

Corruption in Europe & Beyond - 5

Problems in Measuring
and Assessing
Corruption

Why is there a problem?

- Nature of the beast
 - A victimless crime?
 - Fear of reporting
 - Codes of silence
 - Attitudes – concept of ‘normal’

Official Statistics

- Legal
 - Reports
 - Investigations
 - Prosecutions
 - Convictions
 - Sentences
- Economic
 - Size of shadow economy
 - Size of bribes
 - Impact
- Problems?

Official Reports

- Commission Reports
- Problems?

Perceptual and Attitudinal Surveys

- Elite perceptions of and attitudes towards the situation
- Other perceptions of and attitudes towards the situation
 - Citizens
 - Businesspeople
 - Specialists
 - ‘Horse’s mouth’

Perceptual and Attitudinal Surveys - 2

- TI CPI
- TI GCB
- WEF GCR
- Freedom House
- Eurobarometer
- Problems?

Galtung's Analysis of Critiques of the CPI

- 7 critiques:
 - Only publishing the takers, and not the givers and abettors (so he justifies his development of the BPI)
 - Irregular and uncontrolled country coverage (largely beyond TI's control)
 - Biased sample: more than 90% of the world is missing (he largely rejects)
 - Imprecise and sometimes ignorant sources (but many data-sets are so based; at least the CPI is honest about this)
 - Far too narrow and imprecise a definition of corruption (e.g. not enough on collusion or the bribe-payer's agency) – he's more sympathetic to this criticism
 - Does not measure trends: cannot reward genuine reformers – the most serious flaw – he advocates publishing the CPI only every 4-5 years, and BPI annually!
 - Guilty by association – aid conditionality
- Overall, acc. to Galtung, CPI has become counter-productive

Assessment of the 2012 revised CPI methodology

- ‘The JRC analysis suggests that the new methodology for the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI), besides being appealing for reasons of transparency and replicability, it is also conceptually and statistically coherent and with a balanced structure (i.e., the CPI is not dominated by any of the individual sources). . . Altogether, the statistical analyses described in this report underline the contribution of the CPI to the measurement of perceived corruption in the public sector at national level worldwide:
 - The CPI covers more countries than any of the individual sources alone
 - The CPI may be more reliable than each source taken separately
 - The CPI can efficiently differentiate the level of corruption between countries, unlike some sources where a large number of countries is assessed at the same level of corruption
 - The CPI reconciles different view points on the issue of corruption, noteworthy since no country is classified as better off than another country on all common sources’

(M. Saisana & A. Saltelli, *Corruption Perceptions Index 2012 Statistical Assessment*, European Commission 2012: 21)

Horse's Mouth Surveys

- Access
- Codes of Silence
- Examples
 - (Indirect) TI's Government Defence Anti-Corruption Index (2012?)
 - (Indirect) TI's Defence Companies' Anti-Corruption Index (2012?)
 - (Direct) Numerous surveys of police officers
- Solution?
- Problems

Experiential Surveys

- Of business:
 - BEEPS
 - ICBS
 - TI BPI
 - GCR
- Of citizens
 - ICVS
 - TI GCB
 - Miller, Grødeland and Koshechkina
- Problems?

TI CPI - FSU, Selected Years

| | 1996 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2012 | Rank 05 | Rank 12 |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|---------|
| Armenia | | 2.5 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 34 | 4= | 6 |
| Azerbaijan | | 1.5 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 27 | 12= | 10 |
| Belarus | | 4.1 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 31 | 6= | 7 |
| Estonia | | 5.7 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 64 | 1 | 1 |
| Georgia | | | 2.3 | 3.8 | 52 | 10= | 3 |
| Kazakhstan | | 3.0 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 28 | 6= | 8= |
| Kyrgyzstan | | | 2.3 | 2.0 | 24 | 10= | 12 |
| Latvia | | 3.4 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 49 | 3 | 4 |
| Lithuania | | 4.1 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 54 | 2 | 2 |
| Moldova | | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 36 | 4= | 5 |
| Russia | 2.9 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 28 | 9 | 8= |
| Tajikistan | | | 2.1 | 2.1 | 22 | 14 | 13 |
| Turkmenistan | | | 1.8 | 1.6 | 17 | 15 | 14= |
| Ukraine | | 1.5 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 26 | 6= | 11 |
| Uzbekistan | | 2.4 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 17 | 12= | 14= |

