



INSTITUTO
UNIVERSITÁRIO
DE LISBOA

The effects of socioeconomic factors on perceptions of corruption
in Portugal

Maria do Rosário Luz Clara Costa Andrade

Master in Political Economy

Supervisor:

Patrícia Isabel Mira Batista Calca, Integrated Researcher
ISCTE - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

February, 2025

Department of Political Economy

The effects of socioeconomic factors on perceptions of corruption
in Portugal

Maria do Rosário Luz Clara Costa Andrade

Master in Political Economy

Supervisor:

Patrícia Isabel Mira Batista Calca, Integrated Researcher
ISCTE- Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

February, 2025

Acknowledgments/Agradecimentos

Esta dissertação foi uma maratona praticamente infundável de esforço, superação e crescimento pessoal. As palavras aqui escritas são consequência de muito trabalho, de alguma frustração, mas sobretudo do apoio que me foi dado ao longo deste processo e de toda a minha vida.

Em primeiro lugar, gostaria de agradecer aos meus pais por tudo o que fizeram e fazem por mim, por serem uma constante inspiração e um exemplo a seguir. Um obrigada gigante por terem ouvido todas as minhas frustrações e angústias e por me terem permitido crescer num ambiente que me deu a confiança e liberdade para seguir o meu próprio caminho. Gostaria também de agradecer de forma especial à minha irmã Rita por todo o apoio dado, por todas as vezes que teve de ler os rascunhos desta tese sem perceber absolutamente nada do que eu lhe estava a explicar e por dizer sempre de sorriso na cara e com confiança que tudo o que eu estava a escrever era muito interessante e que de certeza que ia correr bem. Gostava de agradecer também à minha restante família por terem aceitado trocar as nossas habituais conversas sobre o Benfica, sobre futebol e sobre música por conversas sobre a minha tese e sobre todas as dificuldades que eu estava a ter.

Um grande e sentido agradecimento tem que ser dirigido à minha orientadora, professora Patrícia Calca, por todo o apoio dado neste processo, pelas conversas que me davam a confiança da relevância e interesse do tema e por estar sempre disposta a debater comigo para me alargar os horizontes e permitir ver o verdadeiro alcance deste tema.

Obrigada a todos os amigos que este mestrado me deu pela sua amizade sincera e apoio constante, pela preocupação verdadeira que tivemos uns com outros desde o início e por todos os momentos de gargalhadas que as nossas intensas conversas e longos debates me proporcionaram. Obrigada a todos os meus amigos que me foram dando conselhos e recomendações, que foram rezando pelo estado da minha tese e que nunca deixaram de me dar a confiança necessária para terminar esta e tantas outras etapas da minha vida. Obrigada aos que me obrigavam a fazer pausas e que me levavam de volta ao mundo real para ganhar perspetiva.

Obrigada ao ISCTE pelos 5 anos maravilhosos que cá passei, por me ter dado a conhecer tantas pessoas que me ajudaram e levaram a concluir não só este mestrado, mas também a licenciatura em Economia. Deram-me a oportunidade de aprender com professores que eram verdadeiros especialistas, mas que não deixavam de se interessar por me ajudar e por responder a todas as minhas questões. O ambiente académico que o ISCTE me proporcionou foi um verdadeiro privilégio. A todos os amigos que aqui fiz a minha eterna gratidão.

Obrigada a todos os professores que me ajudaram no decorrer desta vida académica, mas não podia deixar de enaltecer o papel que o meu professor de Economia do secundário, o professor José Miranda (antigo professor da Escola Secundária Sebastião da Gama, em Setúbal) teve no desenvolvimento do meu interesse pela área de Economia e pelo aprofundamento constante dos meus conhecimentos nesta área.

Resumo

Esta dissertação examina como diferentes fatores socioeconómicos contribuem para aumentar ou diminuir as perceções de corrupção na sociedade portuguesa. Este trabalho estuda como os portugueses concebem corrupção e as interações e diferenças entre perceção de corrupção e experiência de corrupção.

A análise das perceções de corrupção gerais e das perceções referentes a funcionários públicos permitem entender que os cidadãos portugueses percecionam altos níveis de corrupção nos ambientes que os rodeiam no dia-a-dia. Estas elevadas perceções não são fruto de experiência de corrupção e podem ser uma consequência de um sentimento de desconfiança geral, respostas não refletidas, falta de compreensão de percentagens e números e uma definição de corrupção percecionada mais abrangente que a definição legal.

Das mil e vinte entrevistas individuais previamente realizadas por projetos financiados por duas fundações portuguesas, as respostas foram recolhidas e estudadas através do teste de modelos econométricos. Estes modelos econométricos testam o poder explicativo dos fatores socioeconómicos e dos seus efeitos nas perceções de corrupção (gerais e só setor público) e experiência de corrupção (experiência direta e indireta).

Através da análise dos modelos é possível concluir que mulheres, pessoas em situações económicas piores, pessoas que usam meios de comunicação social tradicionais (jornal) mais frequentemente e pessoas que procuram com maior frequência notícias políticas nas redes sociais, tendem a percecionar maiores níveis de corrupção. Indivíduos com mais escolaridade e pessoas que votaram nos maiores partidos políticos (PS e PSD) percecionam níveis mais baixos de corrupção na sociedade. Estas conclusões correspondem ao período temporal em que decorreram os questionários.

Palavras-chave: Perceção da corrupção, Experiência de corrupção, Fatores socioeconómicos, Sociedade portuguesa;

Abstract

This dissertation examines how different socioeconomic factors contribute to either increase or decrease the perceptions of corruption across the Portuguese society. This work studies how Portuguese citizens conceive corruption and the interactions and differences between corruption perceptions and corruption experience.

The analysis of general perceptions of corruption and perceptions regarding public sector employees allows to understand that Portuguese citizens perceive a high level of corruption across their day-to-day environments. These high perceptions are not driven by corruption experience and can be a consequence of a general feeling of distrust, non-reflected answers, lack of understanding of percentages and numbers, and a broader perceived definition of corruption when compared to the legal one.

From the one thousand and twenty individual interviews done by previous projects funded by two Portuguese foundations, the answers are collected and studied through the test of econometric models. These econometric models test the explanation power of the socioeconomic factors and their effects on corruption perceptions (general and public sector only) and corruption experience (direct and indirect experience).

Through the models' analysis is possible to conclude that women, people who are in worse economic situations, people who use traditional media (like newspapers) more often and people who look more frequently for political news on social media platforms, tend to have higher perceptions of corruption. Highly educated individuals and people who voted for bigger political parties (either PS or PSD) tend to perceive less corruption across society. These conclusions are specific to the time period of the questionnaires.

Keywords: Corruption perceptions, Corruption experience, Socioeconomic factors, Portuguese society;

Table of contents

Resumo	iii
Abstract	v
Introduction	1
Literature Review	5
Definitions of corruption	5
Corruption- a Political Economy problem.....	7
Corruption and its perception- a never-ending story	8
Perceptions of corruption	9
Perceptions of corruption- influences.....	11
Perceptions of corruption- consequences.....	13
Perceptions of corruption- the Portuguese puzzle	14
Literature review- conclusion	15
Methodology	17
Systematized data.....	23
Results and discussion.....	25
The perceived definition of corruption.....	25
Corruption perceptions’	27
Corruption perceptions’ regarding only public sector employees.....	30
Corruption experience	33
Perceptions of corruption: comparison between global and public sector incidence ..	37
Perceptions of corruption and corruption experience: understanding the dispute of the phenomena.....	39
Main take-aways of the results and discussion section	43
Conclusion.....	45
Bibliographic references	49
Sources.....	53
Appendix	55

Index of tables

Table 1. Dimensions studied by the dependent variables 20
Table 2. Dimensions studied by the independent variables..... 21
Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the dependent variables 24
Table 4. The terms most associated with corruption 26
Table 5. Independent variable coefficients across the multiple models.....27

Introduction

The society that we live in nowadays is a forcefield of interactions between individuals, enterprises, institutions and the respective governmental entities that regulate and create some of these connections. These are not isolated islands but rather a connected entanglement with its unlimited overlaps and twists. There are numerous situations that can be characterized as intersections between different dimensions of the society and phenomena that do not exclusively belong to one area of expertise. One that breaks barriers in fields of study and is transversal to newspaper editions, coffee shop conversations, internet chatrooms and parliaments across the globe, is the phenomenon of corruption.

This dissertation will then dive deeper into a specific dimension of the corruption phenomenon that involves how citizens perceive this topic: the perceptions of corruption. This work will restrict its analysis to perceptions of corruption in Portugal because this country has high perceptions of corruption while also having institutions with high enforcement of the law (de Lancer Julnes and Villoria, 2014), has highly volatile perceptions of corruption when compared to the rest of Western countries (Melgar, Rossi and W.Smith, 2010) and has a dichotomised feeling towards corruption: some behaviours are accepted while others are condemned (de Sousa,2008). The combination of these features makes Portugal an interesting case to study. This dissertation will have as research question: “How do socioeconomic factors contribute to different levels of corruption perceptions' in Portugal?” and the remaining portion of this introductory section will contextualize and justify the choice for the question.

Corruption is an example, in this case with a bad connotation and adverse consequences, of interactions between different spheres of the society. The term corruption can be associated with political and economic scandals and/or for its social impact. It became a recurring term in everybody's day to day vocabulary as it has been associated with campaign slogans across the years and in almost every region of the world. The term is becoming more frequently tossed around in debates in television as antagonists try to make it stick to specific individuals, opinions, political parties or even businesses. Corruption involves resources (both economic and labour) and the power to (mis)use them and can ultimately alter important decisions that can impact society in more ways than one can imagine. A phenomenon that can reach the economic, political and social dimensions of a society or specific country with this intensity and frequency is definitely worth further studying.

The universe of corruption related investigations, dissertations and papers, is vast and can/has been studied from different analysis perspectives. From its connection to corruption experience or the discussion of the typology of behaviours included and even, the connection to the judicial system, the topic has been developed but it is not yet with its many gaps and answers fully covered or answered. How come some countries have corruption as the topic to tackle in the protection of democracy and others feel like it does not impact their countries as much? How do people in the same regions of the globe or within the same country perceive completely different versions of the reality of corruption impact? The way different communities sense this topic or why some people perceive higher corruption around them is not something as developed as it should be. So, this current dissertation will study this particular perspective of corruption perceptions.

Corruption perceptions are worth to further investigate for its effects and the consequences that they entail in the foundations of our societies: the complex relation and trust between people and institutions. High perceived corruption levels mean that an individual thinks that a higher number of people around him/her are corrupt and this influences how they act, vote, think about others and the way they view the institutions and policies that are made by and for the people he/she thinks are corrupt. But how are perceptions about the same society so distinct? How can someone perceive the same exact country as very corrupt while the person sitting next to them thinks it is corruption free? The key is in the features and personal circumstances. Every individual is influenced by the context in which they live, and this can deeply influence the way of thinking on such a sensitive topic as corruption. The knowledge that can be gained by the study of these effects can shed new lights on how specific policies could and should be designed or implemented to dissuade and fight corruption. If specific socioeconomic factors could be tied to specific reactions to perceived corruption levels, there is definitely room for improvement on how policies are designed by being able to partially anticipate the outcomes. The focus is thus going to be on how socioeconomic factors contribute to different levels of perceptions of corruption.

One of the most intriguing countries that can be studied within the perceptions of corruption universe is Portugal. The Portuguese society has relatively high perceptions of corruption (*de Lancer Julnes and Villoria, 2014*) while having a dichotomy: both condemning and tolerating some aspects/behaviours of corruption at the same time (*de Sousa, 2008*). This means that amongst the Portuguese citizens there is a difference in how behaviours and situations are perceived. Some interactions are completely condemned while others are more accepted, practiced and engaged in the way of living and as a consequence, perception levels regarding

corruption will change according to how someone individually interprets this dichotomy. This outward contradiction in how someone can perceive a different level of corruption from their peers in Portugal is a puzzle within the existing literature, as it has not been solved by the contributions previously made. This dissertation with its research question then defined as “How do socioeconomic factors contribute to different levels of corruption perceptions' in Portugal?” can provide additional information and insights to be a step closer to closing this literature gap.

The research question and its design have as main goal the attempt to confirm that socioeconomic factors indeed contribute to perceptions of corruption being different. The goal is to infer if socioeconomic factors can account for distinctions between corruption perceptions' levels. The research done also has the specific objective to assess if the effects of the socioeconomic factors in the Portuguese citizens follow the same hypotheses/premises already found for other countries in previous studies (all research hypotheses are derived from literature and so, are mentioned in the literature review section). The answer to the research question also has as specific goal to evaluate the relation between corruption perception and corruption experience but also to create a possible explanation for the high perceived levels of corruption in Portugal (de Lancer Julnes and Villoria, 2014).

The study of the research question will be done through the use of both qualitative and quantitative data. The two types of data have the same source: a survey made by GfK Metris for Instituto de Ciências Sociais (ICS) of Universidade de Lisboa within the context of two research projects funded by two different Portuguese foundations. From the one thousand and twenty interviews made between December of 2020 and April of 2021, the corruption perceptions of the Portuguese society can be grasped and the influence of the factors studied through the use of regression models (econometric models). Since the answers given are specific to this certain timeframe, the conclusions should not be considered as transversal in time and as a definitive and solo answer (in themselves) to the literature puzzle and gap presented above. The conclusions of this dissertation should be considered as additional information, and a pit stop in the journey to finding the answer to the literature gap. These conclusions as just a different part of the process and not the big solution to the problem.

The hypotheses to be either confirmed or denied are in the section that follows this introductory part: the literature review. The literature review will revise what the existing literature has debated on corruption and perceptions of corruption, and additionally, the relation between the two. After addressing this relation, the literature review narrows its focus onto perceptions of corruption: its definitions, influences, consequences and the Portuguese puzzle.

The literature review is then followed by a methodology section. The role of the methodology section is to explain the pathway designed to properly answer the research question which, in this case, includes the way how the interviewees conceived corruption plus the variables studied and used in the models. The data, collected through the methodology chosen, needs a section in which it will be systematized and organized to provide further clarity. After this, the data will then be presented in proper context and discussed throughout the following section: the results and discussion one. This section contains the answers to the goals of the dissertation and the confirmation or refutation of the previously mentioned premises. This dissertation finishes with the summary of the main ideas in a more concise way in the conclusion section.

Literature Review

After introducing the topic in the previous section, the current section of this dissertation has the purpose of revising the existing literature regarding the corruption and perceptions of corruption phenomenon and go more in dept regarding its gaps and major debates.

This literature review will start by discussing the multiple definitions of corruption and specifying the one that is going to be used throughout this research. Next, corruption will be discussed within the political economy framework and presented as a problem that regards such field of work. The relation that connects corruption and perceptions of corruption will be presented as well as the relation between perceptions of corruption and corruption experience/reality. To properly investigate the topic of this dissertation, there is the need to dig deeper into the causes and consequences of perceptions of corruption that previous studies, authors and investigators have already established. To further complement this section, the discussion will be narrowed down to perceptions of corruption in Portugal and what has been written specifically about the topic in and about this particular country and the relevance to further investigate the subject. Throughout this section the research hypotheses will presented and numbered. To conclude this part of the dissertation, the main ideas found in the existing literature will be summarised while also presenting the way through which this dissertation will contribute to the development of this field of study.

Definitions of corruption

Corruption is a concept that is prominent in many different environments across today's society and is the main attraction in multiple electoral campaigns across different regions of the globe. From being associated with highly publicized scandals to being attached to certain moments in time, corruption is a word that does not have a consensual way of being defined across the existing literature.

Within the vast literature that concerns this topic, the authors have reached distinct possibilities on how to define corruption. Corruption definitions' can be separated into two main groups: objective definitions and subjective definitions. The objective ones are straightforward, clear and not dependent on point of view of the person analysing the concept. The subjective ones as the word subjective implies are a kind of statements that gives importance to the personal perspective of the observer of the topic and is dependent on how a person defines the concept in itself.

Objective definitions have a lot of diversity that is worth highlighting so, consequently, they can be divided into three different groups with three diverse typologies: there are the resource/market focused, the behaviour-focused ones and the legal definitions. The resource/market focused ones associate corruption with the resources that it involves and describe it as the (mis)use of public resources for private purposes and needs (Andersson & Heywood, 2009; Klitgaard et al., 1996; Werlin, 1973). Corruption can also be defined as something that disturbs allocative decisions and that can be translated as a “*basic tension between market mechanisms and voting processes*” (Rose-Ackerman, 1978). The behaviour-focused definitions enhance that corruption is a mismatch between the expectations of how people should behave and how they effectively act when faced with potential status gains. So, corruption is a deviant way of acting, a deviant behaviour (Nye, 1967; Scott, 1972). One of these deviant behaviours that is highlighted in the literature is the abuse of power: “*Corruption is an abuse of entrusted power*” (de Sousa & Calca, 2020). The spotlight is, unlike in the previous definitions, on the conduct of the individual in itself instead of the resources that are wasted as a consequence of the deviant behaviours. The last type of objective definitions are the legal ones. Each country has its own way of describing corruption in its law or constitution and since the data that will be analysed is Portuguese, it only makes sense to check how the Portuguese Law defines corruption. According to Stockemer and Calca (2013), the public ministry defines corruption in a threefold way – involving a broad definition of corruption, the highlight of peculation and the importance of economic participation in business. These authors describe this definition of corruption as “*rather weak*” and as having “*many loopholes*”.

The subjective definitions argue that there is more to defining corruption than just a universal rule or way of describing it. The subjective definitions of corruption are, as previously explained, notions that are observer-dependent and as such acknowledge that what one person considers as corrupt might be a practice accepted by others (Jain, 1998; Jos, 1993). This category of definitions gives special attention to notions that are not mentioned by the objective ideas such as corruption being a “*social construction*” (de Sousa, 2008) and also, that corruption is related and “*largely about perceptions*” (Heidenheimer, 2005) as it depends on how each and every single individual evaluate and classify different situations, relations and behaviours.

