The National Anti-Corruption Action Plan (NACAP) of Ghana was adopted in 2014 after a wide-scale multi-stakeholder consultation process. It is unique among national strategies for tackling corruption in that it acknowledges the “disproportionate negative impact of corruption on women, children and other ‘equity-seeking groups’ such as persons with disability and other vulnerable groups”. NACAP explicitly states that bribery often occurs in the form of sexual favours, and that “the design, implementation and monitoring of anti-corruption initiatives must take account of the unique differences, needs, concerns, priorities and experiences of women and men”. It is believed that prior to the development of NACAP, most people held the view that reducing corruption is the responsibility of just a few institutions. The inclusive process of developing and adopting NACAP in parliament generated a greater sense of collective responsibility.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 25 September 2015, acknowledges that corruption is a key obstacle to sustainable development. Sustainable Development Goal 16, the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) and NACAP obligate Ghana to conduct studies on corruption and to make them a regular, scientifically based measurement of its occurrence. Not long after the adoption of NACAP, it was realized that a national corruption survey would contribute greatly to the assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of NACAP itself as well as to other national policies and programmes for combating corruption. Under the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of UNCAC, Ghana identified the need for technical assistance “to conduct a corruption survey that has not been done since 2001”.

It is against this background that the Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice, in partnership with the Ghana Statistical Service and with support from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), has conducted the first comprehensive, nationally representative population survey on corruption in Ghana. The fieldwork involved a survey of 15,000 respondents across the country, in all regions and in both urban and rural areas.

The main objective was to collect evidence-based information on forms of corruption affecting the population of Ghana in order to determine the prevalence of corruption and its prevailing typologies. The results of the survey will provide benchmark indicators that can be used to inform relevant policies and track future progress while ensuring international comparability with surveys of a similar nature carried out in other countries. In addition, the survey collected detailed information on the prevalence of bribery, taking into account the gender dimension of corruption. The data collected and related policy implications are presented in this report, which is published jointly by the implementing partners and UNODC. The survey findings will also strengthen the capacity of national institutions to make corruption monitoring a regular activity in the country.
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1. Scope of Bribery
The vast majority of the adult population has contact with public officials

83.8 per cent of the adult population had at least one contact with a public official

83.8%

86.1%
urban areas

80.5%
rural areas

The survey shows that more than 8 out of 10 adults in Ghana had at least one contact with a public official in 2021. Some 64.8 per cent interacted with those public officials more than once, indicating that interaction between the public and those who are employed in Ghana's public institutions is widespread and well-established.
More than a quarter of people who have contact with public officials pay them bribes

26.7 per cent of the adult population paid a bribe to a public official in 2021

Out of all adults who had at least one contact with a public official in 2021, 26.7 per cent paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official but refused to do so.
Bribe-payers paid an average of 5 bribes in 2021.

The frequency with which bribes are paid is another important dimension of public sector corruption. Bribe-payers paid an average of 5 bribes in the 12 months prior to the survey, resulting in an average of 0.98 bribes paid per adult in Ghana in 2021. This means that more than 17.4 million bribes were paid in Ghana that year, showing the magnitude of administrative corruption in the country.
Younger people are more likely to pay bribes than older people

With a prevalence of bribery of 29.9 per cent, people aged 25–34 are the age group most vulnerable to paying bribes. The prevalence of bribery decreases steadily to 17.6 per cent among those aged 65 and over, while among the youngest adult age group (18–24) it is 23.9 per cent.
Executive Summary

Bribery is most prevalent among highly educated people

With a prevalence of bribery of 40.6 per cent, people with a master's degree and/or a bachelor's degree are much more likely to have been asked to pay a bribe than those with no formal education. According to the survey, people with the highest level of (tertiary) education were 1.7 times more likely than people with no formal education to have paid a bribe, or been asked to pay a bribe but refused to do so, when in contact with a public official.
2. Who Takes Bribes
Executive Summary

GRA – Ghana Revenue Authority

MMDAs – Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies

Police officers 53.2%
Ghana Immigration Service officers 37.4%
GRA customs officers 33.6%
Lands Commission 32.4%
Driver and Vehicle Licensing Authority 29.5%
Passport Agency officials 29.0%
Prosecutors, judges or magistrates 22.3%
National Intelligence Bureau 21.2%
National Road Safety Authority 17.8%
Prison officials 17.0%
MMDAs* officials 12.7%
GRA** tax or revenue officers 12.7%
Members of the Armed Forces 10.3%
Welfare officials (social welfare) 10.3%
Embassy and/or Consulate officers 10.1%
Public utility officials 9.5%
Teachers, lecturers or professors 9.5%
Doctors, nurses and midwives 7.9%
Executive branch of government 5.6%
Elected local government representatives 4.3%
Social security officials 3.8%
Other health workers in public hospitals 3.3%
Elected government representatives 2.9%

* GRA – Ghana Revenue Authority
** MMDAs – Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies
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Police officers are the public officials that receive most bribes

The survey results indicate that the prevalence of bribery in relation to police officers is considerably higher than in relation to any other type of public official in Ghana, at 53.2 per cent. Ghana Immigration Service Officers and GRA customs officers come next, at 37.4 and 33.6 per cent, respectively. Elected government representatives are bottom of the list, at 2.9 per cent.
3. How Bribery Works
Most bribes are paid at the direct request of a public official.

6 out of 10 bribes paid to public officials are requested directly by those officials:

- Direct request: 59.4%
- Indirect request: 15.3%
- Sign of appreciation*: 14.4%
- Facilitate procedure: 4.7%
- Norm: 4.3%
- Third party request: 1.6%

* The Code of Conduct for the Ghana Civil Service prohibits receiving gifts in any form, except those given by personal friends (section 24.1 a).

Acts of bribery can be set in motion in different ways. In Ghana, 6 out of 10 bribes paid to public officials are requested directly by those officials. This is an indication that bribes are both common and expected and underlines the bargaining power of public officials, whose position enables them to solicit a payment in exchange for the promise of providing a public service that should be rendered upon request and, on occasion, totally free of charge.
Cash is by far the most common type of bribe paid

Almost 9 out of 10 bribes are paid in the form of cash

84.8%

13.3%

9.7%

5.0%

2.2%

Cash

Food and drink

Exchange for other service

Valuables

Animals

Bribes paid to public officials come in different forms. Almost 9 out of 10 of those paid in Ghana are in the form of cash (84.8 per cent). Food and drink and the exchange of a public service for another service are far less common, although in the country’s rural areas (17.8 per cent) more bribes are paid in the form of food and drink than in its urban areas (10.1 per cent).
Total cash bribes paid in Ghana are the equivalent of almost one third of the 2021 budget of the Ministry of Education.

A total of roughly Ghanaian cedi 5 billion was paid in cash bribes to public officials in 2021.

Cash bribes are 1.5 times larger in urban than in rural areas of the country, with the national average bribe amounting to Ghanaian cedi 348. Given that roughly 17.4 million bribes were paid in Ghana in 2021, a total of roughly Ghanaian cedi 5 billion is paid in cash bribes to public officials on a yearly basis in Ghana, or the equivalent of 32.9 per cent of the 2021 budget of the Ministry of Education.
Speeding up a procedure is the main reason for paying bribes

Almost half of all bribe-payers paid a bribe to either speed up or finalize an administrative procedure in 2021 (33.6 per cent and 10.8 per cent, respectively). This, and the fact that the majority of bribes are directly requested by public officials and are paid in advance of a service, suggests that bribes are paid because people seeking a service are informed by a public official, either implicitly or explicitly, that a procedure will not be processed without the payment of a bribe.
People are very reticent to report corruption

Only 3 per cent of people who pay a bribe actually report it

Just 3 out of 100 people who paid a bribe in Ghana in 2021 reported it to an official or an unofficial institution. The two most common reasons cited for not reporting are that bribery is simply a common practice and people think it pointless as nobody would care.
4. Gender Dimensions of Corruption
When in contact with public officials, women are less likely than men to pay bribes

In 2021, one third (34.1 per cent) of all men who had contact with a public official either paid a bribe or were asked to do so but refused, while this was the case of one fifth of women (20.7 per cent). Moreover, women in Ghana are less likely to engage in bribery than men irrespective of where they live, their age, educational background and employment status.
Female public officials are also less likely than their male counterparts to solicit bribes.

The survey data indicate that the share of male public officials who solicit or take a bribe (25.2 per cent) is roughly twice that of female public officials (13.1 per cent). Male public officials are more likely to solicit or take bribes from men than from women, with 61.2 per cent of all bribes resulting from interactions with men. Female public officials, on the other hand, are just as likely to solicit or take a bribe from men as from women.
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Women are more exposed than men to sexual corruption

In 2021, 2.6 per cent of women were asked for sexual favours when interacting with public officials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual corruption – the exchange of sexual favours or acts of a sexual nature in place of monetary bribes – disproportionately affects women in Ghana, with women being roughly twice as likely as men to be asked for sexual favours when interacting with public officials. In 2021, 2.6 per cent of women in Ghana were asked for sexual favours when interacting with public officials, which is likely an underestimate given the social stigma that surrounds this topic.
Executive Summary

5. Nepotism and Vote-Buying
Some 12.7 per cent of respondents or members of their household applied for a public sector post in the period 2019 to 2021. Out of the 25.2 per cent who were subsequently recruited, 41.4 per cent admitted using nepotism, bribery or both to improve their chances of recruitment. Moreover, it was found that nearly one third (29.0 per cent) of successful applicants had neither sat a written test nor been interviewed before being hired. More importantly, those who had relied on nepotism, bribery or both to obtain their public sector post (40.4 per cent) were more likely to have reported not undergoing any form of assessment than those who had not (21.0 per cent).
Executive Summary

Vote-buying occurs in Ghana, although with substantial regional differences

More than 1 out of 10 citizens were offered a bribe for their vote in the last general election

Despite the fact that the electoral process is a core element of a well-functioning democracy, 10.3 per cent of the adult population of Ghana reported that they were personally offered money or a favour in exchange for their vote before or during the 2020 general election, and a further 4.2 per cent reported that a member of their household was offered money or goods in exchange for their vote. There are substantial regional differences, however, with 1 in 4 people reporting vote-buying in the Oti region, but just 1 in 11 doing the same in the Eastern region.
Ananse Ntontan

(the spider’s web) is a symbol of creativity, the complexities of life and wisdom. Creativity is the creation of something new and different. Understanding relates to knowledge, experience as well as reasonable judgement in decision-making and taking necessary actions.
1. Scope of Bribery
Delivering public services to the population is a fundamental duty of public officials. This covers everything from the renewal of passports and driving licences, to the provision of good-quality healthcare services, security by police officers and justice by judges and prosecutors. The experience of the population when interacting with public officials and accessing public services can thus be an important factor in establishing and maintaining trust in public institutions. If people perceive that corruption is widespread and corrupt officials are not being held accountable, they lose confidence in public institutions and those who work in them and lead them.\(^1\)

This chapter provides an overview of how widespread bribery is in Ghana when people come into contact with public officials for the provision of public services. To provide a comprehensive overview of their experiences, the data are disaggregated by level of urbanization, region, educational attainment, age and employment status of those exposed to bribery. The chapter concludes with a look at bribery in the private sector.

---

**Bribery in the public sector**

As in many countries around the world, interactions with public officials form an integral part of daily life in Ghana. Whether encountering a police officer on the road, attending a doctor’s appointment at a public hospital or applying for a passport, a large share of the population of Ghana has regular encounters with public officials. This is measured using the “contact rate”, which is an important concept to take into consideration when analysing the experience of bribery among the population because public officials can only seek undue remuneration for their services through direct or indirect contact with the general public.

In 2021, 83.8 per cent of the adult population had at least one contact with a public official and such interactions are more likely in urban areas (86.1 per cent) than in rural areas (80.5 per cent). Almost two thirds (64.8 per cent) of the people who had contact with public officials interacted with those officials more than once, suggesting widespread and well-established interaction between the public and those that represent Ghana’s public institutions.

---

Since there may be differences in the reach and presence of administrative institutions and, therefore, in the provision of public services, levels of interaction with public officials vary by region. The contact rate is lowest in the North East and Western North regions of the country (71.6 and 72.7 per cent, respectively), whereas it is highest in the Upper East and Greater Accra regions (89.2 and 91.1, respectively).

Educational attainment also appears to be an important factor in determining who has contact with public officials in Ghana, with the contact rate being 11.8 percentage points higher among people with a tertiary-level education than among people with no formal education.

What is the contact rate?

The share of the adult population who interacted with a public official at least once in the past 12 months.

