transition to 2014

The end of transition is imminent. Transition is referred to the process by which the lead responsibility of Afghan security forces will be gradually transferred from NATO-led ISAF forces to Afghan National Security Forces.

Whether widespread corruption affects a smooth transition is a question that merits discussion. The findings of this study show that perceptions of corruption do not necessarily influence the belief in a successful transition and do not influence perceptions about the capabilities of the national security forces to take over. However, confidence in government’s ability to ensure successful transition is rather low. Approximately 42% of respondents believe that the government is not able to perform successful transition of security responsibilities from the international forces to Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF).

![Figure 54: Government’s ability to ensure successful transition](image)

Perceptions of successful transition differ by location such that urban residents are more sceptical of the ability of the government to ensure a successful transition than rural residents (51% urban versus 40% rural).
An overwhelming majority of respondents (97%) who believe that the government can ensure a successful transition also believe that the ANSF is able to maintain security in the country. Conversely, respondents who lack confidence in a successful transition by the government, identify lack of resources, capacity, morale, and the presence of corruption as the main reasons that would hinder transition. The following figure illustrates a breakdown of these perceptions:

As it can be observed, distribution of reasons across the spectrum is somewhat even. Lack of resources is identified by 18% of respondents as the main reason for an unsuccessful transition followed by corruption within the government (16%), lack of morale (15%) and lack of trust (14%). Respondents believe that corruption within the government (respondents did not specify corruption within ANSF per se) potentially can threaten a successful transition. However, experiences of corruption with the police and/or the judiciary, and the perception of corruption as a national issue do not determine the level of confidence in a successful transition. In other words, the belief in success of transition is not function of perceptions of corruption.
CONCLUSION

A number of important messages can be taken from this survey. The first and most important point is that corruption is a complex phenomenon. Perceptions of corruption are not only formed by personal and household experiences of corruption, but also by what is heard about corrupt practices. In general, the rates of the perception that a particular state sector is corrupt are much higher than immediate personal experiences of corruption. Hence, perceptions do not necessarily correspond to experiences of corruption.

The actual experiences of corruption, especially in sectors such as the judiciary and the police, are believed to have had tremendous negative impacts on household wellbeing.

This survey also indicates the prevalence of bribery and the monetization of corruption. Significantly more respondents in 2012 than in 2010 relied on bribery and believed that bribery transactions were effective means of getting things done.

Reliance on the middlemen—the commissionkars who can facilitate smooth corrupt transactions—has remained high. Increasingly more respondents show confidence in the effectiveness of bribery. This would suggest to institutionalization of corruption and a role of commissionkars as semi-officials state servants.

The efforts of the government of Afghanistan and the international community were not seen as sufficient in addressing corruption and respondents believed that much more should be done. The majority of respondents either had not heard the international community denouncing corruption or believed that the international community was not offering support to honest local politicians.

Widespread corruption, either perceived or experienced, has led to pessimistic attitudes regarding the government’s ability to fight corruption. Many respondents believed that corruption could lead to the expansion of the Taliban. Combined efforts of individuals and effectively devised policies can possibly reduce corruption.
APPENDIX I: METHODOLOGY

The survey was conducted among 7,560 respondents in 34 Afghan provinces in a single wave in September -December 2011. It was designed and implemented by IWA. A total of 68 surveyors (34 men and 34 women) were trained to conduct the in-person interviews. Only Afghan citizens aged 18 or above and residing in Afghanistan were interviewed. The margin of sampling error is +/- 1% at a 95% confidence interval at the national level.

**Distribution of sampling points by province and rural/urban strata**

A multistage procedure was followed to ensure that the sample of the Afghan population was representative. The survey sample was first divided to take into account the rural (80%) and urban (20%) composition of Afghanistan. For the survey, the 20% urban population is composed of people living within municipal limits, i.e. those defined by the municipality. Only provincial capitals were selected as urban centers. Secondly, in each province, the number of respondents selected was proportional to the number of the overall provincial population relative to the Afghan population on the basis of data available from the Central Statistics Organization. Only in Nimroz, Noristan and Panjshir the number of respondents was deliberately selected three times higher than the proportion of the population. This oversampling was carried out to ensure that a minimum of 150 interviews was conducted in those provinces in order to reduce the margin of sampling error at the provincial level. Third, in each province, the sample was divided into a similar number of male and female respondents to allow for a gender-balanced sample. The interviews among the male and female respondents were conducted by surveyors of the same sex as the respondents.

To reflect the geographical distribution of the rural population in each province, a minimum of two districts, including at least eight villages, were randomly selected. At first, 105 very high risk areas which were too insecure have been removed from the sample frame and after that the district selection started. Districts were first divided into two categories to capture the rural population from both villages near cities and villages in remote areas. The districts where the provincial capitals were situated were not selected as rural districts. The districts in each category were selected randomly. If insecurity prevented surveyors from reaching the respondents in the selected districts, replacement districts were also randomly selected. The total number of rural interviews in each province was then equally divided among the selected districts. The villages also randomly selected using CSO village list. During the data collection one reserve list was designed and for those villages, which were very insecure and or were not found we used from this reserve list.

In three provinces Nemorz, Sarepul and Wardak we could survey only two districts, because the other sample which was randomly selected was in insecure districts and one district in Sarepul was Balkhab district and because of winter the team couldn’t go for survey and we replaced them with close by district which was randomly selected in the table.

The enumerator we used in Noristan was a doctor with his wife and because we couldn’t manage to find female enumerator for Kunar than we sent the Nuristan team to Kunar province.

Due to insecurity mostly in southern provinces and heavy snow and winter season Northern provinces, some of the villages have been replaced by other villages.