Both groups of definitions are (as shown) used throughout the existing literature for different purposes and different types of research. A common storyline across the majority of authors regardless of the type of definition used is that the term corruption gives “*rise to moral condemnation*”. Corruption is a term with a negative connotation and is not defended by anyone in public discussions. It is a word that people avoided being associated with (de Sousa, 2008).

To summarize, corruption can be defined in an objective way through a focus on the resources it requires, on the behaviours adopted and on the legal definition present in each country's law. The other side of this literature debate defends that corruption is perception-related and dependent on how subjects evaluate behaviours as corrupt or not- a subjective perspective on the topic. Only the negative connotation that comes with the term brings the two types of definitions to common ground.

Corruption- a Political Economy problem

Corruption can be considered a multidimensional phenomenon that involves multiple areas of the society and as such, becomes the object of interest and the focus of study for many scholars across the social sciences' domain. There are numerous social sciences and points of view to study this topic, but what turns corruption into a Political Economy problem? The answer is in the following ideas present in the literature.

Political Economy is a field of study that analyses "*the connections between politics and economics within capitalism*" (Clift, 2014). Its focus is on the engineering behind how the economic and the political systems actually work and the relations between these two types of systems (Gamble et al. (2000); as cited in Clift,2014:5). Corruption is a topic that perfectly fits the Political Economy framework for the aspects involved, its effects and its economic consequences.

Corruption is related to the most fundamental axis of the Economics discipline: choosing between alternatives with a finite number of resources. In this case, decisions are made within and by the political sphere and result in the disturbance of the economic process of allocating resources to the best alternatives available. As Rose-Ackerman (1978) describes, corruption is a "*second-best solution*" that leads to the deviation of resources from the best options to the less ideal options in order to fulfil the wants and needs of a few "*unscrupulous people*". Economic resources are also wasted in keeping these illegalities as secrets. Corruption is therefore a link between the political dimension by whom the decisions are made and the economic dimension of wasting resources and influencing and/or benefiting public and private companies.

Corruption is also a Political Economy problem because of the toll that it takes on both the economic pole and political pole of every society. According to research (Rose-Ackerman & Palifka, 2016), high inequalities, inflation, low economic growth and low investment are consequences of corruption. As well as a low level of trust in the political institutions (government, parliament or politicians in general) and a damaging downgrade of their reputation (Bondoso, 2015; Johnston, 2005).

To summarize, corruption is a phenomenon that can be considered a Political Economy problem as this scientific framework is dedicated to studying the interactions between the economic and political systems. Corruption is a perfect match to this description as it represents the disruption of economic decisions by political actors and with the economic and political consequences it produces.

Corruption and its perception- a never-ending story

Corruption is, as we previously seen, a concept that does not have a single way to be defined or interpreted across the literature. Since the concept may not be self-evident (Navot & Beerli, 2017), is there a connection between how the concept is defined and how it is perceived? The majority view present in the existing literature defends that there is indeed a connection between corruption and perceptions of corruption.

Melgar et al. (2010) highlight that even though the two concepts are connected is important to remember that they are different from each other, and each one has its own particularities. The authors also stress that “*when corruption perception may strongly differ from the current level of corruption, the latter influences the former*”.

According to de Lancer Julnes and Villoria (2014), the relation between corruption and its perception is clear and can be translated into a vicious cycle. The real level of corruption results in “*widespread perceptions of corruption*” that consequently leads to real corruption once again. This vicious cycle is a never-ending phenomenon because as soon as citizens perceive corruption as widespread across society, they expect others to behave corruptly, and this legitimizes (in their minds) their own engagement in such type of activities, behaviours and connections. This is described as a “*second order collective action dilemma*” (Ostrom, 1998) since there are no longer incentives to not cheat (as there is the feeling that everybody is corruptly engaging) and as citizens no longer opt for keeping an agreement- they openly choose the strategy of being corrupt. This connection is attached like a self-reinforcing relation: each concept constantly feeds and enhances the other (de Lancer Julnes & Villoria, 2014; Persson et al., 2012; Søreide, 2002).

Perceptions of corruption are also related to a different dimension of corruption: corruption experience. Corruption experience impacts the way people see corruption from then on, from the moment there is an encounter with a corrupt experience, perceptions change (Gutmann et al., 2020). Charron (2016) established the same connection but with the uniqueness of having access to regional data. Donchev and Ujhelyi (2014) were able to add another dimension to the existing literature through being able to connect corruption experience to perceptions of

corruption on the individual level. Regional data and data on the individual level are scarce regarding literature on corruption perceptions’.

To conclude, corruption and its perception are distinct but connected concepts. This connection is described as a vicious cycle or a self-reinforcing relation because as soon as real corruption rises and it is perceived as a widespread phenomenon, there is an open acceptance of corrupt behaviour and people are more willing (and “legitimized”) to behave in a corrupt manner. This re-leads to an increase of corruption as the cycle evolves. Corruption experience influences the way people perceive corruption at a broader scale, at an individual level and when accounting for regional data.

Perceptions of corruption

It is a given fact across the existing literature that corruption is a hard phenomenon to describe and as a consequence, perceptions of corruption leave enough room for different approaches and definitions as well.

Perceptions of corruption can be, first of all, defined through their utility to study and further understand corruption: perceptions as an “*indirect approach*” to shed new lights into what is known about corruption (de Lancer Julnes & Villoria, 2014). Understood as a tool and means to reach the goal of understanding a bit better such complex concept as corruption.

Perceptions of corruption are also described as not accurately accounting for a situation as a whole (at least don’t reflect an “*absolute situation*”) and as being a “*social phenomenon*” (Melgar et al., 2010). Navot and Beerli (2017) use a more specific and concrete definition of the phenomenon: “*Perceptions of political corruption are related to judgments about the extent or degree of political corruption found among persons, conduct, institutions, and regimes*”. This more specific definition of perceptions of corruption contrasts with the string of literature that avoids defining the phenomenon in a concrete manner and introduces the need to determine how to capture these judgements.

To capture exactly what someone perceives as corrupt is necessary to ask questions but is extremely important to ask the right ones. The way a question is posed can influence the mode a respondent answers- this is called the framing effect. The framing effect happens when “*different ways of presenting the same choice problem change the choices that people make*” (Cookson, 2000) and within the perceptions of corruption framework, this is a call for attention as it means that researchers will achieve different results and different conclusions that might not match their investigations’ objectives and people’s true opinions. According to de Sousa (2008), the study of perceptions of corruption needs a specific type of questions that are able to

“assess people’s ethical predispositions/judgements indirectly and that take into consideration ethnographic factors”.

Gouvêa Maciel et al. (2022) through their research connect these previous concerns: they propose four main types of perception-based measurements of corruption while connecting these different definitions to the type of questions to achieve each one. They incorporate concrete definitions of perceptions of corruption while also acknowledging that different questions lead to capturing distinct angles of the phenomenon. The authors use the concepts of egocentric vs sociotropic and specific vs generic and every definition is composed by two characteristics (one from each opposing pair). Egocentric is used if the question relates to self-reported personal experience: “Have you ever...?” contrasting with sociotropic if it is about society-wide incidence: “How widespread is ...?”. Specific is when it is discriminated in the question a type of conduct (for example, bribery, nepotism, etc) while generic is when there is no limitation given regarding the practices referred to (each person will answer with its own conception and perception of the topic; the question does not exclude any type of behaviour).

All these definitions and questions bring a different perspective to the analysis, so perceptions of corruption are made and studied from separate sources – a non-monolithic concept (de Lancer Julnes & Villoria, 2014).

Even though perceptions of corruption can be seen as a vehicle to study corruption (as previously mentioned), the use of a perception-based indicator or a perception-related questionnaire is subject to a debate in the existing literature and is not without heavy criticism.

There are different disadvantages associated with perception-based research and specifically, with its application to corruption-focused research. Some authors state that studies based on perceptions of corruption do not reach precise enough conclusions (Dimant & Schulte, 2016) while others criticize by debating that perceptions may or may not be related to actual levels of corruption and enhance how this potential relation may be overstimulated by media reports of corruption cases (Golden & Picci, 2005). Fazekas et al. (2016) consider that within perceptions of corruption there are certain types of reliability on the data. The one that accounts for grand corruption behaviour, or events is not reliable since people do not have enough interaction with this kind of situations to accurately perceived them. Others consider that direct observation would solve some of the problems mentioned above and apply that methodology in their projects (McMillan & Zoido, 2004; Olken & Barron, 2009).

Despite all this criticism, there are authors who recognize that perceptions are easier sources of data to gather, and access compared to other kinds of research. Perceptions are also the foundation for numerous corruption indices such as Transparency International's Annual

Corruption Perception Index and the World Bank's Control of Corruption Index (Olken & Pande, 2012).

To summarize the present section of this literature review, perceptions of corruption are a non-monolithic phenomenon as there is not a single way to define them or single-handedly compose this phenomenon. Perceptions of corruption can be a vehicle to study corruption as well as being considered a social phenomenon. There are multiple possible ways to define it but the research of Gouvêa Maciel et al. (2022) gives a useful framework that combines both concrete definitions with types of questions that lead researchers to different sets of conclusions. Even though most corruption indices are perception-based, many authors criticize them pointing out in their works its many disadvantages.

Perceptions of corruption- influences

After sorting out how the existing literature defines perceptions of corruption and how previous authors present the advantages and disadvantages of this type of analysis, is important to check what are the already established and studied connections regarding how people perceive corruption. In this section of the literature review, an overview of both the factors that influence and explain differences within perceptions of corruption, and the consequences that an increase of the perceived corruption level has in the society will be presented.

Already discussed in the current literature review, but still worth reminding, is that one of the factors that influence perceptions of corruption is corruption experience (Gutmann et al., 2020), but is definitely not the only one.

According to de Lancer Julnes and Villoria (2014), there are three hypothesized factors that generally influence perceptions of corruption: someone's personal economic situation, the economic performance of the country and the size of the municipality. Then, the authors also hypothesize about some other factors that influence how an individual perceives some action as corrupt or not but regarding to a specific kind of public servant or worker. The factors studied and that will be mentioned in the next sentences allow for the formulation of the first research hypothesis: *H1: Socioeconomic factors contribute to individuals having different perceptions of corruption.* According to their research (based on data from Spanish citizens), if the economic performance of a country is perceived as poor, individuals perceive higher levels of corruption. This same relation also applies to perceptions about personal economic situations: with individuals who perceive themselves as being in worse economic situations tend to perceive higher levels of corruption across society. Regarding the size of municipalities, people whose residence is in smaller villages perceive lower levels of corruption. Gender differences

were tested and found as female interviewees perceived higher levels of corruption than men, fact also supported by Van de Walle (2008) with data from the Flanders region in Belgium. This conclusions reached by the data on Spanish and Belgium individuals allow for the design of a second research hypothesis to be done as follows: *H2: Women and people in worse economic situations perceive corruption as higher.* Lancer Julnes and Villoria (2014) also found a significant relation only between one media channel and higher perceptions of corruption: people that read newspapers with more frequency, have higher perceptions of corruption. The effects of traditional media like newspapers, given its widespread availability across the society, are important to consider and test: *H4: People who use traditional media more frequently (reading the newspaper), have higher perceptions of corruption.* One other factor that increases the level of perceived corruption (for the Spanish respondents) is the alienation from the political system- the more alienated from the political sphere, the more widespread corruption is perceived to be.

Gutmann et al. (2020) also concluded with their research that women perceive higher levels of corruption than their male colleagues and that richer individuals perceive less corruption than people with less economic conditions. This research finds that religion also plays a role in differentiating perceptions of corruption with Protestant Christians having lower perceptions of corruption. The most significant finding of this 2020 research is that the authors did not find a meaningful difference between how unemployed and employed people perceive corruption. Gutmann et al. (2020) state that “*Societies that are thriving economically perceive corruption to be less of a problem ...*” confirming the same relation that de Lancer Julnes and Villoria (2014) and Knack (2007) had previously recognized in connection with the economic performance of a country.

You and Khagram (2005) and Melgar et al. (2010) also infer that women tend to perceive higher corruption levels than men, but an age difference has no impact in accounting for different levels of perceptions of corruption. Melgar et al. (2010) find that divorced people perceive corruption higher and in contrast, married people perceive less corruption while more educated individuals perceive less corruption when compared to people with less than secondary education. Melgar et al. (2010) with the connection between education levels and perceptions of corruption paved the way for the following hypothesis, *H3: People with higher education levels perceive less corruption or lower corruption levels.* Melgar et al. (2010) also confirm a majority view in the existing literature: personal economic situation is inversely related to perceived corruption levels. This 2010 article found no significant influence of

religion but investigated that an influential factor is the degree of religiosity: people who attend religious services more frequently perceive less corruption.

To conclude, the existing literature points out that there are a lot of different factors that influence the perceived level of corruption by an individual. Women tend to have higher perceptions of corruption than men (de Lancer Julnes and Villoria, 2014; Gutmann et al.,2020; Melgar et al., 2010; Van de Walle,2008; You and Khagram,2005). Richer individuals perceive less corruption than people in economic disadvantage (de Lancer Julnes and Villoria, 2014; Gutmann et al.,2020; Knack,2007; Melgar et al., 2010). The effects of education level, religion and religiosity, marital status, exposure to media outlets resources, employment situation, alienation towards the political system and size of the municipality are statistically significant but the sign of their effects is not consensual throughout the available literature.

Perceptions of corruption- consequences

Perceptions of corruption are a phenomenon worth studying and highlighting within the Political Economy framework for the sometimes-undermined consequences that influence our day-to-day lives.

High levels of perceived corruption lead to a feeling of distrust towards institutions and specially, the democratic ones. This loss of trust can then originate the rise of extremist and populist parties, the percentage of people choosing not to vote increases and economies become “anaemic” (Monteiro, 2021). Loss of potential investments in number and value will occur has there is a break of trust regarding the management of resources by politicians and important institutions; less investment is translated to less economic growth and development (Mauro, 1995; Peneda, 2023). Less investment would represent economic instability.

Melgar et al. (2010) even go deeper and make a powerful statement when saying that “(...) *the perception of economic corruption would have more devastating effects than corruption itself ...*” as these authors believe that corruption perception would result in a dangerous increase in institution instability. The authors also strain those high levels of perceptions of corruption lead to “*deterioration of the relationships among individuals, institutions, and states*” – societies change with the lack of trust in institutions, the relations between the economic and political spheres become more tense and less efficient.

If this phenomenon is looked at as a vicious cycle it means that when perceptions of corruption increase, real levels of corruption consequently become higher (de Lancer Julnes and Villoria, 2014). There are opposing views in the literature when discussing the effect of this cycle in electoral participation. The majority views this relation as inverse (when the levels

of real corruption are higher, the population decreases their electoral participation), but there are some countries that go the other way around (higher corruption levels lead to people being more eager to vote and increase electoral participation) (Stockemer & Calca, 2013).

In conclusion, the upsurge of perceived corruption levels leads to a worrying break of trust between population and democratic institutions with both political and economic consequences: rise of populism, less investment, lack of economic growth, political and economic instability and potentially less electoral participation, on top of increasing the real levels of corruption.

Perceptions of corruption- the Portuguese puzzle

Since the research question guiding this dissertation is: “How do socioeconomic factors contribute to different levels of corruption perceptions' in Portugal?”, it is necessary and mandatory to assess how the available literature evaluates this phenomenon in Portugal. With this being said, this present section will present how throughout the years this topic was researched and what conclusions the authors reached. This will be the only section of this literature review that will be organized in chronological order to better capture the evolution of the studies and conclusions regarding Portugal.

According to de Sousa (2008), even though there is usually a consensus from society to condemn corruption, Portuguese citizens tolerate it as they engage in “*small influence peddling*”- something in the Portuguese language known as “*cunhas*”. This brings attention to the fact that corruption involves more than just one type of conduct or behaviour like nepotism or bribery. Small influence peddling is no stranger to both regular citizens and public workers as it is a behaviour that the author defines as being perceived as “*not (...) especially problematic or damaging to democracy*”. The concept of small influence peddling is so embedded in the normality of everyday life that is completely tolerated across society. The author also reveals that Portugal can be considered as being tolerant towards corruption but with Portuguese citizens perceiving bribery, extortion and abuse of office as corrupt actions.

Melgar et al. in 2010 used the module on Citizenship of the 2004 International Social Survey Program (ISSP) to study the perceptions of corruption across more than 30 countries. The authors rank the countries from the highest to the lowest one with percentage of respondents that could change their perceptions about the highest level of corruption. Trying to capture if there are countries where perceptions of corruption are more volatile than in others. Portugal is the only country from the European Union (the 2004 format) that is in the first half of table, being the Western country with the highest volatility regarding perceptions of corruption.

Lancer Julnes and Villoria (2014) point out that there is a contrast between how Portuguese citizens perceive corruption within institutions and how institutions actually enforce their rules to fight corruption. The authors consider the Portuguese institutions with a high enforcement of the law despite citizens having high institutional distrust and high perceptions of corruption. This literature article can then be used to form one more research hypothesis to study the connection between the difference in how Portuguese citizens perceive the corruption levels as worse off or more worrying than what is being actually experienced in the society (as a consequence of this high enforcement of the law). The hypothesis to be tested is then: *H5: Perceptions of corruption of the Portuguese individuals are different from corruption experience.*

Domashova and Politova (2021) divide the countries of the world in clusters according to the level of the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) registered between 2012 and 2019, with Portugal in cluster 0- the one with the lowest average levels of perceived corruption. Peneda (2023), with data from 2021, puts Portugal with the third highest level of nepotism in the European Union. The author also states that 63% of Portuguese perceive that the government is “hostage” of some interest groups, but 80% believes that citizens can make a difference in the fight against corruption.

In conclusion, Portuguese citizens are relatively tolerant of corruption, specially of small peddling influence but also have high perceptions of corruption regarding institutions, bribery, abuse of office and extortion. The Portuguese perceptions of corruption are relatively high in the European context. The number of studies regarding perceptions of corruption in Portugal is always at the national level and still very insufficient to solve this real and literature puzzle.