Figure 1

Contact rate, total and by level of urbanization, 2021

83.8 per cent of the adult population had at least one contact with a public official

83.8%

86.1% urban areas

80.5% rural areas

Note: The contact rate refers to the number of adults who had at least one contact with a public official in the 12 months prior to the survey, as a percentage of the adult population.
Figure 2

Contact rate, by educational attainment, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Contact Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary, non-tertiary education</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The contact rate refers to the number of adults who had at least one contact with a public official in the 12 months prior to the survey, as a percentage of the adult population. The category “No formal education” includes people with informal schooling, less than primary education and people who never attended school or received any informal schooling.

Prevalence of bribery in the public sector

The importance of measuring the experience of bribery among the population when in contact with public officials was recognized in the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. Under Goal 16, with the aim of achieving peaceful, just and inclusive societies for all, target 16.5 seeks to substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms.

What is the prevalence of bribery?

The share of adults who had contact with a public official in the previous 12 months and paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked to pay a bribe but refused to do so.
As set out in target 16.5, the prevalence of bribery is defined as the proportion of the adult population who paid at least one bribe to a public official, or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official but did not do so, in the 12 months prior to the survey, relative to all adults who had at least one contact with a public official over the same period. Based on that, the prevalence of bribery in Ghana is 26.7 per cent, meaning that one out of four people who had contact with a public official in the 12 months prior to the survey reported having been asked to pay a bribe by a public official, or asked to pay one but refused to do so. The survey revealed that, on average, there is no difference in the prevalence of bribery in rural and urban areas of Ghana.

There are, however, sizable variations across the 16 regions of the country. The prevalence of bribery in the Bono East, Savannah and Volta regions, for example, is substantially lower than the national rate, at 11.8, 14.5 and 19.1 per cent, respectively, while in the Western North, Ahafo and North East regions it is substantially higher, at 53.4, 47.0 and 41.9 per cent, respectively.
The prevalence of bribery in Ghana also varies across age groups. Younger adults are more likely to pay bribes than the older population. In 2021, with a prevalence of bribery of 29.9 per cent, people aged 25–34 were the age group most likely to pay bribes. The prevalence of bribery decreases steadily to 17.6 per cent among those aged 65 and over, while bribery among the youngest adult age group (18–24) has a prevalence of 23.9 per cent.
People with different levels of educational attainment experience bribery to a different extent, and many factors may explain these differences. One relates to the type of public official with whom people interact and the type of public services sought. It may also be common for corrupt public officials to target wealthier socioeconomic groups to a greater degree than poorer socioeconomic groups, as the former may be considered more likely to have the means to pay bribes.

Indeed, the survey shows that the group most likely to interact with public officials and most likely to experience bribe requests is that with the highest level of educational attainment (bachelor’s degree or above). That means that people with the highest level of (tertiary) education are 1.7 times more likely than people with no formal education to report that they paid a bribe, or were asked to pay a bribe but refused when in contact with a public official.

---

2 While the difference in the contact rate between those with tertiary education and those with no formal education is relatively small in relation to health workers and teachers and lecturers in public schools, the survey data show that highly educated people have a substantially higher contact rate with government representatives, police officers, tax authorities, passport agency officers and lands commission officers. See chapter 2 of the present report for more information on the contact rate and the prevalence of bribery by public official.
There is also a strong association between the employment status of bribe-payers and the prevalence of bribery. For example, roughly 37 per cent of people with a salaried position in the public and private sectors paid a bribe or were asked to pay a bribe in 2021. The lowest prevalence of bribery was among those who do not have a salaried position, such as the retired and housewives or housekeepers, at 17.4 and 15.8 per cent, respectively. Self-employed people appear to have significantly less exposure to bribery in the public sector than people who work in the public sector themselves.
Frequency of bribery in the public sector

In addition to the prevalence of bribery, another important dimension is the frequency of bribe payments. As shown throughout this report, exposure to bribery differs across the population of Ghana. From the analysis of contact rates and bribery prevalence rates presented above, it is apparent that some population groups are more susceptible than others to paying bribes to public officials and that people who pay bribes often have more than one contact with the public official in question.

In 2021, bribe-payers paid an average of 5.0 bribes, with little difference between urban and rural areas of the country. This results in an average of 0.98 bribes paid per adult in Ghana in 2021, which means that more than 17.4 million bribes were paid in Ghana that year, showing the magnitude of administrative bribery in the country.3

Of those people who reported that they had paid a bribe in 2021, 29.3 per cent reported having done so only once, whereas 17.6 per cent reported paying more than 10 bribes in the 12 months prior to the survey.

---

3 See the methodological annex to the present report for details of how these figures were calculated.
According to the survey data, 4.5 per cent of respondents are currently living with some form of disability (4.0 per cent of men versus 4.9 per cent of women). People living with disabilities may be exposed to bribery in a different way to the rest of the population. On the one hand, because of the challenges people living with disabilities face, public officials may try to take advantage of them and request bribes from them more often from than from other people. On the other hand, public officials may target people with disabilities less often than others because they often belong to lower-income groups in the population. In order to examine the unique circumstances and challenges faced by people living with disabilities when accessing public services and interacting with public officials, the survey collected data aimed at providing understanding about whether individuals who reported that they are living with a disability experience bribery in a different way to people who are not.

The set of questions measuring disability status is based on the Short Set data collection tool developed by the Washington Group on Disability Statistics, and classifies a respondent as living with a disability if they reported having “a lot of difficulty” doing a set of activities in the different domains listed below or if they reported that they “cannot do at all” these activities.

---

4 Some 21.5 per cent of people with disabilities report that their household has great difficulty covering basic expenses, compared with 12.4 per cent of people with no disability.
5 Available at https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/.
Using this self-perceived measure of disability status allows for an examination of commonalities and differences in interactions with public officials and bribery experiences between people living with and without disabilities. The data suggest that there were no notable differences between people living with and without disabilities in terms of contact rate with public officials in the 12 months prior the survey. However, people living with disabilities were found to be less likely to pay or be asked to pay a bribe when interacting with public officials than people without disabilities: 26.9 per cent of people living without disabilities experienced bribery in 2021, whereas the prevalence of bribery was 23.3 per cent among people living with disabilities.

Bribery in the private sector

The analysis so far has pertained specifically to the experiences of bribery in relation to public sector officials. However, the issue of corruption and, more specifically, of bribe-paying extends to the private sector. The survey also inquired about respondents’ experiences with six types of private sector employee: doctors, nurses and midwives in private hospitals, teachers in private schools, employees in private banks, employees in private insurance companies, private security guards and other employees in private businesses.7

7 Further details on the prevalence of bribery for each of the private sector employees mentioned are provided in chapter 2.
The survey shows that, overall, people are less likely to interact with private sector employees than public officials: 38.8 per cent reported having had contact with a business entity employee in 2021, versus 83.8 per cent with public officials. As in the public sector, the contact rate with private sector employees varies substantially across the regions of Ghana, with the contact rate being much higher in the Greater Accra, Western and Western North regions, at 59.1, 50.0 and 45.0 per cent, respectively, than in regions such as the Upper West, Oti and Bono East, at 11.2, 17.7 and 18.5 per cent, respectively. The contact rate with private sector employees is much higher in urban areas (46.9 per cent) than in rural areas (27.6 per cent) of the country as many more private services are more likely to be accessed in the former.

In terms of interaction with private sector employees by level of educational attainment, people with the highest level of education, such as a bachelor's degree or above, are much more likely to interact with private sector employees (contact rate: 66.2 per cent) than people with the lowest level of educational attainment, that is people with no formal education (contact rate: 24.0 per cent).

![Figure 13: Contact rate with private sector employees, by region, 2021](image)

Note: The contact rate refers to the number of adults who had at least one contact with a private sector employee in the 12 months prior to the survey, as a percentage of the adult population. North East is not included because of an insufficient number of observations.
Prevalence of bribery in the private sector

Not only is the contact rate with private sector employees in Ghana much lower than with public officials, but also the payment of bribes to private sector employees is much less prevalent than to public officials: the prevalence of private sector bribery in 2021 was 9.1 per cent, whereas the prevalence of public sector bribery was 26.7 per cent.\footnote{In the case of private sector bribery experiences, the survey only asked about cases where bribes were paid, not cases where bribes were solicited but refused, so the prevalence estimates of bribery in the private sector are not directly comparable to the prevalence estimates of bribery in the public sector. For reference, the prevalence of bribery in the public sector without refusals is 23.4 per cent, and 26.7 per cent with refusals.} In addition, compared with the public sector, where there is no notable difference in the prevalence of bribery in urban and rural areas, people are more likely to pay bribes to private sector employees in rural areas than in urban areas. There are also notable variations in the prevalence of private sector bribery across the regions of Ghana.

Figure 14
Prevalence of bribery in the private sector, overall and by level of urbanization, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The prevalence of bribery in the private sector refers to the proportion of the adult population who paid at least one bribe to a private sector employee in the 12 months prior to the survey, relative to all adults who had at least one contact with a private sector employee in the same period.
Prevalence of bribery in the private sector, by region, 2021

Note: The prevalence of bribery in the private sector refers to the proportion of the adult population who paid at least one bribe to a private sector employee in the 12 months prior to the survey, relative to all adults who had at least one contact with a private sector employee in the same period.
Bi Nka Bi

No one is supposed to bite the other

The image is based on two fish locking on each other’s tails. The sign means that people should watch out against any devious acts of provocation or civil strife.
2. Who Takes Bribes
Although people in Ghana pay bribes to officials in all types of public institutions and authorities, some types of public official are more likely than others to request bribes during interactions with the public. This chapter looks in detail at how bribery varies by analysing interactions between the public and specific types of public official. This analysis is complemented by a comparison with bribery in relation to private sector employees and their interactions with the public.

Public officials and bribery

Interactions with public officials

When measuring the likelihood of people paying a bribe to, or being asked to pay a bribe by, a public official of a particular public institution, it is necessary to calculate the contact rate in relation to the type of public official who works there. As shown, the contact rate varies substantially by type of public official. With a contact rate of 60.2 per cent and 51.3 per cent, respectively, health care professionals such as doctors, nurses and midwives, and teachers and lectures are the two types of public official with whom the largest share of people have contact. The third most contacted type of public official is public utility officials and inspectors, with a contact rate of 43.2 per cent. Police officers are the fifth most contacted type of public official, with 19.4 per cent of adults having had contact with them in 2021. Interactions with all other types of public official occur to a lesser extent, the least contacted public officials being those of the National Intelligence Bureau.
**Public officials and the prevalence of bribery**

As stated in the chapter “Scope of Bribery”, 26.7 per cent of all survey respondents who had at least one contact with a public official in the 12 months prior to the 2021 survey paid at least one bribe, or were asked to pay a bribe, in the same period. The prevalence rate of bribery to a particular type of public official can obviously be either higher or lower than the overall prevalence of bribery. This depends entirely on the number of people who had contact with that particular type of official and those who actually paid, or were asked to pay a bribe to that official.⁹

In Ghana, the prevalence of bribery is highest in relation to police officers (53.2 per cent), followed by Ghana Immigration Service Officers (37.4 per cent) and Ghana Revenue Authority (GRA) Customs Officers (33.6 per cent). At the other end of the scale, the prevalence of bribery

---

⁹ It is important to note that the overall prevalence of bribery is not the average of the prevalence of bribery (rate) by type of public official, since it is calculated as all those who had at least once contact with any type of public official and were asked for a bribe, including those who refused to pay it.
is one of the lowest in relation to health workers other than doctors, nurses and midwives, at 3.3 per cent, and elected government representatives, at 2.9 per cent. When comparing the contact and bribery prevalence rates, it becomes evident that although only one fifth of adults had contact with police officers in the 12 months prior to the survey, around half of them had to pay a bribe to, or were asked to pay a bribe by, a police officer. This in stark contrast with health care officials in public hospitals and clinics, in relation to whom, despite a high contact rate (60.2 per cent), the prevalence of bribery is comparatively low, at 7.9 per cent.

**Figure 17**

Prevalence of bribery, by type of public official, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police officers</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Immigration Service officers</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA customs officers*</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands Commission</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver and Vehicle Licensing Authority</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passport agency officials</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors, judges or magistratates</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Intelligence Bureau</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Road Safety Authority</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison officials</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDAs officials***</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA tax or revenue officers</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the Armed Forces</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare officials (social welfare)</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy/Consulate officers</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public utility officials</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, lecturers or professors</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors, nurses and midwives</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive branch of government</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected local government representatives</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security officials</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health workers in public hospitals</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected government representatives</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* GRA – Ghana Revenue Authority; ** MMDAs – Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies.
Note: The prevalence of bribery refers to the proportion of the adult population who paid at least one bribe to a specific public official, or were asked to pay a bribe by that public official but did not do so, in the 12 months prior to the survey, relative to all adults who had at least one contact with a public official in the same period.

