



NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Volume 2, Issue 3

Online ISSN: 2682-6151

Print ISSN: 2682-6143

2019

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. S.O. Adebayo

Managing Editor

B.E. Nwankwo Ph.D

Personality Type, Motivation and Gender as Determinants of Corruption Engagement

¹Sampson, Kelechi Nwonyi**

¹Ronald C. Oginyi

¹Nkechi Emma-Echiegu

¹Sunday Mbam Ofoke

¹Emmanuel Tochukwu Elom

¹Kenneth Chigbo

¹Department of Psychology and Sociological Studies, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki.

**Email: kelechinwonyi@gmail.com. Tel: +2348068573082

Abstract

This study investigated personality type, motivation and gender as determinants of corruption engagement. A total of 276 civil servants from Abakaliki in Ebonyi State participated in the study. They comprised one hundred and thirty-six males (136) and one hundred and forty females (140). Their ages ranged from 18 to 55 years with a mean age of 34.97 and standard deviation of 9.92. Participants were selected using simple random sampling technique. Three instruments were used; the big-five personality inventory, multi-dimensional work motivation scale and corruption propensity Scale. Three hypotheses were tested. Cross sectional design was adopted and Hierarchical Multiple Regression was used to analyze the data. Results revealed that neurotic personality significantly predicted corruption engagement ($\beta = .15, p < .01$). Motivation ($\beta = .12, p < .05$) significantly predicted corruption engagement and Gender ($\beta = -.67, p < .05$) also significantly predicted corruption engagement. A practical implication of the findings is that presence of neurotic personality characteristics in people such as anxiety, worry, frustration, envy, jealousy, guilt, depressed mood and loneliness encourage corruption. Limitations of the study were stated and suggestions stated for further studies.

Keywords: Personality Type, Motivation, Gender, Corruption.

Introduction

Corruption is globally a big problem threatening human progress. It is not the exclusive preserve of any nation, race or section of the world but transcends national boundaries and frontiers and symbolizes phenomenal universal unwholesomeness politically (Aluko, 2009). Over the years, presence of corruption has attracted the world's attention because of its negative effects on a country's economic, social and political development and growth. According to the Global Economic Crime Survey (2009) corruption threatens the world's economy. It is one of the biggest crimes faced in the global economy in 2009, and among the top three types of economic crimes committed in 2009 amidst asset misappropriation, accounting fraud and bribery and corruption. It is not a new phenomenon rather it is as old as the history of mankind itself. Corruption made itself visible when the institution of the government was established. It strikes almost all parts of the society and destroys the functioning of cultural, political and economic structure of the society (Amundsen, 1999). Corruption is broadly defined as the abuse of official power or authority for

personal gain (Heidenheimer, 1989; Lambsdorff, 2006; Park, 2003; Svensson, 2005; van Klaveren, 1989). There is a general consensus that corruption exists in many countries and has a negative impact on society (Meon & Sekkat, 2005). Corruption has adverse consequences in terms of social justice and optimal allocation of government funds (Gupta, Davoodi, Alonso-Terme, 2002; Méon & Sekkat, 2005). There are certain circumstances in societies with high levels of corruption which aid corrupt deals. For example, in countries with widespread corruption such as Nigeria, engaging in corrupt deals becomes easy in terms of locating corruption corroborators. If the level of corruption is high, then it is easier to find a potential "partner" for a corrupt deal who has already acquired the necessary "skills" for this act (Della Porta & Vannucci, 1999). In addition, regulatory authorities in corrupt societies are often involved in corrupt activities themselves, thus reducing the probability of punishment for and suppression of such behavior (Lui, 1986).

According to researchers Inglehart and Welzel (2010) values of self-expression can reduce the incentive to engage in corrupt behavior as concern for public interest is more important than personal gain. However, such an approach does not take into account the individual and psychological characteristics of human beings. Values are considered from the cultural perspective; they do not exist separately from people, because values govern the behavior of people on an individual level. It is important to define the relationships between values and attitudes toward corruption at the individual level. Individual human characteristics have been studied relatively recently in the context of corruption analysis (Dulleck & Torgler, 2012; Dong & Torgler, 2009; Guerrero, Rodríguez, Oreggia, 2008; Mocan, 2008; Torgler & Valev, 2010). Till today individual and psychological factors associated with corruption have been insufficiently studied. Notably, studies of individual and psychological characteristics pay more attention to the individual determinants of corrupt behaviours such as bribe taking (Berninghaus, 2013; Bendahan, 2015). These aspects are certainly important, but it is also important to analyze the psychological characteristics of people who engage in corrupt practice. For example individuals willing to pay bribes support the culture of corruption and help maintain an environment which fosters corruption. If society is tolerant towards corruption and accepts it, the corruption will continue.