37See the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province Name</th>
<th>Insecurity</th>
<th>Snow / Far</th>
<th>Snow / Insecurity</th>
<th>Grand total by province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GHOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRAT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADAKHSHAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADGHIS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARYAB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHAZNI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARWAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKHAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAWZJAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPISA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMANGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARI PUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDAK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALKH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAMYAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARAH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMROZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZABUL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sampling selected the following districts in each province is as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province Name</th>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Rural/Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BADAKHSHAN</td>
<td>PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF BADAKHSHAN</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(FAIZ ABAD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARGO</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAHARAK</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAGHISTAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MUQUR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QALA-E-NOW</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAGHLAN</td>
<td>BAGHLAN PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF BAGHLAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(PUL-E-KHUMRI)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DUSHI</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIRING WA GHARU</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAHREEN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUL-E-HISAR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TALA WA BARFAK</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALKH</td>
<td>BALKH PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF BALKH</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MAZAR-E-SHARIF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BALKH</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAWLAT ABAD</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KISHINDEH</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZARI</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAMYAN</td>
<td>KAHMARD</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PANJAB</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAMYAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAYKUNDI</td>
<td>MIRAMOR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANG-E-TAKHT</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHAHRISTAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARAH</td>
<td>BALA BULUK</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUR CHAMAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QALA-E-KAH</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARYAB</td>
<td>FARYAB PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF FARYAB</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MAIMANA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALMAR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIL CHIRAGH</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KHANI CHARBAGH</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QARAM QUL</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QURGHAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHIRIN TAGAB</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHAZNI</td>
<td>GHAZNI PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF GHAZNI</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GHAZN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAGHATU</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAGHURI</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghor</td>
<td>Khwaaja Omari</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waghaaz</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wali Mohammad Shahid Khugyani</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daewlatyar</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lal Wa Sarjangal</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chighcheran</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmand</td>
<td>Provincial Capital of Helmand (Lashkar Gah)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garm Ser</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAD Ali</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herat</td>
<td>Provincial Capital of Herat (Herat)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adraskan</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghoryan</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karrukh</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nizam-E-Shahid (Guzara)</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawzjan</td>
<td>Provincial Capital of Jawzjan4 (Sheberghan)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aqchah</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mardyam</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabul</td>
<td>Provincial Capital of Kabul (Kabul)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bagrami</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalakan</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shakar Dara</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surubi</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandahar</td>
<td>Provincial Capital of Kandahar (Kandahar)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arghandab</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandahar</td>
<td>Damansk</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapisa</td>
<td>Hissa-e-Duwumi Kohistan</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koh Band</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Njurab</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khost</td>
<td>Jaji Maidan</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manduzay (Esmayel Khel)</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNARHA</td>
<td>BAR KUNAR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNARHA</td>
<td>KHAS KUNAR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNARHA</td>
<td>SAR KANI</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNDUZ</td>
<td>PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF KUNDUZ (KUNDUZ)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNDUZ</td>
<td>ALI ABAD</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNDUZ</td>
<td>HAZRATI IMAM SAHIB</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNDUZ</td>
<td>QALA-E-ZAL</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGHMAN</td>
<td>ALINGAR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGHMAN</td>
<td>ALISHING</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGHMAN</td>
<td>MEHTERLAM</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGHMAN</td>
<td>QARGHAYEE</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGAR</td>
<td>BARAKI BARAK</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGAR</td>
<td>MOHAMMAD AGHA</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGAR</td>
<td>PULI ALAM</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF NANGARHAR (JALALABAD )</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>BATI KOT</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>DEH BALA</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>KOT</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>KUZKUNAR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>LALPOOR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>NAZYAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>SURKH RUD</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMROZ</td>
<td>PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF NIMROZ (ZARANJ)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMROZ</td>
<td>KANG</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOORISTAN</td>
<td>NOOR GRAM</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOORISTAN</td>
<td>PAROON</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOORISTAN</td>
<td>WAMA</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKTIKA</td>
<td>MATA KHAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKTIKA</td>
<td>SHARAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKTIKA</td>
<td>URGOON</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKTYA</td>
<td>DAND PATAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKTYA</td>
<td>JAJI</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKTYA</td>
<td>SAYYID KARAM</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANJSHIR</td>
<td>HISSA-E-AWAL ( KHNJ )</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANJSHIR</td>
<td>PARYAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANJSHIR</td>
<td>UNABA</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANJSHIR</td>
<td>PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF PARWAN</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CHARIKAR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARWAN</td>
<td>BAGRAM</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARWAN</td>
<td>KOHI SAFI</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARWAN</td>
<td>SHINWARI</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMANGAN</td>
<td>PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF SAMANGAN</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AYBAK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMANGAN</td>
<td>DARA-E-SOOF-E-BALA</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMANGAN</td>
<td>HAZRAT-E-SULTAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMANGAN</td>
<td>ROI-DO-AB</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR-E-PUL</td>
<td>PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF SAR-E-PUL</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SAR-E-PUL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR-E-PUL</td>
<td>SANGCHARAK</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKHAR</td>
<td>PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF TAKHAR</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(TALUGAN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKHAR</td>
<td>CHAHAB</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKHAR</td>
<td>KALAFGAN</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKHAR</td>
<td>KHWAJA GHAR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKHAR</td>
<td>WARSAJ</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROZGAN</td>
<td>PROVINCIAL CAPITAL OF UROZGAN</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(TIRINKOT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROZGAN</td>
<td>CHORA</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROZGAN</td>
<td>DEHRAOUD</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDAK</td>
<td>JALREZ</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDAK</td>
<td>MARKAZ-E-BEHUSD</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZABUL</td>
<td>QALAT</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZABUL</td>
<td>SHEMEL ZAYI</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZABUL</td>
<td>SHINKAI</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection of settlements, starting points and households

Settlements were randomly selected by the survey coordinator in each rural district and urban center from a list of villages and towns. The aim was to include no more than 20 interviews in each settlement so as to increase the number of villages and towns surveyed. In each village or town, a starting point (often, a mosque or a school) and a direction were indicated to surveyors who selected households following a random walk procedure. The total number of the household who lived in the villages has been divided to 20 interviews, the first interview was the male interview and the second interview was the female interview. Example if in a village have 200 households the interval in this village is 20, first house was selected randomly and after that after every 20 household have been selected for interview. If no adult of the required sex was available in a house for the interview, the interviewer moved to the next right house to complete his interview.

No sorting and selection by age at the household level were carried out.

After the completion of interviews, IWA’s local monitors were provided with the information regarding the location of the settlements and targeted households. They randomly monitored both the sampling and the conduct of the interviews by inquiring among household members about verifiable information concerning the households that were registered by surveyors.

