

Evaluation Study:

Personality and morality as factors for effective corruption prevention

conducted at the
international conference "Corruption prevention in the midst of crisis?"
of the dbb akademie 2010 in Cologne

Table of Contents

1. Background of the Study	3
2. Personality Traits (the Big Five).....	5
3. Moral Dimensions.....	7
4. Attitudes and Perceptions of Corruption	12
5. Analysis	14
5.1 Impact of Personality Traits on Attitudes towards Corruption	14
5.2 Impact of Morality on Attitudes towards Corruption	16
6. Conclusion	19
Annexes.....	20

1. Background of the Study

The fact that personality traits have cognitive and emotional consequences is hardly controversial. A close link to political attitudes has been proven in a wide range of studies in the English-speaking world over the last few years.¹

Personality traits are commonly determined according to five assessment dimensions – the "BIG FIVE" of *extrovertedness / introvertedness*, *openness*, *agreeableness*, *neuroticism* (emotional stability) and *consciousness*.² These dimensions are widely used to evaluate personality traits. A link, which repeatedly emerges in this context, exists between the personality trait of *openness* and liberal attitudes, as well as between *consciousness* and conservative attitudes. At political level, for example between political parties in the USA, this can be said to correspond to classic distinctions between the Democratic party in the first case and the Republican party in the latter case. The other three personality traits mostly occur independently of the political orientation. People with high scores in terms of these traits therefore equally refer to liberal and conservative attitudes, making it hard to assign people to a group in a general manner.

In recent years, a research paradigm has also established itself in the field of empirical research into morality, which can also prove that basic moral orientations significantly influence political attitudes. Within this research tradition, morality and its reasons are not cognitively anchored but are conceptualised as a group of – emotion-driven – dispositions and proven using neuro-psychological approaches and measuring procedures.

As with personality traits, current empirical research highlights five basic dimensions – *fairness*, *harm/care*, *ingroup*, *hierarchy* and *purity*³ – which are taken as universally valid. According to this view, moral values in the far east tend to be more concerned with the collective dimensions of *ingroup*, *authority* and *purity*, while, while, for example, in western Anglo-American cultures, the two individualistic dimensions of *fairness* and *harm/care* are more dominant. In empirical studies on the role of political attitude, it has been proven that a significant link exists e.g. in the USA between Democratic political attitudes and individualistic orientation, as well as between Republican attitudes and collectivistic orientation. These links must be clearly differentiated though, as an American Republican cannot be put on a par with the far eastern orientation. In this case it is merely that collectivistic dimensions play a greater role than for the Democrats, together with the individualistic dimension.

In Europe, and particularly in Germany, these results are usually critically received, particularly with regard to an assumed link between personality traits and party allegiance. Particular criticism is expressed concerning the party system, which must be clearly distinguished from European political culture.

Regardless of party-political links, which shall not be the primary focus, the objective of this study is to evaluate the results of a consultation of corruption experts, which took place during an international conference of the dbb akademie co-financed by OLAF in

¹ U.a. Verhulst et al. (2010) "The nature of the relationship between personality traits and political attitudes." *Personality and Individual Differences* 49; Gerber et al. (2010) "Personality and Political Attitudes." *American Political Science Review* 104; Hirsh et al. (2010) "Compassionate Liberals and Political Conservatives: Associations of Agreeableness With Political Ideology and Moral Values." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 36.

² At this juncture, the dimensions will be referred to throughout the entire study, in order to preserve the original and complete meaning of the terms used in the evaluation.

³ Ebd.

Cologne in November 2010. Out of approximately 220 international participants, the majority of whom came from Europe, 134 took part in the survey, which aimed to measure the BIG FIVE personality traits and five moral dimensions. The personality traits were measured using a reduced, calibrated scale with two items used to measure personality statements. The moral dimensions were assessed using a scale with three items developed by Johannes Haidt⁴.

The objective of the study was to determine whether the personality dimensions measured in this way have any influence on the perception of and attitudes towards corruption. In order to measure attitudes to corruption, a number of aspects were determined with the help of corruption experts, which was reduced to ten pairs of statements (factors), each with two particular statements about corruption, after removing duplications.