Corruption is Nigeria's biggest challenge (Uzochukwu, 2013). It is clear to every citizen that the level of corruption in the country is high. It's found in every sector of society. Be it a small or big sector, there is every possibility of observing corrupt practices when critically examined. Nigeria is one of the Countries in Africa that loses billions of naira yearly because of corruption, and was ranked the 148th least corrupt country out of 175 countries, according to the 2017 corruption index reported by Transparency International (Transparency International, 2017). In

2018, Nigeria was 144th least corrupt country out of 175 countries by Transparency International (Transparency International, 2018). That Nigerians (both the leaders and the led) are corrupt is not an over-statement. This fact is attested to by Dike (2003) who submitted that corruption is ‘pandemic’ in Nigeria. Every country such as Nigeria must confront corruption. It is detrimental to economic, social and political development and violates the fundamental principles of democracy such as equality, fairness, transparency and accountability (Sandholtz & Koetzle, 2000; Warren 2006). According to section 8(1) of the Anti-Corruption Law of Nigeria (2004), it entails the act of asking for, receiving or obtaining any property or benefit of any kind for oneself or for any other person (Anti-Corruption Law, 2004). Corruption is a global problem with certain destructive tendencies in the Third World Countries like Nigeria.

Corruption serves as a spring board to under-development in Nigeria. This menace has led to situations like slow movement of files in offices, police extortion of toll fees, port congestion, queues at passport offices and petrol stations, ghost workers syndrome, election irregularities, among others (Dike, 2005, Ihenacho, 2004, Oliyide & Odeku, 2002 & Oloja 2002 in Aluko, 2009). Most economic, political and social problems in underdeveloped societies like Nigeria emanate from corruption which manifest in many ways such as: lack of accountability, inadequate funding of programs, diversion of public resources to private ownership, different types of discriminations, ethnicity, lack of competence, inefficiency etc.

Corruption is a common word used by both adults and children in Nigeria, because it is found in every sector of Nigeria. Corruption has now been nick named in most Nigerian languages especially in the three major languages (Ndokwu, 2004). The Igbo’s call it Igbu-ozu, the Yoruba’s call it Egunje while the Hausa’s call it Chuachua. People no longer frown or feel ashamed to engage in corrupt practices. Hence, Chuachua/Egunje or Igbuozu now seem acceptable and it is possible to hear someone openly complaining that there is no Chuachua, Egunje or Igbuozu at his or her place of work and as such a person might quickly resign if he or she finds another work where there is opportunity for corruption. Corruption has been cited as the major reason why developmental prescription, aids and policies made for Nigeria by international financial organizations have inexplicably failed. Corruption breaks down the law and order, structure of the economy, thereby making it easy for the nation to be infested with all sorts of deficiencies and crimes.

Personality type which refers to the psychological classification of different types of individuals has been implicated in corruption (Bernstein, Penner, Clarke-Stewart, & Roy 2008). It is the collection of personality traits which are thought to occur together consistently, especially as determined by a certain pattern of responses to a personality inventory (Bernstein, Penner, Clarke-Stewart, & Roy 2008). Personality type is a set of individual differences that are affected by the

development of an individual: values, attitudes, personal memories, social relationships, habits, and skills (McAdams & Olson, 2010; Mischel & Smith, 2004). The big five factor personality theory, constructed by Cattell, represents one of the personality taxonomies. Derived from a list of thousands of personality descriptive terms, the Big Five represents five personality trait dimensions that empirical research has indicated can account for the larger comprehensive range of personality factors: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience (Goldberg, 1990).

According to Michael (2014) individuals scoring lower in agreeableness and lower in conscientiousness have a higher propensity to commit white-collar crime. Aaron and Emmanuel (2015), have shown the association between personality (i.e. extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience) and corruption propensity. The result of their research revealed that extraversion and conscientiousness positively and inversely predicted corruption propensity respectively. Personality dimensions (i.e. extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience) makes up personality, causes the differences and variations among individuals and a high or low score in these dimensions influences the individual's behavioral tendencies. As a result, personality could be implicated in people's attitude, involvement or attraction to corrupt behavior.

Motivation is the process of stimulating people to actions to accomplish their goals. According to Pardee (1990) motivation is the reason for people's actions, desires, and needs. Motivation is also one's direction to behavior, or what causes a person to want to repeat a behavior such as engaging in corruption. In everyday usage, the term motivation is frequently used to describe why a person does something. Motivation can be intrinsic or extrinsic. A person is intrinsically motivated if the desire for change comes from within the individual. Intrinsic motivation (also referred to as personal factors) is the self-desire to seek out new things and new challenges. It is mostly embedded during childhood and plays a major role in the individual tendency towards or against corruption (Speckemeier, 2015). Motives that often drive corrupt actors to their criminal actions are frequently manifested through professional ambition, the pure pleasure in the exercise of power, the excessive demands in the workplace or the disappointment of missed opportunities. The likelihood of corrupt behavior does not only depend on internal values or personality. The personal circumstances (referred to as situational factors) also provide external incentives which influence the individual. The external incentives for corrupt actions can be very diverse. Everyday corruption often happens because of emergency situations. Especially in developing countries customs, police, officials from authorities, teachers and doctors act corruptly because they are so poorly paid (Speckemeier, 2015). In corporate surroundings external factors

like job security, consequences of the misconduct of targets or the attitude of the management on the issue of corruption (corporate culture) usually have an additional influence on the overall attitude towards corruption. If the employees do not achieve the company's goals, they may risk their job. The interpretation of both situational and personal factors eventually explains the emergence of corruption (Speckemeier, 2015). In 1991, psychologist Icek Ajzen brought together previous research and developed three essential determinants that synthesize the behavioral tendencies of the individual regarding corruption; attitudes towards own behavior (How does the individual assess its own corrupt behavior?), subjective norm (how does the environment assess corruption?), perceived control (How high are risk and penalties?). In other words, the more positive the attitude towards corruption is, the more positive subjective norms (e.g. insufficient regularities of top-management) are and the fewer alternatives to bribery exist, the higher is the intention to corrupt behavior. Overall, corruption emerges due to diverse motivations and through several actions, making it almost impossible to fully extinguish it from the surface.