TI CPI - CEE, Selected Years

| | 1996 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2012 | Rank 2005 | Rank 2012 |
|----------------|------|-----------------|-----------------|------|------|-----------|-----------|
| Albania | | | 2.4 | 3.3 | 33 | 13 | 13 |
| B i H | | | 2.9 | 3.2 | 42 | 9 | 9 |
| Bulgaria | | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 41 | 5 | 10= |
| Croatia | | 3.7 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 46 | 6= | 5= |
| Czechia | 5.4 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 49 | 3= | 4 |
| Hungary | 4.9 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 4.7 | 55 | 2 | 3 |
| Rep. Macedonia | | | 2.7 | 4.1 | 43 | 12 | 8 |
| Montenegro | | (see Serbia) | (see Serbia) | 3.7 | 41 | 10= | 10= |
| Poland | 5.6 | 4.1 | 3.4 | 5.3 | 58 | 6= | 2 |
| Romania | | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 44 | 8 | 7 |
| Serbia | | 1.3 (inc. Mont) | 2.8 (inc. Mont) | 3.5 | 39 | 10= | 12 |
| Slovakia | | 3.5 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 46 | 3= | 5= |
| Slovenia | | 5.5 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 61 | 1 | 1 |

TI GCB – FSU 2004-13 (Question: In the past 12 months, have you or anyone living in your household paid a bribe in any form? Answer: Yes (percentages))

| | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007* | 2009 | 2010/11 | 2013 |
|--------------|------|------|------|-------|------|---------|------|
| Armenia | | | | | 43 | 22 | 18 |
| Azerbaijan | | | | | 46 | 47 | |
| Belarus | | | | | 13 | 27 | |
| Estonia | 6 | | | | | | 6 |
| Georgia | 6 | 7 | | | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Kazakhstan | | | | | | | 34 |
| Kyrgyzstan | | | | | | | 45 |
| Latvia | 18 | | | | | 15 | 19 |
| Lithuania | 32 | 28 | | 29 | 30 | 34 | 26 |
| Moldova | 32 | 29 | 27 | 30 | 28 | 37 | 29 |
| Russia | 21 | 17 | 8 | 17 | 31 | 26 | |
| Tajikistan | | | | | | | |
| Turkmenistan | | | | | | | |
| Ukraine | 25 | 13 | 23 | 30 | 21 | 34 | 37 |
| Uzbekistan | | | | | | | |

TI GCB - CEE 2004-13

| | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2009 | 2010/11 | 2013 |
|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|
| Albania | 30 | | 66 | 71 | | | |
| B i H | 13 | 6 | | 5 | 9 | 23 | 28 |
| Bulgaria | 6 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 8 |
| Croatia | 9 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| Czechia | 21 | 18 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 15 |
| Hungary | | | | | 14 | 24 | 12 |
| Rep. Macedonia | 9 | 8 | 9 | 44 | 4 | 21 | 17 |
| Montenegro | | | | | | | |
| Poland | 5 | 8 | | 5 | 4 | 15 | |
| Romania | 25 | 22 | 20 | 33 | 14 | 28 | 17 |
| Serbia | | 19 | 13 | 21 | 20 | 17 | 26 |
| Slovakia | | | | | | | 21 |
| Slovenia | | | | | | 4 | 6 |

GCR FOR FSU - 2010

| | Corruption A (Global Rank) | Corruption B (Score) | Corruption C (Variable Rank) |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Armenia | 104 | 16.9 | 1 |
| Azerbaijan | 101 | 21.6 | 1 |
| Belarus | | | |
| Estonia | 30 | 3.5 | 10 |
| Georgia | 42 | 1.8 | 13 |
| Kazakhstan | 93 | 17.3 | 1 |
| Kyrgyzstan | 132 | 17.3 | 1 |
| Latvia | 75 | 12.0 | 5 |
| Lithuania | 50 | 9.3 | 5 |
| Moldova | 102 | 13.0 | 3 |
| Russia | 111 | 21.2 | 1 |
| Tajikistan | 106 | 10.5 | 4 |
| Turkmenistan | n.a. | | |
| Ukraine | 127 | 13.9 | 2 |
| Uzbekistan | n.a. | | |

GCR for CEE - 2010

| | Corruption A (Global rank) | Corruption B (Variable Score) | Corruption C (Variable Rank) |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Albania | 68 | 13.6 | 2 |
| B i H | 100 | 9.2 | 4 |
| Bulgaria | 94 | 15.1 | 1 |
| Croatia | 80 | 13.2 | 4 |
| Czechia | 67 | 15.4 | 1 |
| Hungary | 60 | 12.0 | 4 |
| Rep. Macedonia | 56 | 8.3 | 4 |
| Montenegro | 58 | 8.4 | 5 |
| Poland | 41 | 3.8 | 9 |
| Romania | 57 | 6.9 | 7 |
| Serbia | 87 | 16.0 | 1 |
| Slovakia | 72 | 20.7 | 2 |
| Slovenia | 36 | 6.4 | 6 |