**Prevalence of bribery by type of public official and by region, area, age and education**

The prevalence of bribery in relation to certain types of public official shows some variability at the regional level in Ghana. The 2021 survey results reveal that, in all of the country’s 16 regions, police officers are among the top three public officials in relation to whom the prevalence of bribery is highest. Other public officials that are frequently among the three types in relation
to whom the prevalence of bribery is highest across the 16 regions are officials of the Passport Agency, Ghana Immigration Service and Lands Commission Officials.

The prevalence of bribery in relation to types of public official also differs by the level of urbanization of areas in the country. For instance, the prevalence of bribery in relation to police officers is higher in rural areas (61.3 per cent) than in urban areas (48.0 per cent), as it is in relation to Ghana Immigration Office officials (53.0 per cent versus 30.6 per cent) and Land Commission and Land Title officials (37.6 per cent versus 30.8 per cent). The most marked difference between rural and urban areas in the prevalence of bribery in relation to public officials is in the case of National Road Safety Authority officials (32.6 per cent versus 10.1 per cent). However, public officials are not always more likely to solicit bribes in rural areas, for example, the prevalence of bribery in relation to Passport Agency officials is higher in urban areas than in rural areas (31.5 per cent versus 19.7).

Figure 18
Prevalence of bribery, by type of public official and level of urbanization, 2021

* GRA – Ghana Revenue Authority; ** MMDAs – Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies.
Note: The prevalence of bribery refers to the proportion of the adult population who paid at least one bribe to a public official, or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official but did not do so, in the 12 months prior to the survey, relative to all adults who had at least one contact with a public official in the same period.
How often bribes are paid to public officials

From the analysis of the prevalence of bribery in relation to different types of public official and the examination of contact rates by type of public officials who take bribes, it is apparent that people are more likely to pay bribes to particular types of official. As shown in the chapter “Scope of bribery”, bribe-payers reported paying an average of five bribes in 2021. However, that average masks large variations in the frequency of bribe-payments across public officials, which range from 2.0 bribes paid to passport officers to 6.1 paid to National Road Safety Authority officials, indicating that bribe-paying in relation to certain types of public official is highly concentrated. For example, half of people in contact with police officers in 2021 paid them bribes, and those who paid bribes did so an average of four times. This means that bribe-paying is not an isolated event and that those who pay bribes are likely to repeatedly pay bribes, perhaps because they routinely face situations in which bribes can be extracted from them. The survey data reveal, however, that although the prevalence of bribery is highest in relation to police officers, they are not the public officials who receive the highest average number of bribes. National Road Safety Authority officials are those who receive bribes most frequently, with an average of 6.1 bribes received in 2021.

In addition to the prevalence of bribery by public official, the indicator for the average number of bribes paid to various types of public official provides an additional angle for analysing the vulnerability to bribery of the adult population of Ghana.

Figure 19
Prevalence of bribery and average number of bribes, by type of public official, 2021

* MMDAs – Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies; ** GRA – Ghana Revenue Authority.
Note: Some public officials are excluded from this calculation due to a low number of observations.
What forms of bribe are paid to public officials?

The vast majority of bribes paid to public officials in Ghana take the form of cash payments, regardless of the type of public official to whom they are paid. For instance, in 2021 police officers received 96.9 per cent of their bribes in the form of a cash payment, as did 93.7 per cent of public utility officers, 94.1 per cent of passport officials and 93.9 per cent of custom officers. However, some public officials did accept bribes in non-cash form; for example, only 45.0 per cent of bribes paid to teachers, lecturers and professors were paid in cash.

Size of bribes paid to public officials

As mentioned in the chapter “How Bribery Works”, the average cash bribe paid to public officials in Ghana masks huge variations in the size of cash bribes, which depends on a number of factors, such as the economic reasons for which bribes are paid, the service sought at the time of payment and the area where bribes are paid. Similarly, there are large variations in the size of bribes according to the type of public official who receive them. Among all types of public official for which there was sufficient data, with an average of Ghanaian cedi 1,669, the largest cash bribes were paid to Lands Commission Officers, and Prosecutors, judges or magistrates (Ghanaian cedi 1,208). By contrast, much smaller average amounts were paid to health workers (Ghanaian cedi 91–253) and police officers (Ghanaian cedi 220).
These disparities suggest very different dynamics in the payment of bribes, depending on the public official on the receiving end of those payments. It is notable that the largest average bribes are paid to public officials with whom most citizens have little contact in their daily lives. This may suggest that large bribes, although relatively rare, are generally paid to influence important decisions by public officials, which can have substantial economic or personal consequences (for example, by influencing land-related decisions, immigration matters, or prosecutors and judges). Conversely, the dynamics behind smaller bribes seem to be related to public officials with whom people have more frequent contact (such as police officers, and health care workers, public utility officials) as well as to bribes that are paid to avoid moderate fines or sanctions, to maintain utility connections or to reduce tax payments.

**Figure 21**

*Average bribe size (Ghanaian cedi), by type of public official, 2021*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Official</th>
<th>Average Bribe Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lands Commission</td>
<td>1,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors, judges or magistrates</td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Immigration Service officers</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected local government representatives</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDAs officials*</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA customs officers**</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passport agency officials</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, lecturers or professors</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public utility officials</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors, nurses and midwives</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver and Vehicle Licensing Authority</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police officers</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA tax or revenue officers**</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health workers in public hospitals</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MMDAs = Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies; ** GRA = Ghana Revenue Authority.
Note: Some public officials are excluded from this calculation due to a low number of observations.

**Private sector employees and bribery**

**Interactions with private sector employees**

The survey also inquired about respondents’ experiences with six types of private sector employee: doctors, nurses, midwives and other paramedics in private hospitals, teachers, lecturers and professors in private schools, employees in private banks, employees in private insurance companies, private security guards and other employees in private sector businesses.
In terms of the contact rate, 20.9 per cent of survey respondents report having been in contact with employees of private banks, followed by 17.4 per cent with education professionals in a private institution and 16.8 per cent with healthcare professionals in private hospitals. Contact rates with other private sector employees are substantially lower.

Contact rates with teachers, lecturers and professors in private institutions are much lower than in the public sector, where the contact rate is 51.3 per cent. Similarly, while 60.2 per cent of survey respondents had been in contact with doctors, nurses or midwives working in public sector institutions in the 12 months prior to the survey, the contact rate with health care professionals working in the private sector is just 16.8 per cent.

Prevalence of bribery in relation to private sector employees

As shown in the chapter “Scope of Bribery”, bribes are requested by employees working in the private sector, although to a much smaller degree than by officials working in the public sector of Ghana. Among the private sector employees covered in the survey, teachers, lecturers and professors are those in relation to whom the prevalence of bribery is highest (9.6 per cent), followed by health care professionals in private healthcare institutions (7.6 per cent) and private security guards (7.3 per cent).
Figure 23
Prevalence of bribery in relation to six types of private sector employee, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Employee</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and lecturers in private schools</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors, nurses and midwives in private hospitals</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private security guards</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance companies employees</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other business employee</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank employees</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some public officials are excluded from this calculation due to a low number of observations.
Mako translates as “PEPPERS”

It is a symbol of inequity and uneven development. Mako is a shortened variant of the Akan adage “Mako nyinaa mpatu mmere,” which means “All peppers (probably on the same branch) do not ripen simultaneously.”
3. How Bribery Works
To provide a clearer picture of the causes and uses of public sector bribery, the present chapter looks at the mechanisms underlying bribe-payments and bribe-taking in Ghana. The chapter starts with an analysis of the modality and timing of bribe requests by sex of bribe-payer, by region of Ghana and by selected types of public official to whom bribes are paid. It goes on to describe the main forms that bribery takes and examines the size of cash bribes paid in 2021. Following an analysis of the motivations behind the payment of bribes, the chapter closes with an overview of the reporting of bribery to various authorities in Ghana.

How acts of bribery are initiated

The payment of a bribe to a public official can be set in motion in a number of ways: via a direct or indirect request from a public official to the service user, including a request through a third party; or in the form of an offer by the bribe-payer himself/herself. According to the survey, 6 out of 10 bribery requests are made directly by a public official, with men (63.0 per cent) being more likely to experience direct bribery requests than women (54.5 per cent). Moreover, direct bribery requests are more common in rural areas (65.2 per cent) than in urban areas (55.3 per cent).

A sign of appreciation in the form of a gift from a bribe-payer to a public official is the second most commonly cited modality of bribery, with an average of 15.3 per cent of bribe-payers giving such gifts to public officials. The relatively large share of people giving gifts as a sign of appreciation to public officials is in line with public perceptions in Ghana, where some 60.1 per cent of people believe that it is acceptable to do so after a public service has been rendered. Unlike in the case of direct bribery requests, which men are more likely to experience, women (22.2 per cent) are twice as likely as men (10.2 per cent) to give a gift to a public official as a sign of appreciation.

---

10 A topic of debate in relation to the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption is the issue of gift giving to a public official as a sign of appreciation. The question often discussed is at what point does a gift transgress into a covert bribe or an expectation of a future service rendered?
There is a substantial regional variation in the modality of how bribery is initiated. When focused on direct requests by public officials in each of the 16 regions of Ghana, the data show that the share varies from as little as 24.8 per cent to as much as 91.8 per cent. In other words, 9 out of 10 bribes in Oti are directly requested by a public official, while that is the case of just 2 out of 10 bribes in the Western North region. Such a large share of bribes being directly requested by public officials may suggest that acts of bribery do not come to the attention of the relevant authorities or that when they do, they are not investigated or there is no follow-up.
Timing of bribery

According to the survey, about two thirds of bribes are paid before a service is rendered. Such a large share of bribes being paid in advance of a service is an indication that the payment of bribes to public officials is often expected in Ghana. It also further underlines the bargaining power of public officials, whose position of relative power enables them to solicit a payment in exchange for the promise of providing a public service that should have been rendered upon request and, on occasion, even free of charge.
Men are somewhat more likely than women to pay a bribe before (68.4 versus 60.3 per cent) or during the provision of a service (10.3 versus 5.7 per cent), while women are more likely than men to pay after a service has been provided (29.9 versus 17.5 per cent). The fact that a larger share of women pay bribes after a service has been provided can be partly explained by the fact that women are more likely than men to pay a bribe as a sign of appreciation, which usually occurs after a service has been provided.

By contrast, men are more likely than women to pay a bribe before a service has been provided, following a direct request from a public official. One explanation for this could be the types of public official to whom men pay bribes. As shown in the chapter "Gender Dimensions of Corruption", the difference in the prevalence of bribery between men and women can largely be explained by men being substantially more likely than women to pay bribes to the police. Police officers, meanwhile, are much more likely to directly request a bribe than other public officials with whom people interact and pay bribes to, such as teachers and healthcare officials, who are more likely to receive a bribe as a sign of appreciation.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Health care official</th>
<th>Police officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct request</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign of appreciation</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forms of bribes

Bribes paid to public officials come in a number of forms, including cash, food and drink, valuables, an exchange for another service or favour, and animals. The highly sensitive form of sexual corruption, when sexual favours or acts of a sexual nature are requested instead of a bribe, is covered in the chapter "Gender Dimensions of Corruption".

In Ghana, the vast majority of bribes (84.8 per cent) are paid in cash, while food and drink, an exchange for another service or favour, or payments using animals are substantially less prevalent. Food and drink is, however, a more common form of bribe payment in rural areas (17.8 per cent) than in urban areas (10.1 per cent).

There is a distinct difference between the type of bribes men and women pay. Men (89.0 per cent) pay in the form of cash more often than women (79.2 per cent), while women (18.7 per cent) are twice as likely as men (9.3 per cent) to pay bribes in the form of food and drink.
Almost 9 out of 10 bribes are paid in the form of cash.
How bribery works in the private sector

As with bribery in the public sector, the most common form of payment to private sector employees is in cash. Compared with bribes paid to public officials, however, bribes paid to private sector employees are more likely to be in the form of food and/or drink, valuables and animals. While most people are still very reluctant to report instances of bribery in Ghana, bribery incidents involving private sector employees are more likely to be reported (5.6 per cent) than those involving public sector officials (3.1 per cent).