Researches on the relationship between gender and corruption showed that corruption and gender are in many ways closely connected. Gender aspect to corruption research initially emerged as academics and policymakers were interested in the possibility of increasing the share of women in public life to decrease levels of corruption. This was motivated by findings that women often appeared to behave more public-spirited than men did (Goetz, 2007). Swamy, Anand, Stephen, Lee, and Azfar (2001) explored levels that corruption might be impacted by gender, analyzing a considerable number of studies; and found that higher numbers of women in parliament are linked to lower levels of corruption. Since 2001, the thesis that increasing the number of women in political office provides an efficient means for fighting corruption has been widely circulated in international media (Agbo, & Iwundu, 2015). It was supported by a cross-country regression analysis published in a World Bank Development Research Group report, which indicated that at the country level, higher rates of female participation in government are associated with lower levels of corruption (Agbo, & Iwundu, 2015). The idea that women are inherently less corrupt than men is largely based on behavioral studies, showing that women have higher scores on integrity tests (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1998), and showcase higher norms of ethical behavior (Glover, Bumpus, Logan, & Ciesla, 1997; Reiss & Mitra, 1998). Dollar, David, Raymond and Gattia (2000) hypothesized that women are more likely to sacrifice personal gains for the common good and are therefore less prone to be involved in corrupt behavior. Similarly, some studies argue that women are less corrupt because of differences in self-control (Swamy, Anand, Stephen, Lee, & Azfar, 2001), risk aversion (Byrnes, Miller, & Schafer, 1999; Eckel & Füllbrunn, 2015; Harris, Jenkins, & Glaser, 2006) and a lower willingness to engage with criminal or corrupt officials (Frank,

Lambsdor, & Boehm, 2011). A similar view is supported by the findings of Alatas, Cameron, Chaudhuri, Erkal and Gangadharan (2006) concerning gender differences in regard to corruption. They found that in Australia, women tend to be less tolerant of and engage less in corruption than men. They also suggest that there is a larger variation among women in attitudes towards corruption than among men, because there is “larger variation in the social roles of women than the social roles of men across countries” (Alatas, Cameron, Chaudhuri, Erkal & Gangadharan, 2006). Furthermore, according to a study in Moldova, women see corruption as a more acute problem than men do. Women also reported feeling more angry and humiliated about paying bribes (Carasciuc, 2000). A World Bank report including 150 countries in Europe, Africa and Asia concluded that women are more trustworthy and less prone to corruption. In addition, data from transition countries show that corruption is less severe in situations where women have a larger share of parliamentary seats and senior positions in the government bureaucracy (Michailovq, Julija & Melnykovska 2009).

Hypotheses

1. Personality trait dimensions (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, neuroticism and Openness to experience) significantly predict corruption engagement among workers.
2. Motivation will significantly predict corruption engagement among workers.
3. Gender will significantly predict corruption engagement among workers.

Method

Participants

Two hundred and seventy-six (276) civil servants from Ebonyi State participated in the study. They comprised one hundred and thirty-six (136) males and one hundred and forty (140) females. Participant’s age ranged from 18 years to 55 years with a mean age of 34.97 and standard deviation of 9.92. Participants were drawn from federal Inland Revenue service, Corporate Affairs Commission, Ministry of works, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Power and staffs of National Directorate of Employment Abakaliki Ebonyi State through simple random sampling technique.

Instruments

A questionnaire comprising three scales was employed in this study. They are Big Five Personality Inventory (BFI), the Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS) and Corruption Propensity Scale (CPS).

Big Five Personality Inventory (BFI) (John, Donahue & Kentle 1991)

This is a 44-item inventory developed by John, Donahue and Kentle (1991). It assesses personality from five distinct dimensions: Extraversion (8 items), Agreeableness (9 items), Conscientiousness (9 items), Neuroticism (8 items) and Openness to experience (10 items). According to Omoluabi (2002), BFI was adapted for the use of professionals in Nigeria after several years of research at re-standardizing it, in order to enhance its suitability and relevance for Nigerians. John, Donahue & Kentle (1991) reported a Cronbach alpha coefficient of reliability of .80 and a 3 month test retest reliability of .85 for the BFI. The authors also reported mean convergent validity coefficients of .75 and .85 with the Big five Instruments authored by Costa & McCrae (1992) and Goldberg (1992) respectively. A pilot testing by Effiong (2015) using Nigerian participants indicated that the dimensions are reliable and valid.

Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS) (Gagné et al., 2014)

The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS) developed by Gagné et al., (2014) consists of 19 items and measures Demotivation - which consists in the absence of motivation for an activity; Extrinsic regulation - which refers to commitment to activities for instrumental reasons, such as receiving rewards, approval, avoiding punishment and/or disapproval, increasing self-esteem, or reaching a personally valued goal; External regulation - the performance of an activity to obtain rewards or punishments administered by others. The items in each dimension are evaluated on a seven-point Likert scale, where 1 = nothing, 2 = very little, 3 = a little, 4 = moderately, 5 = strongly, 6 = very strongly and 7 = completely. The MWMS was reported to have Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .86 indicating that it is reliable and valid for measuring individual's motivation.

The Corruption Propensity Scale (CPS)

The Corruption Propensity scale (CPS) with 18-items, was developed by Agbo and Iwundu (2015) after examining the major anti-corruption laws in Nigeria. Item stems was constructed around acts identified as corrupt acts in the laws. These laws include the Economic and Financial Crime Commission Act (EFCC) and the Independent Corrupt Practices and other Related Offences Act (ICPC). Most of these acts revolve around forgery, falsification, solicitation and acceptance of bribery, and misappropriation of public funds through diversion, concealment, and so forth. Some of the items in the scale are "if I have the opportunity of handling the money that belongs to this country, I will make sure I benefit from it" and "I don't mind favouring a client for a bribe". The items have 7-point response options, ranging from disagree strongly (1) to agree strongly (7). All

items were directly scored so that higher scores indicated higher propensity to engage in corrupt acts. Aaron and Emmanuel (2015) obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .91. Substantial levels of test-retest reliability were also obtained.

Procedure

The questionnaires were administered with the help of the research assistants after obtaining permission from the HODs. Rapport was created with the participants before administering the questionnaires. Participants were equally assured that their responses will be treated with confidentiality; and that participation in the study was voluntary. The questionnaires were collected back from the participants after they were filled. Fifty (50) questionnaires were distributed in each of the six organizations, making it a total of three hundred (300) questionnaires. Of the three hundred (300) questionnaires distributed, only two hundred and eighty-two (282) questionnaires were returned, while only two hundred and seventy-six (276) questionnaires were found to be properly filled and usable for data analysis. All data were accurately entered and stored in a password-protected computer. Time frame for the exercise lasted 3 days. At the end of data collection in each organization, the researchers thanked all the participants for participating in the research.

Design/Statistics:

Cross sectional design was adopted. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to indicate how personality dimensions, motivation and gender serve as determinants of corruption engagement. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 was employed for the data analyses.

Results

Data obtained from participants were analyzed by computing the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables. Thereafter, to test the hypotheses, multiple regression was conducted in which corruption was the dependent variable.

Table 1: Means, standard deviations, and correlations for demographic variables, personality type, motivation and gender on corruption engagement

S/N	Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	Age	34.97	9.92	-													
2	Marital Status			-.15	-												
3	Religion			.12	.04	-											
4	Edu Level			.44	.08	.32	-										
5	Ethnic Group			.10	.06	.47	.30	-									
6	How long	6.22	4.23	.68	.10	.17	.52	.15	-								
7	Extraversion	23.42	4.55	.02	.14	-.10	-.08	-.20	-.05	-							
8	Agreeableness	29.25	5.52	-.10	-.12	-.14	-.09	-.19	-.20	.40***	-						
9	Conscientiousness	29.11	5.37	-.03	-.06	-.14	-.09	-.04	-.07	-.04	.30***	-					
10	Neuroticism	22.74	3.53	-.09	-.02	.09	.07	.06	-.01	-.14**	-.10*	-.10*	-				
11	Openness	31.00	6.25	-.07	-.06	-.13	-.13	-.18	-.17	.42***	.46***	.26***	.01	-			
12	Motivation	77.84	15.86	-.03	-.02	-.16	-.18	-.07	-.07	.08	.17**	.32***	.01	.12*	-		
13	Gender	1.50	.50	-.03	-.10	-.03	-.20	.002	.05	.04	-.06	-.04	-.09	-.04	.06	-	
14	Corruption	68.54	28.30	.12*	.11*	.06	.28***	.19***	.04	-.13**	-.13**	-.02	.18**	-.03	.06	-.70***	-

*= P < .05; **p < .01 (significant) Gender= 1-male, 2-female

Result of correlation show that corruption engagement was significantly related to age ($r = .12$, $p < .05$); marital status ($r = -.12$, $p < .05$); educational level ($r = .29$, $p < .001$); ethnic group ($r = .10$, $p < .05$); extraversion ($r = .10$, $p < .05$); agreeableness ($r = .10$, $p < .05$); neuroticism ($r = .10$, $p < .05$), and gender ($r = .10$, $p < .05$). Thus, extraverted, agreeable and neurotic individuals engage more in corruption. Extraversion was significantly related to agreeableness ($r = .40$, $p < .001$), neuroticism ($r = -.14$, $p < .01$), and openness ($r = .42$, $p < .001$). Agreeableness was significantly related to conscientiousness ($r = .30$, $p < .001$), neuroticism ($r = -.10$, $p < .05$), openness ($r = .46$, $p < .001$), and motivation ($r = .17$, $p < .01$). Conscientiousness was significantly related to neuroticism ($r = -.10$, $p < .05$), openness ($r = .26$, $p < .001$), and motivation ($r = .32$, $p < .01$). Openness was significantly related to motivation ($r = .12$, $p < .05$).