If we disregard the trivial observation that corruption experts, as well as theoreticians and practitioners from the field of organisational corruption prevention, do not generally have a positive attitude to corruption, the objective was to identify statements, with which anti-corruption interventions can be characterised as preventive or objective. This may appear to be a purely cognitive task, but this is not the case. This is generally true, as any attempt to separate cognition from emotion would be doomed to failure⁵. A more preventive or repressive attitude generally depends greatly on the image of humanity. The value inductions of basic emotional attitudes play an essential part.

As shown by the outcomes described below, all three of the analysed factors produce encouraging, if not ultimately unambiguous, results. The five moral dimensions can be clearly distinguished and their “forced” reduction down to two factors also produces a very good result. The individualistic and collective orientations are reproduced. At the same time, a factor analysis using our scale produces a plausible four-factor model. This applies for a factor analysis using the full data set. A differentiation that we made based on the data from Western European cases (an American participant was assigned to this group) led to a three-factor model in each case, while the differences certainly point to a range of repression/prevention cultures. This East-West divide is the only difference indicated by the demographic data obtained, which was used for the analyses, as only this data provides a sufficient number of cases for sub-populations.

In order to test the central hypothesis, the factor values obtained were studied in various combinations, in order to identify links to attitudes to corruption prevention. The resulting outcomes reinforce the assumption that personality traits are essentially linked to attitudes to corruption. It is even more impressive when it comes to moral dimensions, even if the picture appears more striking for the above-mentioned links to party research.

⁴ Graham et al. (2009) “Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96, 5.

⁵ The recurring connections between cognitive and emotional modules in our brains prove this impressively.

2. Personality Traits (the Big Five)

In order to test whether the ten personality descriptions also represent the personality traits to be measured, a factor analysis was conducted.⁶ The statements used to describe personality appear in pairs, with two consecutive pairs representing the two opposite poles of a personality trait, such as extrovert versus introvert. In order to avoid the emergence of negative or deceptive relations, which were also proven during a sample calculation, the second five pairs were recoded. The survey results are shown in the following table, for factor loadings with a value greater than 0.5.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Calm, emotionally stable	.844				
Anxious, easily upset	.762				
Conventional, uncreative		.815			
Open to new experiences		.761			
Dependable, self-disciplined			.849		
Critical, quarrelsome			.685		
Disorganised, careless				.743	
Sympathetic, warm				.648	
Reserved, quiet					.893
Extroverted, enthusiastic					.685

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

This result is extremely satisfactory, as five pairs were identified, of which three can clearly be assigned to the five personality traits. The first component, or pair of statements concerning personality, clearly corresponds to the *psychic stability* characteristic, while the second corresponds to the characteristic of *openness* and the fifth component can be assigned to the characteristic of *extrovertedness/introvertedness*.

The third and fourth components combine the personality traits of *consciousness* and *agreeableness*. This means that it is no longer possible to clearly represent each of the five personality dimensions with two statements.

In the following calculations, the last two characteristics are therefore only represented with one of the two statement pairs (*disorganised, careless* or *critical, quarrelsome*), while the pair with the greatest variance was selected.

The component matrix specially developed for the Western European countries also produces five pairs, which correspond to the personality traits with a minor distinc-

⁶ From a technical point of view, a principal component analysis was conducted. To some extent, this is the default method for factor analyses, even if, strictly speaking, they do not deserve this name, because it differs from the statistical approach. But it generally leads to the same results as the factor-analytical procedures.

tive feature. The characteristic of *agreeableness* is only represented by one statement pair. The second statement pair - *critical, quarrelsome* – occurs in the personality trait *psychic stability*. A positive finding of this nature reinforces the chosen scale, while the fact that the model as whole is less conclusive is possibly due to the special characteristics of Eastern European participants. In this context, the assumption cannot be denied that the participants were also influenced by language problems (the questionnaire was written in English).

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Calm, emotional stable	.844				
Anxious, easily upset	.826				
Critical, quarrelsome	.580				
Extroverted, enthusiastic		.869			
Reserved, quiet		.851			
Dependable, self-disciplined			.829		
Disorganised, careless			.683		
Open to new experience				.856	
Conventional, uncreative				.795	
Sympathetic, warm					.941

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Extroverted, enthusiastic	.823				
Anxious, easily upset	.783				
Disorganised, careless	-.616		.612		
Calm, emotional stable		.877			
Open to new experience		-.755			
Reserved, quiet			.929		
Sympathetic, warm				.777	
Critical, quarrelsome				-.680	.502
Conventional, uncreative				.596	
Dependable, self-disciplined					.962

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 11 iterations.