Figure 28
Percentage distribution of different forms of bribe payment in private and public sector bribery, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food/drink</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuables</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other service</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size of cash bribes

With cash being the primary form of bribes, it is worth taking a closer look at the size of cash bribes paid. The average bribe paid is Ghanaian cedi 348, or roughly $44 based on the 2021 spot exchange rate. Given that roughly 17.4 million bribes were paid in Ghana in 2021,

11 The survey did not collect information on the equivalent monetary value of non-cash bribes.
12 Using an exchange rate of Ghanaian cedi 1 = $ 0.1256, obtained on 16 June 2022 from https://www.xe.com/currencyconverter/convert/?Amount=1&From=GHS&To=USD.
13 That is the equivalent of $157 in 2021 PPP. Amounts in Ghanaian cedi have been converted to International Dollars in terms of Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) so as to take into account the difference in the cost of living in Ghana and in the United States of America and equalize the purchasing power of currencies. The PPP conversion factor (2.21) used to convert Ghanaian cedi into International Dollars used in the present report was obtained at https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/PA.NUS.PRVT.PP?locations=GH (accessed on 16 June 2022). What this means is that GHS 348 would buy a bundle of goods and services in Ghana that would cost $157 if purchased in the United States at United States prices.
14 Given that the average is highly sensitive to outliers, another way to estimate the amount most people pay is the median, which is Ghanaian cedi 50, which is roughly $6 using current exchange rate or $23 in 2021 PPP.
the average bribe size of Ghanaian cedi 348 results in a total of approximately Ghanaian cedi 5 billion paid in cash bribes¹⁵ to public officials in 2021. To put the numbers into perspective, this corresponds to almost one third (32.9 per cent) of the 2021 budget of the Ministry of Education.¹⁶

Figure 29
Amount of cash bribes paid to public officials, 2021

Bribes are paid for a variety of purposes to different officials with varying frequency. Some bribes are paid only once, for example, to obtain a particular document, while others are paid more frequently, for example, to avoid the payment of traffic fines. It is possible that bribes paid for more frequently requested services are reasonably smaller than bribes paid for services that are requested less frequently. Indeed, the survey data show that the size of cash bribes varies substantially, the majority of which are relatively small: 7 out of 10 bribes are under Ghanaian cedi 200 and 3 out of 10 more than Ghanaian cedi 200. It is noteworthy that almost 1 out of 10 bribes is more than Ghanaian cedi 1,000.

¹⁵ Equivalent to $628,000,000.
¹⁶ The 2021 Ministry of Education Appropriation bill was Ghanaian cedi 15,631,637,855.
The size of the average bribe paid in Ghana further differs greatly between urban and rural areas. At Ghanaian cedi 404, the average bribe in urban areas is approximately 1.5 times larger than the Ghanaian cedi 265 average in rural areas. The share of small bribes (under Ghanaian cedi 50) is larger in rural (47.3 per cent) than in urban areas (31.7 per cent), whereas the share of larger bribes (above Ghanaian cedi 100), is higher in urban (47.8 per cent) than in rural areas (35.2 per cent).

An interesting finding from the survey data is that not all bribe-payers are willing to pay the actual amount requested by the public official. Roughly 4 out of 10 bribe-payers indicate negotiating the value of a bribe paid, with men being 1.3 times more likely to negotiate the value of the cash bribe than women.
Why bribes are paid to public officials

Just under half of people who pay a bribe to a public official in Ghana do so to either speed up a process or to ensure its finalization (44.4 per cent combined). The combination of this and the fact that the majority of bribes are requested directly by public officials and are paid in advance of a service, strongly suggests that such bribes are paid because people have been informed, either implicitly or explicitly, that their request will not be processed without the payment of a bribe. A relatively large number of bribes are also paid to avoid the payment of a fine (13.8 per cent), avoid problems with the authorities (9.8 per cent) and for no specific purpose other than to maintain a good relationship with the authorities (5.3 per cent). The survey data indicate that men are more likely to pay a bribe to avoid paying a fine than women, while women are more likely to pay a bribe purely as a sign of appreciation.

Figure 32
Percentage distribution of the five most frequently cited purposes for paying a bribe to public officials, 2021
Two thirds of all bribes paid to public officials in Ghana are paid for personal or family-related reasons and the remainder are paid for business-related reasons. Women in Ghana are slightly more likely than men to pay bribes for personal reasons, while men are more likely than women to pay bribes for business-related reasons.

There are many different services/reasons for which bribes are paid to public officials, but the most common is during a regular police motor traffic control (23.7 per cent). Altogether, police officers are involved in 35.4 per cent of cases, either in relation to a regular traffic police control or other police matters. Other common bribe-paying scenarios in the daily lives of people include medical visits, public utility services, admission to a public school and Driving and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) services, such as a roadworthy certificate or a driving licence.

There are significant variations in the size of bribes paid depending on the service provided/requested. For example, the average bribe paid during a regular police motor traffic control is relatively small, at roughly Ghanaian cedi 67, whereas for other police matters the average amount increases to Ghanaian cedi 387. The largest average bribe is paid for job applications in the public sector (relatively uncommon, at 1.6 per cent), with an average of roughly Ghanaian cedi 2,700. More information can be found on that in the chapter “Other Forms of Corruption”.
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**Figure 33**

*Percentage distribution of main reasons for paying a bribe, by sex, 2021*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ghana</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal/family</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Diagram showing the percentage distribution of main reasons for paying a bribe, by sex, 2021. The diagram uses bars to represent the percentage of bribes paid for personal, business, and both reasons, with separate bars for Ghana, Men, and Women. The data shows that for Ghana, the majority of bribes are for personal reasons, while for Men and Women, both personal and business reasons are significant.]
To report bribery, or not report bribery?

According to the survey, the vast majority of people do not report instances of bribery to either an official authority (e.g. police, prosecutor, anti-corruption agency, etc.) or a non-official institution or platform, including the press and social media. This appears to be a very common attitude that is consistent across men and women, age groups, and urban and rural areas. The one exception to this behaviour is found in the Eastern region of Ghana, where 13 per cent of people indicate reporting bribery.
How Bribery Works

Figure 35
Share of bribery incidents reported to an official authority or non-official institution, 2021

This raises questions about why people do not report bribery incidents to any authority, be it official or unofficial. Some 6 out of 10 people indicate that this is because bribery is simply a common practice and that reporting is pointless as nobody would care. A small but concerning share of people (7.7 per cent) do not actually know to whom to report bribery.

Figure 36
Percentage distribution of the main reasons why a bribery incident was not reported to any official or unofficial institution, by sex, 2021
It could be expected that people who were requested to pay a bribe but refused to do so would be willing to report their bribery experience. This does not seem to be the case, however, as even among people who refused to pay a bribe in 2021, 9 out of 10 said that they did not report the incident to either an official or unofficial institution. Nevertheless, refusing to pay a bribe does come at a cost, with one out of three people having refused to do so indicating suffering negative consequences as a result of their refusal.

Figure 37
Percentage distribution of consequences of refusing to pay a bribe, 2021

When asked who they would report to if, in future, they had to report an incident when they were requested to pay extra money or a gift to a public official, most people said they would either go to the police, a traditional leader or the supervisor of the public official in question.

Figure 38
Percentage distribution of who people would report to if they had to report a bribery incident, by sex, 2021

Note: The question allowed for the selection of up to three options, therefore the totals add up to more than 100 per cent.
Osram Ne Nsoromma

The Moon and the Star

The Adinkra proverbs “KYEKYE PE AWARE” means that the North star represents deep love for marriage. It is always in the sky, waiting for the moon to return. Thus, the symbol represents how a woman always waits for the return of her husband.
4. Gender Dimensions of Corruption
As shown in the chapter “Scope of Bribery”, one out of four people in Ghana who had contact with a public official was exposed to bribery in 2021. Indeed, as so many people are exposed to administrative bribery, it begs the question: Are men and women equally at risk of bribery in Ghana? The present chapter uses the corruption survey data to look at administrative bribery from the perspective of men and women confronted with bribery requests by public officials, and the differences between male and female public officials when engaging in bribery. New evidence is also presented on the sensitive topic of requests for sexual favours by public officials as a form of bribery. The analysis will not only help improve the understanding of bribery in Ghana in general, but also provide policymakers with an evidentiary basis for designing and tailoring national anti-corruption policies.

**Differences in the interactions of men and women with public officials**

As shown in chapter 1 of the present report, 83.8 per cent of the adult population in Ghana had at least one contact with a public official in the 12 months prior to the survey. To understand the differences between men and women in their experience of bribery, the first step is to look at the contact rate of the two sexes. The survey data revealed that men in Ghana are slightly more likely to interact with a public official (84.9 per cent) than women (82.9 per cent).
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**Figure 39**

**Contact rate, by sex, 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Contact Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The contact rate refers to the number of men and women in Ghana who had at least one contact with a public official in the 12 months prior to the survey, as a percentage of the adult male/female population. The difference between men and women in the contact rate is statistically significant (p < 0.01).
The contact rate among women was lower than that among men in many of the 16 regions of Ghana, with the exception of five of them (Eastern, Bono, Bono East, North East and Upper West) where women reported a higher contact rate than men with public officials. The biggest difference in the contact rate was recorded in the regions of Volta (8.0 percentage points less for women), Central (6.4 percentage points), and Upper East (5.5 percentage points).

Disaggregating the contact rates by the level of urbanization in the country also reveals some gender-specific patterns, as both men and women have a higher contact rate with public officials in urban areas than in rural areas, with women in rural areas having the least contact with public officials among the four different subgroups. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the difference in the contact rate between men and women is somewhat more pronounced in rural areas than urban areas.
In addition to geographical factors, the type of public official with whom men and women interact is perhaps one of the most important factors when analysing the differences in the bribery experience between the two sexes. Figure 42 shows the contact rates of men and women with 23 different types of public official. The data show that men have a higher rate of contact than women with most types of public official. They are substantially more likely than women to interact with public utility officials, police officers, local government representatives and representatives of the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Authority. Women, by contrast, have a higher rate of interaction with health care providers (such as doctors, midwives, nurses and other health workers in the public sector). Indeed, the contact rate of women with public health care providers is the highest contact rate recorded in the country for 2021.

**Figure 42**

*Contact rate, by sex and type of public official, 2021*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Official Type</th>
<th>Men Contact Rate</th>
<th>Women Contact Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctors, nurses and midwives</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, lecturers or professors</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public utility officials</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police officers</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health workers in public hospitals</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected local government representatives</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver and Vehicle Licensing Authority</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDAs officials**</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA tax or revenue officers*</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security officials</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected government representatives</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands Commission</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Immigration Service office</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA customs officers*</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors, judges or magistrates</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare officials (social welfare)</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the Armed Forces</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Road Safety Authority</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive branch of government</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison officials</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy/Consulate officers</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Intelligence Bureau</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MMDAs – Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies
** GRA – Ghana Revenue Authority

Note: The contact rate refers to the number of men and women in Ghana who had at least one contact with a public official in the 12 months prior to the survey, as a percentage of the adult male/female population.
There are many factors that could explain the differences in the contact rate between men and women in Ghana. Some may be related to the broader gendered divisions of paid and unpaid labour in Ghana, some to the existing differences between men and women in terms of health and educational needs, and others to established gender norms and expectations. Women, for example, may have greater contact with health care providers because they tend to access health care not only for themselves but also for their children and ageing family members in need of assistance.¹⁷ Such gender disparities in household responsibilities are confirmed by the survey data as well; for example, a substantially larger share of women (87.2 per cent) than men (76.9 per cent) report looking after children in their household. Men are roughly 1.8 times more likely than women to report not being involved in childcare at all.

Conversely, a much larger share of men (62.6 per cent) than women (25.8 per cent) report being the main person in the household to interact with public authorities when problems arise. Furthermore, men also are more than twice as likely (2.1 times) to be solely responsible for paying household bills such as electricity, water, waste, etc. and more than 2.5 times as likely to take care of household official business such as when applying for building permits or similar household needs.

---

Further in-depth research is needed to improve understanding of the factors that determine the contact rate of men and women with different public institutions and what is needed to ensure that the two sexes have equal access to all the public services provided in Ghana.

**Differences in the experiences of men and women with bribery in the public sector**

Overall, women in Ghana tend to have a slightly lower contact rate with public officials than men, but this does not necessarily mean that they are exposed to bribery less than men. As mentioned previously, the prevalence of bribery is defined as the share of male/female adults who had contact with a public official in the previous 12 months and paid a bribe to a public official or were asked to pay a bribe but refused to do so. To understand the gender differences in exposure to bribery, it is therefore important to establish how many women and men interacted with public officials and then consider how many of those women and men actually paid a bribe or were asked to pay a bribe but refused to do so during the interaction.