The final data collected included the following provinces and districts:

The raw data collected from the provinces had the following characteristics:
### 78. Ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pashtun</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajik</td>
<td>2301</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazara</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbek</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmen</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimaq</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluch</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashai</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuristani</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7549</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 79. Urban and Rural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KABUL</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPISA</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARWAN</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDAK</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGAR</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGHMAN</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANJHER</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAGHLAN</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAMYAN</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHAZNI</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKTIKA</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKTYA</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHOST</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNARHA</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOORISTAN</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADAKHSHAN</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKHAR</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNDUZ</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMANGAN</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALKH</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR-E-PUL</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHOR</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAYKUNDI</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROZGAN</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZABUL</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANDAHAR</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAWZJAN</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARYAB</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELMAND</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADGHIS</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERAT</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARAH</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMROZ</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7549</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%</strong></td>
<td><strong>79%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: Gender Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3767</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7549</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Marital Status Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>6085</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widower/Widow</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7510</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7549</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Age Group Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 Years Old</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 Years Old</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 Years Old</td>
<td>2343</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55 Years Old</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 or Over 55 years old</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7427</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training of the surveyors

Surveyors were trained in five waves of no more than 20 surveyors and in the language in which they were supposed to conduct the interviews. In total, three days of training were offered to each surveyor; this included a general course on the purpose and modality of quantitative research, techniques of interviewing, proper household and respondent selection, review of the questionnaire content, elementary use of the GPS, class simulations of interviews and, finally, inside and outside test interviews to assess the performance and understanding of the surveyors. One training was held in Balkh province for all northern provinces. One in Herat province for the western provinces, and one in Kandahar for southern provinces, and two trainings in Kabul (one for Dari region and one for Pashto regions). These trainings were held in Pasho and Dari.

Quality control

After the questionnaires had been completed and returned to Kabul, all provinces were divided into four zones for verification purposes. IWA’s monitors crosschecked both the sampling and the proper filling of the questionnaires. At least two districts per province surveyed were selected. For each, a random sample of questionnaires was verified. 12% of the total interviews were crosschecked in this way. Furthermore, a different team of men and women controlled the quality of the interviews by a similar procedure, but over the phone from Kabul.

Calibration and weighting

The raw data resulting from the random sampling matched most of the basic characteristics of the Afghan population as provided by other major surveys and the figures of the Central Statistics Organization, except in the case of the level of literacy. Nonetheless, weights were applied to some indicators to bring them as close as possible to the population distribution at both the national and provincial levels. At the national level, the structure by age (18+ years of age) was maintained for each province on the basis of statistics provided by the Households Listing survey of the Central Statistics Office CSO. This included a recalibration of the oversampling in Nimroz, Nuristan and Panjshir provinces. Furthermore, data were calibrated at the national level according to six basic indicators (rural/urban, sex, ethnicity, literacy, age and employment) before being calibrated at the provincial level for sex and literacy variables. Calibration at the provincial level was carried out to ensure a representative sample in each province. This did not have a significant impact on calibrated data at the national level.

The final calibrated data represented the following characteristics:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pashtun</td>
<td>4,214,068</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajik</td>
<td>3,288,394</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazara</td>
<td>1,076,429</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbek</td>
<td>1,287,400</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmen</td>
<td>241,520</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimaq</td>
<td>132,185</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>62,741</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluch</td>
<td>64,543</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashai</td>
<td>140,585</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuristani</td>
<td>58,912</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19,535</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,588,008</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabul</td>
<td>1,171,353</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapisa</td>
<td>162,812</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parwan</td>
<td>233,632</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardak</td>
<td>237,280</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagan</td>
<td>141,192</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangarhar</td>
<td>628,837</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lashman</td>
<td>166,314</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjsher</td>
<td>53,537</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghlan</td>
<td>341,982</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamyan</td>
<td>154,079</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazni</td>
<td>487,740</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paktika</td>
<td>357,240</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paktya</td>
<td>234,416</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khost</td>
<td>295,110</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunara</td>
<td>184,154</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nooristan</td>
<td>57,376</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badakshan</td>
<td>382,416</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takhar</td>
<td>397,079</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunduz</td>
<td>337,567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samangan</td>
<td>147,408</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkh</td>
<td>509,504</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sar-e-Pul</td>
<td>205,700</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghur</td>
<td>305,460</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daykundi</td>
<td>226,178</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urozgan</td>
<td>134,672</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabul</td>
<td>102,304</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandahar</td>
<td>408,765</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawzian</td>
<td>212,329</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faryab</td>
<td>410,384</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmand</td>
<td>610,200</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badghis</td>
<td>242,528</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herat</td>
<td>778,510</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farah</td>
<td>217,472</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimroz</td>
<td>52,480</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,588,008</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2,462,873</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>8,125,134</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,588,008</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,301,282</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,286,726</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,588,008</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1371202</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>8561150</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widower/Widow</td>
<td>521130</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>75536</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10529018</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1371202</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>8561150</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widower/Widow</td>
<td>521130</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>75536</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10529018</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**83. Are you now working, retired, looking for a job, student or a housewife?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>4428438</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired [skip to Q.86]</td>
<td>318480</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for a job (Unemployed) [skip to Q.86]</td>
<td>1470509</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student [skip to Q. 86]</td>
<td>380133</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife [skip to Q.86]</td>
<td>3982785</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10580343</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Literate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KABUL</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPISA</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARWAN</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDAK</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGAR</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGHMAN</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANJSHIR</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAGHLAN</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAMYAN</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHAZNI</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKTIKA</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKTYA</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHOSHT</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNARHA</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOORISTAN</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADAKHSHAN</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKHAR</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNDUZ</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMANGAN</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALKH</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR-E-PUL</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHOR</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAYKUNDI</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROZGAN</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZABUL</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANDAHAR</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawzjan</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faryab</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmand</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badghis</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herat</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farah</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimroz</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES SURVEY

Q1. What is the biggest problem in Afghanistan?
1. Insecurity
2. Access to education
3. Corruption
4. Access to health
5. Illegal drugs
6. Access to justice
7. Presence of armed groups
8. Access to water and electricity
9. Lack of development
10. Lack of political freedoms
11. Unemployment
12. Other

