



CSPP

WZB

Berlin Social Science Center

CORRUPT BEHAVIOUR, POLITICAL VALUES & TRUST

Richard Rose & Bernhard Weßels

CSPP, U. of Strathclyde Glasgow & WZB Berlin Social Science Center

ECPR General Conference

Prague Saturday 10 September 2016, 11am

Further information: richard.rose@strath.ac.uk

CORRUPT BEHAVIOUR DEFINED

Corrupt behaviour: Individuals violate formal or informal standards

Standards take many forms

- Laws against bribery (Transparency International)
- Keep to election mandate (Miller & Stokes)
- Avoid public exposure of shameful behaviour (Jacquet)

INSTITUTIONS HOLDING POLITICIANS TO ACCOUNT

Bribery: Prosecution through the courts

Misleading voters: Elections

Shameful behaviour: Media, polls, court of public opinion

Elections not the only institution enforcing political accountability

SURVEY DATA

Three countries , Corruption Perception Index (TI)

Britain	8.1
France	7.0
Spain	5.8

Telephone interviews by Efficiencie3, Reims

Britain	1,004	4-22	January 2016
France	1,003	11-29	December 2015
Spain	1,000	11-22	December 2015

Funding: British ESRC grant The Global Experience of Corruption (ES/13482X/1) & WZB Berlin Social Science Center, “Democracy & Democratization”



Bigger difference between standards than between countries

How many politicians ...	Britain %	France %	Spain %
MISLEAD VOTERS: Promise to do one thing if elected and then do the opposite after being elected?			
All of them	35	44	40
Most of them	39	40	47
Sum	74	85	87
Some	23	12	13
Hardly any	3	4	1
BREAK LAW: Take money from people who want political favours?			
All of them	8	6	5
Most of them	24	29	32
Sum	32	35	38
Some	53	45	55
Hardly any	15	20	8
BEHAVE SHAMEFULLY: Politicians in their private behaviour over-indulge in drink, sex or drugs?			
All of them	9	7	3
Most of them	22	20	17
Sum	31	27	19
Some	55	49	67
Hardly any	15	25	14

HOLDING POLITICIANS TO ACCOUNT

What should be done to an official who does this?

Go to jail; lose office; lose votes; pay a fine; apologize; nothing.

	Britain	France	Spain
Endorsing either or both	%	%	%
BREAKS LAW: Go to jail; lose job	87	88	94
MISLEADS VOTERS: Lose votes	62	58	72
BEHAVES SHAMEFULLY: Go to jail; lose job	54	60	74

Citizens want standards enforced by tough punishment

COMPETING THEORIES OF THE EFFECT OF CORRUPTION ON LEGITIMATING ATTITUDES

TRUST: INSTRUMENTAL *ZWECKRATIONALITÄT* (Weber)

The more people think politicians break standards, the less they trust:

Representative institutions, parties
Authoritative institutions, government

DEMOCRACY: ABSOLUTE *WERTRATIONALITÄT*

If people are committed to democracy as an absolute value, the less
the effect of broken standards



Democracy is preferable to any other form of government OR
Or sometimes authoritarian gov't preferable; no difference, don't know

	Britain	France	Spain
	%	%	%
Democracy always best	58	67	88

	Logistic regression coefficient		
	Britain	France	Spain
Democracy always best			
Mislead voters	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Take bribe	0,35	0,27	n.s.
Behave shamefully	n.s.	0,27	n.s.

Strict punishment	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Corruption important problem	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Support governing party	0,95	0,80	n.s.
Support opposition party	0,67	n.s.	n.s.
Participate anti-corruption protest	0,48	0,37	0,97
High social class	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Low social class	n.s.	n.s.	-0,84
Age	0,01	n.s.	0,03
Female	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Constant	-2,50	-0,96	n.s.



Trust in Parties; Central Government. Scale 0 to 10; 0: no trust; 10: full trust

Mean	Britain	France	Spain
Parties	4,16	3,72	3,03
Government	4,32	4,00	2,79

	TRUST IN: POLITICAL PARTIES			CENTRAL GOVERNMENT		
	Regression coefficient			Regression coefficient		
	Britain	France	Spain	Britain	France	Spain
Mislead voters	0,71	0,74	1,19	0,61	0,64	0,73
Take bribe	0,70	0,35	0,51	0,84	0,52	0,80
Behave shamefully	0,23	0,26	0,30	0,34	0,32	0,45
Strict punishment	-0,24	n.s.	n.s.	-0,24	-0,31	n.s.
Corruption important problem	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-0,64	n.s.	n.s.
Support governing party	1,42	1,75	1,15	1,41	1,90	2,97
Support opposition party	0,49	0,82	0,51	n.s.	n.s.	-0,34
Participate anti-corrup. Protest	0,54	n.s.	n.s.	0,56	n.s.	n.s.
High social class	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Low social class	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Age	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Female	n.s.	0,44	n.s.	n.s.	0,33	n.s.
Constant	n.s.	-0,99	-1,50	n.s.	n.s.	-2,00

BREAKING STANDARDS AFFECTS TRUST NOT DEMOCRATIC VALUES

	Britain	France	Spain
	Explained variance (adj. / pseudo R-squared)		
	%	%	%
Trust in political parties	28,6	25,3	25,2
Trust in central government	34,3	26,9	35,3
Support for democratic values	8,6	5,4	11,0

Robust findings:

- All three kinds of bad behaviour of politicians affect political trust, a performance characteristic of political systems
- Bad behaviour does not systematically affect democratic commitment, an absolute value
- When theorizing about the influence of corruption on mass attitudes, need to specify what specifically is effected and why.

LIST OF VARIABLES	Codes	Mean	Std. Dev.
Mislead voters	1 All politicians to 4 Hardly any	1,81	0,78
Take bribe	1 All to 4 Hardly any	2,73	0,78
Behave shamefully	1 All to 4 Hardly any	2,86	0,77
Strict punishment	1 Jail, lose job and/or votes	2,17	0,78
Corruption important problem	1 If corruption one of 3 most important problems	0,35	0,48
Support governing party	1 Yes; all others = 0	0,17	0,38
Support opposition party	1 Yes; all others = 0	0,46	0,50
Participate corruption protest	1 Yes; all others = 0	0,65	0,48
High social class	1 High; others = 0	0,21	0,41
Low social class	1 Low; others = 0	0,33	0,47
Age	In years	47,36	16,74
Female	1 - Female, others = 0	0,51	0,50