**Figure 45**

**Prevalence of bribery, by sex, 2021**

Note: The prevalence of bribery refers to the proportion of the adult male/female population who paid at least one bribe to a public official, or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official but did not do so, in the 12 months prior to the survey, relative to all male/female adults who had at least one contact with a public official in the same period. The difference in the prevalence of bribery between men and women is statistically significant (p < 0.01).
According to the survey data, men in Ghana are 1.6 times more likely than women to pay or be asked to pay a bribe. In the 12 months prior to the survey, 34.1 per cent of all men who had contact with a public official either paid a bribe or were asked to do so but refused. The figure for women was significantly lower, at 20.7 per cent. The difference in the prevalence of bribery between men and women remains significant across age groups, education levels and employment status.\textsuperscript{18}

The survey data showed that men are substantially more likely than women to experience bribery in Ghana. The significantly higher prevalence of bribery among men begs the question: Do the two sexes have contrasting views about how acceptable it is to pay bribes.

The survey shows that there are no discernible differences between men and women when it comes to their opinions about the acceptability of bribery: a roughly equal proportion of men and women (around 80 per cent) think that it is never acceptable for public officials to request a bribe in order to speed up administrative procedures. Considering the large difference in their actual experiences of bribery, this finding is noteworthy.

\textbf{Figure 46}

\textbf{Percentage distribution of men and women according to the acceptability of bribery for speeding up administrative procedures, 2021}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Men: 6.2\% 6.2\% 7.3\% 80.3\% 0.1\%
  \item Women: 4.9\% 5.7\% 8.4\% 80.5\% 0.5\%
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{18} In a multiple regression, gender remains a significant predictor of bribery (p < 0.01) when controlling for respondent age, education and employment status.
Men and women in Ghana appear to have very similar views about how frequently bribery occurs in everyday interactions with public officials. For example, roughly half of both men and women believe that public officials request money or gifts in return for services that should be provided for free very frequently. The similarity in the opinions of men and women about the prevalence of bribery, despite their different experiences, shows how perceptions and opinions are heavily influenced by factors beyond personal experiences, such as the experiences of partners, extended family members, friends and colleagues, as well as exposure to commentaries about corruption in the media.

Moreover, it is noteworthy that the differences in the bribe-paying experiences of men and women apply to the country as a whole. A regional disaggregation of the data suggests that men are more likely than women to be exposed to bribery irrespective of the region of Ghana in which they live. In the 11 regions with sufficient sex-disaggregated data on bribery experiences, the prevalence of bribery among men is significantly higher than among women, with a particularly large difference, of more than 20 percentage points between men and women, recorded in the Western region.

---

19 In Bono East, Oti, Savannah, North East and Upper West, the limited number of female respondents who reported paying or being asked to pay a bribe does not allow for a reliable estimation of sex disaggregated prevalence rates.
Differences between men and women in the prevalence of bribery do not appear to vary based on the degree of urbanization of the area in which they live. In this respect, the survey data on bribery experiences shows that the difference between men and women was of similar size in urban and rural areas: in both settings, men are around 1.6–1.7 times more likely than women to experience bribery.
To improve understanding of what could possibly explain the overall difference in the bribe-paying experience of men and women, it is necessary to look at the different types of public official to whom men and women actually pay bribes. The survey data suggest that one of the largest differences is in the payment of bribes to police officers, to whom men are approximately 1.4 times more likely than women to pay a bribe. As large differences in bribe-paying were also revealed in relation to public utility officers, the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Authority and GRA customs officers, to whom men were respectively 1.5, 1.4 and 1.3 times more likely than women to pay a bribe. By contrast, in the case of several other frequently encountered types of public official, such as teachers and health care professionals, the difference in the bribe-paying experience of men and women is practically non-existent. This suggests that the overall difference in the bribe-paying experience of men and women is largely determined by interactions with just a few types of public official, in particular police officers, authorities dealing with vehicle licensing, land commission and customs officers.

---

**Figure 50**

Prevalence of bribery, by sex of bribe-payer and by type of public official to whom a bribe was paid, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Official</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police officers</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA* customs officers</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Immigration Service officers</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands Commission</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver and Vehicle Licensing Authority</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passport Agency officials</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors, judges or magistratates</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Road Safety Authority</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA* tax or revenue officers</td>
<td>134%</td>
<td>120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDAs** officials</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public utility officials</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, lecturers or professors</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors, nurse and midwives</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security officials</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected local government representatives</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health workers in the public hospitals</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MMDAs – Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies; ** GRA – Ghana Revenue Authority

Note: Other types of public official are omitted because the limited number of respondents who reported paying a bribe when interacting with those officials does not allow for reliable estimation of sex disaggregated prevalence rates.

---

20 The term “bribe-paying” is used here and subsequently for brevity and should be understood to also include instances when people were asked to pay a bribe and refused.

Are women less likely to pay bribes than men? Evidence from 18 countries

Figure 51
Prevalence of bribery, by sex of bribe-payer, countries/territories with available data since 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo*</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo*</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* References to Kosovo shall be understood to be in the context of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999).
Source: Based on national sex-disaggregated survey data from 18 countries/territories collected via the United Nations Crime Trends Survey and other national sources.
With improved availability of survey data on individuals’ experiences (rather than perceptions) of bribery, cross-national studies have shown that, on average, men are more often the target of bribery requests than women when in contact with public officials.\(^22\) This general pattern is confirmed by data on the prevalence of bribery by sex collected by UNODC from 18 countries in various world regions. While overall bribery prevalence (for both sexes) varies widely within the sample of 18 countries (from less than 1 per cent in Luxembourg to more than 45 per cent in Afghanistan), women are generally less likely than men (by 4 percentage points on average) to engage in bribery when in contact with a public official.\(^23\) There are, however, important differences between countries in the sample. In Mexico and Nigeria, for example, the prevalence of bribery is more than 10 percentage points lower among women than among men, while in Albania the opposite pattern can be observed: 21 per cent of women who had contact with a public official report having paid a bribe, compared with 17 per cent of men. With a male bribery prevalence of 33 per cent and a female bribery prevalence of 20 per cent, the estimates from Ghana are most comparable to those found in Nigeria. Further research is necessary to understand the socioeconomic and cultural factors that shape gender-specific bribery practices in different countries.

Differences between men and women in their experiences with bribery in the private sector

Mirroring the findings in the public sector, the survey data revealed that women in Ghana are, on average, less likely than men to interact with private sector employees. In the 12 months prior to the survey, the male contact rate with private sector employees was 2.6 percentage points higher than that of women.\(^24\) This pattern pertains to most types of private sector employees (including bank employees, insurance officials, security guards, and other business employees). However, as in the public sector, women were more likely than men to interact with private sector employees in the education and health sectors.


\(^{23}\) This refers to the unweighted average difference in bribery prevalence between men and women across the sample of 18 countries.

\(^{24}\) The difference between men and women in the contact rate for private sector officials is statistically significant (\(p < 0.05\)).
In line with the survey findings in the public sector, the data on bribe-paying experiences in the private sector reveal that men are more likely to be exposed to bribery than women. Men are roughly 1.2 times more likely than women to pay a bribe or be asked to pay a bribe in the private sector. In the 12 months prior to the survey, 10.2 per cent of all men who had contact with any private sector employee paid a bribe, while the figure for women was 8.2 per cent.

Where data availability allowed for sex-disaggregated prevalence estimates by different types of private sector employee, the data revealed important differences in the bribery experiences of men and women. In sectors where women are more likely than men to interact with employees, the prevalence of bribery was quite similar between the two sexes. By contrast, in the banking sector, where men are significantly more likely to interact with employees than women, the prevalence of bribery is significantly higher (roughly double) among men (4.7 per cent) than among women (2.5 per cent). This may suggest that the difference between men and women in the prevalence of bribery in the private sector is driven to a large extent by big differences in their bribery experiences in sectors in which men interact with employees more often than women.
Differences between male and female public officials when engaging in bribery

Every bribery transaction requires at least an offer or a request. There is no requirement for the offer to be accepted or for the request to be met for the act of bribery to occur. In other words, there are bribe-payers who pay or are asked to pay bribes and there are public officials who receive or solicit bribes. Each of these acts constitutes the criminal offence of bribery. The present chapter has thus far focused on the differences between male and female bribe-payers in their experience of bribery, but the following section focuses on the differences between male and female public officials when receiving or requesting bribes.
In the early 2000s, academic and policy research emerged that highlights the importance of adopting a gender perspective in the analysis of corruption and in anti-corruption policymaking. This research triggered the question about whether women might play a decisive role in reducing corruption, with early empirical work showing that women are less involved than men in bribery and are less likely to condone bribe-taking. Although these findings have since been challenged and the initial evidence considered suggestive at best, the debate on whether policies that promote gender equality in positions of power can effectively reduce corrupt behaviour has gained momentum in recent years. Researchers have found supporting evidence that a more gender-balanced workplace is a less corrupt one. However, women tend to hold fewer decision-making positions, which limits their opportunities to benefit from corruption regardless of the gender-balance in the workplace. More research and better disaggregated data are needed to improve the understanding of the gender dimensions of corruption. The present survey aims to contribute to filling that gap by presenting data on the experience of the adult population in Ghana when in contact with male and female public officials and their behaviour with respect to bribery.

According to the Ghana 2021 Population and Housing Census, 41.1 per cent of all public sector (government) employees are women. This represents a small but noteworthy increase since 2010 when the Population and Housing Census recorded that the share of women employed in the public sector was 36.6 per cent. The gender imbalance in public sector employment is also reflected in the contact rate between the public and male and female public officials: according to the survey data, 80 per cent of people had at least one contact with a male public official in the 12 months prior to the survey, whereas 72 per cent had at least one contact with a female public official in that period. Based on these contact rates, the survey data indicate that the share of male public officials who solicit or receive unsolicited bribes when interacting with the public is twice that of female public officials who do so. An estimated 25.2 per cent of all male public officials who had contact with citizens in the 12 months prior to the survey engaged in bribery (i.e. were either paid a bribe or requested a bribe but were refused), while a much smaller share of female public officials (13.1 per cent) requested or received a bribe.

---

26 UNODC: The Time is Now: Addressing the Gender Dimensions of Corruption (Vienna, 2020).
27 Ibid.
Public perceptions versus reality: who are the corruptible public officials?

Since the survey data show that the share of male public officials who engage in bribery is twice that of female public officials in Ghana, it is both interesting and relevant to analyse whether public perceptions of bribery align with the reality of bribe-paying in the country.

The survey collected information about people’s opinions about whether male or female public officials are more likely to request a bribe, with 60 per cent of survey respondents indicating that male officials are more likely to do so and only 4.8 per cent indicating that female officials are more likely to do so. Although the majority of people think that male public officials are more corrupt than their female colleagues, however, a substantial share (33.2 per cent) think that male and female public officials are equally corrupt.
There are also interesting differences of opinions between men and women on whether male or female public officials are the more likely to request a bribe. Although the majority of both men and women think that male public officials are more likely than their female counterparts to request a bribe, a larger share of men think that female public officials are more corrupt than male public officials. By contrast, the opinion that public officials of both sexes are equally prone to soliciting bribes is more prevalent among women than men.
To understand people’s opinions about the corruptibility of male and female public officials in Ghana, it is necessary to examine the reasons why they think men or women are the more susceptible to bribery. Among those survey respondents who think that female public officials are more corruptible than their male colleagues, two main justifications are: i) women are more protected than men if reported for bribery, which was the opinion of 53.3 per cent of individuals who believe that female public officials are more corruptible; and ii) women earn less than men (46.9 per cent). By contrast, among the survey respondents who think that male public officials are more corruptible than their female colleagues, the two main justifications are: i) men have to provide for their family to a greater extent than women, which was the opinion of 75.4 per cent of individuals who believe that male public officials are the more corruptible; and ii) men are less afraid to solicit bribes (67.9 per cent).

Although the share of female employees in the public sector (government only) is 41.1 per cent, this share varies substantially across the different institutions in the country. In the case of the educational and health sectors specifically, the share of female employees is larger, at 43.9 per cent and 59.9 per cent, respectively. In the case of the police, the share is substantially lower, with only 29.0 per cent of police officers being female.

Although a disproportionate share of male public officials engages in bribery, there are substantial variations in corrupt behaviour across different types of public official in Ghana. When looking at the sex-disaggregated prevalence of public officials engaging in bribery, this becomes evident among four types of public official: health care providers, teachers, public utility officials and police officers. The survey data suggest that one out of two male police officers engage in bribery when interacting with the public, while only one out of four female police officers behave similarly. This would suggest that male police officers are roughly twice as likely to engage in bribery as their female colleagues. Among public utility officials, engaging in bribery is also significantly more likely among men (10.1 per cent) than among women (2.8 per cent), but the overall prevalence of bribe-taking in the public utility sector is much lower than among the police. By contrast, the survey data show no noteworthy gender differences in bribery behaviour among health care providers and teachers.