Q2. What is the biggest problem in Afghanistan that the government must address?
1. Insecurity
2. Access to education
3. Corruption
4. Access to health
5. Illegal drugs
6. Access to justice
7. Presence of armed groups
8. Access to water and electricity
9. Lack of development
10. Lack of political freedoms
11. Unemployment
12. Other

Q3. Do you think the government has done enough to address the problem over the last five years?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

Q4. In your judgment, is the government present in your village or town?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
Q5. In your view, do the people mentioned here work for the benefit of all the people, for the benefit of some, or only for their own benefit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>For The Benefit of All People</th>
<th>For The Benefit of Some of the People</th>
<th>For Their Own Benefit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uloswol?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Governor?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Ministers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of Afghanistan?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Parliament?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Provincial Council?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Commanders?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Community Development Council (CDC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{malik / arbab / qariyadar – WakeleGuza}?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Employees?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Judges?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Police?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghan national Army</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO / ISAF / American Soldiers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taliban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6. In your opinion, is corruption a common occurrence in the country?
Yes
1. No
2. don't know

Q7. In your opinion, has corruption become a more significant problem over the last two years?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

Q8. Which sector has more corruption?
1. Private sector
2. Civilian part of public sector
3. National security organizations including National Police, Security Directorate and National Army
4. Foreign organizations, NGOs and the civil society sector
5. Foreign military
6. Political parties
7. Media
8. Other
9. Don’t know

Q9. Which public institutions do you consider the most corrupt?[List up to three respecting the priority of spontaneous responses given]
First choice / Second choice / Third choice
1. Ministry of Justice
2. Directorate of National Security
3. Ministry of Interior
4. Ministry of Defense
5. Ministry of Finance
6. Ministry of Education
7. Ministry of Higher Education
8. Ministry of Transport
9. Ministry of Water and Energy
10. Ministry of Health
11. Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development
12. Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation & Livestock
13. Ministry of Commerce
14. Ministry of Labor, Social Affairs, Martyrs and Disabled
15. Municipalities
16. Banks
17. Courts
18. President's Office
19. Parliament
20. High Office of Oversight
21. Elections Commissions

22. State-run enterprises

23. Other

Q10. Do you believe there have been some improvements in reducing corruption in any public institution during the last 12 months?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

Q11. If yes, in which state institutions have you seen progress?

[List up to three respecting the priority of spontaneous responses given]

First choice / Second choice / Third choice

1. Ministry of Justice
2. Directorate of National Security
3. Ministry of Interior
4. Ministry of Defense
5. Ministry of Finance
6. Ministry of Education
7. Ministry of Higher Education
8. Ministry of Transport
9. Ministry of Water and Energy
10. Ministry of Health
11. Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development
12. Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation & Livestock
13. Ministry of Commerce
14. Ministry of Labor, Social Affairs, Martyrs and Disabled
15. Municipalities
16. Banks
17. Courts
18. President’s Office
19. Parliament
20. High Office of Oversight
21. Elections Commissions

22. State-run enterprises

23. Other

Q12. Roughly speaking, how many times have you actually sought government services over the last 12 months?

1. Never
2. Once
3. Two to three times
4. Four to six times
5. Seven to ten times
6. Eleven or more times

**Q13. Have you personally experienced corruption over the last 12 months?**
1. Yes
2. No
3. Refused to answer

**Q14. If yes, how many times have you faced corruption over the last 12 months?**
1. Once
2. Twice
3. Three times
4. Four times
5. Five Times
6. Six to ten times
7. Eleven or more times

**Q15. If yes, which form of corruption have you experienced?**[Multiple responses]?
1. Paid a sum of money
2. Offered a gift or Sherenee
3. Paid a professional commission-taker or *commissionkar*
4. Paid in livestock such as goats, sheep, cow etc.
5. Paid in harvest such as wheat etc.
6. Exchange of favour or service[Skip to Q 19]
7. Nepotism [Skip to Q 19]
8. Used ethnic, tribal, personal or family relations [Skip to Q 19]
9. Other [Skip to Q 19]
10. Refuse to answer [Skip to Q 19]

**Q16. If yes, how many times have you been forced by corrupt officials to commit corruption?**
1. Once
2. Twice
3. Three times
4. Four times
5. Five Times
6. Six to ten times
7. Eleven or more than eleven times

**Q17. If you paid a sum of money, a gift, part of harvest or livestock or any other material item, when was the last time you paid that?**
1. one month
2. two month
3. three month
4. four month
5. five month
6. six month
7. seven month
8. eight month
9. nine month
10. ten month
11. eleven month
12. twelve month
13. Don’t know

Q18. What was the amount of the bribe paid the last time you paid a bribe?
1. Less than 100 Afs
2. Between 100 Afs and 500 Afs
3. Between 501 Afs and 2,000 Afs
4. Between 2,001 Afs and 10,000 Afs
5. More than 10,000 Afs

Q19. How do you assess the general effect of corruption or bribes on your household?
[Definition: the household includes all individuals who share daily food under a same roof]
1. None
2. Little
3. Considerable
4. Extremely high
5. Don’t know

Q20. Has the financial burden due to corruption on your household over the last 12 months?
1. Increased?
2. Stayed the same?
3. Decreased?
4. I don’t know

Q21. By your estimates, how much money has your household paid in bribes or other forms of corruption during the last 12 months?
1. None
2. Up to 2,500 Afs
3. Between 2,501 and 5,000 Afs
4. Between 5,001 and 10,000 Afs
5. Between 10,001 and 20,000 Afs
6. More than 20,000 Afs
Q22. To which of the following government services does your household have access from the village or the town in which you live?

Yes / No / Don’t know

1. Police
2. Courts
3. Primary and secondary education
4. Hospitals or health services
5. Housing or resettlement service
6. Electricity provided by the government
7. ID cards
8. Arbab of village or wakil-e-guzar of town
9. Employment, social affairs, martyrs and disabled
10. Haj services
11. Transport services and traffic department
12. National Solidarity Program

Q23. In which state services has the existence of corruption had a negative impact on your household?[List the two responses given spontaneously]

First response / Second response

12. Security by Police
13. Justice by Courts
14. Payment of duties to Customs
15. Payment of taxes to Ministry of Finance or tax authorities
16. Primary and secondary education
17. Higher education
18. Hospitals or health services
19. Housing or resettlement service
20. Land and property registry, sale and purchase
21. Construction permit
22. Electricity provided by the government
23. ID cards, passport
24. Arbab of village or wakil-e-guzar of town
25. Employment and social affairs
26. Martyrs and disabled services
27. Haj services
28. Transport services including getting driving license
29. Other

Q24. Have you or a member of your household paid a bribe, a gift or other material items to obtain any of the following state services over the last twelve months and what was the amount?