Literature review- conclusion

This last section of the literature review has the aim of highlighting the main ideas and bringing together the conclusions presented in the read and referenced literature sources.

Corruption is a concept that is not easily defined and that can be looked at through multiple angles but always in relation to some level of condemnation. There are objective definitions which do not depend on the person’s personal perspective of the situation and are related to resources, behaviours or legal parameters. There are also subjective definitions that state that an action that is considered corrupt by someone can be accepted by someone else.

Corruption is a perfect match to the Political Economy framework as it represents the disruption of economic decisions by political actors and with the economic and political consequences it produces.

Perceptions of corruption are an indirect way of studying corruption and are connected with corruption levels as the vicious cycle between the two is a never-ending story. There are a lot of ideas connected to the way people view corrupt behaviours, but it is worth highlighting, within the existing literature, the contribution of Gouvêa Maciel et al. (2022) that developed a set of 4 possible definitions of the phenomenon connecting different angles of analysis with different ways of framing how people perceive corruption.

Perceptions of corruption are influenced by a number of different factors with previous authors establishing important connections that are worth confronting against other sets of data (through the research hypotheses) while also leaving room for further investigation of the connections that weren't able to be strictly reached: in particular, the ones regarding socioeconomic factors. The economic and political consequences that high perceptions of corruption have in current societies cannot be undermined and should be regarded as a critical issue to be considered in discussions regarding this field of study.

Given the high perceptions of corruption registered in Portugal by previous studies regarding bribery, abuse of office and extortion, it is extremely important to continue to develop the available literature. Even though Portuguese citizens are considered tolerant towards some specific types of corruption, the available studies only contemplate national level data which is insufficient to study this phenomenon in bigger and proper dept.

Methodology

Following the section where the topic of this dissertation was contextualized within the existing literature, the goal is to design the best way possible to answer the research question and test the five hypotheses previously formulated. The research question of the dissertation is “How do socioeconomic factors contribute to different levels of corruption perceptions' in Portugal?”. The five hypotheses are as follows: H1: Socioeconomic factors contribute to individuals having different perceptions of corruption. H2: Women and people in worse economic situations perceive corruption as higher. H3: People with higher education levels perceive less corruption or lower corruption levels. H4: People who use traditional media more frequently (reading the newspaper), have higher perceptions of corruption. H5: Perceptions of corruption of the Portuguese individuals are different from corruption experience.

How is it possible to check the way through which socioeconomic factors contribute to the perceptions of corruption of the Portuguese citizens? The answer is through data.

The first step is to do a general overview of the survey from which the data was extracted. The survey (that can be found in the appendix of this dissertation) was applied to one thousand and twenty people between the ages of eighteen and seventy-five years old from all across the Portuguese territory. From December 19th of 2020 to April 21st of 2021, the data was collected from the individual interaction of the trained interviewers with citizens living in Portugal at that time, but not necessarily born in the country. The choice of the interviewees was made by a quotas-based method in order to ensure that the sample was representative of the Portuguese society. Based on the 2011 population census on the Portuguese population, this survey ensured that the interviewees were representative when it comes to the population density and distribution, their gender, age and the level of education attained. Since the more than one thousand interviews guaranteed representativity, this survey is perfectly suited to study the research question of the present dissertation.

The survey was made by GfK Metris, a company responsible for market studies, for Instituto de Ciências Sociais (ICS) of Universidade de Lisboa within the context of two research projects funded by two different Portuguese foundations: Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT) and Fundação Francisco Manuel dos Santos. The projects were titled *Corrupção e Ética em Portugal 2020* and *EPOCA-Corrupção e crise económica*, which were opportunities to study corruption in relation with its ethical implications and within the economic context of a crisis.

In order to properly answer the research question, it is important to understand what Portuguese citizens conceive as corruption or as a corrupt behaviour. From what it is known

from the existing and already analysed literature, there are numerous ways to define corruption, so it is of extreme urgency to understand what the interviewees (as a representation of the Portuguese citizens) grasp as corruption. The legal definition of corruption in the Portuguese law is “(1) corruption in the broad sense with all its variants, (2) peculation including the peculation of use, and (3) economic participation in business.” (Stockemer and Calca, 2013). It is important to keep this definition in mind to be able to properly discuss what constitutes corruption within the Portuguese society. The perceived definition of corruption by the interviewees will be overviewed by the analysis of the answers to the following question: “P14. The term corruption is recurrent amongst conversations, but it can mean different things to different people. With our country in mind, when you hear the term corruption, what are the words that you most associate with the topic? Give a maximum of three words.” The assessment of the qualitative data from the answers given, will allow for the construction of a conceptual framework of the topic of corruption within the use of this specific set of data. This pool of answers will give a better understanding of what is being discussed within this work and that is why it is the first portion of the data that will be assessed.

The questions posed by the survey cover a wide range of topics allowing for both qualitative and quantitative data to be extracted. After the analysis of the answers to question P14, it is important to discuss how the analysis of the quantitative data will proceed.

The goal of this dissertation is to check how socioeconomic factors influence corruption perceptions through the validation or denial of the hypotheses, thus the connection between both dimensions and the dimensions themselves, have to be extracted from the questions available within the study. The (possible) connections will be assessed through multiple linear regression econometric models made with/through the statistical software Stata. These types of statistical models allow for the use of several explanatory variables (the different socioeconomic factors) to account for their effects on the dependent variable (for example: corruption perceptions’, corruption experience, corruption perceptions’ regarding only public sector employees). These effects on the possible dependent variables are the possible explanations for hypotheses number one to four. The veracity of hypothesis number five will come from the comparison between the answers of two of the dependent variables that will be mentioned further ahead, corruption perceptions and corruption experience.

Eight models are going to be tested and have as dependent variables the corruption perceptions (models one and two), corruption perceptions regarding only public sector employees (models three and four), direct corruption experience (models five and six) and indirect corruption experience (models seven and eight).

Corruption perceptions are assessed through the answers to the question “P20. *Imagine that 100 people live in Portugal. Out of these 100, how many would you say are corrupt?*” The answers considered are any number between zero and one hundred. If the person acknowledges that they do not know the answer or if they refuse to answer, these answers are coded as 999 or 997 and are excluded from the model. The question will be used to assess the percentage of corrupt people that the respondents believe that exist in Portugal and will represent the general level of corruption perceptions in Portugal.

Corruption perceptions regarding only public sector employees are evaluated through the answers to the question “P21. *Imagine that the total number of public sector employees in Portugal is 100. Out of these 100, how many would you say are corrupt?*” The answers considered are any number between zero and one hundred. If the person acknowledges that they do not know the answer or if they refuse to answer, these answers are coded as 999 or 997 and are excluded from the model. This question will be used to evaluate the way people perceive corruption within the exclusive pool of public sector employees thus presenting the percentage of perceived corrupt public sector workers.

Corruption experience is divided in two parts: direct corruption experience (first hand encounters with corruption) and indirect corruption experience (second-hand experiences of corruption). Direct corruption experience is assessed through the answers to the question “P25. *How many times, in the last 3 years, has any public sector employee asked you or gave you the impression that they wanted bribes in exchange for their services?*” This is a multiple-choice question with the options given being: never, one time, two times, three times, four times and five or more times. If the person acknowledges that they do not know the answer or if they refuse to answer, these answers are coded as 99 or 97 and are excluded from the model. This question will be used to assess if the respondent has had, in fact, any direct contact with corrupt situations or not. This will allow for comparisons and for connections to possibly be established between corruption direct experience and corruption perceptions. Indirect corruption experience is weighed by the answers to the question “P27. *When it comes to people that you know in a close/personal way, how many times, in the last 3 years, has anyone of them told you how they solved a problem or unlocked a decision by offering a bribe to a public sector employee?*” This is a multiple-choice question with the options given being: never, one time, two times, three times, four times and five or more times. If the person acknowledges that they do not know the answer or if they refuse to answer, these answers are coded as 99 or 97 and are excluded from the model. This question will be used to assess what level of indirect contact

with corruption the respondent has had. This will allow for comparisons and for connections to possibly be established between corruption indirect experience and corruption perceptions.

Table 1. Dimensions studied by the dependent variables

Dependent variable	Dimension studied
P20	Perceptions of corruption
P21	Perceptions of corruption regarding only public sector employees
P25	Direct corruption experience
P27	Indirect corruption experience

The eight models estimated will be composed by different combinations of socioeconomic factors. The perception regarding the (un)fairness of income distribution will be assessed through the question “P8. Would you classify the income distribution in Portugal as very fair, fair, neither fair nor unfair, unfair or very unfair?”. The perception regarding the (in)sufficiency of the own household income is analysed through the question “D26. Regarding your household’s income, would you say that you: 1) live comfortably with it, 2) are able to live with it, 3) are finding difficult to live with it, 4) are finding very difficult to live with it?”. Both this question and the one above are related to the economic dimension of the society and the individual’s everyday life.

The questions *D9*, *D12* and *D15* all regard the employment situation of the interviewee. *D9* has its focus on the current employment situation and *D12* unfolds the employment dimension, allowing for distinctions to be made between business owners, self-employers and people that are working for others. *D15* is a subsection of the previous questions as it unveils information regarding the nature of the respondents’ employers: whether they work in the private or public sector. All these questions study a different dimension of employment and subsequently, account for interactions with the economic, the social and the political sphere of the Portuguese society.

The influence of social media usage and the habit of reading newspapers when looking for updates concerning politics and society will also be considered through the analysis of the questions *D4* and *D5*, respectively.

Other personal features that are important to account for are gender (*D6*), highest qualification/education levels attained (*D24*) and political affiliation (*D3*). For the analysis of the question regarding political affiliation it is important to consider that at the time the answers

were collected (between December of 2020 and April of 2021), the Socialist Party was the one who was in government.

For every question analysed the respondents could express their refusal to answer or if they did not know the answer, in either case, these types of answers are disregarded from the model thus it is expected that none of the models used will reach the total of one thousand and twenty valid answers.

Table 2. Dimensions studied by the independent variables

Independent variable	Dimension studied
P8	Perception regarding the (un)fairness of income distribution
D3	Political affiliation
D4	Frequency of using social media as source for information
D5	Frequency of reading newspapers as source for information
D6	Gender
D9	Current employment situation
D12	Situation within employment
D15	Nature of the employer
D24	Education level
D26	Perception regarding the (in)sufficiency of the own household income

Systematized data

This current section of the dissertation, titled systematized data, has the aim to provide further clarity to the work through the systematization of the data used throughout the analysis made. A section solely dedicated to the data used is deemed necessary to provide the reader the clues to clearly understand and solve the connections made in the following sections: the results and discussion, and the concluding section. This portion of the dissertation thus starts with a recap of the general features of data and then, proceeds to present the descriptive statistics of each of the four dependent variables: corruption perceptions, corruption perceptions' regarding only public sector employees, direct corruption experience and indirect corruption experience. These four variables are presented in the exact same order that they are going to be discussed and detailed in the following section of this paper (results and discussion section).

The data used to form the perceived definition of corruption in the Portuguese society and used in the econometric models to analyse the influence of the socioeconomic factors in the different dependent variables, was collected through a survey. The survey was made by GfK Metris for ICS in the context of two research projects funded by Fundação Francisco Manuel dos Santos and FCT. The interviews were made between December of 2020 and April of 2021. One thousand and twenty people were questioned on multiple topics and all of them were between eighteen (18) and seventy-five (75) years old. Based on the information collected in the 2011 population census, the individuals chosen are considered representative of the Portuguese society thus relevant to be used to answer the research question of this dissertation.

The question P20 was used to study the perceptions of corruption. The individuals were asked to state the number of people, out of one hundred living in Portugal, they believed to be corrupt. The most common answer was fifty (50) and the mean value was 40,44982. This question was answered a total of eight hundred and forty-seven times (847) and had as standard deviation the value of 26,5317. The answers varied between a minimum of 0 and maximum of 100 corrupt individuals in the Portuguese society.

The question P21 studied the dimension of corruption perceptions' regarding only public sector employees. The interviewees had to choose a number that represented the portion of public sector employees (out of a universe of one hundred public sector workers) that they felt were corrupt. The most common answer was fifty (50) and the mean value was 40,62888. This question had a total of eight hundred and thirty-eight (838) answers and had as standard

deviation the value of 27,01753. The answers varied between a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 100 public sector employees considered as corrupt.

The question P25 studied direct corruption experience. The individuals had to report the number of times they had encounters with corrupt activities/services. The most common answer was never (1), and the mean value was 1,128153. This question was answered nine hundred and ninety-one (991) times and had as standard deviation the value of 0,5343972. The answers varied between the minimum of never having experienced corruption (1) and having experienced direct corruption five or more times (5).

The question P27 was used to account for the level of indirect corruption experience. This time the individuals had to name the number of times they had heard acquaintances reporting to them their own corruption experiences. The most common answer was never (1) and the mean value was 1,355465. This question was answered a total of nine hundred and seventy-nine (979) times and had as standard deviation the value of 0,8712039. The answers varied between the minimum of never (1) and having heard of indirect corruption experience five or more times (5).

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the dependent variables

Dependent variable	Observations	Mean	Mode	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
P20	847	40.44982	50	26.5317	0	100
P21	838	40.62888	50	27.01753	0	100
P25	991	1.128153	1 (Never)	0.5343972	1	5
P27	979	1.355465	1 (Never)	0.8712039	1	5

Results and discussion

The results and discussion section of this dissertation aimed to on one hand present the concepts, variables and models studied. But on the other hand, to discuss the findings and establish connections between the dimensions studied to try to contribute to the knowledge on the phenomenon while also, trying to either validate or disprove the five hypotheses established through the literature review. First, the perceived definition of corruption will be presented in order to provide a conceptual framework of what Portuguese citizens perceive as corruption. For the following subsections regarding corruption perceptions, corruption perceptions regarding public sector workers and corruption experience, the structure is as follows: presentation of the results of the individual variable, presentation of the econometric models – one complete and one without political affiliation – and comparison of the effects of the socioeconomic variables in both models. After that, the comparisons between dimensions are going to be made to establish parallels and differences between global perception of corruption and perception of corrupt public sector workers and as well, between global perception of corruption and corruption experience (in its two forms: direct and indirect). The discussion will be made throughout the different subsections and as the results are presented. This section will end with a brief recapitulation of the main ideas discussed regarding the investigation hypotheses.

The perceived definition of corruption

The interviewees were asked to state the words that for them would better be associated with corruption concerning Portugal, without regarding a specific point of view or behaviour, therefore these answers could only generate a sociotropic and generic definition of the phenomenon. From the 1581 examples provided, the most common answers were “politicians”, “stealing” and “money”, in this respective order, and all together add up about twenty percent of the total answers. After those and worth more than 3 percent or answered by more than seventy different individuals, the most common answers were “dishonesty”, “thieves”, “bribes”, “banks” and “football”.

These eight words are associated with resources or the access to them (“politicians”, “money” and “banks”), with bad/deviant behaviours (“stealing”, “dishonesty” and “thieves”) or even with both (“bribes” and “football”). These terms can be matched with only two of three

distinct types of the objective definitions present in the literature and previously mentioned: resource/market related or behaviour-focused ones.

Table 4. The terms most associated with corruption

Terms mentioned	Frequency	%
Politicians	253	10
Stealing	134	5
Money	127	5
Dishonesty	106	4
Thieves	100	4
Bribes	95	4
Banks	81	3
Football	75	3

From these most frequent answers, it is interesting to highlight that only one of them can be perfectly fit into what the Portuguese law defines as corruption, only “bribes” can be considered as a corrupt behaviour. Even though there are other words with a bad connotation and meaning like “stealing” or “dishonesty”, they cannot be considered corruption at the eyes of the Portuguese law. It is clear that the interviewees associate corruption with a vast number of badly connoted words but not all that is considered bad can be considered corrupt. This is an important distinction to bear in mind when analysing the results regarding the topic. Therefore, it is explicit in the answers to the questionnaire that there is a mismatch between what people perceive as corrupt and what actions can be legally considered as corrupt. The perceived definition of corruption is a much bigger umbrella that can cover a whole lot more of bad deeds and conducts than what is under the umbrella of the actual definition of the phenomenon. This can possibly be an explanation for the difference between experienced levels of corruption and perceived levels of corruption- the law and citizens are conceptualizing corruption in diverse ways.

In order to properly introduce the subsections regarding each of the four dependent variables (corruption perceptions, corruption perceptions regarding public sector workers and corruption experience- direct and indirect), it was necessary to gather in one place the information related to the multiple variable coefficients and their values throughout the eight

models. Thus, the table below presented, numbered as five and titled as Independent variable coefficients across the multiple models, supplies an overview of all the values of every single independent variable across each different model. It also allows to analyse the effects of the variables in proper context and compare them with other models (or even within models). This table is exhibited before the presentation and discussion of the models, as the subsections were quite dense and required a guidebook to interpret some of the connections and reflections later done.

Table 5. Independent variable coefficients across the multiple models

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
P8	(+) 2.293886	(+) 3.951193	(+) 1.526521	(+) 3.892832	(+) .0527327	(+) .0033684	- .0280236	(+) .0081219
D26	(+) 3.880326	(+) .1703764	(+) 2.607667	- .057857	- .000315	(+) .0012467	(+) .0043863	(+) .0086964
D15	(+)0.1348498	(+) .1005607	(+) .6971352	(+) .3105245	- .0022297	- .0016514	- .0030007	- .0034768
D24	- .4692101	- 1.463082	- .302951	- 1.986477	(+) .0044545	- .0026349	- .010144	(+) .006938
D12	(+) 4.740998	(+) 3.515312	(+) 1.06301	(+) 2.098638	(+) .0311353	(+) .0211954	(+) .2373225	(+) .2173779
D6	(+) 2.944107	(+) 1.888588	(+) 4.458096	(+) 5.037596	- .1012108	- .0694871	- .032763	- .0807896
D9	(+) .5701782	- .0939083	(+) 1.022938	(+) .0772112	(+) .0314039	(+) .0114906	- .0184396	- .0160001
D4	(+) .9044848	- .865914	- 1.300691	- 1.61942	(+) .0189757	(+) .0049262	- .015194	- .0298446
D5	(+) .5269081	(+) .5990638	- .1287503	- .1153954	(+) .0004534	(+) .0029674	- .003099	- .0014395
D3	- .0984999	X	- .1287503	X	- .0096184	X	- .0179299	X

Corruption perceptions'

The question P20 was answered a total of eight hundred and forty-seven times and the most frequently answered value was fifty which means that for one hundred and seventy interviewees, every fifty out of one hundred people that live in Portugal are corrupt. The most

frequent answer actually means that 20% of the enquired perceive that half of the people that they encounter in their everyday lives is corrupt.