The table for the Eastern European participants produces a result, which can only be interpreted with difficulty and was therefore not further investigated. So that the personality traits can also be used for the Eastern European participants, we only worked with the individual statement pairs in the following analyses.

3. Moral Dimensions

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Purity whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency	.819			
Purity whether or not someone did something disgusting	.779			
Purity whether or not someone was able to control his or her desires	.697			
Authority whether or not the people involved were of the same rank or status	.682			
Authority whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for legitimate authority	.647			
Authority whether or not someone failed to fulfil the duties of his or her role	.534			
Fairness whether or not someone acted unfairly		.821		
Fairness whether or not someone was denied his or her rights		.745		
Fairness whether or not some people were treated differently than others		.666		
Harm whether or not someone was harmed			.839	
Harm whether or not someone used violence			.694	
Harm whether or not someone suffered emotionally			.661	
In-group whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group				.801
In-group whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty				.785
In-group whether or not the action was done by a friend or relative of yours				.501

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in 9 iterations.

With an analysis based on the eigenvalue criterion, the first table, which was produced for the statements relating to the five moral dimensions, highly impressively proves that the selected factors make valid measurements possible. Although only the four moral dimensions were addressed in the survey, a clear link emerges. The statements on *purity* (decency) and *hierarchy* were summarised. As both dimensions represent a collective orientation, a summary seems consistent.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Purity whether or not someone did something disgusting	,907				
Purity whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency	,901				
Purity whether or not someone was able to control his or her desires	,698				
Fairness whether or not someone acted unfairly		,781			
Fairness whether or not someone was denied his or her rights		,762			
Fairness whether or not some people were treated differently than others		,757			
Authority whether or not someone failed to fulfil the duties of his or her role		,484			,412
Harm whether or not someone was harmed			,820		
Harm whether or not someone used violence			,675		
Harm whether or not someone suffered emotionally		,402	,651		
In-group whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group				,806	
In-group whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty				,775	
Authority whether or not the people involved were of the same rank or status					,790
In-group whether or not the action was done by a friend or relative of yours				,469	,659
Authority whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for legitimate authority	,425				,453

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in 10 iterations.

If an eigenvalue analysis is conducted based on five moral dimensions, the results still correspond to the usual separation, which is no longer as selective.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component	
	1	2
Fairness whether or not someone was denied his or her rights	,796	
Harm whether or not someone suffered emotionally	,761	
Fairness whether or not someone acted unfairly	,753	
Harm whether or not someone used violence	,705	
Fairness whether or not some people were treated differently than others	,704	
Harm whether or not someone was harmed	,690	
In-group whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group	,463	
Purity whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency		,795
Purity whether or not someone did something disgusting		,752
Purity whether or not someone was able to control his or her desires		,723
Authority whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for legitimate authority		,701
In-group whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty		,613
Authority whether or not someone failed to fulfil the duties of his or her role		,585
In-group whether or not the action was done by a friend or relative of yours		,584
Authority whether or not the people involved were of the same rank or status		,582

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

If we conduct an eigenvalue analysis with only two factors, this produces the above-described solution, which fully reflects the theoretical expectations. The result reproduces the separation between an individualistic attitude, with the juxtaposition of *fairness* and *harm*, and a collective attitude, with the components *purity*, *authority* and *in-group*.

The West

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component	
	1	2
Purity whether or not someone did something disgusting	,843	
Purity whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency	,831	
Purity whether or not someone was able to control his or her desires	,784	
Authority whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for legitimate authority	,634	
In-group whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty	,632	
In-group whether or not the action was done by a friend or relative of yours	,569	
Authority whether or not the people involved were of the same rank or status	,550	
Authority whether or not someone failed to fulfil the duties of his or her role	,534	
Fairness whether or not someone was denied his or her rights		,771
Fairness whether or not someone acted unfairly		,760
Harm whether or not someone suffered emotionally		,681
Harm whether or not someone used violence		,658
Fairness whether or not some people were treated differently than others		,656
Harm whether or not someone was harmed		,574
In-group whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group		,428

