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Government Integrity Index

4 Dimensions
13 Constructs
27 Indicators

Objective Indicators & Subjective Indicators

23 municipalities & counties
Structure of Government Integrity Index (GII)

4 Dimensions

Input  Process  Output  Impact
Structure of Government Integrity Index (GII)

13 Constructs

Input
- Human Resources
- Budget
- Law and Regulations

Process
- Procurement
- Anti-Corruption Audit
- Public Education on Anti-Corruption
Structure of Government Integrity Index (GII)

Output
- Complaints
- Disclosure
- Misconduct
- Law Breaking

Impact
- Media Report
- Staff Perception
- Public Opinion
Structure of Government Integrity Index (GII)

Objective Indicators:
- Input Index
- Process Index
- Output Index
- Impact Index

Subjective Indicators:
- Human Resources
- Budget
- Law and Regulations
- Procurement
- Anti-corruption Audit
- Public education on anti-corruption
- Complaints
- Disclosure
- Misconduct
- Law Breaking
- Media report
- Staff perception
- Public opinion
Structure of Government Integrity Index (GII)

- **Objective Indicators**: come from official statistics
- **Subjective Indicators**: come from two surveys
  - Public opinion telephone survey (hereafter Public Opinion Survey)
  - Staff mailing survey (hereafter Staff Survey)
Operationalization of GII

Stage 1

- **Standardization**: from original statistics to standardized Z scores.

- **Normalization**: multiply each standardized Z score by -1, if necessary
  - If the statistics look neutral, use their correlations with public opinion survey results to determine the directions
Operationalization of GII

Stage 2

- **Combining** normalized standardized scores into sub-dimension scores.

  - Weighting method:
    1. using consensus by Delphic method, or
    2. performing factor analysis for each sub-dimension extract only the first factor then using regression method to get weights
Operationalization of GII

Stage 3

- **Combining** sub-dimension scores into dimension scores.

  Weighting method:
  
  (1) using consensus by Delphic method, or
  
  (2) performing factor analysis for each dimension

- **Dimension score adjustment** using linear transformation,

  - \[ S_{Ax} = 70 + (10 \times S_x) \]
Operationalization of GII

Stage 4

- **Combining** dimension scores into final index.

Weighting method:

1. using consensus by Delphic method, or
2. performing factor analysis on six dimension scores

- **Final index adjustment**
  
  using linear transformation

\[ \text{GII} = 70 + (10 \times \text{FI}) \]
Features of GII Results

- We have finished our **Beta Version** of GII with data from 23 municipalities/counties
  - We are working on the second round data collection

- **Grouping** rather than **ranking** by **multiple comparison technique**
Citizens’ Assessment on Governmental Integrity in General
Citizens’ Assessment on Magistrates/Mayors’ Integrity
Citizens’ Assessment on Department Chiefs’ Integrity
Final Scores in GII Beta Version
Why grouping?

Think about this…

If the score difference between the Last No.4 city/country and the Last No.3 is 50, while the difference between the Last No.2 and the Last No.1 is 0.5…

Can we say this ranking is fair??
Conclusions

We believe that

- Using **grouping technique** rather than ranking method has some advantages:
  - taking the concept of “variation” into account,
  - making the assessment results are fairer and more acceptable,
  - minimizing the emotional overreaction or critique from the evaluated objects.
Conclusions

Who has been involved in the GII measurement?

- **Directly involved:**
  - Citizens
  - Public employees

- **Indirectly involved:**
  - The media (by news reports/coverage)
  - Governments themselves (by official statistics input)
Conclusions

**Impacts:**
- Educating public officials that corruption/integrity can be measured.
- Requesting agencies to collect needed data regularly.
- Promoting the idea of “indicator management” to government-wide Department of Government Ethics.

**Challenges:**
- Responding rate of staff survey is quite low, probably due to the sensitivity of the issue.
- Need to prevent from the systematic bias occurring from specific departments/local governments.
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