The answers varied between the minimum value of 0 and the maximum value of one hundred people. Only a single person believed that there are no corrupt people, and this response was given by a public sector employee that lives in the Porto district. The thirteen people that believed that everybody in the society is corrupt were mainly from coastal districts like Porto and Setúbal. This belief was also mainly shared by private sector workers or self-employed people (only one public sector worker shared this belief).

Additionally, 19,6% believe that ten or less people out of one hundred participate in corrupt activities and 23,73% believe that more than half of the population is corrupt.

Given the considerable number of answers higher than fifty or even ninety, it is only responsible to pose the question whether or not the interviewees utterly understand that when picking a number out of one hundred, they are choosing a percentage of people. Is it understandable for all that, when they pick the number 50, it means that they are stating that they believe half of the population is corrupt? Maybe and probably not. This misinterpretation of what is being asked combined with a broader definition of corruption (bigger than the one considered by legal entities), should be considered as a reason for the high perceived levels of corruption registered in Portugal.

Two econometric models were tested with the question P20 as their dependent variable, those were numbered models one and two. It was important to make a model without a declared political affiliation and a different one with this effect measured, because a lot of people were not comfortable stating their political opinions and consequently, the number of available observations dramatically decreased. For this reason, for every single different dependent variable chosen, there were two models tested- a complete one and the one without political affiliation, in this case, models one and two respectively.

Model one had 288 observations and a R^2 of 4,88% (0,0488). Only two of the socioeconomic factors had a negative sign regarding their influence on corruption perceptions': the education level and the political affiliation. Higher education levels attained are translated into lower levels of perceived corruption. This meant that the individuals whose education levels were higher, like a bachelor's or a master's degree, believed that less people were corrupt than when compared to someone with only a high school diploma. This effect of education levels confirmed hypothesis number three. Individuals who voted for either the Socialist Party (PS) or the Social Democratic Party (PSD), had the tendency to perceive lower levels of corruption than the ones who claimed to affiliate with political parties with smaller

parliamentary representation. The fact that there were socioeconomic factors whose effect were not only with different signals but with different coefficients, meant that socioeconomic factors had the power to make the level of perceived corruption different according to the different answers given by the interviewees. This was the confirmation of hypothesis number one. The other socioeconomic factors had a positive sign regarding their influence on the dependent variable. Higher perceived levels of injustice related to income distribution in the economy, higher economic discomfort regarding the own's family income and jobs in either family businesses or own projects or companies are factors that lead to an increase in corruption perceptions. Female interviewees and people who were unemployed or retired tended to have higher perceptions of corruption than their male counterparts or people who were, at that time, working. Individuals in worse economic situations could be considered a mixture of someone who is unemployed or retired (due to the lower income received when compared to a salary/wage) and also, someone who is feeling more uncomfortable with their own income when comparing with others. Given that these two variables increased perceptions of corruption and also female interviewees perceived a higher number of Portuguese corrupt citizens than men, the hypothesis number two was also confirmed. Regarding the consumption of societal and political content, the more frequent use of both traditional media and social media platforms was translated into higher levels of perceived corruption. Since the use of traditional media (like a newspaper) more frequently was a synonym of higher perceptions of corruption, hypothesis number four was also proved. Moreover, the nature of the employer was the factor with the least impact and although its effect was positive, it was of extremely low relevance. The variables with the most impact were the perception regarding the own's family economic (dis)comfort as well as whether the individual was self-employed or working for the family business or working for others.

Model two had 649 observations and a R^2 of 3,13% (0,0313). When taking the political affiliation out of the picture, a couple of variables switched their effects to the opposite signal. Unemployed or retired individuals now tended to have lower perceptions of corruption than employed individuals. The use of media outlets for news on politics or society wide topics has a role in decreasing the perceptions of corrupt actions. The more times individuals turned to these mass media channels to be political enlightened, the less and less they believed in the degree of corruption across the Portuguese society. This means that, in this particular model, the perceptions of corruption increase or decrease according to the source where individuals look for news on politics and society.

Unlike what was studied through model one, in this second model, the nature of the employer is pertinent and with a positive sign. People who were either self-employed or worked for the private sector had higher levels of perceived corruption when compared to people who worked for/in the public sector. In model two, the variables with the most important effects were the perception regarding the (in)justice of income distribution across the Portuguese society and the nature of the relation intra-employment (self-employed, working for family business or working for others).

To summarize, when the political affiliations were taken out of the equation, the perceptions of employed vs unemployed people switched its signal as well as the influence of the use of more traditional means of communication to gain knowledge on politics. Both models have in common the fact that the nature of the relation intra-employment is a determinant factor for the way corruption is perceived.

Corruption perceptions' regarding only public sector employees

The question P21 was answered a total of eight hundred and thirty-eight times and the most frequent answer was the number fifty (50), with 19,09 % of the interviewees believing that half of the people who work for the public sector are corrupt. This answer concentrated the perceptions of one hundred and sixty people considering their views specifically on how corruption is intertwined with and within the Portuguese public sector.

The answers to this question varied between a minimum of zero and a maximum of one hundred corrupt public sector employees. Five individuals answered that not a single public sector employee in Portugal is corrupt. Four of them were from coastal district Porto and one was from the Santarém district. All worked for someone other than themselves or their families. Only one worked for the public sector and the other four were working for the private sector. Inversely, twenty-four individuals answered that all public sector workers were corrupt. The vast majority of those individuals – twenty-two of them - were self-employed (thirteen) or worked for private enterprises (nine). Two-thirds were from coastal districts (Porto, Braga and Setúbal) and seven others were from inland districts and one from the Azores Islands.

Moreover, 79,47% of the interviewees believed that more than ten people out of one hundred public sector employees are corrupt. This means that almost 80% of the people questioned believe that in the universe of public sector employees, more than one out of ten public sector workers that people encounter is corrupt. 25,3% of the answers stated than more

than half of the public sector employees are corrupt, and these are numbers that paint a very dark picture of what people perceive is being done within the Portuguese public sector.

Additionally, it is worth highlighting that there were two public sector employees that answered that 100% of public sector employees were corrupt. Can this be considered an admission of self-guilt, or do they work in a completely corrupt environment? Does everybody that they meet, connect or work with really engage in some kind of corrupt behaviours or actions? This connects to the previously discussed idea that some of the respondents do not (at least fully) understand what the answers given actually infer. It is clear that there is no self-reflection on the reality that is being painted through the individual answers because it is unimaginable that, for example, ninety out of one hundred public sector employees would be corrupt and even more, that this fact would stay under the radar of the judicial system in a democratic and developed country like Portugal. This tendency was, as expected, present in both P20 and P21 as the perceptions of corruption of public sector employees are taken into account and are an important part of the global perceptions of corruption on the Portuguese society.

Likewise, in the previous section, two econometric models were tested with the same dependent variable, in this case, with question P21. Model three with all socioeconomic factors tested and model four tested without political affiliation to check the influences of the factors on the perceptions of corruption regarding only public sector employees.

Model three had two hundred and eighty-one observations and a R^2 of 3,46% (0,0346). Four socioeconomic factors registered a negative sign thus a negative influence on the studied dimension. Higher education levels attained led to lower levels of perceived corruption among public sector employees. The individuals who used more regularly both traditional media outlets and social media platforms like Facebook, X (at that time Twitter) or others, to inform themselves on political and issues related to society perceived a lower number of corrupt public sector employees. The more people informed themselves on politics and society regardless of the channel, the less they perceived corruption levels in the public sector. The political affiliations also had a negative impact on the dependent variable and demonstrated that people who voted for either PS (at that time in government) or PSD perceived lower amounts of corrupt public workers. The higher perceptions stated were associated with (declared) voters who supported political parties other than the two most voted parties. The perceptions discussed in this current section were also positively influenced by a number of socioeconomic factors. More negative views on personal economic situation/comfort or pessimistic opinions on how (in)just the income distribution in Portugal is, were synonyms of higher perceptions of corrupt public

employees. Female interviewees and people who were either self-employed or worked for a family business perceived higher corruption amongst public workers than men or people who work for others. Employed individuals perceived less corruption than unemployed or retired individuals. The factor studied through question D15 had a positive but not relevant effect. The two factors with the most significant effects were gender and the perception regarding the own's family economic (dis)comfort.

Model four had six hundred and forty-four observations and a R^2 of 4,16% (0,0416). When taking the political affiliation out of the model, only one variable changed its effect: the perception regarding the own's family economic (dis)comfort. The effect changed from a positive to a negative signal and this meant that, in this new model, when someone perceived their own economic situation to be more comfortable, they were more likely to perceive a higher number of public sector employees to be corrupt. From the factors that remained with the same signal, the nature of the employer within the section of working for others (from question D15) was as in the previous model deemed not relevant. The two factors with most significant impact on increasing the level of perceived corruption were the gender of the interviewee and the perception regarding the justice of income distribution in Portugal.

In both models three and four, more traditional media channels and social media usage have the same signal and as the number of times that people use them for informational purposes increased, the lower perceptions of corruption regarding public sector employees got. The declaration or not of political affiliation does not change the way the majority of socioeconomic factors influence this specific dimension of perceptions of corruption. The declaration of political affiliation decreased the number of observations in more than 350 answers, and this reveals an underlying issue in discussing topics regarding political positions or opinions. This non-discussion contrasts with how easily people declare that they inform themselves on politics and issues important to society.

To summarize, when the political affiliations were taken out of the equation, the perceptions of the more economically/financially comfortable people tended to be more pessimistic regarding the propagation of corruption amongst public sector employees. These perceptions were then higher in number of corrupt workers and with a different influence than in the complete model. Both models have in common the signals of the other factors' influence and the fact that the gender of the interviewee is of extreme importance.

Corruption experience

Corruption experience was analysed through two different questions (P25 and P27) in order to analyse this twofold phenomenon: citizens living in Portugal can form their opinions on corruption by direct or indirect contact. People can either experience corruption or hear about it over conversations with family or friends whose lives have now encountered such behaviours or situations.

The question regarding direct corruption experience (P25) was answered a total of nine hundred and ninety-one (991) times. The most frequent answer was that the interviewee never experienced corruption with nine hundred and twenty people stating that they never had a public employee asking them for a bribe. This means that 92,84% of people who answered this question never experienced corruption. From the remaining given answers, thirty-seven people answered that they experienced corruption once, twenty people answered that they experienced it twice, six people answered that they experienced it three or four times and eight individuals answered that they experienced corruption five or more times. Only seventy-one people who answered this question never had contact with corruption which deeply differs from the 920 who had never encountered or engaged in such activities.

Two econometric models were tested with question P25 as a dependent variable: models five and six. Model number five tested the effects of all socioeconomic factors on the levels of experienced corruption and model six excluded the effect of the declaration of political affiliation.

Model five had three hundred and twenty-seven observations and a R^2 of 3,51% (0,0351). Four socioeconomic factors had a negative signal and consequently, a negative influence on the number of times interviewees had experienced corruption. Men experienced corruption more often than women and people who perceived their own economic situation as more comfortable than others had the tendency to have experienced more situations in which a public sector employee asked them for a bribe. When discussing the situation within the people who for others (D15), people who work for the private sector experienced less corruption than public sector employees. Self-employed people also experienced less corruption than public sector employees. So, public sector employees are the workers that experienced corruption the most. The political affiliations also had a negative impact on the dependent variable and demonstrated that people who voted for either PS (at that time in government) or PSD experienced corruption less times than others. The remaining socioeconomic factors had a positive influence on the corruption experience. The higher people perceived the injustice level in income distribution to

be, the more experience they had with corrupt incidents. Higher educational levels attained were a synonym of higher likelihood to have experienced a corrupt encounter. Individuals who either were self-employed or worked for their family-owned businesses were more likely to have experienced more corruption than those who worked for others. The more frequent the search for political information via either social media platforms or more traditional media channels, the more corruption people experienced. The more people sought out to be informed on political and social topics, the more likely they were to have experienced corruption. More information was connected with a higher number of corruption experiences. It is important to highlight that compared to other models, model five showed lower coefficients for the socioeconomic factors studied. There was not a single variable with a coefficient higher than one but the variable with the highest coefficient was gender.

Model six had a total of seven hundred and fifty-eight observations and a R^2 of 0,82% (0,0082). Even though this model had a higher number of observations, the explanation power was drastically reduced to the lowest number from all the models studied in this dissertation. When political ideology support was removed from the model, the explanation of the socioeconomic factors is only barely above 0,5%. Only two economic factors swapped signs from model five to model six. The education level attained is now a synonym of lower number of corruption experiences. Moreover, people who perceived their economic situations to be worse were more likely to have experienced corrupt interactions more often. The factors did not have a significant effect on the dependent variable plus these effects were even less mobilizing than in the model that took the political affiliation into account.

Both models regarding direct corruption experiences had similar effects on the vast majority of the socioeconomic factors and could be both characterized for the low coefficient of their independent variables.

Personal encounters with people who ask for bribes can change someone's perspective on how corrupt the society around them is. However, that only represents one portion of corruption experiences. This other portion is most of the times overlooked and not included in the study of the phenomenon of corruption experience. There is another way to experience corruption and that is through what the people we know have faced in their everyday lives. Thus, knowledge surrounding corruption can be learnt through indirect experience and is also important to be studied.

The analysis of the question P27 allowed to dig deeper into indirect experiences of corruption. This question was answered nine hundred and seventy-nine times, and the most common response was a statement of no contact with indirect corruption. 81,61% of people,

which account for 799 interviewees, revealed that the people they personally knew were not asked for a bribe by a public sector employee in the past three years. This means that only about 19% of people had a conversation with an acquaintance in which they revealed having been tempted with a corrupt way to achieve or fasten the access to a public service. Eighty-two people answered one time, forty-nine people answered two times, twenty-eight people answered three or more times and twenty-one people answered five or more times in which someone revealed to them a situation of corrupt access to a public service through the payment of a bribe. The answers to the question P27 reveal that the indirect contact with corruption is not common at all and that the overwhelming majority of people have not heard of episodes of corruption from the people closest to them.

The study of the effects of socioeconomic factors in indirect corruption experience was studied through models seven and eight that have the question P27 as their dependent variable. As in the previous sections, the first model discussed is the one with all factors included and the second one is the model without the declared political affiliation.

Model seven had three hundred and twenty-three observations and a R^2 of 3,02% (0,0302). Only two socioeconomic factors had a positive signal: the perception of own's economic situation and the nature of the employer. The more struggling an individual perceive themselves to be, the more likely it was for their family members or acquaintances to have experienced corruption. Worse perceptions about the balance of the family available income to face expenses, the more likely the indirect contacts with corrupt activities. Moreover, an individual who was self-employed was more likely to have been in contact with corrupt activities than people who worked for others (in the public or the private sector). From these two factors, the nature of the employer revealed to be the most relevant one. The remaining factors had a negative influence on the degree of indirect experiences of corruption. The absence or lower numbers of indirect experiences of corruption were connected to higher levels of education, people whose job was in the private section or were self-employed, people who perceived the income distribution to be unfair and people who were not working (either unemployed or retired). Male individuals had higher indirect corrupt experiences than their female counterparts. People who turned for social media platforms and more traditional media channels to inform themselves on politics, were associated with the fewest number of indirect corruption experience. The role of the political affiliation had the same effect as in the other few models studied: the vote for either PS or PSD created a bias towards a negative influence. In the case of model seven, this meant that people who voted for these two parties- for the one in government or the bigger party from the opposition- had lower contacts with corruption through

the experiences of others. Considering all the factors studied with either a positive or negative impact on the dependent variable, the one whose coefficient was higher (and this means that this factor can move the dependent variable with more impact) was whether the individual was self-employed or worked for others or even if they worked for a family business. It is also important to highlight that even though the signal of the socioeconomic factors can be studied, in this particular model, their effects are not truly relevant and as moving as in some of the previous studied model.

Model eight studied all the socioeconomic factors with the exception of the political affiliation. This model had seven hundred and fifty-one observations and a R^2 of 2,11% (0,0211). Comparing with the other model used to study indirect experience of corruption, this one had two socioeconomic factors swapping signs. Two factors that previously had a negative influence on the number of indirect corrupt experiences, now contributed to increase the number of such events. In model eight, the more unjust people perceived their economic situation to be, more likely they were to know people who had encountered a corrupt event. Also, people with higher education levels had more probability of closely knowing someone that was asked to be involved in a dubious situation. Similarly to the previous model, even though the dichotomy working for others versus self-employed workers was the most determinant factor, the overall effects of the remaining factors were not relevant. None of the socioeconomic factors had an effect higher or similar to 0,5 which proved that even though the variables had explanation power, their effects were not powerful to alter, at least in a determinant way, the number of indirect corruption experiences.

The indirect corruption experience was thus studied through two models with same general tendencies: the low effects of the variables studied and the relation with the employer (working for others, self-employed or working for a family business) being the most determinant socioeconomic factor.