31 Among those survey respondents who believe that female public officials are more likely than their male colleagues to ask for a bribe, there are no clear gender differences in terms of the main justifications put forward for this belief.
32 Among those respondents who believe that male public officials are more likely than their female colleagues to solicit a bribe, there are no clear differences between men and women in terms of the main justifications put forward for this belief.
Overall, it therefore appears that in sectors with a larger share of female employees such as education (43.9 per cent of the total) and health (59.9 per cent), male officials are less likely to engage in bribery than in those sectors where men are over-represented, such as the police force (29.0 per cent). This could be related to sector-specific characteristics, such as salary levels, social status or average educational attainment, but it could also be related to the attitude of female officials to bribery having an indirect (and positive) impact on male colleagues. Further, sector-specific research is needed to improve the understanding of how a more gender-balanced workplace in the public institutions of Ghana could both promote gender equality and contribute to the fight against corruption.

**Figure 57**

Prevalence of bribery, by sex of public official, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The prevalence of bribery by sex of public official is calculated by dividing the total number of adults who paid or were asked to pay a bribe to a [male or female] public official by the total number of adults in contact with a [male or female] public official in the 12 months prior to the survey.

An interesting gender dimension to analyse is related to the sex of public officials engaging in bribery and the sex of people who interact with those public officials. The survey indicates that more than 60 per cent of all bribes taken or solicited by male public officials in Ghana are from men, while less than 40 per cent are from women. By contrast, female public officials appear to be as likely to take or solicit bribes from women as they are to take or solicit bribes from men.

---

34 Ibid.
Money and gifts are not the only currency of corruption

The request for sexual favours when interacting with public officials without recourse to physical forms of coercion (also referred to as “sextortion” or “body currency”) is a type of abuse of authority that occurs in countries of all income levels. Acts of a sexual nature being the currency of corruption tends to occur in situations where power disparities between those who pay and those who solicit bribes are large, and the bribe-payer has no other means of payment. Evidence suggests that women are disproportionately affected, but due to the highly sensitive nature of this phenomenon, collecting reliable and nationally representative data is challenging (see box below). A further challenge is that victims may not necessarily view demands for sexual favours as acts of corruption, adding an additional layer of under-reporting.

---

35 The word “sextortion” has definitional ambiguities and is used differently in different jurisdictions, for example, to refer to webcam blackmail (United Kingdom) or the threat of exposing private or sensitive information (Pennsylvania, United States). For more details, see UNODC, The Time is Now: Addressing the Gender Dimensions of Corruption (Vienna, 2020), p.44.


38 UNODC, Gender and Corruption in Nigeria (Vienna, 2020).

Requests for sexual favours: a sensitive topic among men and women in Ghana

To explore how sensitive the topic of requests for sexual favours is among the Ghanaian population, the survey asked men and women how comfortable they would feel about sharing different types of corruption experiences (including bribery involving sexual favours) with their family, friends and colleagues. Overall, the survey data indicated that both men and women feel relatively comfortable talking about their bribery experiences, especially with other family members, whether the experiences are related to accessing medical services, securing a new job or avoiding paying a fine to the police. However, an important exception was when people were asked who they would tell if they had to provide a sexual favour to a public or private sector official in exchange for a public service.

The share of both men and women who would feel comfortable talking about their bribery experience involving sexual favours with family members, friends or colleagues is significantly smaller than for other bribery experiences. Around 50 per cent of both men and women indicated that they would not feel comfortable telling anybody at all about experiencing requests for sexual favours by public or private sector employees. The data reveal no marked differences between men and women in terms of how comfortable they would feel talking about experiences of bribery, including bribery involving sexual favours. This suggests that the request of sexual favours is deemed a sensitive topic by an equal (and large) share of both men and women.
Bearing in mind the caveats about measuring bribery involving sexual favours, the survey data suggest that women are significantly more at risk than men of being asked for sexual favours when interacting with public officials or some types of private sector employee. While 3.4 per cent of all women reported having been asked for sexual favours when interacting with public officials in the three years prior to the survey, only 1.6 per cent of men reported experiencing such behaviour.\(^{40}\) When considering this type of experience in the past 12 months, rather than the past three years, the figure decreases to 2.6 per cent for women and 1.1 per cent for men.\(^{41}\)

---

\(^{40}\) The difference between men and women is statistically significant (\(p < 0.01\)).

\(^{41}\) The difference between men and women is statistically significant (\(p < 0.01\)).
As with other types of bribery, there appears to be a disconnect between actual experiences of sexual forms of corruption, in which women are significantly more likely to be targeted than men, and opinions about the prevalence of such behaviour, which are very similar for both men and women (roughly three out of four people). This may be because opinions about the prevalence of bribery involving sexual favours are not necessarily based purely on personal experiences, but can be influenced by the experiences of partners, extended family members, friends and colleagues, as well as media narratives. Nevertheless, while women are significantly more likely than men to be personally exposed to sexual corruption, they appear to have very similar views to men on the frequency with which it occurs and to what extent it is acceptable.
Around 76 per cent of both men and women think that public officials often make such requests and roughly 85 per cent think that providing sexual favours is unacceptable. A surprising finding in the data is that the provision of sexual favours in exchange for services is deemed acceptable by around 14 per cent of both men and women.

**Figure 62**
Percentage distribution of men and women who think that providing sexual favours for public services is acceptable, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always acceptable</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually acceptable</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes acceptable</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never acceptable</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The specific question was: “What is your opinion about the following behaviour? Is it Always acceptable, Usually acceptable, Sometimes acceptable or Never acceptable for a citizen to provide sexual favours for services that otherwise would have not been made available to them?”
Eban

The fence represents the protection of the family from external and harmful factors.
Other Forms of Corruption
Corruption in the public sector recruitment process

A form of corruption affecting the public sector is the use of dishonest means and methods that facilitates the bypassing of established recruitment processes. Certain candidates for public sector positions may be given preferential treatment on the basis of their personal, family or social connections rather their skills and experience, or because of the payment of bribes. Such practices may have a detrimental effect not only on the efficiency, productivity and management of public resources and service delivery, but also on the fight against corruption itself. Rather than an impartial and merit-based recruitment process, corruption in recruitment processes can lead to the hiring of candidates who are willing to pay bribes or resort to other forms of corruption. This, in turn, may create a vicious circle that is difficult to break and where corrupt behaviour can be seen as the “normal way of doing business” when it could actually be a criminal offence. This section presents evidence on the experience of corruption in public sector recruitment practices in Ghana.

What is nepotism

UNCAC does not include the term “nepotism” but instead states that the abuse of functions and trading in influence should be criminalized. This type of behaviour refers to situations when an official uses their public employment for personal gain, or for the gain of somebody else. The use of the term “nepotism” here is therefore not limited to family members, but also includes other relatives and friends.

---

42 In line with UNCAC paragraph 1 (a) of article 7 “Each State Party shall […] maintain and strengthen systems for the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion and retirement of civil servants and, where appropriate, other non-elected public officials:

(a) That are based on principles of efficiency, transparency and objective criteria such as merit, equity and aptitude.”
Job opportunities in the public sector can be attractive to some job seekers, not only for the nature of the work itself but also for the advantages typical of employment in the public administration, such as job security, social status, fair remuneration and other possible benefits and entitlements. In Ghana, approximately 1 out of 10 employed people work in the public sector, of whom 58.9 per cent are male and 41.1 are female.43

According to the results of the survey, some 12.7 per cent of people had either direct or indirect experience of applying for a public sector position in the period 2019 to 2021 (meaning that the respondent applied for a position either personally or that a member of his/her family did), of whom 25.2 per cent actually secured a job.

The Public Services Commission supervises and regulates human resource management matters within public service agencies in Ghana based on exemplary recruitment, hiring and training programmes for employers. Developed by the Public Services Commission, The Human Resource Management Policy Framework and Manual for the Ghana Public Services is the guiding document that provides a holistic approach to human resources management within the public institutions of the country. By applying the principles outlined in the Manual, the public sector is expected to “attract, recruit and retain talented and qualified individuals” based on a recruitment process that is “open, transparent and based on the principle of merit”. To achieve this, the Manual suggests that some or all of the following steps should be followed during recruitment:

43 The present survey indicates that about 8 per cent of the employed population aged 18 and older work in the public sector. The Ghana Statistical Service’s Ghana 2021 Population and Housing Census – General Report Volume 3E (2021) indicates that the public sector engages about 10 per cent of the employed population aged 15 years and older. The majority of the employed population in Ghana are self-employed without employees (60 per cent) and self-employed with employees (6.7 per cent). Overall, 50.3 per cent of the population aged 15 years and older are employed, 7.3 per cent are unemployed and 41.9 per cent are outside the labour force.

- advertisement of the position (internal and external);
- receipt of applications;
- short-listing of applicants;
- employment test including, where necessary, psychometric test, knowledge test, performance test, graphic response test, attitude and honesty test;
- selection interview;
- hiring decision by the appointing authority;
- reference and background checks;
- medical examination;
- offer of appointment by which the successful candidate is given a letter of appointment;
- setting out in clear terms the conditions of employment;
- acceptance or otherwise of offer of appointment by candidate within the specified time; and
- contacting unsuccessful candidate as a matter of courtesy.

The Commission is responsible for the recruitment of civil servants at the director level and above, with appointments by the President made in consultation with the Council of State. Civil servant positions in lower categories are advertised and recruited in a decentralized manner by each public institution, with support from the Commission.

Figure 63
Percentage distribution of public views about how frequent public officials influence the hiring of friends or relatives in the public sector, 2021

Note: The figures do not add up to 100 per cent because the category “don’t know” is excluded.
When asked how common it is for public officials to influence the hiring of friends or relatives in the public sector, 89.3 per cent of the adult population believed this happens either very or fairly frequently. Despite the widespread negative perception of a non-meritocratic public sector job market, 70.4 per cent of people believe that such practices are never acceptable, suggesting that there is a large discrepancy between how people perceive the public sector recruitment process to work and how they think it should work.

**Figure 64**
Percentage distribution of public views about how acceptable it is for public officials to be recruited on the basis of family ties and friendship networks, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The figures do not add up to 100 per cent because the category “don’t know” is excluded.

**Bribery and nepotism in the public sector recruitment process**

The survey collected information on the experience of successful applicants for public sector positions in relation to two types of corruption: bribery and nepotism. The data reveal that 41.4 per cent of successful applicants for public sector positions used either nepotism (25.8 per cent), bribery (7.8 per cent) or both (7.8 per cent) to secure their job. This is in stark contrast to their perception of the process, with 81.7 per cent believing that their good educational background, professional expertise or other qualifications related to the position were the reasons for their recruitment. Men (86.7 per cent) were more confident that they were recruited because of their professional experience and qualifications than women (77.2 per cent).
Furthermore, the findings of the survey suggest that a considerable share of successful applicants for positions in the public sector had not undergone a fair and transparent recruitment process, highlighting a process vulnerable to corrupt practices. Although public sector employees should undergo a selection process based on their educational and professional expertise, it was found that 29.0 per cent of successful applicants neither underwent a written test nor an oral interview before being hired. More importantly, those who had relied on nepotism, bribery or both to obtain their job were more likely to report not having undergone any form of assessment (40.4 per cent) than those who had not (21.0 per cent).

It is also important to examine the perceptions of those who were not hired after applying for a public sector position (74.8 per cent of public sector job applicants). A widespread belief that corruption, bribery and/or nepotism are the main reasons for applications being successful may either encourage people to resort to such practices when applying in future or discourage them from applying to the public sector altogether. The data show that, of those who applied but were not selected, 14.5 per cent blamed nepotism (i.e. somebody else was hired because they had the right connections), 9.2 per cent blamed political affiliation (i.e. somebody else got the job because they belonged to the same political party as the employer) and an additional 29.5 per cent believed a bribe had been paid by the applicant who was selected.

---

Corruption in the private sector recruitment process

Bribery and nepotism can also occur in the private sector recruitment processes. In Ghana, roughly one out of eight employed people work in the private sector (formal), of whom 63.9 per cent are male and 36.1 are female.\(^\text{46}\) The survey also collected information about the experience of the population when applying for jobs in the private sector. The results indicate that 8.6 per cent of the adult population had either direct or indirect experience of applying for a private sector position in the period 2019 to 2021 (meaning that the respondent applied for a position either personally or that a member of his/her family did). Of those who applied for a private sector job, 55.5 per cent indicated being selected for the position, compared with only 25.2 per cent of public sector job applicants.