{Read the options randomly}

30. Security by Police
31. Justice by Courts

Not paid / less than 500 / between 501 Afs and 2,000 Afs / between 2,001 Afs and 10,000 Afs / more than 10,000 Afs
32. Payment of duties to Customs
33. Payment of taxes to Ministry of Finance or tax authorities
34. Primary and secondary education
35. Higher education
36. Hospitals or health services
37. Housing or resettlement service
38. Land and property registry, sale and purchase
39. Construction permit
40. Electricity provided by the government
41. ID cards & passport
42. Arbab of village or wakil-e-guzar of town
43. Employment and social affairs
44. Martyrs and disabled services
45. Haj services
46. Transport services including driving license

Q25. How certain were you or was your household member that the bribe you had to pay allowed services to be obtained?
1. Highly certain
2. Some certainty
3. Little certainty
4. Not certain at all

Q26. From what you remember or know, for which of those services have your household members used professional commission takers or commissionkar?
47. Security by Police
48. Justice by Courts
49. Payment of duties to Customs
50. Payment of taxes to Ministry of Finance or tax authorities
51. Land and property registry, sale and purchase
52. Construction permit
53. Electricity provided by the government
54. ID cards & passport
55. Retirement pension
56. Martyrs and disabled services
57. Haj services
58. Transport services including driving license
59. Other

Q27. For which state services you or your household members were prevented from using the services due to corruption?
[Spontaneous responses]
Yes, deprived of the service / No, not deprived of the service / Don’t know
60. Security provided by Police
61. Justice provided by Courts
62. Payment of duties to Customs
63. Primary and secondary education
64. Higher education
65. Hospitals or health services
66. Housing or resettlement service
67. Land and property registry, sale and purchase
68. Construction permit
69. Electricity provided by the government
70. ID cards and/or passport
71. Municipal and district authority services
72. Employment and social affairs
73. Martyrs and disabled services
74. Haj services
75. Transport services including driving license

Q28. Have you or your household faced corruption in the judiciary over the last 12 months?
76. Yes
77. No in this duration I never been to judiciary (skip to Q33)
78. No, I went to judiciary but I didn’t faced corruption (skip to Q33)
79. Don’t know (skip to Q33)

Q29. If faced corruption in the judiciary you or your household were ...?
1. As a complainant
2. As an accused
3. As a witness
4. Other

Q30. At what stage did the corruption occur?
[If more than one, list up to three] (Spontaneous answers)
First / Second / Third
1. District Attorney’s Office
2. Provincial Attorney’s Office
3. Attorney General’s Office
4. District Court
5. Provincial Court
6. Supreme Court
7. Special Court
8. Provincial Justice Department
9. Provincial Administrative Tribunal
10. Other

Q31. Have you turned to other non-state justice providers to resolve the problem?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Refused to answer

Q32. If yes, who were they?
80. District Governor
81. District Chief of Police
82. Provincial Governor
83. Provincial Council Members
84. MPs of your province
85. Ministries in Kabul
86. NSP shuras
87. Local shuras or jirgas
88. Local commanders
89. Mullahs, malawis or any other individual with religious credentials
90. Other local influential figures including tribal elders
91. Taliban courts
92. By yourself or your family (own revenge)
93. Other
94. Refused to answer

Q33. Have you or your household faced corruption regarding land and property issues over the last 12 months?
   1. Yes
   2. No, in the past 12 month I don’t had any dispute (skip to Q38)
   3. No, We had dispute but we didn’t face any corruption(skip to Q38)
   4. Don’t know (skip to Q38)

Q34. If faced with corruption on land or property issues, you or your household were... ?
   1. Transferring property
   2. Determining boundaries of land or property
   3. Buying land or property
   4. Paying land or property taxes
   5. Selling land or property
   6. Resolving disputes with immediate neighbours
   7. Distributing land or property
   8. Other

Q35. Where did corruption happen? If more than one, list up to three.
   1. District office
   2. Police district office
   3. District’s court offices
   4. Provincial court offices
   5. Provincial amlak office
   6. Provincial Justice Department of Ministry of Justice
   7. Provincial Administrative Tribunal of Ministry of Justice
   8. Refugees and Returnees Ministry’s provincial department
   9. Municipality or district authority
10. Amlak Department of Ministry of Agriculture
11. MRRD provincial offices
12. Other district offices
13. Other provincial offices
14. Others specify

Q36. Have you turned to other non-state institutions to resolve the land or property problem?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Refused to answer

Q37. If yes, who were they?
1. Local shuras or jirgas
2. Taliban courts
3. Local commanders
4. By yourself or your family
5. Mullahs, mawlawis, or any other individuals with religious standing
6. Other
7. Other local influential figures
8. Refused to answer

Q38. Have you or your household faced corruption in the police during the last 12 months?
1. Yes
2. No, in the past 12 month I didn’t asked for service (skip to Q41)
3. No, I asked for services but don’t face with corruption
4. Refused to answer

Q39. If you or your household faced corruption in the police, what was the purpose of your interaction?
95. House, shop, office or car robbery
96. Livestock and harvest robbery
97. Robbery in public places and pickpocket
98. Death, injury or other physical damage
99. Circulation accident or violation of traffic law
100. Illegal trafficking of drugs or other illegal products
101. Kidnapping and human trafficking
102. Moral crimes such as rape, adultery, use of alcohol and drugs
103. Verification of ID card, driving license or passport that was not available
104. Other specify

Q40. Where did the corruption happen?
105. At police headquarters
106. On the road or in a open environment by patrolling police
107. At home
108. At work place
Q41. Have your household paid bribes to government officials in order to maintain the main source of the revenue for the household over the last twelve months?

111. Yes
112. No [skip to Q 43]
113. Don’t know [skip to Q 43]
114. Refused to answer [skip to Q 43]

Q42. If paid, what was the amount paid?