From the analysis of both questions regarding corruption experience, it was learnt that the political affiliation was a decisive topic as from model seven to model eight the number of answers dropped by more than four hundred, similarly to the also noteworthy drop of answers from model five to model six. The subtraction or addition of the political affiliation variable in the corruption experience models changed the influence of education levels and one more factor in each subdimension. Declaring a political affiliation or intention of vote for a specific party must be connoted with expectations and stereotypes as it seems it was the most taboo topic that these models studied. Most people were not willing to discuss the political party they would vote for even though the interviewers guaranteed the anonymity of the individual answers. This

poses the reflection and discussion if it was, on one hand, a matter of distrust in discussing this particular topic with others who were not family members, close friends or associates and on the other hand, if it was an eventual distrust that the information discussed could be kept as private as the questionnaire guaranteed. It could even be a mixture but is definitely related to a feeling of distrust transversal to most of the interviewees. This feeling was present in the underlying subtext of the given answers to the questions related to the perceived length of the corruption's tentacles across society and then more specifically in the public sector. Given and exemplified by the various models studied, political affiliation is a determinant variable by its answers but also by the silence it echoes and, as a result, it can be concluded that the approach to collect this type of information must be carefully analysed or even rethought. This marvel of non-answers or purposeful silence must condition the data collected and requires further study. There is, then, clearly a dimension of the intersection between the economic, political and social spheres of the society that has not been yet declassified.

Perceptions of corruption: comparison between global and public sector incidence

After studying the models with perceptions of corruption and perceptions of public sector corruption as dependant variables, it was important to compare these two dimensions. Firstly, with a comparison of the dependant variables (perceptions of corruption regarding the Portuguese society as a whole and only regarding the public sector workers) and secondly, with a comparison of the models and how socioeconomic factors influenced the two variables already mentioned in this phrase. The comparison of the models only included the complete models- the models with political affiliation, thus model number one and model number three.

Thinking about how widespread corruption is across the Portuguese society is not the same exercise of thinking how many public sector employees one has encountered are corrupt. Even though these are different dimensions is important to highlight and reinforce that public sector employees are part of the society, so some of the effects captured by one phenomenon must be included in the more global view of perceptions.

The answers to the questions on how many people or how many public sector employees out of one hundred were corrupt shared some connections: an accumulation of answers around round numbers (like twenty, fifty or ninety), the same most common answer (the number fifty or half of the population) and relatively similar patterns of distribution of answers (almost the same percentage of people believe in more than half of the universe of the question being corrupt). Even though the distribution of answers is relatively similar, the numbers are a bit

higher when discussing the perceptions around the public sector corruption. These numbers were also associated with the qualitative data gathered as the only profession/job that was mentioned in the universe of corruption-related words was indeed a public sector job: “politicians”. An already mentioned idea, but that is worth reminding, is that the answers to both questions drafted an astonishingly worrying sketch of the Portuguese society. The perceptions of corruption across the society and across the public sector were extremely high with a considerable number of individuals (about twenty five percent in each case) perceiving more than five people out of every ten they meet as corrupt. These numbers demonstrated that both dimensions were perceived as high at an almost unimaginable level that cannot clearly be confirmed in reality. Additionally, this revealed a peculiar level of distrust towards not only the public sector but society in general, which could mean that the Portuguese society takes a more judgemental approach when discussing corruption related topics regardless of not having details of a specific behaviour or person (the interviewer did not question about a specific judicial case, behaviour or someone involved, so the perceptions must be about something or someone in a more abstract way).

The models also allowed for a comparison to be made between the effects that the socioeconomic factors had on both dimensions. Even though the socioeconomic factors had a higher explanatory power for the general perception results (model one had a higher R^2), models number one (perceptions for general population), and number three (perceptions for the public sector) had both similarities and differences on the effects of the factors.

The effects of the perception on the personal economic situation/comfort, the perception of the level of income distribution (in)justice, the gender of the interviewee and the variables regarding employment (workers vs non workers, workers for others vs self-employers and type of organization within working for others) had a positive signal and influence in increasing the levels of perceived corruption and the levels of public sector perceived corruption. The effects of political affiliation and the education degree concluded contributed to a decrease in those same perceptions, with a vote for major parties (PS and PSD) and a higher education level becoming a translation to a perceived public sector and society tainted with less corruption. Both models had as most determinant variables a combination of the perception regarding one’s income comfort and one other factor.

The effects of the social media and traditional media channels usage were not the same regarding the two types of perceptions. Regarding perception of corruption in the society, more informed positions on political and society news meant an increase of the perceived corruption level. Regarding perception of corruption in the public sector, more informed individuals

perceived lower levels of corruption amongst public sector workers. A dichotomy was then observed as the most frequent consumption of news meant a belief in higher corruption levels in the society but lower corruption levels in the public sector. So, the most informed Portuguese citizens must attribute corrupt acts not only to the sector studied but also to the private sector. The mention of “banks” and “football” in the list of the terms best associated with corruption can account for a misplace of fault/perception regarding a corrupt act, with individuals more likely attributing the word corrupt to those whose jobs did not involve the deviation of public economic resources. This difference between the influence of consumption of information on both models also reveals that Portuguese citizens can see the bigger picture of the public sector. They can look beyond the fact that politicians are the most reported on public workers when corruption scandals happen and beyond the influence politicians have in both social media and newspapers columns or radio shows. The more informed interviewees see the public sector as more than just politicians so even though they perceived corruption in society as higher, they do not necessarily match it solely to the public sector.

Moreover, it is also important to highlight that the tendency within the information channels was the same. More traditional media channels and social media applications like Twitter or Facebook had the same signal effects to the dependant variables. The effects previously mentioned were either positive or negative regardless of where people sought out information. People who preferred to seek for political information in social media posts had the same tendencies on perceptions of corruption in the society and in the public sector than those who favoured hearing news on television, newspapers and such channels. The difference on the perceptions was not on the type of channel used but on the frequency of the usage regardless of source.

Perceptions of corruption and corruption experience: understanding the dispute of the phenomena

As previously shown in the literature review of this dissertation, the relation between perceptions of corruption and corruption experience must be further studied to uncover and understand its complicated dynamics with the effects of the socioeconomic factors. So, after the comparison between the two perceptions dimensions, the contrast between corruption’s perception and corruption experience was put into paper. The analysis was made through the study of both the variables in themselves and then the models in which the effects on those variables were studied. First, the analysis with direct corruption experience and after that, the indirect way of experiencing corruption.

The study of the answers given on how many times people were asked for a bribe in the past years could not have painted a more different picture than the scenario built up by the answers regarding perceptions of corruption. As previously stated, only one person perceived no corruption at all in the Portuguese society and twenty-five percent of individuals believed more than five out of ten people were corrupt. The numbers of perceptions were far more dooming than the actual corruption experience these interviewees had ever encountered. The overwhelming majority of individuals never experienced corruption: 92,84% of people never had any direct contact with a corrupt situation. This meant that the perception people had could not have come from what they had experienced directly, since only less than 8% people had experience with it in the first place. There was an unmistakable mismatch between corruption experience and corruption perception as they perceive a level of corruption far worse than what they had experienced. The fact that direct experience is not driving perception opened the door to previously made arguments that a combination of not understanding what is being asked (and the concept of percentage choosing), a broader perceived definition of corruption (the answers were broader than the legal definition in the Portuguese law) and a general feeling of distrust towards the discussion of topics with others and the distrust towards the guaranteed privacy of the answers, could account for the high levels of perceived corruption from the interviewees and in general, the Portuguese society.

Direct corruption experience was indeed different from corruption's perception but some of the socioeconomic factors had similar or same sign effects on the two topics. Both were affected negatively by the political affiliation as people who voted for PS or PSD perceived and directly experienced less corruption than people who voted for smaller parties. The social media and traditional media channels use increased both the corruption perception and experience as did the perception regarding the injustice of income distribution. Individuals who were self-employed had higher perceptions and firsthand experiences of corruption than people who worked for others.

The remaining socioeconomic factors changed signals from direct corruption experience to corruption perception so from model one to model five and vice-versa. More educated individuals had more direct corrupt experience but lower perceptions of corruption. The sensation of comfort regarding the available income produced higher corruption experiences but lower corruption perceptions. Public sector workers experienced more direct corruption but perceived lower levels of it than people who were working in the private sector. Men perceived lower corruption levels than women, but men were the ones who engaged in more corrupt behaviours.

From the effects of the socioeconomic factors, two clear and distinct patterns emerged from the data: the general profile of who perceived more corruption and the profile of those that had more corruption experiences. Women, people who perceived themselves as financially worse than others and self-employers are the ones who perceived the highest levels of corruption in the Portuguese society. On the opposite polar, men, people who perceived themselves as financially better off than others and public sector workers were the ones who had experienced corruption on more occasions. The profile of the people with more direct experience of corruption also matches the features of those who have more access to a position where they can either corrupt or be corrupted- a public sector job for people with high economic comfort and with higher levels of education. This means that corruption experience is connected and dependent on the access to positions and consequently, to enough power to corrupt others or influence something if corrupted. Yet again, the differences between direct corruption experience and corruption perception were demonstrated but this time through the clear distinction between the two profiles deduced. The people who were perceiving corruption as high were not quite the ones who had a first-hand knowledge and experience of corruption.

The aggregate of the socioeconomic factors was more explanatory and had more mobilizing effects for the perception model than for the direct corruption experience model. Model number one had variables with higher coefficients and a higher R^2 (4,88%) than model number five which meant again that there is indeed an almost palpable gap between the two dimensions.

The concept of experience was not yet completely studied as direct encounters with corrupt situations are not the only way to experience corruption. Even though is not very much studied, conversations with family members, friends and acquaintances on the topic of corruption are surely an indirect way to experience it.

It was already established that direct corruption experience was different from corruption perception, but did indirect corruption experience follow the same logic? Or could indirect corruption experience explain the higher perceptions and give more clues on why people perceive such dark scenarios? The answers to the question on how many times interviewees were told by a close person that they used a bribe to unlock a problem, did not explain such abysmal differences between corruption experienced and corruption perceived.

The answers showed that 81,61% of the interviewees never experienced indirect corruption. Thus, only about 18% of people had second-hand experience with corruption. This number meant that the interviewees experienced corruption more frequently through the experiences of others than through their own day to day life since about only 8% had experienced direct contact with deviant corrupt situations. Even though, indirect corruption experience was higher than

direct corruption experience, it was still not enough to explain the pessimistic scenarios of how widespread corruption is across the Portuguese society. The indirect corruption experience added up with the direct corruption experience (and knowing that a few of these people overlapped) were not reason enough to account for the perceived level of corruption. This meant that regardless of the scope of experience, in its direct or indirect form, perceptions of corruption were indeed different from corruption experiences. This was the confirmation of hypothesis number five: these two dimensions were different from each other. When taking this validation in mind, the interviewees were then forming their conceptions not based on personal experience neither on the people close to them, as the vast majority did not have the experience to support these claims. So, the interviewees perceived corruption as an existing but vague and distant (to them) phenomenon/notion. Corruption as something that happens (and a lot) but more likely coming from people they do not know.

Four of the socioeconomic factors had the same signal effect on both the indirect corruption experience model (model number seven) and the corruption perceptions model (model number one). Higher education levels attained meant both lower perceptions of corruption and lower number of indirect corruption experiences. The political affiliation for either PS or PSD reduced both the indirect experience and the perceptions of corruption. Higher perceived economic discomfort and self-employed workers were a synonym of higher indirect corruption experiences and higher perceptions of corruption.

The six remaining socioeconomic factors changed from a positive effect to a negative one or the other way around, having a distinct effect in each of the two dependent variables. Men had more indirect corruption experience while women had higher perceptions of corruption. Unemployed people had higher perceptions of corruption but lower indirect contact with such situations. People who perceived the income distribution in Portugal as more unjust or unfair had higher perceptions of corruption but lower experiences. Private sector workers perceived higher numbers of corrupt people but had lower indirect contacts with corruption. More politically informed people had lower indirect experiences of corruption and higher perceptions of corruption regardless of turning to social media platforms or more traditional media channels as sources.

The socioeconomic factors were once again more explanatory of the perceptions dimension than the experience dimension, in this case, the indirect experience. Regarding the comparison between models five and seven, the socioeconomic factors better explained direct corruption experience than indirect corruption experience.

To summarize, the difference between the scenarios painted by the answers regarding corruption perceptions and corruption experience could not have been clearer. Corruption experience, in its direct or indirect way, was always different from the high perceived spread of corruption across the Portuguese society. The fact that experience was not driving perception opened the door for further possible explanations to the high perceived levels of corruption. The distinct profiles, which were drawn from the effects of socioeconomic factors, of those who experienced corruption directly and those who perceived it higher, just came as further confirmation of the existence of a dispute between the two dimensions and the consequent confirmation of the hypothesis number five.

Main take-aways of the results and discussion section

The five hypotheses developed in the literature review section were investigated and studied in this results and discussion section. The development of these hypotheses is the key to answer the research question: “How do socioeconomic factors contribute to different levels of corruption perceptions' in Portugal?”.

Hypothesis number one was confirmed as the different socioeconomic factors, with its effects with different signs and different coefficients, contributed to distinct levels of corruption perception. A change in the answers regarding a specific socioeconomic factor led to changes in the perceived level of corruption.

Since hypothesis number one was confirmed, the discussion of the following premises was done. It would only make sense to discuss particularities of the socioeconomic factors if they indeed contributed to the perceptions of corruption being different amongst interviewees. The discussion of hypotheses numbered two, three and four, could only happen if the first one were confirmed. All three hypotheses were verified as true, so, women and people who were in worse economic situations perceived higher levels of corruption as did people who used traditional media with higher frequency. People with higher education degrees had a perception that less people in the Portuguese society were corrupt. The establishment of the truthfulness of these three different hypothesis can be connected to the same ideas already defined by the work of previous studies and authors.

The validation of hypothesis number two allowed for the confirmation of a relation already established in the existing literature by the following authors: de Lancer Julnes and Villoria, 2014; Gutmann et al.,2020; Knack,2007; Melgar et al., 2010; Van de Walle,2008; You and Khagram,2005. The validation of the hypothesis number three confirmed what was written by

Melgar et al. in their 2010 work. The confirmation of hypothesis number four confirmed the connection established by de Lancer Julnes and Villoria (2014).

Hypothesis number five was proven right by the clear mismatch between the number of people that declared having had contact with corruption (in a direct or indirect form) and the perceptions of corruption. Individuals perceived far worse scenarios than the actual corruption experience they had; thus, perceptions of corruption were different than corruption experience.

Conclusion

The way individuals perceive corruption levels across the Portuguese society is affected by different configurations of the socioeconomic factors that influence their lives. A distinction within a socioeconomic factor contributes to different results and views regarding the number of corrupt population perceived across the Portuguese society.

The corruption perceptions are higher than the number of either direct or indirect corruption experiences that the interviewees claimed to have had. The number of people that declared to have encountered or heard about corruption were not enough to explain such massive perceived levels of corruption in Portugal. Experience was then different from perceptions but not a driver of such highly perceived phenomenon. A broader conceptualization of corruption different from the legal definition, a misinterpretation of what is being asked when discussing percentages and numbers, no self-reflection regarding the scenarios that the individual answer paints and a general feeling of distrust (for example when discussing political affiliations or that if shared, that information would not be kept as private as promised) are alternative explanations that could account for the high perceptions of corruption in Portugal.

Model number one, the one that tested the influence of the socioeconomic factors on general perceptions of corruption, confirmed some already established ideas in the existing literature by previous articles and authors. Women, people who are in worse economic situations and people who use traditional media (like newspapers) more often, tended to have higher perceptions of corruption. While highly educated individuals tended to perceive less corruption across society than people with lower education degrees. This model also allowed for new lights to be shed into some socioeconomic factors whose effects on perceptions of corruption were not clearly or consensually stated in previous literature. In the Portuguese context, people who voted for the political party in government (PS) or the biggest political party of the opposition (PSD) perceived lower levels of corruption than people who voted for smaller and less centrist parties and the political affiliation was determinant by its answers and non-answers to the question. The media dimension was further developed, in this dissertation, with the introduction of the social media platforms effect and that turned out to follow the same pattern of more traditional media sources. Perceptions of corruption change not by the source where people look for political information, but by the frequency they access these informational platforms.

Perceptions of corruption as a society-wide problematic entail perceptions of corruption regarding public sector employees and even though these were also relatively high, they did not account for a full explanation of the general phenomenon so, Portuguese citizens must also

attribute some corruption to the private sector of the economy. The vast majority of the socioeconomic factors followed the same patterns in the model regarding perceptions of public sector employees that were established for the general perceptions model. The only exception was the role of the use of traditional media and social media platforms that, in this case, reduce the number of perceived public sector employees. This effect contributed to the reinforcement of the idea that people can look beyond the public sector, more concretely, to the private sector when corruption is being discussed.

The study of the socioeconomic effects on both corruption perceptions and corruption experience allowed for the dichotomy to be further proved as two distinct profiles were constructed. These two profiles are polar opposites as the individuals who perceive higher levels of corruption are not the ones that have experienced it. Women, people who perceived themselves as financially worse than others and self-employers are the ones who perceived the highest levels of corruption in the Portuguese society. On the other hand, men, people who perceived themselves as financially better off than others and public sector workers were the ones who had experienced corruption on more occasions.

The study of the effects of each of the socioeconomic factors and the conclusions reached above, allowed to answer the research question: “How do socioeconomic factors contribute to different levels of corruption perceptions' in Portugal?”. Socioeconomic factors contribute through the effects that each individual variable has on corruption perception: with its positive or negative influence and with impact of the magnitude of the respective influence (the coefficient).

The conclusions reached are not without limitations. The conclusions reached in this dissertation are conscribed to a specific time period between December of 2020 and April of 2021. Perceptions of corruption are dependent on many factors and the alteration of the time period could change the levels of corruption perceptions but also the answers to the questions asked and consequently, even the socioeconomic factors could change in themselves. These conclusions are important because they add information to what is known about perceptions of corruption and more specifically, about what affects them in Portugal. The development of a possible explanation of the high perceptions of corruption in Portugal and the new connections established with the effects of some socioeconomic factors (not previously studied) are a step closer to close the gap of the lack of information in this topic and about Portugal.