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

An analogous distribution also emerged when the analysis was restricted to the Western participants. However, in this case, the factors appear in reverse order. This is primarily due to statistical reasons (proportion of explained variance), but also implicitly says something about the relevance of the content. From this point of view, it appears remarkable that collective and conservative values play a primary role in the West, while the reverse order emerges for the East. *Fairness* is a dominant element in this context. However, at the same time, the individualistic and collective attitude emerges less clearly than in the West. While only the *ingroup* element plays a marginal role as part of the individualistic component in the West, in the East the *authority* and *ingroup* elements have an impact on the individualistic component. Ultimately, this does not, however, contradict the theoretical approach suggested here, which states that the collective value dimensions of *purity*, *ingroup* und *authority* play a greater role for the collective orientation than for the individualistic orientation.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component	
	1	2
Fairness whether or not someone acted unfairly	,894	
Fairness whether or not some people were treated differently than others	,880	
Harm whether or not someone used violence	,850	
Fairness whether or not someone was denied his or her rights	,846	
Authority whether or not someone failed to fulfil the duties of his or her role	,763	
Harm whether or not someone suffered emotionally	,757	
Harm whether or not someone was harmed	,750	
Purity whether or not someone was able to control his or her desires	,668	,588
In-group whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group		,833
In-group whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty		,827
In-group whether or not the action was done by a friend or relative of yours		,684
Purity whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency	,570	,671
Authority whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for legitimate authority		,634
Purity whether or not someone did something disgusting		,506
Authority whether or not the people involved were of the same rank or status		

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

4. Attitudes and Perceptions of Corruption

An analysis of statements describing attitudes to corruption produces the following results.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Organisations are social systems	.737			
Fighting corruption is a sub-goal of an organisation's mission	.657			
Changing behaviour can be facilitated by positive reinforcement	.650			
Corruption violates moral norms	.631			
Corrupters are criminals		.825		
Corrupters have to be severely punished		.656		
Individual rights are more important than organisational welfare			.760	
Current law is sufficient to minimise corruption			.573	
Corruption is defined by law				.747
Prevention is superior to sanctioning corruption				-.714

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in 8 iterations.

The first four statements in the matrix refer to the perception of organisations as social systems. In this context, corruption prevention is not a central objective but only a sub-goal, while the interpretation of this argument can be extremely controversial. It is also possible that the assignment of corruption prevention as a sub-goal of organisational objectives becomes more significant. If we see morality as an emotionally structured construct for the stabilisation of social communities, the fourth statement (violation of moral norms) also makes sense. This group of statements could be described as the “*social attachment factor*”. A conceivable characterisation based on party sociology as a liberal attitude seems impossible.

The second group of statements, in other words the second factor, perceives corrupt people as criminals, who need to be punished, while the third group of statements refers to a liberal position. Whether, as part of this divide, the second group, which seems to favour punishment as a method of corruption prevention, can therefore be equated to a conservative position, cannot be generalised.

The third group, although it can be equated to a liberal attitude, is also only significant for the European context, as it is a liberal position without a social orientation. This also becomes clearer below, when the link to moral orientation is analysed.

The fourth group formally assumes a special significance, as it is based on the two opposite poles of supremacy of law and preventive social intervention. In terms of content, the first pole seems to correspond to the second group and the second pole seems to correspond to the first group. Yet they form their own dimension. In order to describe this using language, in contrast to the group that favours punishment, refer-

ence is made to the group that acts more preventively.⁷ This could be a central factor, as it contrasts punishment and the law with prevention. However, a clear statement is not possible due to a lack of further significant links. At this point, it must be assumed that the dividing line between prevention/repression is possibly not central for this sample. When the number of factors was reduced, this did not produce any better solutions, i.e. no meaningful characterisation could be identified in terms of content.

The West

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component		
	1	2	3
Corrupters have to be severely punished	.777		
Fighting corruption is a sub-goal of an organisation's mission	.719		
Corrupters are criminals	.704		
Corruption violates moral norms	.649		
Organisations are social systems	.493		
Individual rights are more important than organisational welfare		.681	
Changing behaviour can be facilitated by positive reinforcement		.664	
Current law is sufficient to minimise corruption		.566	
Corruption is defined by law			-.765
Prevention is superior to sanctioning corruption			.667

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in five iterations.