1. Less than 500 Afs
2. Between 501 Afs and 2,000 Afs
3. Between 2,001 Afs and 10,000 Afs
4. Between 10,001 Afs and 20,000 Afs
5. More than 20,000 Afs

Q43. Have you or a member of your household been victim of nepotism either in the state administration or with NGOs, international organizations or private companies during the last twelve months?

[Definition of nepotism: abuse of authority for according advantages to one’s own family members or relatives in recruiting or promoting]

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know
4. Refused to answer

Q44. Would you rely on nepotism if this is necessary to secure a job?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know
4. Refused to answer

Q45. Have you or a member of your household filed a formal complaint related to corruption over the last 12 months?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know
4. Refused to answer

Q46. If yes, what were the channels used to file the complaint?

[If more than one, circle the most recent channel used]
1. The Attorneys or the Attorney General
2. The Courts or the Supreme Court
3. The Special Commissions of Meshrano or WolesiJirgas
4. Ministers of Deputy-Ministers
5. Province or District Governors
6. Former GIAAC or current HOO
7. Other
8. Do not remember/Refused to answer
Q47. On a scale of one to five where one is the most common and five the most uncommon, how would you rate the following forms of corruption in Afghanistan?

Highly common/ Common/ Relatively common/ Uncommon/ Highly uncommon

1. Giving money or bribe
2. Using social relationships or favoritism
3. Embezzlement or illegal use of money under one’s authority
4. Modifying and/or establishing laws and regulations for one’s private or group interests
5. Misuse or stealing of government property
6. Involvement in falsifying of documents or fraud
7. Court tempering

Sexual extortion or exploitation going from harassment to assault

Q48. On a scale of one to five where one is the most acceptable and five the most unacceptable, how would you assess the following attitudes of the civil servants vis-à-vis state customers?

Most acceptable / Acceptable / Relatively acceptable / Unacceptable / Most unacceptable / Don’t know

1. Creating unduly difficulties as indirect request for bribe
2. Asking directly for money
3. Asking money from the poor
4. Asking for gift against small services
5. Not performing official task in an appropriate time while expecting to be offered a bribe
6. Civil servants’ taking money with the excuse that they don’t have enough income
7. Reducing taxes and customs duties in exchange for taking a percentage of them

Q49. Would you protect your interests through bribery if you had an opportunity to do so?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know
4. Refused to answer

Q50. Would you buy products from a company that you know to be involved in corruption and the prices of which are slightly lower than market prices?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know
4. Refused to answer

Q51. Do you trust private banks in Afghanistan to put your money?

1. Yes  skip to Q.53
2. No
3. I don’t know
Q52. If no, what is the main reason?
1. Lack of Islamic banking
2. Banks involved in corruption
3. Risk of loss of money
4. Weak financial management and leadership
5. Other

Q53. Do you feel guilty when you pay a bribe?
1. Yes
2. No

Q54. In your opinion, is a corrupt person detested in society or in his social environment?
1. Yes
2. No

Q55. Compared with previous governments, which type of relationship was most usually relied on in corrupt actions under the Karzai governments?
1. Family relationships
2. Personal relationships
3. Ethnic relations
4. Money
5. Party or faction links
6. None

Q56. On a scale of one to three where one is the least important factor in causing corruption, how do you assess the following factors?
Least important / Important / Most important / Don’t know
1. Weak law enforcement and weak government control
2. Lack of sanctions and discipline among civil servants
3. Low salary among civil servants
4. Civil servants feel protected and are, indeed, supported by superiors or political leaders
5. Lack of political will at the highest levels of the state
6. No objection of the state beneficiaries of state services to corruption
7. Public administration is not monitored by civil society and Parliament
8. Large influx of donor money

Q57. From your or your household’s experience, what kind of relationship is most often relied on in corrupt actions?
1. Individual
2. Family
3. Ethnic
4. Religious
5. Party
6. Alliance or faction
7. Professional
8. Political
9. Acquaintance with local commanders
10. Acquaintance with high-level officials
11. Other

Q58. From you or your household’s experience, which type of individual is most often the intermediary in bribe-taking?
1. Relatives
2. Acquaintances
3. Intermediary or commission-takers
4. Customers with experience of corruption
5. Civil servants
6. Other

Q59. Have you heard the Taliban denouncing corruption in the Afghan state?
Yes
No

Q60. In your view, is corruption within the state facilitating the expansion of the Taliban?
1. Yes, absolutely
2. Yes, a little
3. Absolutely not
4. Don’t know

Q61. If yes, corruption within which institutions is helping the most the expansion of the Taliban?
1. Provincial and District Governor Offices
2. Provincial and District Police
3. Courts and Attorney’s Offices
4. Customs
5. Central government
6. Other

Q62. On a scale of one to five where one is the least efficient and five is the most efficient, who is the most efficient in reducing corruption in Afghanistan?
(Please read)
Least efficient/ Most efficient/ Don’t know
1. Afghan government
2. United Nations, other international organizations
3. Foreign military
4. Taliban
5. NGOs
6. Media
7. Private companies
8. Mullahs and Ulemas
9. Tribal and local influential leaders
10. Commanders
11. Parliament
12. Provincial Councils
13. Community Development Councils
14. The judiciary

Q63. On a scale of one to five where one is the least effective and five the most effective, how do you assess the anti-corruption performance of the following over the last twelve months?

Least efficient / Most efficient / Don't know

1. The President
2. The Attorney General
3. The Head of the High Office of Oversight
4. Your Provincial Governor
5. Your District Governor or Mayor
6. Your Provincial Members of Parliament

Q64. On a scale of one to five where one is the least able and five the most able, who within the Afghan government do you consider to be the most able in reducing corruption in the state administration in the coming year?