Future studies about perceptions of corruption in Portugal if done with data from a different time frame, should consider the impacts of the feelings towards governments in post-pandemic era and the changes in the political landscape and configuration of the parliament (the many

changes in the parties' representation and change of the left-right dynamics). Regarding the social media usage dimension, it would be extremely important to consider the differences between different social media platforms. There is a huge distinction between different platforms, who they are used by, how political and social information is shared, and to whom the information shared is destined to reach. To possibly check whether or not there is one of them that is linked to higher perceptions of corruption, this dimension should be unfolded with comparisons analysing and studying the specific usage of each platform. Future studies should also try to uncover more on the reasons for such high perceptions of corruption in Portugal when compared to corruption experience since it is clear that something is not being completely caught and measured by the current literature.

Bibliographic references

- Andersson, S. and Heywood, P.M. (2009). The Politics of Perception: Use and Abuse of Transparency International's Approach to Measuring Corruption. *Political Studies*, [online] 57(4), pp.746–767. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2008.00758.x>.
- Bondoso, A. (2015). O contributo do Controlo Interno para a Prevenção da Corrupção: Estudo dos Municípios Portugueses. (OBEGEF, Ed.) Edições Húmus.
- Charron, N. (2016). Do corruption measures have a perception problem? Assessing the relationship between experiences and perceptions of corruption among citizens and experts. *European Political Science Review*, 8(1), pp.147–171. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1755773914000447>
- Clift, B. (2014). *Comparative Political Economy: States, Markets and Global Capitalism*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Cookson, R. (2000). Framing effects in public goods experiments. *Experimental Economics*, 3(1), pp.55–79.
- de Lancer Julnes, P. and Villoria, M. (2014). Understanding and addressing citizens' perceptions of corruption: the case of Spain. *International Review of Public Administration*, 19(1), pp.23–43. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2014.887295>
- de Sousa, L. (2008) 'I Don't Bribe, I Just Pull Strings': Assessing the Fluidity of Social Representations of Corruption in Portuguese Society, *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 9(1), 8-23. DOI: 10.1080/15705850701825402
- de Sousa, L. and Calca, P. (2020). Understanding corruption through the analysis of courtcase content: research note. *Qualitative Research Journal*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/qrj-04-2020-0029>
- Dimant, E. and Schulte, T. (2016). The Nature of Corruption: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. *German Law Journal*, 17(1), pp.53–72. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2071832200019684>
- Domashova, J. and Politova, A. (2021). The Corruption Perception Index: analysis of dependence on socio-economic indicators. *Procedia Computer Science*, 190, pp.193–203.
- Donchev, D. and Ujhelyi, G. (2014). What Do Corruption Indices Measure? *Economics & Politics*, 26(2), pp.309–331.

Fazekas, M., Tóth, I.J. and King, L.P. (2016). An Objective Corruption Risk Index Using Public Procurement Data. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, [online] 22(3), pp.369–397. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-016-9308-z>.

Golden, M.A. and Picci, L. (2005). PROPOSAL FOR A NEW MEASURE OF CORRUPTION, ILLUSTRATED WITH ITALIAN DATA. *Economics and Politics*, [online] 17(1), pp.37–75. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0343.2005.00146.x>

Gouvêa Maciel, G., Magalhães, P.C., de Sousa, L., Pinto, I.R. and Clemente, F. (2022). A Scoping Review on Perception-Based Definitions and Measurements of Corruption. *Public Integrity*, pp.1–18. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2022.2115235>

Gutmann, J., Padovano, F. and Voigt, S. (2020). Perception vs. experience: Explaining differences in corruption measures using microdata. *European Journal of Political Economy*, [online] 65. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2020.101925>

Heidenheimer, A.J. (2005). Perspectives on the perception of corruption. In: *Political Corruption: Concepts and Contexts*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp.141–154.

Jain, A.K. (1998). *Economics of corruption*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Johnston, M. (2005). *Syndromes of Corruption: Wealth, Power, and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.

Jos, P. (1993). Empirical Corruption Research: Beside The (Moral) Point? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3(3), pp.359–375.

Klitgaard, R., MacLean-Abaroa, R. and Parris, H.Lindsey. (1996). *A practical approach to dealing with municipal malfeasance*. Mediterranean Development Forum. Kenya.

Knack, S. (2007). Measuring Corruption: A Critique of Indicators in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. *Journal of Public Policy*, 27(3), pp.255–291.

Mauro, P. (1995). Corruption and Growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(3), pp.681–712.

McMillan, J. and Zoido, P. (2004). How to Subvert Democracy: Montesinos in Peru. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 18(4), pp.69–92.

Melgar, N., Rossi, M. and W.Smith, T. (2010). *The Perception of Corruption*. International

Journal of Public Opinion Research, 22(1), pp.120–131.

Monteiro, T. (2021). Implicações Éticas da Corrupção no Portugal Democrático (1976- 2019) . Master's Degree Dissertation.

Navot, D. and Beerli, I. (2017). Conceptualization of Political Corruption, Perceptions of Corruption, and Political Participation in Democracies. *Lex localis - Journal of Local Self-Government*, 15(2), pp.199–219. doi: [https://doi.org/10.4335/15.2.199-219\(2017\)](https://doi.org/10.4335/15.2.199-219(2017))

Nye, J.S. (1967). Corruption and Political Development: A Cost-Benefit Analysis. *American Political Science Review*, [online] 61(2), pp.417–427. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1953254>

Olken, B.A. and Pande, R. (2012). Corruption in developing countries. *Annual Review of Economics*, 4, pp.479–509.

Olken, Benjamin A. and Barron, P. (2009). The Simple Economics of Extortion: Evidence from Trucking in Aceh. *Journal of Political Economy*, 117(3), pp.417–452. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/599707>

Ostrom, E. (1998). A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Choice Theory of Collective Action: Presidential Address. *American Political Science Review*, 92(01), pp.1–22. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2585925>

Peneda, M. (2023). Corrupção na Contratação Pública em Portugal: o impacto das ligações políticas nas empreitadas de obras públicas. Master's Degree Dissertation.

Persson, A., Rothstein, B. and Teorell, J. (2012). Why Anticorruption Reforms Fail- Systemic Corruption as a Collective Action Problem. *Governance*, 26(3), pp.449–471.

Rose-Ackerman, S. (1978). *Corruption: A Study in Political Economy*. New York; San Francisco; London: Academic Press, Cop.

Rose-Ackerman, S. and Palifka, B.J. (2016). *Corruption and government: causes, consequences, and reform*. New York, Ny: Cambridge University Press.

Scott, J.C. (1972). *Comparative political corruption*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice- Hall.

Sørreide, T. (2002). *Corruption in public procurement. Causes, consequences and cures*. Bergen, Norway: Chr. Michelsen Institute Development Studies and Human Rights.

Stockemer, D. and Calca, P. (2013). Corruption and turnout in Portugal—a municipal level study. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 60(5), pp.535–548. doi:

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-013-9481-7>

Van de Walle, S. (2008). Perceptions of corruption as distrust? Cause and effect in attitudes towards government. In: L. Huberts, C. Jurkiewicz and J. Maesschalck, eds., *Ethics And integrity and the politics of governance*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp.215–236.

Werlin, H.H. (1973). *The Consequences of Corruption: The Ghanaian Experience*. *Political Science Quarterly*, 88(1). doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2148649>

You, J. and Khagram, S. (2005). A Comparative Study of Inequality and Corruption. *American Sociological Review*, 70(1), pp.136–157.

Sources

Sousa, L. de, Magalhães, P.C. and Clemente, F. (2022). Corrupção e Crise económica: percepções dos portugueses sobre corrupção [Policy Brief]. *Handle.net*, [online] 2 vols. doi: <http://hdl.handle.net/10451/55149>

External reference of the project: PTDC/CPO-CPO/28316/2017

Appendix

Appendix I- Original questionnaire applied to the interviewees (the Portuguese version)

CORRUPÇÃO E ÉTICA EM PORTUGAL 2020 **QUESTIONÁRIO**
N.º: _____,
_____,
_____,
_____.

Bom dia/boa tarde/boa noite! Chamo-me... sou entrevistador/a da GfK Metris, uma empresa de estudos de mercado que está a realizar um inquérito para o Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa sobre assuntos sociais e políticos em Portugal, no âmbito de dois projectos de investigação financiados pela Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia e pela Fundação Francisco Manuel dos Santos.

Antes de começar, queremos assegurar desde já que as suas respostas são confidenciais e serão tratadas em conjunto com as respostas dos outros inquiridos e nunca individualmente, em conformidade com o Regulamento Geral de Protecção de Dados.

Agradecemos a sua colaboração para responder ao inquérito que demora cerca de 30 minutos. A sua participação é voluntária e poderá ser interrompida a qualquer momento.

Aceita participar no inquérito?

**P1. Qual é o assunto que considera, hoje em dia, mais importante para o país?
(NÃO SUGERIR NADA E ESCREVER TUDO O QUE O INQUIRIDO DISSER)**

Recusa (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 97

Não sabe (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 99

P2. Como avaliaria a situação da economia portuguesa no ultimo ano: melhorou muito, melhorou, nemmelhorou nem piorou, piorou, ou piorou muito? (LER; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

Melhorou muito 1

Melhorou 2

Nem Melhorou nem Piorou 3

Piorou 4

Piorou muito 5

Recusa (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 97

Não sabe (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 99

P3. Pensando agora na sua situação financeira e na da sua família: no último ano, essa situação melhorou muito, melhorou, nem melhorou nem piorou, piorou ou piorou muito? (LER; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

Melhorou muito 1

Melhorou 2

Nem Melhorou nem Piorou 3

Piorou 4

Piorou muito 5
 Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 97
 Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 99

P4. Pensando agora na sua situação financeira e na da sua família desde que começou a pandemia COVID-19: essa situação melhorou muito, melhorou, nem melhorou nem piorou, piorou ou piorou muito? (LER; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

Melhorou muito 1
 Melhorou 2
 Nem Melhorou nem Piorou 3
 Piorou 4
 Piorou muito 5
 Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 97
 Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 99

P5. Utilizando este cartão, em que medida cada uma das seguintes situações se aplicou a si e à sua família nos últimos três anos, numa escala que vai de 0 (não se aplicou nada) até 10 (aplicou-se totalmente).

(MOSTRAR LISTA 1; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA POR VARIÁVEL/ITEM)

P5.1 Teve de se governar com um orçamento familiar mais baixo.

P5.2 Teve que tirar dinheiro das poupanças ou endividar-se para cobrir despesas do dia-a-dia.

P5.3 Teve de reduzir as despesas com férias ou com coisas novas para a casa.

Não se aplicou-se nada totalmente													Recusa(SE ESPONTÂNEO)	Não sabe(SE ESPONTÂNEO)
0	1			2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	97	99

P6. O(a) senhor(a) ou um membro do seu agregado familiar são proprietários de uma habitação, ou seja, uma casa ou um apartamento (mesmo que adquirida através de empréstimo bancário)? (**LER; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

- Sim, e está totalmente paga 1
- Sim, mas ainda está a pagar empréstimo..... 2
- Não 3
- Recusa (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 97
- Não sabe (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 99

P7. Vou ler-lhe algumas frases. Em relação a cada uma delas, pedia-lhe que, utilizando esta lista, me dissesse em que medida concorda com cada uma delas, numa escala que vai de 0 (discorda totalmente) a 10 (concorda totalmente).
(MOSTRAR LISTA 2; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA POR VARIÁVEL/ITEM)

P7.1 “Sinto-me frustrado quando penso naquilo que tenho em comparação com o que as outras pessoas comoeu têm”

P7.2 “Quando comparo aquilo que tenho com aquilo que outros como eu têm, dou-me conta que estou bastante bem na vida”

Discorda											Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)
Concorda totalmente												
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	97	99

P8. Acha que a distribuição do rendimento em Portugal é muito justa, justa, nem justa nem injusta, injusta, ou muito injusta? (**REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

- Muito justa..... 1
- Justa..... 2
- Nem justa nem injusta 3
- Injusta 4
- Muito injusta 5
- Recusa (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 97
- Não sabe (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 99

P9. De um modo geral, qual é o seu grau de satisfação com a vida? Responda, por favor, utilizando esta escala em que 0 significa extremamente insatisfeito(a) e 10 extremamente satisfeito(a). (**MOSTRAR LISTA 3; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

Extremamente											Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)
Extremamente insatisfeito(a)												
satisfeito(a)												
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	97	99

P10. Pense agora na actuação do governo português até agora na resposta à pandemia COVID-19. Qual é o seu grau de satisfação com a forma como o Governo está a actuar? Responda, por favor, utilizando esta escala em que 0 significa extremamente insatisfeito(a) e 10 extremamente satisfeito(a). **(MANTER LISTA 3; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)**

P10.1. E em geral, independentemente da resposta à pandemia, qual é o seu grau de satisfação com a forma como o Governo está a actuar? Responda, por favor, utilizando esta escala em que 0 significa extremamente insatisfeito(a) e 10 extremamente satisfeito(a). **(MANTER LISTA 3; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)**

Extremamente insatisfeito(a) a Extremamente satisfeito(a)											Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	97	99

P11. Diga-me, por favor, qual a confiança que tem em cada uma das instituições que lhe vou dizer. Situe a sua posição nesta escala em que 0 significa que não tem nenhuma confiança na instituição que referi e 10 quer dizer que tem toda a confiança nessa instituição. **(MOSTRAR LISTA 4; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA POR VARIÁVEL/ITEM)**

P11.1 Na Assembleia da República?

P11.2 Nos Partidos Políticos?

P11.3 Na Polícia?

P11.4 Nos Tribunais?

P11.5 Na Administração Pública?

P11.6 No Governo?

P11.7. E, utilizando a mesma escala, que confiança diria que tem na Comunicação social? **(MANTER LISTA 4; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA POR VARIÁVEL/ITEM)**

Nenhuma a Toda a confiança											Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	97	99

P12. Vou descrever agora algumas formas de governar o país. Gostaria de saber o que o(a) Sr(a) pensa sobre cada uma delas. Para cada uma, diga se é muito boa, boa, nem boa nem má, má ou muito má.

(LER; ASSINALAR UMA RESPOSTA POR VARIÁVEL/ITEM)

P12.1 Ter um líder forte que não precise se preocupar com deputados e com eleições.

P12.2 Ter técnicos especializados, em vez de políticos, que tomem decisões que sejam as melhores para o país.

P12.3 Ter um governo militar.

P12.4 Ter um sistema político democrático.

Muito boa	1
Boa	2
Nem boa nem má.....	3
Má.....	4
Muito má	5
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO).....	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO).....	99

P13. Qual dos seguintes valores é para si o mais importante quando pensa num estado democrático?

(MOSTRAR LISTA 5)

E qual é o segundo mais importante? **(REGISTAR UMA RESPOSTA POR COLUNA)**

1º LUGAR		2º LUGAR
A) COMPAIXÃO	01	01
B) EFICIÊNCIA.....	02	02
C) HONESTIDADE.....	03	03
D) IGUALDADE.....	04	04
E) IMPARCIALIDADE	05	05
F) INFORMALIDADE.....	06	06
G) LEGALIDADE	07	07
H) MÉRITO.....	08	08
I) PRESTAÇÃO DE CONTAS	09	09
J) TRANSPARÊNCIA.....	10	10
OUTRA: QUAL?		98
OUTRA: QUAL?		98
RECUSA (SE ESPONTÂNEO)		97
NÃO SABE (SE ESPONTÂNEO).99		99

P14. O termo corrupção é recorrente nas conversas, mas pode significar coisas distintas para várias pessoas. Pensando no nosso país, quando ouve falar de corrupção, que palavras associa a esse assunto? Cite até ao máximo de três palavras.

(NÃO SUGERIR NADA E ESCREVER ATÉ TRÊS PALAVRAS SUGERIDAS PELO INQUIRIDO)

PALAVRA 1: _____

PALAVRA 2: _____

PALAVRA 3: _____

Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)..... 97

Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)..... 99

P15. Agora vou ler-lhe um conjunto de situações relacionadas com o desempenho de cargos públicos e políticos. Gostaria de saber até que ponto considera que cada uma destas situações corresponde a um caso de corrupção ou não, usando uma escala de 0 a 10, em que 0 significa que não é corrupção, e 10 significa que é corrupção.”

(MOSTRAR LISTA 6 COM ESCALA; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA POR VARIÁVEL/ITEM)

P15.1 Um presidente de câmara atribuiu por concurso a construção de habitações sociais a uma construtora da região. O dono desta empresa apoiou financeiramente a campanha do autarca.

P15.2 Um banco privado foi resgatado sob a tutela do ministro das finanças. Quatro anos após ter cessado funções, o agora ex-ministro foi convidado para presidente do conselho de administração desse banco.

P15.3 Um deputado recebeu uma avença de um escritório de advogados em troca de esclarecimentos sobre várias matérias legislativas em curso nas quais participa como legislador.

P15.4 O presidente de uma entidade reguladora de produtos farmacêuticos e a sua família passaram férias na casa de um amigo, empresário no sector. A empresa em questão obteve uma autorização para a realização de testes a um novo medicamento.

P15.5 Um funcionário público acelerou alguns processos tendo recebido uma gratificação da parte dos utentes interessados.

P15.6 Um Procurador solicitou a um empresário 500 mil euros como contrapartida pelo arquivamento de uma investigação de branqueamento de capitais no sector imobiliário.

P15.7 Um diretor de serviços de urbanismo de uma câmara cobrava informalmente 5% de donativos por cada projecto urbanístico aprovado. O dinheiro era depositado numa conta de um centro social (IPSS) do qual é presidente.

P15.8 Um vereador utilizou funcionários e máquinas da autarquia para realizar obras de restauro na sua quinta.

P15.9 Um ministro nomeou o seu genro como assessor de imprensa.

P15.10 Um indivíduo pediu à sua irmã, enfermeira num hospital, para falar com o médico a fim de antecipar a sua consulta que estava em lista de espera de 2 meses.

P15.11 O governo acelerou a compra de EPIs (equipamentos de proteção individual) a preços acima do mercado sem concurso (por adjudicação directa), justificando necessidade dos materiais para os hospitais públicos com a finalidade de combater a COVID-19.