For the western participants, a three-factor model produces the most workable solution. It then points to a group of prevention advocates in the first factor, while the second factor corresponds to the liberals identified above. The first group in this western model is characterised by the fact that it brings together the first two groups of the general model, in other words the perception of organisations as social systems and the tendency to punish. The special significance of the tendency to punish becomes clear, as the statement “*Changing behaviour can be facilitated by positive reinforcement*”, which formed part of the general model, is no longer included. This comes close to assigning a basic conservative attitude to the first group.

⁷ In this context, we refer to a group in order to simplify the language used. The factor refers solely to a variable. In real terms, only the particularly high values of this survey can be assigned to a clear statement or group, such as prevention advocates. This also applies for all other descriptions as a group.

The East

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component		
	1	2	3
Corruption violates moral norms	,819		
Fighting corruption is a sub-goal of an organisation's mission	,808		
Corruption is defined by law	,797		
Changing behaviour can be facilitated by positive reinforcement	,751		
Organisations are social systems	,630		,611
Corrupters are criminals		,750	
Current law is sufficient to minimise corruption		,741	
Prevention is superior to sanctioning corruption		,693	
Corrupters have to be severely punished		,581	
Individual rights are more important than organisational welfare			,877

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in four iterations.

The model for the Eastern European participants is significantly different from the Western European variant. Although a liberal group can also be identified in this context and the first component corresponds to the *social attachment factor* of the general model, the second component cannot be assigned a simple description based on its content. The summarisation of the punishment-oriented and preventive attitude to corruption is particularly contradictory. But this is possibly only the expression of a different cultural logic.

5. Analysis

5.1 Impact of Personality Traits on Attitudes towards Corruption

When the four identified groups of attitudes to corruption are compared with personality trait evaluations, no significant links emerge. This appears sobering at first glance, if the influence of personality traits and morality on corruption prevention is identified as a primary objective. Another starting point was provided by findings concerning the influence of personality traits on party preference or the presence of conservatism or liberalism. However, two characteristics are relevant: *consciousness* and *openness*. In addition, such things as conservative or liberal attitudes can only be measured to a limited extent using the scale for attitudes to corruption.

If, however, we conduct comparative measurements based on 10 statement pairs for five personality traits as independent variables, the following moderate effects are obtained. A link emerges between *agreeableness* and the statement *sympathetic, warm* for the first group, which was referenced to the *socially attached*.

The group of people, who advocate punitive measures for corruption prevention, is influenced by *consciousness* via the characteristics *dependable, self-disciplined* and

critical, quarrelsome. A slight link between the personality trait *consciousness* and a conservative attitude becomes clearly visible, even if the tendency to punish is seen as a conservative characteristic.

A liberal attitude is influenced by people being “*open to new experiences*”, so that the identified link also becomes visible to some extent within this context. A certain amount of scepticism is required here, as this hardly corresponds generally to the liberal orientation in political sociology in the English-speaking world.

A preventive attitude to corruption prevention points to links with *extroverted, enthusiastic* characteristics. If we take account of the fact that the fourth group is defined by a bipolar factor, it emerges that the *extrovertedness* positively correlates to the attitude that “*Corruption is defined by law*” and emotional stability is linked to people who also argue that “*Prevention is superior to sanctioning corruption*”.

In a nutshell, it can be seen that a charitable disposition (*agreeableness*) leads to social commitment and increased awareness (*social attachment, consciousness*). The absence of a charitable disposition is directly linked to a tendency to punish. *Openness* also determines liberality, while *extrovertedness* leads to a pragmatic attitude. As a condition of balanced emotional control, emotional stability (*psychic stability*) ultimately determines the preference for preventive measures aimed at corruption prevention.

The assignment of openness to a liberal position and increased awareness to a conservative position that tends to favour punishment, which is frequently seen in studies focusing on the link between personality traits and political attitudes, is therefore replicated in the approaches adopted.

Overall, the effects of personality traits therefore certainly impact upon attitudes to corruption and are therefore also certainly consistent with the theory. However, it must not be forgotten that, despite significant effects in exceptional cases, the overall explanatory power of personality traits is highly marginal.

