

Table 4.1 CPI scores (scale 1–100)

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Score</i>
Washington	87	Oregon	55
Kentucky	79	Vermont	54
Connecticut	75	Hawaii	54
South Carolina	75	Idaho	53
New York	74	Nevada	53
Massachusetts	73	Alabama	52
Wisconsin	73	West Virginia	52
California	71	Canada, federal, 2008	50
Utah	70	Pennsylvania	50
Maryland	68	Newfoundland	48
Ohio	67	Iowa	47
Indiana	66	Oklahoma	47
Texas	66	North Dakota	46
New Jersey	65	Hungary	45
Mississippi	65	Canada, federal, 2003	45
Alaska	64	Illinois	45
Virginia	64	Tennessee	45
Kansas	63	Lithuania	44
Georgia	63	British Columbia	44
Minnesota	62	Ontario	43
US, federal, 2007	62	South Dakota	42
Missouri	61	Quebec	40
Michigan	61	Taiwan	38
Nebraska	61	Western Australia	38
Arizona	61	New Hampshire	36
Colorado	60	US, federal, 1995	36
Maine	59	Nova Scotia	36
North Carolina	58	Wyoming	34
New Mexico	58	Australia, federal	33
Rhode Island	58	Alberta	33
Montana	56	Canada, federal, 1989	32
Delaware	56	Poland	27
Arkansas	56	European Commission	24
Louisiana	55	Germany	17
Florida	55	European Parliament	15

Sources: Chari *et al.* (2007), authors' present research and CPI research.

Table 4.2 The threefold classification of regulatory systems

	<i>Low-regulation systems</i>	<i>Medium-regulation systems</i>	<i>High-regulation systems</i>
Registration regulations	Rules on individual registration, but few details required	Rules on individual registration, more details required	Rules on individual registration are extremely rigorous
Targets of lobbyists defined	Only members of the legislature and staff	Members of the legislature and staff; executive and staff; agency heads and public servants/officers	Members of the legislature and staff; executive and staff; agency heads and public servants/officers
Spending disclosure	No rules on individual spending disclosure, or employer spending disclosure	Some regulations on individual spending disclosure; none on employer spending disclosure	Tight regulations on individual spending disclosure, and employer spending disclosure
Electronic filing	Weak online registration and paperwork required	Robust system for online registration, no paperwork necessary	Robust system for online registration, no paperwork necessary
Public access	List of lobbyists available, but not detailed or updated frequently	List of lobbyists available, detailed and updated frequently	List of lobbyists and their spending disclosures available, detailed and updated frequently
Enforcement	Little in the way of enforcement capabilities are invested in the state agency	In theory, the state agency possesses enforcement capabilities, though these are infrequently used	The state agency can, and does, conduct mandatory reviews/audits
'Revolving door' provision	No cooling-off period before former legislators can register as lobbyists	There is a cooling-off period before former legislators can register as lobbyists	There is a cooling-off period before former legislators can register as lobbyists

Sources: Chari *et al.* (2007), authors' present research and Griffith (2008: 8).

Table 4.4 considers the TI's Corrupt Perceptions Index of 2008 and compares this with the various regulatory environments found in the different states (as no measurement is made by the TI for the political system of the EU, this information cannot be presented). The first column states the name of the country; the second, third and fourth, the TI's Corruption Perceptions Index, its confidence interval and its overall ranking of their 180-country analysis; and the fourth and fifth, the CPI scores and the classification of the lobbyists regulatory system (both of which are based on our evidence presented above).

Table 4.4 Perceptions of corruption and types of regulatory systems

<i>Country</i>	<i>TI's Corrupt Perceptions Index, 2008</i>	<i>Confidence range of TI's scoring</i>	<i>Overall country rank by TI (in its 180-country analysis)</i>	<i>CPI values</i>	<i>Type of lobbying regulatory system</i>
Australia	8.7	8.2–9.1	9	33–38	Medium
Canada	8.7	8.4–9.1	9	32–50	Medium
Germany	7.9	7.5–8.2	14	17	Low
US	7.3	6.7–7.7	18	34–87	High/medium
Taiwan	5.7	5.4–6.0	39	38	Medium
Hungary	5.1	4.8–5.4	47	45	Medium
Lithuania	4.6	4.1–5.2	58	44	Medium
Poland	4.6	4.0–5.2	58	27	Low

Sources: [www.transparency.org/news\\_room/in\\_focus/2008/cpi2008/cpi\\_2008\\_table](http://www.transparency.org/news_room/in_focus/2008/cpi2008/cpi_2008_table) and author's research presented above.

Table 4.4 suggests that, overall, there is no cogent relationship between perceptions of corruption and the types of regulatory systems that have been put in place in the different countries. When turning to 'clean' countries such as Australia, Canada, Germany and the US, which are in the top 20 of the 180 countries surveyed by TI, we see that they are representative of the three types of systems: low, medium and high regulation. Nevertheless, the data may shed some light on Australia: it may be the case that the lower end of the medium range – as opposed to a high-regulation system – was adopted in Australia in 2008 because of the rarity of corrupt practices between lobbyists and politicians. There may have been a perception that a robust regulatory system was not needed to stamp out corruption, as Australia is one of the top 10 cleanest countries in the world according to TI. There is some evidence of this in the passing of the federal bill, when Australian Senator Andrew Murray noted that 'he never experienced any