---

\(^{46}\) The present survey indicates that about 9 per cent of the employed population aged 18 and older works in the private sector. The Ghana Statistical Service’s Ghana 2021 Population and Housing Census – General Report Volume 3E (2021) indicates that the private (formal) sector engages about 12.6 per cent of the employed population aged 15 years and older.
As in the case of public sector recruitment, the survey also examined successful private sector applicants’ experience of two types of corrupt practices: bribery and nepotism. Looking at nepotism and bribery together, 38.4 per cent of successful applicants for private sector jobs indicated using either nepotism, bribery or both to improve their chances of being hired. This share is very similar in magnitude to the one found in the public sector where 41.1 per cent of successful applicants resorted to nepotism and/or bribery. A closer look reveals, however, an important difference between the two sectors: although only 6.7 per cent of successful candidates paid a bribe to secure a job in the private sector, the share was 15.6 per cent in the public sector recruitment, or 2.3 times larger.
Although corrupt practices, both in the form of bribery and/or nepotism, are almost equally prevalent in the public and private sectors of Ghana, people have more positive views about the fairness of the private sector recruitment process. While 89.3 per cent of all adults in the country think that public officials favour the hiring of their friends or relatives, only 64.6 per cent think the same is true of the private sector.

![Figure 69](Figure69.png)

**Figure 69**

*Percentage distribution of public perceptions of the frequency of nepotism in the public and private sectors, 2021*

| Public sector | 57.3% | 32.0% | 7.9% | 1.8%
|---------------|-------|-------|------|------
| Private sector| 26.1% | 38.5% | 26.2%| 7.9%

Note: The figure does not include the “don’t know” category.

Of those who applied for a private sector job, when asked why they were not selected, 20.2 per cent blamed nepotism (i.e. somebody else was hired because they had the right connections) and 16.4 per cent believed a bribe had been paid by the person who was hired.

![Figure 70](Figure70.png)

**Figure 70**

*Percentage distribution of perceived reasons for not being selected for private sector job, 2021*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone else was a better fit</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else relied on nepotism</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else paid a bribe</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination against me</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else had the right political affiliation</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corruption and access to public services

Obtaining legal documents such as driving licences, passports, land titles, birth or death certificates, and accessing vital public services such as medical services are other areas where nepotism, in addition to bribery, can have a significant negative impact on the life of ordinary people. Moreover, socioeconomic factors weigh in as financially and socially disadvantaged people with no relatives or friends to help them may have greater difficulty than others in accessing essential public services.

To assess whether nepotistic practices exist in addition to bribery, the survey collected data on people’s experiences when accessing selected public services and obtaining important legal documents from public institutions in the three years prior to the survey. The findings show that in the period from 2019 to 2021, 26.1 per cent of people requested some of these public services or legal documents at least once and the majority of them were successful in obtaining them (86.5 per cent). The most commonly requested services and/or official legal documents were related to access to medical services, followed by birth/death certificates, school admission, the Ghana card and passports.

**Figure 71**
Percentage distribution of selected types of official documents or public services applied for, 2019–2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to medical services</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission to school</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth/death certificate</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana card</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passport</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver’s licence</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building permit</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business licence</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land title</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are various ways in which people can illicitly facilitate and speed up a procedure for obtaining official documents or public services, such as paying a bribe or enlisting the help of a friend or a relative working in a public institution, or both. The survey data indicate that almost one quarter of people (22.9 per cent) admitted that they had resorted to bribery, nepotism or both in order to get the service or document they needed. There is a noticeable difference in the behaviour of men and women, with men being 1.4 times more likely to rely on bribery and nepotism to obtain documents or access public services. Applications for driving licences, passports, business licences and building permits are the most likely to require either nepotism or a bribe, with more than 4 out of 10 people indicating using either nepotism or a bribe to obtain these documents or public services.
Vote-buying

In democracies, the electoral processes are supposed to be open, transparent and fair. Yet in many countries around the world that may not always be the case as, given the potential benefits of holding public office, some politicians are prepared to resort to illegal means, such as vote-buying,47 to attain or retain political power.

According to the survey, 10.3 per cent of the adult population of Ghana reported that they were personally offered money or a favour in exchange for their vote during the 2020 general election. Specifically, 5.3 per cent were offered money and 5.1 per cent were offered other goods or favours. A further 4.2 per cent reported that although they were not personally offered anything, a member of their household was offered money or goods in exchange for their vote. The following analysis only focuses on those individuals who were personally offered money or a favour for their vote.

What is vote-buying?

An illegal act involving the payment of money or the promise of benefits by a candidate to voters who, in exchange, promise to vote for him or her. This is a form of bribery, but here offered by the electoral candidate or their entourage instead of a public official.

Source: unterm.un.org

47 The results in this section refer to “intended” vote-buying as the survey did not collect information on whether or not citizens accepted a bribe.
The existence of vote-buying may explain why there is a widespread perception among the population (71.6 per cent) that elected representatives either very or fairly frequently engage in forms of electoral manipulation. It should be noted that electoral manipulation includes vote-buying but is not limited to it, as the practice can also include other forms of manipulation such as ballot-stuffing, voter list manipulation, etc.

The prevalence of vote-buying differs in rural and urban areas of Ghana, with the practice being reported more often in rural areas. In urban areas, 4.3 per cent of people were offered money for their vote and 3.6 per cent were offered other favours, while in rural areas, the figure was 6.6 and 7.1 per cent, respectively. The difference in the prevalence of vote-buying across the 16 regions of Ghana was far more substantial. In the Oti and Upper West regions, for example, over 20 per cent of people indicated having been offered either money or a favour in exchange for their vote, whereas in the Eastern region, the figure was 6.6 per cent. In fact, with the exception of the Central region, there seems to be a north-south divide in terms of vote-buying in the country. In the southern regions of Ghana, 10 per cent or fewer people reported vote-buying, while more than 10 per cent of people in the northern regions of the country reported having personally experienced vote-buying.
The socioeconomic characteristics of people who were offered a bribe in exchange for their vote can provide further insights into specific vulnerabilities to vote-buying. Men, for example, were more likely than women to indicate personal experience of being offered money or a favour in exchange for their vote.

Educational attainment also seems related to the experience of vote-buying, with those having completed some form of tertiary education being the least likely to indicate being offered money or a favour in exchange for their vote, while people with only primary education being the most likely to do so. Last but not least, age appears to play a minor role in vote-buying, with 25–34 year olds the age group most likely to indicate having experienced vote-buying and those aged 65 and older the least likely to do so.
Figure 76
Share of adults who were offered money or a favour in exchange for their vote during the 2020 General election in Ghana, by sex, by educational attainment and age group

Note: Share of adults that were personally offered money or a favour in exchange for a vote.
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Methodology
PART 1 – Ghana Integrity of Public Services Survey

Introduction – background

The data presented in this report were collected in the 2021 Ghana Integrity of Public Services Survey (GIPSS) a project funded by the German Federal Ministry of Cooperation and implemented by UNODC and the Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAJ) in collaboration with Ghana Statistical Service (GSS).

The 2021 Ghana Integrity of Public Services Survey was designed as a large-scale household survey, representative at the level of administrative regions in Ghana, with the aim of collecting baseline information on

- direct experiences of corruption events, as victims, by citizens
- experience of reporting corruption to public authorities
- opinions and perceptions of citizens concerning recent trends, patterns and state responses to corruption
- opinions and perceptions about bribery and corruption related to the COVID-19 pandemic
- special module on the gender dimension of corruption including sextortion or “body-currency”
- other forms of corruption such as nepotism and vote-buying

The survey also collected information on the accessibility of civil justice institutions and the experience of people with civil disputes, as well as the feeling of safety and security by the population. Evidence derived from the survey is used to calculate benchmark indicators that can be used to inform relevant policies and track future progress, while ensuring international comparability with surveys of a similar nature carried out in other countries. The data collected allows for monitoring three Sustainable Development Indicators under Goal 16 on Peace, Justice and Inclusive Institutions:

- 16.5.1: Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months
- 16.1.4: Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live after dark
- 16.3.3: Proportion of the population who have experienced a dispute in the past two years and who accessed a formal or informal dispute resolution mechanism, by type of mechanism

1 Metadata for all Goal 16 Indicators can be accessed here: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata.
Survey instrument

Following previous international experiences, the survey instrument\(^2\) is structured into several parts that cover the various information requirements identified:

1. Socioeconomic information about the respondent
2. Attitudes, opinions and perceptions about corruption
3. Experiences with accessing public sector services and experiences of bribery
4. Reporting of bribery
5. Experiences with accessing private sector services and experiences of bribery
6. Nepotism and favouritism in public sector recruitment, promotion, and access to public services
7. Vote-buying
8. Awareness and opinions on specific anti-corruption agencies
9. Perception of safety and security
10. Access to justice

Novel in this GIPSS 2021 Survey is the inclusion of a gender component, which aims to capture the differences between men and women when paying and receiving bribes, as well as the differences in opinion and perceptions about corruption and bribery. Part of this novel module also includes questions aimed at capturing the experiences of the population related to “body currency”.

In building the survey instrument for the 2021 survey, time and effort were invested in adapting a standard survey methodology\(^3\) already tested and refined in other national contexts (such as Afghanistan, Iraq, the western Balkans, Nigeria and many other countries) to the specific Ghanaian context and to ensure national ownership of the survey results. In this process, roundtable discussions were held with the National Steering Committee (NSC)\(^4\) of the survey – consisting of 13 institutions active in anti-corruption work in Ghana, including all the major anti-corruption agencies in Ghana, law enforcement, justice institutions, as well as civil society organizations – for overall guidance on survey implementation. In addition, several working group meetings were held with the National Technical Committee (NTC)\(^5\) for technical guidance in the implementation of the survey, and for consultation and inputs on revisions and additions to the survey instrument.

---


\(^4\) The members if the National Steering Committee (NSC) for the 2021 survey were: Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAl), Ghana Statistical Service (GSS), UNODC, Ministry of Finance, Office of Parliament, National Development Planning Commission, Ghana Integrity Initiative (GII), Centre for Democratic Development (CDD), Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER), German Development Cooperation, Private Enterprise Federation, Ministry of Information and Trade Union Congress.

\(^5\) GSS, CHRAl, UNODC, Labour Department, Political Science Department – University of Ghana, Department of Research and Innovation – University of Cape Coast, Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER) and National Development Planning Commission (NDPC).
In addition to national consultations with stakeholders, extensive desktop research on patterns and modalities of corruption in Ghana were carried out to improve understanding of the patterns, forms and manifestations of corruption in different parts of the country.

**Survey preparation**

After completion of the survey instrument, the questionnaire was programmed by GSS using CSPro software and uploaded into the electronic devices adopted for fieldwork (CAPI – Computer Assisted Personal Interview device). Additional logic and consistency checks were carried out to ensure the correct application of the logical sequence and skip rules during the interviews. UNODC provided external quality assurance in the finalization of the CSPro scripts. Survey experts performed numerous logic and consistency checks, including question-wording, routing, question sequence, and respondent selection. The correct functioning of the programme and the devices was also ensured by the enumerators and the field supervisors.

To ensure high-quality CSPro scripts and smooth functioning of the CAPI devices, a three-day pilot training was conducted for 23 interviewers and supervisors in November 2021. The aim of the pilot was to test the applicability of the survey questionnaire and respondents’ understanding of the questions.

Another critical component of the survey preparation process was the development of an interviewer manual. The manual describes the role and responsibilities of the interviewer, explains the concepts presented in the questionnaire, describes the respondent selection and replacement process, how to handle an interview and how to achieve an open and collaborative conversation with the respondent. An implementation manual for the survey was developed by GSS and reviewed by UNODC. All materials are available for download on the UNODC website.

**Main survey**

**Sample design**

The universe defined for the main survey, is the adult population, living within individual households in Ghana. The survey targeted a total of 15,000 interviews from a nationwide representative sample across the 16 administrative regions with people aged 18 and older. From these, a total of 14,843 (99 per cent) interviews were completed. The sampling methodology adopted was a three-stage stratified cluster sampling. Stratification was achieved by dividing the national frame into the 16 regions and further separating the regions into 234 administrative districts. Ghana has a total of 261 districts but very small districts were merged for sampling purposes which resulted in 234 administrative districts.
Methodology

by a three-stage selection method. The Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) was the Enumeration Areas (EAs) and the second stage was the list of households as recorded in the 2021 population and housing Census Listing exercise. The third stage was the selection of an adult within the selected household.

In the first stage, 1,500 EAs were selected with probability proportional to size (PPS), the size being the population aged 18 years and older in each EA living in residential households. The EA frame was sorted according to geographical code order within each stratum (urban or rural of each region and district) to increase precision and to ensure fair representation.

In the second stage of selection, a fixed number of 10 households was selected in every selected EA, by an equal probability systematic sampling based on the 2021 population and Housing Census household listing. Only one adult member of the selected household was interviewed for the third stage. Where the dwelling of the selected household was a new household therein, the new household was interviewed. Only the pre-selected households were interviewed. No replacements and no changes of the pre-selected households was allowed in order to prevent bias. However, one EAs was replaced due to life security threats by an ongoing ethnic conflict in the EA.