The West

For the participants from the Western countries, a three-factor model emerged as an appropriate solution. The first group within this model shows tendencies to criminalise corruption and favour punitive measures. At the same time, however, the group is also focused on organisations, which represent a social system, in which corruption violates moral norms.

When this evaluation is combined with the personality traits, in contrast to the model as whole, which certainly suffers from a lack of consistency between East and West, this produces a significant solution, with which approx. 22% of the total variance can be explained. Constitutive personality traits are *agreeableness* and *extrovertedness*, though both of the latter occur with negative co-efficients. This means that a lack of *agreeableness*, to a greater extent, and to a lesser extent *introvertedness* favour this factor and therefore the first group.

If individual statement pairs from the corruption survey are compared to the personality survey, it emerges that these effects particularly impact upon the punishment disposition and the perception of corruption as ethical misconduct. The tendency to punish would then be the consequence of a lack of empathy (a lack of *agreeableness*) and an introverted attitude with a basic moral orientation.

In fact, the liberal position of the second group is not explained by a comparison with the personality traits for the West. Effects become visible, however, if the 10 statement

pairs from the survey are taken as a basis. *Extrovertedness* and *emotional stability* play a role in this context. This becomes particularly clear if the key statement “*Individual rights are more important than organisational welfare*” is taken as a basis.

The third bipolar factor, which contrasts the statements “*prevention is superior...*” and “*corruption is defined by law*”, refers to the personality traits without any result. This also applies for the statement “*prevention is defined by law*”. However, links can be identified for the statement “*corruption is defined by law*”, which is favoured by the people who consider themselves *extroverted* and *emotionally instable*, while *agreeableness* (*sympathetic, warm*) tends to point to a negative attitude.

The East

As mentioned above, analyses of personality traits and attitudes to corruption fail to produce any satisfactory solutions for the Eastern European participants. A more extensive analysis of the different factors would therefore be irrelevant. Instead, as for the Western participants, the personality traits were compared with the essential defining statements “*Corruption violates moral norms*”, “*Corrupters are criminals*” and “*Individual rights are more important than organisational welfare*”. In addition, the effects on the punishment disposition and positive attitudes to prevention were also determined.

The links between personality and morality point to a rather fragmentary and contradictory picture. The liberal orientation is influenced positively by a personality which shows signs of *openness*, but negatively by emotional stability. Emotional instability therefore ultimately favours a liberal orientation, whereas emotional instability leads to a tendency to punish. *Agreeableness*, or charity, also leads to a tendency to reject the criminalisation of corruption.

If these findings are viewed as a whole, the natural conclusion is that personality traits only play a partial role in attitudes towards corruption, so that it is scarcely possible to speak of a close connection.

5.2 Impact of Morality on Attitudes towards Corruption

As established above, the statements on moral dimensions are extremely compatible with a factor analytic reconstruction. The explanatory power of the five moral dimensions is outlined below as a means of explaining attitudes to corruption.

If we consider the relationship between moral dimensions and the various groups and their attitudes to corruption, less significant effects become visible, which are highly plausible in terms of content. The group of the *socially attached* must therefore be linked to an individualistic attitude to morality (*harm, fairness*).

The group, which favours corruption prevention based on punishment, is positively linked to the *ingroup*, but is rejected by those, for whom the prevention of *harm* plays a major role.

At the same time, the significance of individual rights, which is constitutive for the third group, is perceived negatively by people for whom the prevention of *harm* is important. Remarkably, *fairness* does not play a role in this context. The fourth group, which refers to *law/prevention*, is significantly linked to moral attitudes of *purity/authority*. This means that, except for *fairness*, all moral dimensions help to explain the attitude dimensions.

Using the factor evaluations as explanatory variables, while focusing on the individual items in the attitude assessment, produces the following significant results.

Analogous to the above-mentioned relationship, organisations are perceived as a social system by people who wish to avoid punishment (*harm*). Remarkably however, the *ingroup* plays a negative role. This may be because other group definitions play a role for *ingroup*-oriented people.

A clear vote in favour of punishment emerges if major significance is attached to *purity/authority*. The statement "*Corruption violates moral rules*" is only significant for people who are inclined to *fairness*. Another positive effect exists between *purity/authority* and people arguing that "*corruption is defined by law*". To a certain extent, this is an expression of a traditional preference for law and order. This view is not adopted by those for whom preventive measures play a major role.