Least efficient / Most efficient / Don't know

115. The President
116. Attorney General
117. Minister of Interior
118. Minister of Justice
119. Minister of Finance
120. Your province Governor
121. Your Mayor or District Governor
122. Head of High Oversight Office
123. Head of Control and Audit Office
124. other

Q65. When you think about people in combating corruption, who is the one person in Afghanistan who you view most favorably? [List up to three spontaneous answers]

First choice / Second choice / Third choice

125. Hamid Karzai
126. Abdullah Abdullah
127. Ramazan Bashardost
128. Ashraf Ghani
129. Abdul Raouf Ibrahim
130. Amrullah Saleh
131. Abdul Hadi Arghandiwal
132. Mohammad Ishaq Aloko
133. Abdul Salam Azimi
Q66. Would you vote for someone who you believe is corrupt?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know
4. Refused to answer

Q67. To what extent do you believe that the government officials for their own benefit they could control the economic activities of the country and they abuse their authorities?
1. Very high
2. Very
3. Less
4. Not doing this at all
   1. I don’t know

Q68. In your opinion, how much the government officials informal they are controlling the distribution, selling and management of land?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

Q69. Has the existence of corruption in the public sector caused land or property disputes in your area over the last 12 months?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

Q70. Have your household has experience any dispute over access to irrigation water that has resulted in corruption or paying a bribe over the last twelve months?
1. No dispute experienced
2. Dispute existed, but not resulted in corruption or bribe
3. Dispute resulted in corruption or bribe

Q71. Have you heard any member of the international community speaking against corruption in Afghanistan over the last 12 months?
   1. Yes
   2. No

Q72. If yes, who have you often heard speaking?
   1. United Nations officials
   2. Foreign military
   3. Officials of other international organizations
   4. NGOs
   5. United States government officials
   6. Foreign officials, but the respondent is not able to identify them
   7. European government officials
   8. Other foreign government officials
   9. Other

Q73. Do you believe the international community wants to fight corruption?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Don’t know

Q74. Do you believe the members of the international community are supportive of honest government officials in your province?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Don’t know

Q75. Do you think the government will be able to successfully ensure the transition of power from international military forces by mid-2014?
   1. Yes
   2. No skip Q77
   3. Don’t know skip 77

Q76. If yes, do you believe the Afghan security forces will be able to ensure the security of the country?
   1. Yes Skip D1
      2. No
      3. Don’t know
Q77. If no, for what reasons do you think the Afghan security forces will not be able to ensure security?

1. Lack of resources
2. Lack of capacity
3. Lack of moral
4. Lack of people’s trust in them
5. Corruption within the government
6. Other
7. Don’t know

PERSONAL DATA

78. Ethnic group

1. Pashtun
2. Arab
3. Tajik
4. Baluch
5. Hazara
6. Pashai
7. Uzbek
8. Nuristani
9. Turkmen
10. Aimaq
11. Other
12. Refused

79. GPS information

80. Respondent’s phone number: __________________________________________________

81. Sex

1. Male
2. Female

82. Marital status

1. Single
2. Widow/widower
3. Married
4. Refused
83. Are you now working, retired, looking for a job, student, an housewife?

1. Working
2. Student
3. Retired
4. Housewife
5. Looking for a job (unemployed)

84. If working, you work as:

1. Civil servant
2. Foreign military employee
3. Farmer, shepherd, or stockbreeder, including Kuchis (Pashtun nomads)
4. Private security or military company
5. Farm laborer (on other’s land)
6. Political personnel (party, Member of Parliament, Provincial Council member)
7. Self-employed professional
8. NGO, United Nations, or other international organization employee
9. Other
10. Refused

85. If a self-employed professional, please detail

1. Small-business owner such as shopkeeper or other informal sales
2. Media and communication professional
3. Skilled worker or artisan such as mason, carpenter
4. Taxi, truck, bus, or car driver
5. Trader (import/export)
6. Executive director or manager of a private production company
7. Other

86. How many people living in your households?

1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five
6. Six
7. Seven
8. Eight
9. Nine
10. Ten
11. Eleven
12. Twelve or more

87. Domicile location?
1. City
2. Remote village
3. Village near city

88. How old are you?

|   |   | Year

89. What is your level of education?

1. Illiterate
2. Semi-literate (can read and write)
3. Completed primary school (level 6)
4. Completed Secondary School
5. Completed high school (level 12)
6. Bachelors
7. Master’s or above
8. Refused

90. How many people were breadwinners in your household during the last 12 months?

1. None
2. One
3. Two
4. Three
5. More than three

91. Are you a breadwinner?

1. Yes
2. No

92. What is the average income of your household in a month?

|   |   |   |   |   |   | Per month

93. How has the income of your household evolved compared to last year?

1. Has increased
2. Has decreased
3. Is the same
4. Don’t know
APPENDIX III: ESTIMATION OF THE AMOUNTS PAID IN BRIBES ANNUALLY

To estimate the total amount of bribes paid by the Afghan population during the year 2012 we have multiplied the number of people likely to pay a bribe (I) by the average amount of the bribes paid (II) and the average number of bribes paid (III) in the year.

(I) Number of people likely to pay

15.3% of adults in our sample personally paid a bribe in 2012. This corresponds to a national population share of 1,621,800 adults (out of 10,588,008 adults according to figures of the Central Statistics Office in 2010) in an estimated total population of 24,960,100 in the country.

(II) Average bribe amount

The average bribe amount paid out has been calculated on the basis of the mean of the amount of the last bribe paid by individual respondents. This amount that is constructed from question 18 was triangulated with the average amount paid by a household and the average amount declared by respondents in the case of each service. The triangulation allowed us to check the consistency of the bribe amounts declared by respondents, but has not modified the amount that has derived from question 18. As such the average amount is 9,528 Afs or 191 USD.

(III) Average number of bribes

The average number of bribes was obtained using the frequency of bribe payments during a year. It is based on the mean of the last time individual respondents paid a bribe. The last time a bribe was paid was again provided in months in question 17. The calculation is based on the average between the two extremes of the range. On average, the last time respondents paid a bribe was 3.6 months before the interview. That works out to the payment of bribes 4.05 times a year.

(V) Total amount of bribes paid in 2012

The total amount of bribes paid by Afghans in 2012 is the product of the calculations in I, II and III. The total amount of bribes is 62,582,667,120 Afs (1,254,543,390 USD).
APPENDIX IV: PROVINCIAL INTEGRITY INDEX

The Provincial Integrity Index (PII) is an aggregate indicator formed from five sub indicators, as follows: (1) the reported amounts of bribes paid by households, (2) the reported number of service bribes paid by households, (3) individual integrity, (4) the anti-corruption performance of state officials, and (5) the support of the international community for honest officials. The data on the sub indicators are derived as the proportions within a given province of the responses expressed for or against corruption. For instance, if the perceived efficiency of the provincial governor in Herat in curbing corruption exceeds that governor’s inefficiency, then the balance would be positive.