Table 2: Coefficient table of Regression of Personality dimensions, motivation and gender on corruption engagement

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Age	.170*	.215	.206	.102
Marital Status	.127*	.152	.150	.039
Religion	-.096	-.106	-.096	-.091
Edu Level	.307***	.296	.315	.126
Ethnic Group	.157**	.131	.127	.173
How long	-.253**	-.282	-.283	-.087
Extraversion		-.109	-.117	-.043
Agreeableness		-.091	-.098	-.152
Conscientiousness		.004	-.030	-.053
Neuroticism		.151**	.141	.084
Openness		.084	.088	.059
Motivation			.115*	.15
Gender				-.67***
R	.36***	.43**	.44*	.77.***
R ²	.13***	.18**	.19*	.59****
R ² change	.13***	.05**	.01*	.40 ***
F value	F(3, 264)=6.71	F(1,259)=3.06	F(1, 258)=3.59	F(1, 257)=246.81

Note: **= $p < .01$, ***= $p < .001$ (significant). Gender = 1-male, 2-female

Regression result above indicated that the control variables age ($\beta = .17$, $p < .05$), marital status ($\beta = .13$, $p < .05$), educational level ($\beta = .31$, $p < .001$), ethnic group ($\beta = .16$, $p < .01$), and how long on the job ($\beta = .25$, $p < .01$) significantly predicted corruption engagement. The control variables accounted for 36% significant variance in predicting corruption engagement ($R^2\Delta = .36$, $p < .001$). Among the dimensions of personality, only neuroticism ($\beta = .15$, $p < .01$) significantly predicted corruption engagement. The dimensions accounted for 1% significant variance in predicting corruption engagement ($R^2\Delta = .05$, $p < .01$). Thus, the more neurotic an individual the more the individual engage in corruption. Motivation was a significant predictor of corruption engagement ($\beta = .12$, $p < .05$). Thus increase in motivation tends to increase corruption engagement. Gender ($\beta = -.67$, $p < .05$) also significantly predicted corruption engagement.

Discussion

Corruption is a general enigma, and it has assumed a dangerous and comical dimension across the globe (Ogunfunmilakin & Ifedayo, 2015). It is indeed a social problem that has ravaged the entire system in all facet of human endeavor. Similarly, it has been noted that societies ridden with

corruption will not survive or developed in an orderly fashion (Aluko, 2002; Obasanjo, 2015). This present study examined personality type, motivation and gender as determinants of corruption engagement. The first hypothesis tested is that personality type dimensions will significantly predict corruption engagements. This study confirmed the first hypothesis as personality type “neuroticism” was a significant positive predictor of corruption engagement. This implies that people with lower level of neuroticism are less likely to engage in corruption. This finding is consistent with the previous empirical researches of Alalehto (2003), Burgess (1972); Eysenck (1970); Eysenck and Eysenck (1971); Little (1963); Price (1968); Feldman (1993); Furnham and Thompson (1991); Miller and Lynam (2001), which showed that criminals have higher overall scores on neuroticism scales than normal groups or non-convicted individuals.

Also in support of this finding is the Eysenck’s personality theory of crime that postulates that individuals inherit predispositions to behave in certain ways under specific environmental conditions. According to Eysenck, neuroticism refers to the stability of personality and a high neuroticism score would represent someone who is more reactive and volatile and perhaps more likely to engage in corruption. Eysenck presumed that neuroticism was related to autonomic nervous system functioning, involving primarily the hypothalamus and limbic system, and that high neuroticism individuals have heightened emotional drives. Throughout his career, he proposed that criminals have relatively high levels of neuroticism, signifying that they have central nervous systems that condition poorly and autonomic nervous systems that overreact and augment failures in refraining from corruption engagement (Eysenck, 1996a). He stated that the reason for neuroticism acting as a predictor is probably related to its drive properties, which multiply the action tendencies present,” (Eysenck, 1996a, pp. 149–150).

Again, Addad and Leslau (1989) conducted a research which aims to investigate the relationship between extraversion, neuroticism, immoral judgment and criminal behavior. The relationships are tested by retrospective measurements of personality traits and criminal behavior in three groups: delinquency, control and comparative. According to the results obtained, it showed that criminals are higher than control subjects in neuroticism and immoral judgment but not in extraversion. Similar relationships were found between criminals and the comparative group. These researchers therefore confirmed that neuroticism significantly predicts criminal behavior which is consistent with the findings of this present research.