If we reduce the five moral dimensions to only two, as documented above in the component matrix, and view the evaluations of these two dimensions as an explanation for the four identified groups, effects can be seen which are hardly significant, but certainly confirm the assumption described in the introduction. Individualistically and collectively oriented moral dispositions are expressed in different attitudes to corruption.

This means that the individualistic orientation has a significant effect, which links it to socially oriented people. In contrast, a collective orientation is characteristic of the group that leans more towards punishment. It is remarkable that the individualistic orientation does not lead us to the liberally oriented third group. At this juncture, a possible explanation lies in the above-mentioned conclusion that the prevention of damage (*harm*) is in conflict with liberal rights. The above factors are of equal significance - fairness, but also the prevention of damage. In addition, no significant link can be proven for the last group (*law/prevention*). To an extent, this contrasts with the above-described relationship between *purity/authority* and this group. It must be remembered, however, that this factor also includes the *ingroup* dimension.

If we consider the individual statements and compare them to the moral dimensions, it can be seen that the tying of corruption to the law is less important for individualistically oriented people than the violation of moral norms.

Collectively oriented people call for more severe punishment based on laws. But the same people advocate preventive measures, while this is not the case for individualistically oriented people. It is therefore not possible to equate punishment with collective value orientation or prevention with individualistic value orientation.

The West

Participants from western countries differ in terms of attitudes to corruption, compared to the model as a whole. In terms of content, the existing model no longer includes four factors, as described above, but only three. As well as the bipolar characteristic *law/prevention*, the liberal dimension remains, while the preference for punishment can be found in the first group.

In the general model, this group was described as *socially attached* and can possibly be characterised as a social-democratic group based on the current theoretical discourse. With reference to the model for the western countries, the characterisation of the first group identified here is fully appropriate. It appears more conservative, while this characterisation would prompt critical reactions in Western Europe. As described

above, this group will therefore be described rather as conservative, while morality is accepted as a characteristic, which helps to define liberals in the general model.

If the results for the identified groups are compared to the moral assessment, in other words to individually or collectively oriented people, significant links become apparent. An individual orientation, i.e. a moral orientation focused on the individual, then leads to a conservative attitude. Although a slight effect of this moral orientation can also be shown for the liberal position, this effect is not significant.

The result appears contradictory, as a punishment should, in theory, be more linked to a collective value orientation. But to equate conservatism with punishment and a liberal-democratic attitude with prevention or positive reinforcement would be oversimplistic. Punishment is then meted out and seen as legitimate, if moral transgressions occur. Beyond the cognitive dimension of legitimacy, we now know from neuro-scientific studies that fair punishment represents a positive experience in the event of any violation of moral norms.

The findings are confirmed when we apply the individually occurring statements referring to attitudes to corruption to the two moral dimensions. It reveals a clear relationship between individualism and those arguing that "*Corruption violates moral rules*", as well as "*Corrupters have to be severely punished*". The more collective attitude proves insignificant in this context. Other significant links emerge for those arguing that "*Changing behaviour can be facilitated by positive reinforcement*" and "*Fighting corruption is a sub-goal of an organisation's mission*". The liberal second group is indirectly influenced, as the opinion that "*Individual rights are more important than organisational welfare*" is linked to a negative effect for the collective orientation.

The East

In the East, the two moral dimensions become less consistent, but can be very clearly identified. The deciding difference compared to the West, however, is that individual values become more important.

As established above, the first group identified when measuring attitudes to corruption corresponds to the first group in the general model, which was linked to *social attachment*, while the third group was characterised by a liberal position.

The other results were marked by contradictions, as punishing and preventive tendencies occurred together. But this plays a decisive role if we apply the results separately to the two moral dimensions. Significant and substantially important effects can only be identified for the conflicting result. The individualistic and collective orientations occur in almost the same order of magnitude. The result does not therefore provide any explanatory power.

The difference becomes apparent in three statements. Having a collective orientation people emphasise that "*Corrupters are criminals*" and "*Corruption is defined by law*". A slight belief in punishment proves to be statistically insignificant. The individual orientation is expressed negatively in statements such as "*Current law is sufficient to minimise corruption*".

6. Conclusion

If we attempt to describe the range of effects defined above with a short conclusion, it can be established that, despite the significance attached to morality, personality often plays a part.