Figure 75
Sample size distribution, by region, 2021
Sampling weights

Sampling weights were computed as follows:

**First stage:**
\[ P_{1hi} = \frac{a_h M_{hi}}{\sum M_{hi}} \]

**Second-stage:**
\[ P_{2hi} = \frac{b}{M_{hi}^*} \]

**Third-stage:**
\[ P_3 = \frac{1}{C} \]

Where:
- \( a_h \) = Number of sample EAs allocated to the \( h \)-th stratum
- \( M_{hi} \) = Number of 2021 Population Census persons aged 18 years or older in the \( i \)-th selected EA in the \( h \)-th stratum or region
- \( \Sigma M_{hi} \) = Total number of persons aged 18 years or older in the \( i \)-th stratum
- \( M_{hi}^* \) = Number of households in the \( i \)-th selected EA in the \( h \)-th stratum
- \( b = 10 \) (number of selected households per EA)
- \( C \) = Number of adult adults in the household eligible for interview

where \( P_{1hi} \) is the probability of selecting the \( i \)-th EA in the \( h \)-th stratum, and \( P_{2hi} \) is the probability of selecting a household in the \( i \)-th EA of the \( h \)-th stratum. The overall probability of selection of a household in the \( i \)-th selected EA of the \( h \)-th stratum is given by:

\[
F_{hi} = P_{1hi} \times P_{2hi} \times P_3
= \frac{a_h b}{\sum M_{hi}} \times \frac{M_{hi}^*}{M_{hi}^*} \times \frac{1}{C}
\]

The weighting factor, \( W_{hi} \), for the \( i \)-th selected EA in the \( h \)-th stratum, is the inverse of the overall probability of selecting that EA. The number of households successfully interviewed in each EA was used in the computation.

That is:
\[
W_{hi} = \frac{1}{F_{hi}} = \frac{\sum M_{hi}^*}{a_h b} \times \frac{M_{hi}^*}{M_{hi}^*} \times C
\]
Methodology

The number of persons successfully interviewed in each EA was used in the computation. Therefore, the final weight for the sample households in the jth EA and the ith sample PSU in stratum h is given by:

\[ W_{hi} = W_{hi} \times \frac{b'}{b''} \]

Where:

- \( b' \) = The number of interviews plus the number of no interviews in the sampled EA
- \( b'' \) = Total number of interviewed sample persons selected in jth samples PSU within ith sample stratum h.

**Quality control – GSS**

Field supervisors were assigned to every team to provide leadership on the field and also to ensure data are edited on the field editing before the data was synched to GSS HQ office. National monitors were also deployed to check whether the teams were actually working in the selected clusters, to observe how the interviews were conducted and provide further training using the output from the quality control logs provided by both GSS and UNODC. A dashboard was also created to provide a real-time review of the output of each interviewer.

**Quality control – UNODC**

Considering the large scope of the study and the nature of extended and sensitive fieldwork, in addition to the systematic quality assurance carried out by GSS supervisors described above, an external quality assurance monitoring of the entire survey operations was conducted by UNODC.

GSS provided UNODC real-time access to the data collected in the field. To monitor the quality of the data collected, UNODC developed a set of objective indicators, which were updated and shared with GSS and CHRAJ daily. Some of these indicators included:

- number of interviews completed by each interviewer per day
- start and end time of interviews
- duration of interviews
- sequence (with time gap in between) and overlap of interviews
- item non-response rate
- number of unfinished interviews
- GPS location of interviews
Potential data quality issues were flagged to GSS and CHRAJ on a daily basis and addressed accordingly. Overall, there were no major issues that compromised the data gathering process, and the data collected were of high quality.

**Quality control – CHRAJ**

In addition to the field monitoring done by GSS Monitoring Team, CHRAJ conducted random monitoring of the work of the interviewers and their supervisors in four regions, namely, the Western, Central, Ashanti and Upper East Regions.

Among others, the CHRAJ Monitoring Team had as its objectives, to:

- Validate the work of the Interviewers as to whether it met the objectives and the standards for the Survey;
- Confirm the authenticity of the data collected by the Interviewers; and
- Assist the interviewers and supervisors address challenges they encounter on the field.

Apart from interacting with the interviewers and supervisors in the field, the CHRAJ Monitors also interacted with some of the interviewees. In all the Commission was satisfied with the quality of engagement the interviewers had with the interviewees, the quality of the data collected, the quality of the reports submitted from the field, and the professionalism exhibited by the Interviewers and their supervisors.

**Training and field work**

A four-day residential training was organized for 160 participants (interviewers, supervisors and facilitators) in December 2021 in Accra. Power point presentations, mock interviews and role-plays were the mode of teaching adopted for the training. A one-day field practice was also organized to help participants better understand the concepts and how the interviews should be conducted.

In total, 35 field teams were formed and deployed across the 16 regions of Ghana. Each team was made up of a supervisor, three interviewers and a driver.

Field teams were deployed to the field immediately after the training. However, the field work was suspended during the festive season of Christmas and New Year’s Eve due to increased travelling during that period.

As part of the measures instituted to ensure the gathering of quality data, additional four days of refresher training was organized for the field officers immediately after the New Year. This was to help refresh them of the concepts and the methodology for the field work and also discuss the findings from the quality control data collected before the break.
**Methodology**

**Data entry and data cleaning**

As the data from the interviews were captured using the data entry software CSPro in the handheld CAPI devices, the data were automatically uploaded to the central GSS Data Processing Centre in Accra immediately after the interview.

In the first stage of data cleaning, the raw data were processed and cleaned of obvious errors by qualified GSS staff. In the second stage, the data were transformed to Stata and sent to UNODC in Vienna for further analysis and processing. Detailed cleaning of inconsistent data points and obvious outliers resulting from erroneous data entries was performed, and a final data set for analysis was prepared by GSS and UNODC before data were analysed for tabulation and report writing.

**Descriptive statistics**

**Figure 76**

Sex distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,731</td>
<td>8,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 77**

Age distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>1,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>1,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>2,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+ or above</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 78

Distribution of respondents by educational attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal schooling only</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than primary education</td>
<td>1,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior secondary /middle school</td>
<td>4,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior secondary/Secondary school</td>
<td>2,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary/ non-tertiary education</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor/equivalent degree</td>
<td>1,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters/equivalent degree or above</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never attended any school</td>
<td>2,837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 79

Ethnic distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akan</td>
<td>6,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewe</td>
<td>2,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole-Dagbani</td>
<td>2,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga-Dangme</td>
<td>1,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Tribes</td>
<td>1,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurma</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grusi</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guan</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mande</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 2 – Key indicators

In this report, five key indicators are used to understand the extent to which bribery is affecting the lives of the adult population of Ghana:

I. contact rate
II. prevalence of bribery
III. frequency of bribery (or average number of bribes paid)
IV. average and total annual amount paid in bribes
V. probability of male and female public officials to engage in bribery

All formulas described below have been multiplied by the weighting factor (W) illustrated above to align all the findings to actual adult population figures.

I. Contact rate

The contact rate is defined as the share of the adult population who had at least one contact with a public official in the previous 12 months. The overall contact rate in the population is calculated as follows:

\[ I = \frac{C}{A} \]

Where C denotes the total number of adults who had at least one contact with any public official in Ghana in the 12-month period prior to the survey; A is the total adult population of Ghana.

Adult population disaggregated by sex is used in the calculation of the contact rate for men and women separately. The contact rate by sex is thus calculated as follows:

\[ I_s = \frac{C_s}{A_s} \]

Where \( I_s \) denotes the contact rate among adults of sex \( s \) (male or female). \( C_s \) is the total number of adult males/females who had at least one contact with any public official in the 12-month period prior to the survey; \( A_s \) is the total adult male/female population of Ghana.

The contact rate by type of public official is calculated in a similar manner using the following formula:

\[ I_t = \frac{C_t}{A} \]
Where $I_i$ denotes the contact rate with public official of type $i$. $C_i$ is the total number of adults who had at least one contact with a public official $i$ in the 12-month period prior to the survey; $A$ is the total population.

Finally, the contact rate by sex of public official is calculated using the following formula:

$$ I_{i,si} = \frac{C_{i,si}}{A} $$

Where $I_{i,si}$ denotes the contact rate with public official of type $i$ and sex $si$ (male/female). $C_{i,si}$ is the total number of adults who had at least one contact with a public official $i$ of sex $si$ in the 12-month period prior to the survey; $A$ is the total population.

**I. Prevalence of bribery**

The prevalence of bribery represents the share of adults paying a bribe when in contact with a public official. It is formally defined as the share of adults who had contact with a public official in the previous 12 months and paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked to pay a bribe. The prevalence of bribery is indicator 16.5.1 under Sustainable Development Goal target 16.5: “Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms”.

The prevalence of bribery is calculated as follows:

$$ P = \frac{B}{C} $$

with $C$ defined above and $B$ defined as the total number of adults who paid or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official in the 12 months prior to the survey. It is important to stress that $B$ also includes people who were asked to pay a bribe but refused. The prevalence of bribery by sex of bribe-payer is calculated as follows:

$$ P_s = \frac{B_s}{C_s} $$

With $C_s$ as defined above and $B_s$ defined as the total number of adult males/females that paid or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official in the 12 months prior to the survey.

Similar to the contact rate, the prevalence rate by type of public official who receives a bribe is calculated as follows:

$$ P_t = \frac{B_t}{C_t} $$
With $C_s$ as defined above and $B_s$ defined as the total number of adult males/females that paid or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official in the 12 months prior to the survey.

Similar to the contact rate, the prevalence rate by type of public official who receives a bribe is calculated as follows:

$$P_i = \frac{B_i}{C_i}$$

Where $P_i$ denotes the prevalence of bribery among adults in relation to public official of type $i$. $C_i$ is the total number of adults who had at least one contact with a public official $i$ in the 12 months prior to the survey; $B_i$ is the total number of adults who paid or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official of type $i$ in the 12 months prior to the survey.

All public officials included in question DT1 of the survey questionnaires are used in the computation of the contact rate and the prevalence rate. Results are weighted with sample weights to obtain representative estimates.

**Prevalence of male and female public officials engaging in bribery**

On the one hand, the concept of the prevalence of bribery presented above describes the share of men and women in Ghana who pay a bribe when in contact with a public official. On the other hand, the share of male and female public officials engaging in bribery is formally defined as:

$$O_{ls} = \frac{B_{ls}}{C_{ls}}$$

Where $O_{ls}$ denotes the share of public officials $i$ of sex $s$ (male or female) soliciting a bribe. $C_{ls}$ is the total number of adults in contact with public officials $i$ of sex $s$ in the 12 months prior to the survey; $B_{ls}$ is the total number of adults who paid or were asked to pay a bribe to a public official of type $i$ and sex $s$.

**II. Frequency of bribery**

The frequency of bribery ($F$) (also called “average number of bribes paid” in the report), is calculated as the average number of times bribe-payers paid a bribe in the 12 months prior to the survey.
The frequency of bribery is obtained as:

\[
F = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} x_k
\]

and:

\[
x_k = \sum_{j=1}^{J} x_{kj}
\]

Where:

- \( x_k \) = the total number of bribes paid to any public official by the \( k \)-th bribe-payer in the 12 months prior to the survey
- \( k = 1, \ldots, K \) Ghanian adult who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official in the 12 months prior to the survey
- \( j = 1, \ldots, J \) Type of public official receiving the bribe
- with \( N \geq C \geq B \geq K \)

### III. Total annual amount paid as bribes

The estimate of the total annual amount paid in bribes (\( T \)) in Ghana is obtained by multiplying the estimated total number of bribes paid in cash in the 12 months prior to the survey (\( D \)) by the average amount paid in the last cash bribe (\( A \)).

- **Total number of bribes paid in cash (\( D \))**

  Letting \( d_k \) as the number of bribes paid in cash by bribe-payer \( k \)-th to any public official, and \( q \) the share of bribes paid in cash out of all bribes, the estimated total number of bribes paid in cash (\( D \)) is the sum of the bribes paid in cash by all \( K \) bribe-payers, that is:

  \[
  D = \sum_{k}^{K} d_k = \sum_{k}^{K} x_k * q
  \]

- **Average amount of bribes paid in cash (\( A \))**

  Letting \( r = 1, \ldots, R \) the last bribe paid in cash by the \( k \)-th bribe payer, and \( a_r \) the amount paid for that bribe, the average amount paid in cash (\( A \)) is equal to:

  \[
  A = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^{R} a_r
  \]

Therefore, the estimate of the total annual amount of bribes paid in Ghana is calculated as

\[
T = D * A
\]