Não é corrupção corrupção											É											Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10													
																				97	99		

P16. Utilizando uma escala de 0 a 10, em 0 significa que discorda totalmente e 10 significa que concorda totalmente, diga-me por favor em que medida concorda com cada uma das seguintes frases.

(MOSTRAR LISTA 7; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA POR VARIÁVEL/ITEM)

P16.1 O comportamento tem que ser ilegal para ser denominado de corrupto.

P16.2 Se a acção for feita por uma causa justa, não se trata de corrupção.

P16.3 Não podemos chamar de corrupto um comportamento praticado pela generalidade das pessoas.

P16.4 Se uma pessoa actuar com desconhecimento da lei, não a podemos chamar de corrupta.

P16.5 Se o resultado de uma acção for benéfico para a população em geral, não se trata de corrupção

Discorda											Recusa	Não sabe
Concorda											(SE	(SE
totalmente											ESPONTÂNEO)	ESPONTÂNEO)
totalmente												
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	97	99

P17. Falando sobre a corrupção em Portugal no último ano, diria que aumentou muito, aumentou, não aumentou nem diminuiu, diminuiu ou diminuiu muito?

(REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

Aumentou muito..... 1
 Aumentou 2
 Não aumentou nem diminuiu 3
 Diminuiu..... 4
 Diminuiu muito 5
 Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 97
 Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 99

P18. Utilizando uma escala de 0 a 10, em 0 significa que discorda totalmente e 10 significa que concorda totalmente, diga-me por favor em que medida concorda com cada uma das seguintes frases.

(MANTER LISTA 7; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA POR VARIÁVEL/ITEM)

P18.1 No âmbito da pandemia Covid-19, as oportunidades para a corrupção em Portugal aumentaram bastante.

P18.2 Num contexto como a da pandemia Covid-19, faz sentido ignorar alguns princípios éticos se isso servir para resolver problemas importantes.

[ENTREVISTADOR: SUGERIR “LEGALIDADE, IMPARCIALIDADE E INTEGRIDADE” SE ALGUÉM LHE PERGUNTAR QUE PRINCÍPIOS ÉTICOS]

Discorda Concorda totalmente totalmente											Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	97	99

P19. Pensando agora na maneira como a corrupção afecta a sua vida pessoal e profissional: no último ano, acha que a sua vida foi muito mais afectada pela corrupção do que antes, mais afectada, nem mais nem menos afectada, menos afectada, muito menos afectada? (MOSTRAR LISTA 8; REGISTRAR APENAS UMARESPOSTA)

Muito mais afectada 1
Mais Afectada 2
Nem mais nem menos afectada 3
Menos afectada..... 4
Muito menos afectada 5
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 99

P20. Imagine que em Portugal vivem 100 pessoas. Destas 100, quantas

diria que são corruptas?Pessoas..... | | | | |
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 997
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 999

[ALEATORIZAR A P21, P22 E P23]

P21. Imagine agora que o número total de funcionários públicos em Portugal é 100. Destes 100, quantos diria que são corruptos?

Funcionários públicos..... | | | | |
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 997
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 999

P22. Imagine agora que o número total de políticos em Portugal é 100. Destes 100, quantos diria que são corruptos?

Políticos
.....
.. | | | | | |Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 997
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 999

P23. Imagine agora que o número total de empresários em Portugal é 100. Destes 100, quantos diria que são corruptos?

Empresários

.....		Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	997
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	999		

P24. Quantas vezes, nos últimos 3 anos, é que funcionários públicos lhe pediram ou deram a entender que queriam presentes ou favores em troca dos seus serviços? (**NÃO SUGERIR NADA; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

Nunca	1
Uma	2
Duas.....	3
Três ou quatro.....	4
Cinco ou mais.....	5
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)99	

P25 E quantas vezes, nos últimos 3 anos, é que funcionários públicos lhe pediram ou deram a entender que queriam subornos em troca dos seus serviços? (**NÃO SUGERIR NADA; REGISTRAR APENAS UMARESPOSTA**)

Nunca	1
Uma	2
Duas.....	3
Três ou quatro.....	4
Cinco ou mais.....	5
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

P26. Pensando em pessoas que conhece pessoalmente, quantas vezes, nos últimos 3 anos, lhe falaram de situações em que resolveram um problema ou desbloquearam uma decisão oferecendo a um funcionário público presentes ou favores em troca? (**REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

Nunca	1
Uma	2
Duas.....	3
Três ou quatro.....	4
Cinco ou mais.....	5
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

P27. E continuando a pensar em pessoas que conhece pessoalmente, quantas vezes, nos últimos 3 anos, lhe falaram de situações em que resolveram um problema ou desbloquearam uma decisão oferecendo a um funcionário público subornos em troca? **(REGISTAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)**

- Nunca 1
- Uma 2
- Duas..... 3
- Três ou quatro..... 4
- Cinco ou mais..... 5
- Recusa **(SE ESPONTÂNEO)** 97
- Não sabe **(SE ESPONTÂNEO)** 99

P28. Em Portugal, há alguns candidatos a eleições envolvidos em casos de corrupção. Na sua opinião, porque razão eleitores apoiam candidatos como estes? Responda, por favor, utilizando uma escala de 0 a 10, em que 0 significa que discorda totalmente da afirmação e 10 que concorda totalmente com a afirmação

(MOSTRAR LISTA 9; REGISTAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA POR VARIÁVEL/ITEM)

P28.1 Porque entendem que o candidato pode ser corrupto mas fez obra

P28.2 Porque consideram que todos os políticos são corruptos e por isso é indiferente em quem se vota

P28.3 Porque beneficiaram de favores do candidato e sentem gratidão

P28.4 Porque não acreditam na justiça e nas suas condenações

P28.5 Porque aquilo que o candidato propõe é mais importante do que saber se é uma pessoa íntegra

P28.6 Porque os candidatos são do partido com o qual simpatiza

Discorda Concorda totalmente totalmente											Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	97	99

P29. Imagine que tome conhecimento pessoal de uma situação de corrupção. Qual ou quais das seguintes razões fariam com que não denunciasses essa situação? Pode escolher mais do que uma razão (**MOSTRAR LISTA 10; REGISTRAR VÁRIAS RESPOSTAS**)

Porque tenho receio de sofrer represálias	1
Porque não sei a quem recorrer	2
Porque as denúncias nunca resultam em nada.....	3
Porque não gosto de acusar ninguém	4
Porque isso iria prejudicar o denunciado	5
Porque isso iria prejudicar outros que não têm nada a ver com o caso	6
Porque não compensa o tempo e os custos que isso teria para mim	
Porque, às vezes, somos forçados a actos incorrectos	8
Outro: Qual?.....	96
Eu denunciaria sempre um caso de corrupção (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	98
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

P30. Nos últimos anos, diria que o seu interesse por futebol tem aumentado muito, aumentado, nem aumentou nem diminuiu, diminuiu ou diminuiu muito?

Aumentou muito.....	1
Aumentou	2
Nem aumentou nem diminuiu	3
Diminuiu.....	4
Diminuiu muito	5
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

P31. Há quem diga que em Portugal a corrupção no futebol é muito rara, mas também quem diga que é muito frequente. Numa escala de 0 a 10, em que 0 significa que acha que a corrupção no futebol é muito rara, e 10 queacha que é muito frequente, qual o número que melhor exprime a sua percepção? (**MOSTRAR LISTA 11; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

Muito Muito rara frequente											Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	97

P32. EXPERIÊNCIA CONJOINT

Nas próximas duas perguntas, procuramos compreender as preferências dos eleitores em Portugal.

Vamos começar por apresentar-lhe alguns perfis de partidos que poderiam, *hipoteticamente*, concorrer às próximas eleições legislativas, *não existindo qualquer*

relação entre os partidos descritos neste cenário e os partidos existentes em Portugal.

Serão apresentados dois partidos *hipotéticos* de cada vez e alguma informação sobre o seu perfil. Vamos repetir esta questão duas vezes com diferentes pares de partidos

Atributos	Valores possíveis
Líder do partido	· MULHER
	· HOMEM
2. Orientação ideológica	· Centro
	· Esquerda
	· Direita
3. Posição sobre limitação de mandatos	· A liderança do partido não impõe limitação de mandatos
	· A liderança do partido excluiu da lista os deputados com três mandatos consecutivos
	· De acordo com o estatuto do partido, os deputados com três mandatos consecutivos são excluídos da lista
4. Declaração de rendimentos dos candidatos	· O partido não disponibiliza as declarações de rendimentos dos candidatos
	· O partido vai colocar as declarações de rendimentos de todos os candidatos no site do partido depois da eleição
	· O partido publica as declarações de rendimentos de todos os candidatos no site do partido antes da eleição
5. Registo de atividades em grupos de interesse	· Não está previsto
	· O partido promete disponibilizar no seu site um registo das reuniões com grupos de interesse
6. Punições a deputados acusados em caso de corrupção	· Não estão previstas
	· O partido promete expulsar os deputados que são acusados de corrupção

Com base nessa informação, se tivesse que escolher entre um desses partidos, em qual votaria?

DADOS DE CARACTERIZAÇÃO

D1. Em política é costume falar-se de esquerda e direita. Pensando nas suas opiniões políticas, como é que se posicionaria nessa escala? (**LER;REGISTAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

Extrema-esquerda.....	1	=> ir para D2
Esquerda	2	=> ir para D2
Centro-esquerda.....	3	=> ir para D2
Centro	4	=> ir para D1.1
Centro-direita.....	5	=> ir para D2
Direita.....	6	=> ir para D2
Extrema-direita	7	=> ir para D2
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97	
Não Sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99	

D1.1. Se tivesse mesmo de escolher entre centro-esquerda e centro-direita, qual delas escolheria? (**REGISTAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

Centro-esquerda	1
Centro-direita	2
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não Sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	98

D2. Há algum partido pelo qual sintas mais simpatia do que pelos outros? (**REGISTAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

Sim.....	1	=> ir para D3
Não	2	=> ir para D4
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97	=> ir para D4
Não Sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99	=> ir para D4

D3. Qual é esse partido? (**RESPOSTA ESPONTÂNEA, NÃO MOSTRAR LISTA. REGISTAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

A - Aliança	01
BE - Bloco de Esquerda	02
CDS-PP - Partido Popular	03
CHEGA	04
IL - Iniciativa Liberal	05
JPP - Juntos pelo Povo	06
L - Livre	07
MAS - Movimento Alternativa Socialista.....	08
NC - Nós, Cidadãos!	09
PPV/CDC - Partido Cidadania e Democracia Cristã	10
PCTP/MRPP - Partido Comunista dos Trabalhadores Portugueses.....	11
PCP - Partido Comunista Português.....	12
MPT - Partido da Terra	13

PDR - Partido Democrático Republicano	14
PEV - Partido Ecologista “Os Verdes”	15
Ergue-te (ex- PNR- Partido Nacional Renovador).....	16
POUS - Partido Operário de Unidade Socialista.....	17
PAN - Partido Pessoas-Animais-Natureza	18
PPM - Partido Popular Monárquico	19
PPD/PSD - Partido Social Democrata.....	20
PS - Partido Socialista.....	21
PTP - Partido Trabalhista Português.....	22
PURP - Partido Unido dos Reformados e Pensionistas.....	23
RIR - Reagir, Incluir e Reciclar.....	24
VP – Volt Portugal.....	25
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO).....	99

D4. Com que frequência acompanha as notícias sobre política e sociedade através da comunicação social?(MOSTRAR LISTA 12; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

Diariamente / Quase todos os dias	5
3-4 dias por semana.....	4
1-2 dias por semana.....	3
Com menos frequência.....	2
Nunca	1
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não Sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

D5. E com que frequência acompanha as notícias sobre política e sociedade através das redes sociais, tais comoo Facebook, o Twitter ou outras? (MANTER LISTA 12; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

Diariamente / Quase todos os dias	5
3-4 dias por semana.....	4
1-2 dias por semana.....	3
Com menos frequência.....	2
Nunca	1
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não Sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

D6. REGISTRAR O SEXO DO INQUIRIDO:

Masculino	1
Feminino	2

D7. Importa-se de me dizer a sua idade?

‘ _____ ’ ANOS

Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 97

Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 99

D8. Diga-me por favor qual é o seu estado civil? (REGISTAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

Casado(a)..... 1

União de facto 2

Solteiro(a)..... 3

Separado(a) ou divorciado(a) 4 Viúvo(a)..... 5

Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)97

Não Sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)99

D9. Quais das seguintes situações se aplica melhor ao que fez nos últimos 7 dias?(LER; REGISTAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

A fazer trabalho pago (por conta de outrem, conta própria, no negócio da família)..... 1

A estudar mesmo se de férias (sem ser remunerado) 2

Desempregado(a) à procura de emprego 3

Desempregado(a), à espera de emprego, mas não à procura de emprego 4

Em situação de doença ou incapacidade/invalidez permanente 5

Na reforma..... 6

A fazer trabalho doméstico, a cuidar de crianças ou de outras pessoas (sem ser pago)7

Outra. ESPECIFICAR??? 8

Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 97

Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 99

D10.1. Essa situação mantém-se a mesma que anteriormente ao período da pandemia COVID-19?

Sim 1 => ir para D11

Não 2 => ir para D10.2

D10 2. Quais das seguintes situações se aplicava melhor ao que fazia antes do período da pandemia COVID-19?

(LER; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

A fazer trabalho pago (por conta de outrem, conta própria, no negócio da família)	1
A estudar mesmo se de férias (sem ser remunerado)	2
Desempregado(a) à procura de emprego	3
Desempregado(a), à espera de emprego, mas não à procura de emprego	4
Em situação de doença ou incapacidade/invalidade permanente	5
Na reforma.....	6
A fazer trabalho doméstico, a cuidar de crianças ou de outras pessoas (sem ser pago)	
7	
Outra. ESPECIFICAR???	98
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

[PARA QUEM NÃO ESTÁ A FAZER TRABALHO REMUNERADO]

D11. Alguma vez teve um trabalho remunerado?

Sim	1
Não	2

[ENTREVISTADOR: Se o inquirido estiver a trabalhar perguntar seguintes sobre o actual emprego; se não estiver a trabalhar actualmente mas tenha trabalhado no passado, perguntar seguintes acerca do último emprego]

D12. Na sua profissão principal é/era... **(LER PAUSADAMENTE; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)**

Trabalhador por conta de outrem	1	=> ir para D14
Trabalhador por conta própria	2	=> ir para D13 E DEPOIS PARA D16
Trabalhador no negócio ou empresa da família	3	=> ir para D14
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97	=> ir para D14
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99	=> ir para D14

D13. Quantos empregados tem/tinha? **(REGISTRAR O NÚMERO DE EMPREGADOS)**

Número de empregados	_ _ _
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	997
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	999

D14. O seu contrato é/era... **(LER; REGISTRAR APENAS**

UMA RESPOSTA) Um contrato de duração ilimitada

(permanente).....	1
Um contrato de duração limitada (temporário)	2
Não tem/teve contrato	3
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

D15. A organização para que trabalha/trabalhou pertence a qual dos seguintes tipos?(**LER; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

Governo central ou local	1	
Outro sector de administração pública (como a educação ou a saúde)		2
Uma empresa pública	3	
Empresa do sector privado	4	
Por conta própria	5	
Outra. ESPECIFICAR???	98	
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97	
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99	

D16. Qual é/era a designação da sua profissão principal? (**DESCREVER DETALHADAMENTE, CODIFICAR COM ISCO08**)

[**SE TIVER CÔNJUGE OU PARCEIRO**]

D17. Quais das seguintes situações se aplica melhor ao que o seu cônjuge ou parceiro fez nos últimos 7 dias?(**LER; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

A fazer trabalho pago (ou temporariamente ausente) (por conta de outrem, conta própria, no negócio da família)1	
A estudar mesmo se de férias (sem ser remunerado)2	
Desempregado(a) à procura de emprego3	
Desempregado(a), à espera de emprego, mas não à procura de emprego4	
Em situação de doença ou incapacidade/invalidez permanente5	
Na reforma 6	
A fazer trabalho doméstico, a cuidar de crianças ou de outras pessoas (sem ser pago)7	
Outra. ESPECIFICAR???	98
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

[**PARA QUEM NÃO ESTÁ A FAZER TRABALHO REMUNERADO**]

D18. O seu cônjuge ou parceiro alguma vez teve um trabalho remunerado?