The PII is formed taking into account three main concerns, as follows: (1) It should include both the experiences and perceptions of households in each province. (2) It should bring together both positive and negative elements that prevent or foster corruption in each province. (3) It should look not only at state services, but also at how state officials and their international supporters are perceived. The PII only considers the past and the present. It does not include any mood factor, such as pessimism or optimism about the future.

Indicator 1: Reported amounts of bribes paid by households (Q21)

This indicator is significant because it allows the index to include a consideration of the sums involved in bribery. It represents an indication of the intensity of the impact of bribery on households. The indicator is formed based on the experiences of bribery reported by households in each province. It is not based on an average of the bribe amounts paid. Rather, the percentage of the bribe amounts paid within a given range of amounts (for instance, between 2,501 and 5,000 Afs) is associated with a coefficient. The coefficients associated with each range are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount paid</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not paid</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2,500 Afs</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2,501 and 5,000 Afs</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5,001 and 10,000 Afs</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 10,001 and 20,000 Afs</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20,000 Afs</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the calculation of this indicator, the given coefficient is multiplied by the proportion of the amounts paid for each category. For instance, if 20% of respondents in Baghlan province reported that their households had paid amounts of up to 2,500 Afs, then the indicator will show a value of “-1”(-5*20%=-1). If no household paid any bribe, then the indicator will present a value of “0”.

Indicator 2: Reported number of service bribes paid by households (Q24)

This indicator is important because it provides information on the extent of the impact of corruption on households that needs to be taken into account in the index. It is formed
based on the reported household experiences of bribery associated with each of the 17 services listed in the survey. Although each service impacts households differently, we have decided to apply a coefficient of “-5” across each service equally. This coefficient is multiplied by the percentage of reported cases of bribery for each specific service in each province. For instance, if 30% of households reported they paid bribes for services related to land, that will give a negative value of “-1.5” (-5*30%=-1.5) for this indicator. Moreover, because bribery has been experienced in each province in more than one service, the indicator is formed by the sums of the negative values for each service.

**Indicator 3: Individual Integrity (Q49)**

This indicator is important because it measures individual attitudes toward bribery. It indicates whether individuals refrain from bribing or participate in bribery. It denotes the degree of the cynicism of citizens toward the main form of corruption in the public administration in each province. It highlights the relationship of citizens to the state at the subnational level as this has been shaped and affected by corruption or integrity within public institutions during the previous year. It accounts for current behaviors toward corruption. Thus, it is a major indicator in understanding how deeply the attitudes of bribery or integrity are expressed within individuals.

To include the significance of this indicator, we have assigned an attitude in favor of bribery a negative coefficient of “-10”, an attitude in favor of integrity a positive coefficient of “+10”, and “0” for those respondents who did not express any opinion. The indicator is formed from the sum of the positive and negative values resulting from multiplying the given coefficient by the proportion of the opinions for or against integrity.

**Indicator 4: Anti-corruption performance of state officials (Q65)**

This indicator is important because it shows the level of confidence of citizens in the ability and willingness of state officials to fight corruption. While it is not a direct indicator of the integrity of public officials, it is closely associated with this characteristic. It is important to integrate the perception of anti-corruption performance of state officials in the index because this perception is a measure of anti-corruption efforts in specific provinces.

The indicator is based on the performance of three officials: the President, the provincial governor and the district governor or mayor. The performance of the President has been included in this indicator because it is at least as important as (if not more important than) the performance of other officials at the provincial level. Indeed, the highly centralized structure of the Afghan state allows the central government to nominate the officials of all line ministries in provinces. Furthermore, the President nominates the provincial governors and has a significant influence over the positions of district governors and mayors.

The value of this indicator is calculated from the sum of the efficient or inefficient individual performances, which are each multiplied by a positive or negative value of “5” for each position. For instance, if a provincial governor is considered positive by 60% of the respondents and inefficient by 40% of the respondents in a province, the balance will be a positive value of “+1”, which is added to the balance of the performances for the other two officials.

**Indicator 5: International support for honest officials (Q74)**
This indicator measures the support of international actors for honest officials. This is important given that providers of international assistance directly channel 80% of all international aid. Also, given that the international military has adopted an anti-corruption approach in governance efforts in collecting intelligence and information and given that the international military has repeatedly stated that the military is not in favor of supporting corrupt officials, it is important to know how Afghans perceive these actors. Finally, public perceptions of the international support for honest officials are important in a context in which international actors and the Afghan government have repeatedly contested each other.

The indicator is based on the perceived positive or negative support of the international community for honest government officials in a province. Each perception has been given a coefficient of “+10” or “-10”. The more prevalent the positive views of international support, the more positive will be the value of the indicator.

**Accuracy of the results**

There was one major limitation in the index exercise: the margin of sampling error is wider in the provinces in which the sample is small. To address this issue, we have oversampled many provinces. As a result, all provinces had more than 150 respondents. The margin of error should therefore be between +/- 8% and +/- 7% for the provinces with less than 200 respondents. Most of the other provinces had between 200 and 500 respondents, representing a margin of sampling error between +/- 7% and +/- 4%.
Map 17: Provincial Index Map of Integrity 2012
Figure 56: Provincial Index of Integrity 2010 – 2012
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**Figure 57: Emphasizing comparison between the security and judiciary perception**

Which public institutions do you consider the most corrupt?
(Only Judiciary and Security)

- Directorate of National Security
- Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Interior
- Courts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Directorate of National Security</th>
<th>Ministry of Justice</th>
<th>Ministry of Interior</th>
<th>Courts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 58: Household corruption experience with judiciary in the past 12 months**

Q28. Have you or your household have faced corruption in the judiciary over the last twelve months?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q33. Have you or your household have faced corruption regarding land and property issues over the last twelve months?

- No: 70 (2010), 88 (2012)

Figure 59: Experiences of corruption 12 months prior to the survey

Q36. Have you turned to other non-state institutions to resolve the land or property problem?

- Yes: 26 (2010), 60 (2012)
- No: 31 (2010), 69 (2012)
- Don’t know: 9 (2010), 5 (2012)

n=2% 2012 of OS

Figure 60: Seeking help with land issues from non-state institutions
Q38. Have you or your household have faced corruption with the police over the last twelve months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 61: Facing corruption with the police