The second finding shows that motivation was a significant positive predictor of corruption engagement. This finding confirmed the second hypothesis that motivation will significantly predict corruption engagement. The study result is consistent with prior empirical study of Pascual-Ezama, Prelec, and Dunfield (2013) who maintained that extrinsic and intrinsic motivations are

significant predictors of cheating on work-related tasks. Pascual-Ezama, Prelec, and Dunfield (2013) examined the effect of social (social prestige) and economic incentives (monetary reward) on cheating and dishonesty in laboratory task. The authors found that “incentives influenced participants to cheat, declaring work finished when it was in fact not”. The authors also suggested that the relationship between social incentives and dishonesty could be explained by the motivation to win the incentives attached to the tasks. The authors also found that intrinsic motivation was a significant predictor of cheating. Participants who expressed likeness for the task finished more tasks and persisted on the task in order to finish it. Importantly, they were less likely to cheat (e.g., declare unfinished work finished). Intrinsic motivation also interacted with supervision in the direction that intrinsic motivation led to less cheating in the absence of supervision. Constructs that tap similar concepts with extrinsic motivation appear to be positively associated with criminal behaviors, while variables associated intrinsic motivations negatively relate to criminal behaviors. For instance, uncertainty avoidance is negatively and positively associated with intrinsic and extrinsic motivations, respectively. People high on uncertainty avoidance tend to avoid complexities and ambiguities. They rather take an easy task or easy route than a complex task or difficult route. Interestingly, studies show that uncertainty avoidance is positively related to corruption (Connelly & Ones, 2008; Davis & Ruhe, 2003; Seleim & Bontis, 2009).

Two major theories in support of this finding are drive reduction theory and the self determination theory. These theories suggested significant relationship between motivational preferences and crime/corruption. According to drive reduction theory (Clark, 1943; & Cherry, 2017), corrupt behavior emanates from the inability of people to obtain the primary human goods in socially acceptable ways. In this theory Clark proposed that a person’s behavior is an external display of his desire to satisfy his physical deficiencies. The self determination theory, posits that humans by nature possess the inner desire to perform for competence, relatedness, and autonomy. These three needs are basic and facilitate optimal functioning of the natural propensity for growth and integration, as well as for constructive social development and personal well-being” (Ryan & Deci, 2000b, p. 68). Self-determination theory argues that not only is intrinsic motivation better than extrinsic motivation, but that the presence of extrinsic motivation undermines intrinsic motivation and associated benefits (Amabile, 1993; Cerasoli, Nicklin, & Ford, 2014). Since intrinsic motivation is associated with the desire for competence and autonomy, it follows that intrinsically motivated people are less likely to cut corners. On the other hand, as extrinsic motivation is associated with contingents separable from the task, and not a desire for competence, extrinsically motivated people are more likely to cut corners or take short routes in order to obtain the reward or the contingent.

Further, the third finding shows that gender was a significant positive predictor of corruption engagement. This finding confirmed the third hypothesis that gender will significantly predict corruption engagement. The effect of gender is consistent to findings across other related criminal behaviors. For instance, males are more likely than females to engage in WCC (Blickle et al., 2006), bribery payment (Ariyabuddhiphongs & Hongladarom, 2014), counterproductive work behavior (Bowling, Burns, Stewart, & Gruys, 2011). Swamy, Anand, Stephen, Lee, and Azfar (2001), explored levels that corruption might be impacted by gender, they find that higher numbers of women in parliament are linked to lower levels of corruption. Similarly, Dollar, David, Raymond and Gattia (2000) hypothesized that women are more likely to sacrifice personal gains for the common good and are therefore less prone to be involved in corrupt behavior.

Also in support of this finding is the sex-role theory of crime which that Postulates that the norms and values associated with femininity are not conducive for corruption engagement, while the norms and values associated with masculinity are more likely to lead to corruption. Parsons (1937) argued that because females carry out the expressive role in the family which involved them caring for their children and looking after the emotional needs of their husbands, that girls grew up to internalize such values as caring and empathy, both of which reduce the likelihood of someone committing crime simply because a caring and empathetic attitude towards others means you are less likely to harm others.

Implications of the Study

Findings from this study have numerous implications; first it shows that neurotic personality, motivation and gender are linked with corruption engagement. Over the years, the federal government of Nigeria and other Anti-Corruption agencies globally conducted lot of researches in an attempt to find ways to tackle corruption. The result of this research can be employed by these agencies charged with the design of anti-corruption programmers' to help fight corruption by identifying those individuals higher in neuroticism as a means of corruption detection and prevention.

Also, findings of this study have important implications in work settings. Organizations often administer personality tests to predict factors such as an employee's job performance (Barrick& Mount, 1991). Use of personality test data could therefore be extended to better understand their employees' corruption tendencies. Within an organization many job functions benefit from a segregation of duties. Another practical implication of the findings is that presence of neurotic personality characteristics in people such as anxiety, worry, frustration, envy, jealousy, guilt, depressed mood and loneliness encourage corruption.

When individuals perceive corruption as a motivator, they are more likely to engage in it; and see it as strength to keep doing their work. Increase in corrupt practices replaces other motivators that would have kept workers going and doing their job, especially in our society where work motivation is totally lacking. This implies that enhancing or presence of all the needed work motivation that keeps workers happy in their job will help reduce corruption engagement.

