

## **Measuring Corruption; Problems Measure; Perception x Bribery**

**HUMBERTO FALCÃO MARTINS**  
FUNDACAO DOM CABRAL

**ETTORE DE CARVALHO ORIOL**  
FUNDACAO DOM CABRAL

## **Measuring Corruption; Problems Measure; Perception x Bribery**

### **Introdução**

Corruption has plagued the world. However, in order to address this problem and propose risk mitigation solutions, the phenomenon needs to be made explicit through measurement. Measuring corruption is not trivial. Measuring complex phenomena (multidimensional, unstable, plural, contextualized) is not insignificant. However, it is possible, although it inevitably requires dealing with intricate methodological issues in nebulous and shifting boundaries.

### **Problema de Pesquisa e Objetivo**

Seeking to follow a line of critical methodological argumentation, this text aims to develop elements that allow us to better state and outline answers and indications for improvement to the following questions: to what extent and under what conditions can currently established metrics of corruption be considered relevant, valid, and reliable?

### **Fundamentação Teórica**

The theoretical foundation of the analysis is based on three points: The question of methodological rigor as a basis for constructing indicators and indices with greater general validity (content, convergent, discriminant, nomological). The question of the debate between perception indicators versus experience indicators. Finally, the respondents were asked the survey questions (Zimelis, 2020)

### **Discussão**

The main point identified in the discussion is that there are indicators in various configurations of the three elements presented in the theoretical basis of the research. These indices (groups of indicators) have greater or lesser methodological rigidity. At this point, drawing attention to the transparency of the methods used to make the index available is essential. They are based on indicators of perception and/or experience of corruption. Those interviewed are internal and external experts, citizens, politicians/bureaucrats, and other possibilities.

The main point identified in the discussion is that there are indicators in various configurations of the three elements presented in the theoretical basis of the research. These indices (groups of indicators) have greater or lesser methodological rigidity. At this point, drawing attention to the transparency of the methods used to make the index available is essential. They are based on indicators of perception and/or experience of corruption. Those interviewed are internal and external experts, citizens, politicians/bureaucrats, and other possibilities.

### **Conclusão**

The article's main conclusion is that even with their limitations, indices, and indicators have a role to play in the fight against corruption. Although many of the criticisms raised by the researchers are well-founded, it is still better to have a lousy metric than no one. However, within the possibilities and indicators analyzed, the constitution of indices with a mosaic of indicators (different respondents and indicators of perception and experience) presents better results in the attempt to capture the level of corruption in a country or region.

### **Referências Bibliográficas**

Zimelis, A. (2020). Corruption research: A need for an integrated approach. *International Area Studies Review*, 23(3), 288-306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2233865920926778>