Sim	1
Não	2

[**ENTREVISTADOR: Se o cônjuge ou parceiro estiver a trabalhar perguntar seguintes sobre o actual emprego; se não estiver a trabalhar actualmente mas tenha trabalhado no passado, perguntar seguintes acerca do último emprego**]

D19. Na sua profissão principal, o seu cônjuge ou parceiro é/era...
(LER PAUSADAMENTE; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

Trabalhador por conta de outrem 1 => **ir para D21**
Trabalhador por conta própria 2 => **ir para D20 E DEPOIS PARA D23**
Trabalhador no negócio ou empresa da família 3 => **ir para D21**
Recusa (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 97 => **ir para D21**
Não sabe (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 99 => **ir para D21**

D20. Quantos empregados tem/tinha? (**REGISTRAR O NÚMERO DE EMPREGADOS**)

Número de empregados | | | |
Recusa (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 997
Não sabe (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 999

D21. O contrato do seu cônjuge ou parceiro é/era ... (**LER; REGISTRAR APENAS**

UMA RESPOSTA) Um contrato de duração ilimitada (permanente) 1
Um contrato de duração limitada (temporário) 2
Não tem/teve contrato 3
Recusa (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 97
Não sabe (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 99

D22. A organização para que o seu cônjuge ou parceiro trabalha/trabalhou pertence a qual dos seguintes tipos?(**LER; REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

Governo central ou local 1
Outro sector de administração pública (como a educação ou a saúde) 2
Uma empresa pública 3
Empresa do sector privado 4
Por conta própria 5
Outra. ESPECIFICAR???. 98
Recusa (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 97
Não sabe (**SE ESPONTÂNEO**) 99

D23. Qual é/era a designação da profissão principal do seu cônjuge ou parceiro?(**DESCREVER DETALHADAMENTE, CODIFICAR COM ISCO08**)

D24. Importa-se de me dizer qual é o nível de instrução mais elevado que concluiu?
(**REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA**)

Não estudou 1
Ensino básico nível 1 (primária/4ª classe) 2

Ensino básico nível 2 (atual 6ºano/ antigo 2º ano do liceu)	3
Ensino básico nível 3 (atual 9ºano/ antigo 5º ano do liceu)	4
Secundário (atual 12º ano – antigo 7º ano do liceu) /	
Cursos médios 5Licenciatura / curso superior	6
Pós graduação / Mestrado / Doutoramento	7
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

D25. Diga-me por favor, qual é o rendimento mensal líquido do seu agregado familiar?
(MOSTRAR LISTA 13; PASSAR O TABLET PARA O ENTREVISTADO E DEIXAR QUE SEJA OPRÓPRIO A PREENCHER ESTA QUESTÃO)

Y) Até 390€.....	01
D) De 391€ a 780€	02
C) De 781€ a 1170€	03
F) De 1171€ a 1560€.....	04
L) De 1561€ a 1950€	05
B) De 1951€ a 2340€	06
H) De 2341€ a 2730€	07
Z) De 2731€ a 3120€	08
P) De 3121€ a 3510€.....	09
I) Mais de 3510€	10

Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

D26. Relativamente ao rendimento do seu agregado familiar, diria que... **(LER; REGISTRAR APENAS UMARESPOTA)**

O rendimento actual permite viver confortavelmente.....	1
O rendimento actual dá para viver	2
É difícil viver com o rendimento actual	3
É muito difícil viver com o rendimento actual.....	4
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

D27. Contando consigo, quantas pessoas vivem em sua casa? **(REGISTRAR O NÚMERO DE PESSOAS)**

Número de pessoas	
..... Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO) 997	
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	999

D28. Pode dizer-me em que país nasceu? (NÃO LER AS OPÇÕES; REGISTRAR APENAS UMARESPOSTA)

Portugal	1
Ex-Colónia (Angola, Cabo Verde, Goa, Guiné-Bissau, Macau, Moçambique, São Tomé)	
2	
Brasil	3
Noutro país. Qual? _____ (ESPECIFICAR)	4
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

D29. Há um clube desportivo pelo qual tenha maior simpatia?(REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

Sim	1 => ir para D30
Não	2 => ir para D31
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97 => ir para D31
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	

.....

99 => ir para D31 D30. Qual é esse clube?

(REGISTRAR APENAS UMA RESPOSTA)

Benfica	1
Porto	2
Sporting	3
Braga	4
Guimarães.....	5
Outro. Qual? _____ (ESPECIFICAR)98	
Recusa (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	97
Não sabe (SE ESPONTÂNEO)	99

D31. Pode dizer-me qual o distrito, concelho e freguesia da sua residência?

DISTRITO:

Aveiro.....	01
Beja.....	02
Braga	03
Bragança.....	04
Castelo Branco	05
Coimbra.....	06
Évora	07
Faro.....	08
Guarda	09
Leiria	10
Lisboa	11
Portalegre	12
Porto	13
Santarém.....	14
Setúbal.....	15
Viana do Castelo	16
Vila Real.....	17
Viseu.....	18

CONCELHO:

FREGUESIA:

D32 REGIÃO: REGISTRAR

Norte Litoral.....	1
Grande Porto	2
Interior.....	3
Centro Litoral.....	4
Grande Lisboa.....	5
Alentejo.....	6
Algarve.....	7

D33. HABITAT: REGISTRAR

Menos de 2.000	1
22.000 a 9.999	2
310.000 a 99.999	3
4100.000 e mais.....	4
5Cidade de Lisboa	5
6Cidade do Porto.....	6
7	

AGRADEÇA E TERMINE

ENTREVISTADOR:

NOME: _____ NÚMERO: ‘ _____ ’

REVISOR: ‘ _____ ’ CODIFICADOR: ‘ _____ ’

Appendix II- English translation of the questions used

P8. Would you classify the income distribution in Portugal as very fair, fair, neither fair nor unfair, unfair or very unfair?

Very unfair

Fair

Neither fair nor unfair

Unfair

Very unfair

Refuse to answer

Don't know

P14. The term corruption is recurrent amongst conversations, but it can mean different things to different people. With our country in mind, when you hear the term corruption, what are the words that you most associate with the topic? Give a maximum of three words.

Word 1:

Word 2:

Word 3:

Refuse to answer

Don't know

P20. Imagine that 100 people live in Portugal. Out of these 100, how many would you say are corrupt?

Number of people:

Refuse to answer

Don't know

P21. Imagine that the total number of public sector employees in Portugal is 100. Out of these 100, how many would you say are corrupt?

Number of public sector employees:

Refuse to answer

Don't know

P25. How many times, in the last 3 years, has any public sector employee asked you or gave you the impression that they wanted bribes in exchange for their services?

Never One Two

Three or four

Five or more

Refuse to answer

Don't know

P27. When it comes to people that you know in a close/personal way, how many times, in the last 3 years, has anyone of them told you how they solved a problem or unlocked a decision by offering a bribe to a public sector employee?

Never

One

Two

Three or four

Five or more

Refuse to answer

Don't know

D4. With which frequency do you follow news on politics and society through traditional media?

Daily/ Almost every day

3-4 days a week

1-2 days a week

Hardly ever

Never

Refuse to answer

Don't know

D5. And with which frequency do you follow news on politics and society through social media platforms like Facebook, Twitter or others?

Daily/ Almost every day

3-4 days a week

1-2 days a week

Hardly ever Never

Refuse to answer

Don't know

D3. What is that political party? (the one you have a higher sympathy for)

A- Aliança

BE- Bloco de Esquerda

CDS-PP – Partido Popular

CHEGA

IL- Iniciativa Liberal

JPP- Juntos pelo Povo

L- Livre

MAS- Movimento Alternativa Socialista

NC- Nós, Cidadãos!

PPV/CDC- Partido Cidadania e Democracia Cristã

PCTP/MRPP- Partido Comunista dos Trabalhadores Portugueses

PCP- Partido Comunista Português

MPT- Partido da Terra

PDR- Partido Democrático Republicano

PEV- Partido Ecologista “Os Verdes”

Ergue-te (ex- PNR- Partido Nacional Renovador)

POUS- Partido Operário de Unidade Socialista

PAN- Partido Pessoas-Animais-Natureza

PPM- Partido Popular Monárquico

PPD/PSD- Partido Social Democrata

PS- Partido Socialista

PTP- Partido Trabalhista Português

PURP- Partido Unido dos Reformados e Pensionistas

RIR- Reagir, Incluir e Reciclar

VP- Volt Portugal

Refuse to answer

Don't know

D6. Gender of the interviewee

Male

Female

D9. What of the following situations better describes what you did for the past 7 days?

Doing a paid job (for others, self-employed, family business)

Student even if on vacation time (not being paid)

Unemployed looking for a job

Unemployed, waiting for a job, but not looking

With illness or permanent incapacitation

Retired

Housework, taking care of children: own children or others (not being paid)

Other option

Refuse to answer

Don't know

D12. (Only asked if in a working situation) In your job you were:

Working for others

Self-employed

Working for family business or family company

Refuse to answer

Don't know

D15. The organization you work/worked can be characterized as which of the following?

Central or local government

Other section of public sector (education or health areas)

Public company

Private sector company

Self-employment

Other

Refuse to answer

Don't know

D24. Do you mind telling me what is the highest degree level you have completed?

Did not go to school

Elementary school (1st to 4th grade)

6th Grade

9th Grade

High school (12th grade)

Bachelor's Degree

Master's Degree/ Doctorate/ Post-Graduate

Refuse to answer

Don't know

D26. Regarding your household's income, would you say that you:

Live comfortably with it

Are able to live with it,

Are finding difficult to live with it

Are finding very difficult to live with it

Refuse to answer

Don't know

Appendix III- Model number one – Perceptions of corruption (complete)

```
regress P20 P8 D26 D15 D24 D12 D6 D9 D4 D5 D3
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	288
Model	10548.6898	10	1054.86898	F(10, 277)	=	1.42
Residual	205424.81	277	741.605813	Prob > F	=	0.1698
				R-squared	=	0.0488
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0145
Total	215973.5	287	752.520906	Root MSE	=	27.232

P20	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
P8	2.293886	2.528084	0.91	0.365	-2.682813 7.270585
D26	3.880326	2.239464	1.73	0.084	-.528205 8.288857
D15	.1348498	.2924949	0.46	0.645	-.4409454 .710645
D24	-.4692101	1.303229	-0.36	0.719	-3.0347 2.09628
D12	4.740998	4.047931	1.17	0.243	-3.227617 12.70961
D6	2.944107	3.447765	0.85	0.394	-3.843042 9.731256
D9	.5701782	.830505	0.69	0.493	-1.064725 2.205081
D4	.9044848	1.570873	0.58	0.565	-2.187882 3.996851
D5	.5269081	.2768756	1.90	0.058	-.0181396 1.071956
D3	-.0984999	.2372505	-0.42	0.678	-.5655431 .3685432
_cons	7.1269	16.47223	0.43	0.666	-25.29975 39.55355

Appendix IV – Model number two – Perceptions of corruption (without political affiliation)

```
regress P20 P8 D26 D15 D24 D12 D6 D9 D4 D5
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	649
Model	14122.4356	9	1569.15951	F(9, 639)	=	2.29
Residual	437232.56	639	684.245007	Prob > F	=	0.0155
				R-squared	=	0.0313
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0176
Total	451354.995	648	696.535487	Root MSE	=	26.158

P20	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
P8	3.951193	1.530335	2.58	0.010	.9461003 6.956286
D26	.1703764	.2673796	0.64	0.524	-.3546725 .6954253
D15	.1005607	.194577	0.52	0.605	-.2815268 .4826482
D24	-1.463082	.8158133	-1.79	0.073	-3.065081 .138917
D12	3.515312	2.626334	1.34	0.181	-1.641977 8.6726
D6	1.888588	2.099181	0.90	0.369	-2.233539 6.010716
D9	-.0939083	.5580219	-0.17	0.866	-1.189687 1.00187
D4	-.865914	.8358881	-1.04	0.301	-2.507333 .7755055
D5	.5990638	.2569854	2.33	0.020	.0944259 1.103702
_cons	23.57723	9.641302	2.45	0.015	4.644765 42.50969

Appendix V – Model number three – Perceptions of corruption regarding public sector workers (complete)

```
regress P21 P8 D26 D15 D24 D12 D6 D9 D4 D5 D3
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	281
Model	7247.17001	10	724.717001	F(10, 270)	=	0.97
Residual	202061.328	270	748.37529	Prob > F	=	0.4713
				R-squared	=	0.0346
				Adj R-squared	=	-0.0011
Total	209308.498	280	747.530351	Root MSE	=	27.356

P21	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
P8	1.526521	2.608915	0.59	0.559	-3.609882 6.662925
D26	2.607667	2.322553	1.12	0.263	-1.964951 7.180284
D15	.6971352	2.243363	0.31	0.756	-3.719574 5.113844
D24	-.302951	1.325562	-0.23	0.819	-2.912703 2.306801
D12	1.06301	4.82368	0.22	0.826	-8.433799 10.55982
D6	4.458096	3.494242	1.28	0.203	-2.421328 11.33752
D9	1.022938	.8462905	1.21	0.228	-.6432295 2.689105
D4	-1.300691	1.630914	-0.80	0.426	-4.511617 1.910235
D5	-.1261555	.2782558	-0.45	0.651	-.6739825 .4216715
D3	-.1287503	.2422475	-0.53	0.596	-.6056846 .348184
_cons	23.11566	18.75774	1.23	0.219	-13.81438 60.0457

Appendix VI – Model number four – Perceptions of corruption regarding public sector workers (without political affiliation)

```
regress P21 P8 D26 D15 D24 D12 D6 D9 D4 D5
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	644
Model	19685.5482	9	2187.28314	F(9, 634)	=	3.05
Residual	453995.45	634	716.081152	Prob > F	=	0.0014
				R-squared	=	0.0416
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0280
Total	473680.998	643	736.673403	Root MSE	=	26.76

P21	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
P8	3.892832	1.565944	2.49	0.013	.817767 6.967897
D26	-.057857	.2735076	-0.21	0.833	-.5949474 .4792335
D15	.3105245	.2780681	1.12	0.265	-.2355214 .8565704
D24	-1.986477	.825743	-2.41	0.016	-3.607999 -.3649545
D12	2.098638	2.848947	0.74	0.462	-3.495877 7.693153
D6	5.037596	2.149151	2.34	0.019	.8172801 9.257912
D9	.0772112	.570127	0.14	0.892	-1.042354 1.196777
D4	-1.61942	.8629494	-1.88	0.061	-3.314005 .0751642
D5	-.1153954	.2628956	-0.44	0.661	-.6316468 .4008561
_cons	27.49318	9.994782	2.75	0.006	7.866299 47.12006

Appendix VII- Model number five – Direct corruption experience (complete)

```
regress P25 P8 D26 D15 D24 D12 D6 D9 D4 D5 D3
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	327
Model	4.47815855	10	.447815855	F(10, 316)	=	1.15
Residual	123.23438	316	.389982214	Prob > F	=	0.3257
				R-squared	=	0.0351
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0045
Total	127.712538	326	.391756252	Root MSE	=	.62449

P25	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
P8	.0527327	.0520356	1.01	0.312	-.0496473 .1551127
D26	-.000315	.0065626	-0.05	0.962	-.0132269 .012597
D15	-.0022297	.0066564	-0.33	0.738	-.0153261 .0108666
D24	.0044545	.0267257	0.17	0.868	-.0481282 .0570372
D12	.0311353	.0855569	0.36	0.716	-.1371979 .1994685
D6	-.1012108	.0729226	-1.39	0.166	-.244686 .0422644
D9	.0314039	.0181179	1.73	0.084	-.0042432 .0670509
D4	.0189757	.0315543	0.60	0.548	-.0431073 .0810587
D5	.0004534	.0063054	0.07	0.943	-.0119526 .0128593
D3	-.0096184	.0050999	-1.89	0.060	-.0196524 .0004156
_cons	1.05737	.3367787	3.14	0.002	.3947584 1.719982

Appendix VIII- Model number six – Direct corruption experience (without political affiliation)

```
regress P25 P8 D26 D15 D24 D12 D6 D9 D4 D5
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	758
Model	1.71366307	9	.190407007	F(9, 748)	=	0.69
Residual	206.128026	748	.275572227	Prob > F	=	0.7175
				R-squared	=	0.0082
				Adj R-squared	=	-0.0037
Total	207.841689	757	.274559694	Root MSE	=	.52495

P25	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
P8	.0033684	.0279666	0.12	0.904	-.0515339 .0582707
D26	.0012467	.0027644	0.45	0.652	-.0041802 .0066736
D15	-.0016514	.0038938	-0.42	0.672	-.0092955 .0059928
D24	-.0026349	.0150147	-0.18	0.861	-.0321109 .0268411
D12	.0211954	.0498147	0.43	0.671	-.0765979 .1189886
D6	-.0694871	.0387609	-1.79	0.073	-.1455802 .0066606
D9	.0114906	.0104541	1.10	0.272	-.0090322 .0320134
D4	.0049262	.0151347	0.33	0.745	-.0247853 .0346378
D5	.0029674	.0051114	0.58	0.562	-.007067 .0130019
_cons	1.15139	.1771293	6.50	0.000	.8036603 1.49912

Appendix IX - Model number seven – Indirect corruption experience (complete)

```
regress P27 P8 D26 D15 D24 D12 D6 D9 D4 D5 D3
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	323
Model	8.85887175	10	.885887175	F(10, 312)	=	0.97
Residual	284.181376	312	.910837743	Prob > F	=	0.4672
				R-squared	=	0.0302
				Adj R-squared	=	-0.0009
Total	293.040248	322	.910062881	Root MSE	=	.95438

P27	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
P8	-.0280236	.0774139	-0.36	0.718	-.180343 .1242958
D26	.0043863	.0100253	0.44	0.662	-.0153395 .024112
D15	-.0030007	.0101734	-0.29	0.768	-.0230178 .0170164
D24	-.010144	.0411416	-0.25	0.805	-.0910941 .0708061
D12	.2373225	.1308261	1.81	0.071	-.0200905 .4947355
D6	-.032763	.1125007	-0.29	0.771	-.254119 .188593
D9	-.0184396	.0276815	-0.67	0.506	-.0729056 .0360265
D4	-.015194	.0486606	-0.31	0.755	-.1109383 .0805504
D5	-.003099	.0096403	-0.32	0.748	-.0220673 .0158693
D3	-.0179299	.007987	-2.24	0.025	-.0336451 -.0022148
_cons	1.804383	.5048111	3.57	0.000	.8111188 2.797648

Appendix X - Model number eight – Indirect corruption experience (without political affiliation)

```
regress P27 P8 D26 D15 D24 D12 D6 D9 D4 D5
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	751
Model	11.4757167	9	1.27507964	F(9, 741)	=	1.78
Residual	531.421753	741	.717168358	Prob > F	=	0.0689
				R-squared	=	0.0211
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0092
Total	542.89747	750	.723863293	Root MSE	=	.84686

P27	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
P8	.0081219	.0447644	0.18	0.856	-.0797582 .096002
D26	.0086964	.0044585	1.95	0.051	-.0000564 .0174491
D15	-.0034768	.0062827	-0.55	0.580	-.0158108 .0088573
D24	.006938	.0242277	0.29	0.775	-.040625 .054501
D12	.2173779	.0803736	2.70	0.007	.0595908 .3751649
D6	-.0807896	.0627787	-1.29	0.199	-.2040349 .0424557
D9	-.0160001	.0168799	-0.95	0.343	-.0491383 .017138
D4	-.0298446	.0245757	-1.21	0.225	-.0780908 .0184016
D5	-.0014395	.0082489	-0.17	0.862	-.0176335 .0147544
_cons	1.325176	.2836536	4.67	0.000	.7683158 1.882037