The presented study like other studies has limitations. First, the population of the study was workers, hence limiting the generalizability of the present finding to other population groups. The present study only found that neurotic personality predicts corruption engagement amongst other dimensions, and this is in contrast to some previous that indicates relationship between other dimensions and corruption engagement. Similarly, the present study tested motivation as a construct without looking at the dimensions. Further studies however, might consider involving other population, and as well test the dimensions of motivation as their impact might be contributing a lot to knowledge.

Conclusion

Corruption has affected the psychological wellbeing of Nigerians, it has eaten deep into the fabrics of our nascent democracy to the extent that it has started to affect the economic, social and political climate of our dear nation. This study critically notes that neurotic personality, motivation and gender are significant predictors of corruption engagement. In view of the findings here that neurotic personality, motivation and gender are significantly associated with corruption is a germane reason to begin deeper investigations concerning the possible role of self-determination theory in the occurrence and management of corruption.

REFERENCES

- Agbo, A. A., & Iwundu, E. I. (2015). Corruption as a propensity: Personality and motivational determinants among Nigerians. *The Journal of Psychology*, 1-25 DOI: 10.1080/00223980.2015.1107523.
- Aguilera, R. V., & Vadera, A. K. (2008). The dark side of authority: Antecedents, mechanisms, and outcomes of organizational corruption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77(4), 431–449.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
- Alatas, V., Cameron, L., Chaudhuri, A., Erkal, N., & Gangadharan, L. (2009). Gender, culture, and corruption: Insights from an experimental analysis. *Southern Economic Journal* 75 (3), 663–680.
- Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational synergy: Toward new conceptualizations of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, 3, 185–201. doi:10.1016/1053-4822(93)90012-S.
- Anand, V., Ashforth, B. E., & Joshi, M. (2004). Business as usual: The acceptance and perpetuation of corruption in organizations. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 18 (2), 39–53.
- Anderman, E. M., Griesinger, T., & Westerfield, G. (1998). Motivation and cheating during early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 84–93. doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.90.1.84.
- Ariyabuddhiphongs, V., & Hongladarom, C. (2014). Bribe taking acceptability and bribe payment among Thai organizational employees: The mediating effect of reciprocity obligation. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation*, 3, 184. doi.org/10.1037/ipp0000018.
- Arrigo, B. A., & Claussen, N. (2003). Police corruption and psychological testing: A strategy for pre-employment screening. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 47, 272–290. doi:10.1177/0306624X03047003003.
- Bauhr, M., Charron, N., & Wängnerud, L. (2019). Exclusion or interests? Why females in elected office reduce petty and grand corruption. *European Journal of Political Research* 58, 1043–1065, 2019 1043 doi: 10.1111/1475-6765.12300.
- Benabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2003). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 70, 489–520. doi:10.1111/1467-937X.00253.
- Benson, M. L., & Simpson, S. S. (2015). *Understanding white-collar crime: An opportunity perspective*. New York: Routledge.

- Bernstein, P., & Clarke-Stewart, R. (2008). *Psychology*, 8th edition. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 410–424. doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410
- Blickle, G., Schlegel, A., Fassbender, P., & Klein, U. (2006). Some personality correlates of business white-collar crime. *Applied Psychology*, *55*, 220–233. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2006.00226.x.
- Bowling, N. A., Burns, G. N., Stewart, S. M., & Gruys, M. L. (2011). Conscientiousness and agreeableness as moderators of the relationship between neuroticism and counterproductive work behaviors: A constructive replication. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *19*, 320330. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2011.00561.x
- Brown, A. J. (2006). What are we trying to measure? Reviewing the basics of corruption definition. In C. Sampford, A. Shacklock, C. Connors, & F. Galtung (Eds.), *Measuring corruption* (pp. 57–79). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic rewards jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *4*, 980–1008. doi.org/10.1037/a003566.
- Chaudhuri, A. 2012. “Gender and Corruption: A Survey of the Experimental Evidence” In *New Advances in Experimental Research on Corruption*, ed. by D. Serra and L. Wantchekon, 13–49. London: Emerald Books.
- Collins, J. D., Uhlenbruck, K., & Rodriguez, P. (2009). Why firms engage in corruption: A top management perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *87*(1), 89–108.
- Coursey, D. H., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). Public service motivation measurement testing an abridged version of Perry’s proposed scale. *Administration & Society*, *39*, 547–568. doi:10.1177/009539970730363.
- Cullen, M. J., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Personality and counter-productive behavior workplace behavior. In M. Barrick, & A. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Personality and work*. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass-Pfeiffer.
- Davis, J. H., & Ruhe, J. A. (2003). Perceptions of country corruption: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *43*, 275–288.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *41*, 417–440. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.41.020190.00222.