The theoretical background to this study is formed by the repeatedly confirmed links between the level of awareness (*consciousness*) and openness (*openness*) of a person as *essential personality traits* and a conservative-Republican or a liberal-democratic attitude on the one hand and, on the other hand, the relationships identified between an individualistic or collective moral orientation and the two named basic political attitudes.

Even if it was not the explicit objective of the study to identify Republicans or Democrats but to determine the bases of a preventive or repressive orientation, the two basic political attitudes correspond to the above-mentioned corruption dimensions, but are clearly not congruent with them, as the findings show. Although Republican and Democratic elements exist, ultimately they do not clearly determine the attitude to corruption. In addition, it can be assumed that prevention and repression do not represent a central conflict line. They first occur in the general model as a fourth factor, which is relatively independent of personality and attitudes to corruption.

In conclusion, the results of the study thus only tend to lead us to the known relationships outlined above. But the differentiated picture, which emerged from the analysis, cannot lead us to clear links. The results can, however, serve to indicate that basic conservative attitudes increase the probability that repressive measures will be applied in order to prevent corruption. But socially oriented personality and moral traits must be linked to a more preventive corruption strategy. Even if the analysis cannot confirm this representatively, it provides initial methods of determining which characteristics must be taken into account as part of the strategic orientation of anti-corruption campaigns.

In conclusion, it must be stressed that, due to the cultural diversity of the participants and potential language barriers caused by the questionnaires, which were only available in German and English, culturally differentiated interpretations may have limited the evaluation. In this context, the relatively small data set must also be taken into account. As part of a more extensive evaluation using larger data sets, the relationships outlined here, in consideration of the restrictions, can therefore be applied in greater depth and particularly to real situations in order to develop anti-corruption concepts.

Annexes

Attitudes to Corruption Questionnaire

The following short questionnaire addresses the relationship between personality, morality and attitudes related to corruption.

Here are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to you. Please rate each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement. You should rate the extent to which the pair of traits applies to you, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other.

Personality

I see myself as:

	Agree strongly 1	Agree moderately 2	Agree a little 3	Neither/ nor 4	Disagree a little 5	Disagree moderately 6	Disagree strongly 7
Extraverted, enthusiastic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Critical, quarrelsome	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dependable, self-disciplined	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anxious, easily upset	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Open to new experiences	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reserved, quiet.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sympathetic, warm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disorganized, careless	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Calm, emotionally stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conventional, uncreative	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Morality

When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your way of thinking.

	Always relevant							Never relevant
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Harm:								
Whether or not someone was harmed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Whether or not someone suffered emotionally	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Whether or not someone used violence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Fairness:								
Whether or not some people were treated differently than others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Whether or not someone acted unfairly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
In-group: (social cohesion)								
Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Whether or not the action was done by a friend or relative of yours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Always relevant					Never relevant	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Authority:							
Whether or not the people involved were of the same rank or status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Whether or not someone failed to fulfil the duties of his or her role	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for legitimate authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Purity:							
Whether or not someone did something disgusting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Whether or not someone was able to control his or her desires	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Corruption

Now we would like you to rate the following opinions and attitudes about corruption

	Agree strongly	Agree moderately	Agree a little	Neither/nor	Disagree a little	Disagree moderately	Disagree strongly
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Corruption is defined by law.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prevention is superior to sanctioning corruption.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Current law is sufficient to minimise corruption.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual rights are more important than organisational welfare.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Corruption violates moral norms.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Corrupters have to be severely punished.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fighting corruption is a sub-goal of an organisation's mission.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organisations are social systems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Corrupters are criminals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Changing behaviour can be facilitated by positive reinforcement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Finally, we would like to ask you for some additional information in order to carry out a differentiated evaluation. We are particularly interested in the question of nationality. However, the evaluation will focus on regional aggregates due to a limited number of cases.

Gender:

Female male

Age:

Please indicate your age:

Sector:

Private sector Public sector

Nationality

We thank you for your co-operation.

This conference was co-funded by the European Commission (OLAF) under the Hercule II Programme 2007-2013: A Community Action Programme to promote activities in the field of the protection of the Community's financial interests. (for more information see http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/programmes/index_en.html)

This programme reflects the views of the dbb akademie. The European Commission (OLAF) is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.