Businesspeople's assessments of corruption as an obstacle to doing business (A), and experience of corruption (B), according to BEEPS (FSU States)

| | 1999 A | 1999 B | 2002 A | 2002 B | 2005 A | 2005 B | Trend re. A 2002-5 | Trend re. B 2002-5 | 2007- 9 A | 2007- 9 B | Trend re. A 2002-9 | Trend re. B 1999- 2009 |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Armenia | 1.9 | 41 | 36 | 14 | 42 | 10.4 | ↓ | ↑ | 39.6 | 16.0 | ↓ | ↑ |
| Azerbaijan | 2.8 | 54 | 37 | 27 | 50 | 30.0 | ↓ | ↔ | 25.1 | 52.2 | ↑ | ↔ |
| Belarus | 1.8 | 17 | 37 | 23 | 14 | 25.4 | ↑ | ↔ | 30.7 | 26.1 | ↑ | ↓ |
| Estonia | 1.9 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 22 | 5.9 | ↓ | ↑ | 5.43 | 3.7 | ↑ | ↑ |
| Georgia | 3.0 | 33 | 60 | 37 | 48 | 10.2 | ↑ | ↑ | 20.4 | 14.7 | ↑ | ↑ |
| Kazakhstan | 2.7 | 25 | 33 | 30 | 27 | 27.2 | ↑ | ↔ | 43.9 | 34.1 | ↓ | ↓ |
| Kyrgyzstan | 3.3 | 26 | 44 | 43 | 60 | 52.6 | ↓ | ↓ | 58.9 | 47.8 | ↓ | ↓ |
| Latvia | | | 30 | 17 | 26 | 12.5 | ↑ | ↑ | 33.9 | 13.4 | ↓ | |
| Lithuania | 2.5 | 17 | 48 | 21 | 46 | 25.6 | ↑ | ↓ | 38.6 | 10.7 | ↑ | ↑ |
| Moldova | 3.0 | 32 | 60 | 34 | 50 | 20.4 | ↑ | ↑ | 40.9 | 33.5 | ↑ | ↔ |
| Russia | 2.4 | 33 | 29 | 37 | 40 | 41.3 | ↓ | ↓ | 50.0 | 39.6 | ↓ | ↓ |
| Tajikistan | | | 48 | 35 | 42 | 24.1 | ↑ | ↑ | 37.8 | 44.6 | | |
| Turkmenistan | | | | | | | | | n.d. | n.d. | | |
| Ukraine | 2.4 | 28 | 53 | 35 | 41 | 30.3 | ↑ | ↑ | 50.2 | 31.8 | ↔ | ↓ |
| Uzbekistan | 2.2 | 46 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 20.4 | ↔ | ↔ | 27.2 | 59.5 | ↑ | ↓ |

Comparing some FSU results - 2010

Two assessments:

TI CPI:

Estonia

Lithuania

Latvia

Georgia

Kazakhstan=

Moldova=

Armenia

Belarus

Azerbaijan=

Ukraine=

Russia (eq.)

Tajikistan (eq.)

Kyrgyzstan

Turkmenistan=

Uzbekistan=

GCR:

Estonia

Georgia

Lithuania

Latvia

Kazakhstan

Azerbaijan

Moldova

Armenia

Tajikistan

Russia

Ukraine

Kyrgyzstan

Comparing some CEE results - 2010

- Two assessments

- TI CPI

- Slovenia
- Poland
- Hungary
- Czechia
- Slovakia
- Croatia =
- Rep. Macedonia =
- Montenegro -
- Romania –
- Bulgaria
- Serbia
- Albania
- B i H

- GCR

- Slovenia
- Poland
- Rep. Macedonia
- Romania
- Montenegro
- Hungary
- Czechia
- Albania
- Slovakia
- Croatia
- Serbia
- Bulgaria
- B i H

Focus Groups

- Size and number
- Problems?
 - Organising
 - Representativeness
 - Adhering to topic

Tracking and Delphi Surveys

- PETS (Uganda 1996 – 13% average 1991-5; 82% average 2001 [Ghana 2000])
- QSDS (Bangladesh and India 2002 – medical practitioners paid but not present 35% and 43%)
- Delphi surveys
- Problems?

Proxy Measures

- Global Integrity
 - ‘The Global Integrity Index assesses the existence, effectiveness, and citizen access to key national-level anti-corruption mechanisms used to hold governments accountable. The Index does not measure corruption. Rather than examine the "cancer" of corruption, the Index investigates the "medicine" being used against it — in the form of government accountability, transparency, and citizen oversight’
- Problems?

Media analysis

- Content analysis
- Speeches; case-studies; representation of corruption
- Problems?
 - Coverage
 - Partisanship
 - Accuracy

Publications and Testimonies

- Memoirs – and problems
- ‘Faction’ – and problems
- Courtroom testimonies – and problems

Interviews

- **Specialists**
 - Commission members – and problems
 - Members of state anti-corruption agencies – and problems
 - Ombudspersons – and problems
 - NGO officials – and problems
 - Investigative journalists – and problems
 - Academics – and problems

Experiments

- E.g. – could attempt to bribe officials in the same kinds of role in two or more countries, and measure their propensity to accept
- Problems
 - Ethics!
 - Legal issues

So if all the methods are flawed . . . ?

- Triangulation (e.g. Kaufmann and Recanatini)
- ‘Multi-angular analysis and validation’ (e.g. Reinikka and Svensson) – or simply multi-angulation
- The bigger problem - of *not* attempting measurement and assessment