- Dollar, D., Fisman, R., & Gatti, R. (2001). Are women really the 'fairer' sex? Corruption and women in government. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 46(4), 423-429.
- Dreher, A., & Schneider, F. (2010). Corruption and the shadow economy: an empirical analysis. *Public Choice*, 144, 215–238. doi:10.1007/s11127-009-9513-0.
- Esarey, J., & Chirillo, G., (2013). Fairer sex or purity myth? Corruption, gender, and institutional context. *Politics & Gender* 9, 361-389.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1977). *Crime and personality* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Eysenck, S. (1997). Psychoticism as a dimension of personality. In H. Nyborg (Ed.), *The scientific study of human nature*. Tribute to Hans J. Eysenck at eighty (pp. 109–121). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.
- Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, V., Van denBroeck, A., Aspeli, V. K., Bellerose, J., Benabou, C., Chemolli, E., Güntert, V. T., Halvari, H., Indiyastuti, D. L., Johnson, P. A., Molstad, M. H., Naudin, M., Ndao, A., Olafsen, A. H., Roussel, P., Wang, Z., & Westbye, C. (2014). The multidimensional work motivation scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(2), 178-196. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2013.877892>
- Gagne, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331–362. doi:10.1002/job.322.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative description of personality: The big-five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6), 1216-1229. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216.
- Hayes, A. F., & Matthes, J. (2009). Computational procedures for probing interactions in OLS and logistic regression: SPSS and SAS implementations. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41, 924–936. doi:10.3758/BRM.41.3.924.
- Hossain, N., Musembi, C. N., & Hughes, J. (2010). *Corruption, accountability and gender: Understanding the connections*. Primers in Gender and Democratic Governance
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The big five inventory - versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- Jones, S. (2008). Partners in crime: A study of the relationship between female offenders and their codefendants. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 8, 147–164. doi:10.1177/1748895808088992.
- Krueger, R. F., Schmutte, P. S., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Campbell, K., & Silva, P. A. (1994). Personality traits are linked to crime among men and women: evidence from a birth cohort. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103, 328.

- Kruh, I. P., Frick, P. J., & Clements, C. B. (2005). Historical and personality correlates to the violence patterns of juveniles tried as adults. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *32*, 69–96. doi:10.1177/0093854804270629.
- Meon, P. G., & Sekkat, K. (2005). Does corruption grease or sand the wheels of growth? *Public Choice*, *122*, 69–97. doi:10.1007/s11127-005-3988-0.
- Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2001). Structural models of personality and their relation to antisocial behavior: A meta analytic review. *Criminology*, *39*, 765–792.
- Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2003). Psychopathy and the five-factor model of personality: A replication and extension. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *81*, 168–178. doi:10.1207/S15327752JPA8102_08.
- Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counter-productive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, *59*, 591–622. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00048.x
- O'Connor, S., & Fischer, R. (2012). Predicting societal corruption across time: Values, wealth, or institutions? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *43*, 644–659.
- Perri, F. S. (2011). White-collar criminals: The kinder, gentler offender? *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, *8*, 217–241. doi:10.1002/jip.140.
- Rivas, M. F. (2013). An experiment on corruption and gender. *Bulletin of Economic Research* *65*, (1), 10-42.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 555–572. doi:10.2307/256693.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 68. doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68.
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D. Ones, H. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 145–164). London, UK: Sage.
- Salgado, J. F. (2002). The big five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *10*, 117–125. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00198.
- Shacklock, A., Sampford, C., & Connors, C. (eds.) (2006). *Introduction*. In *Measuring corruption*. London, UK: Ashgate.
- Sung, H. E. (2003). *Fairer sex or fairer system?* Gender and Corruption Revisited. *Social Forces*.

- Sung, H. E. (2012). Women in government, public corruption, and liberal democracy: A panel analysis. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 58(3), 195-219.
- Swamy, A., S., Knack, Lee, Y., & Azfar, O. (2001). Gender and corruption. *Journal of Development Economics*, 64(1), 25–55.
- Tittle, C. R., Ward, D. A., & Grasmick, H. G. (2003). Self-control and crime/deviance: Cognitive vs. behavioral measures. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19, 333–365. doi:10.1023/B:JOQC.0000005439.45614.24.
- Tremblay, M. A., Blanchard, C. M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L. G., & Villeneuve, M. (2009). Work extrinsic and intrinsic motivation scale: Its value for organizational psychology research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 41, 213–226. doi.org/10.1037/a0015167.
- Turner M. J. (2014). An investigation of big five personality and propensity to commit white-collar crime. In B. S. Donna (ed.), *Advances in accounting behavioral research* (Vol 17, pp. 57–94). United Kingdom: Emerald Group.
- Uzochukwu, M. O. (2013). *Challenges in Nigeria and solutions on how to resolve them*. Published by Hubpages Inc., California, United States
- Van Gelder, J. L., & De Vries, R. E. (2012). Traits and states: Integrating personality and affect into a model of criminal decision making. *Criminology*, 50, 637–671. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00276.x
- Vian, T., Brinkerhoff, D. W., Feeley, F. G., Salomon, M., & Vien, N. T. K. (2012). Confronting corruption in the health sector in Vietnam: Patterns and prospects. *Public Administration and Development*, 32, 49–63. doi:10.1002/pad.1607.
- Ward, T., & Brown, M. (2004). The good lives model and conceptual issues in offender rehabilitation. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 10, 243–257. doi:10.1080/10683160410001662744.
- Wiebe, R. P. (2004). Delinquent behavior and the five-factor model: Hiding in the adaptive landscape. *Individual Differences Research*, 2, 38–62.
- World Bank. (2001). *Engendering development through gender equality in rights, resources, and voice*. New York: World Bank-Oxford University Press.