

UDK: 159.923 : 172.12	Godišnjak za psihologiju, vol 4, No 4-5., 2006, pp. 53-70	ISSN 1451-5407
-----------------------	--	----------------

Vladimir Hedrih⁴

Filozofski fakultet,

Niš

Jelena Želeskov-Đorić

Istraživač-stipendista Ministarstva nauke i zaštite životne sredine republike Srbije

PSYCHOLOGICAL CORRELATES OF RESILIENCE TO PRESSURE OF AUTHORITY FOR UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR⁵

Abstract

The goal of the study was to explore psychological personality correlates of resilience to pressure of authority for unethical behavior. As pressure of authority is one of important inductors of corrupt behavior and having in mind the well-known fact that not all people react in the same way to such pressure, we tried to determine personality differences between those who yield to such pressures and those who resisted. We used an experimental situation in which subjects were pressurized by an authority to make unethical judgment. The results showed that those who yielded without question and those who resisted differ on a number of personality traits (measured by NEO-PR personality inventory), as well as on certain measures of dominant conflict zones and aspects of socio-economic status. The results also show that group leaders (sociometric stars in our case) have great significance for determining the way group will react to unethical requests.

Keywords: *corruption, pressure of authority, abuse of power, personality, dominant conflict zones.*

⁴ vhedrih@hm.co.yu; vhedrih@bankerinter.net

⁵ The creation of this paper and the research involved were supported by the Ministry of Science and Environment Protection of the republic of Serbia, through the research project 149062D, carried out at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Nis.

Introduction

Corruption, a social phenomenon that is much easier to recognize than to define, has existed probably since the dawn of political systems. Throughout history, periods of downfall of different world states have been linked with high levels of corruption, and corruption itself has often been listed as one of the main factors in causing such collapses, inspiring independence movements (American rebellion against British rule, Serbian and other Balkan people's rebellions against the Ottoman Empire, the fall of the Roman Empire - all happened during periods of blooming corruption) but one also able to spur political activity of enraged citizens (manifested by "Angry voting", social movements etc.) (Mc Cann et al., 1999). Currently corruption is a transnational problem affecting many countries in a large degree, and considered to be one of the main, if not the single most important factor in hindering development of a large number of world countries (Carasciuc, 2003).

But to be able to talk about corruption we must make some notion about what corruption is. Although one all-encompassing definition is hard to give, one rather convenient and widespread definition of corruption says that corruption is "abuse of power for private gain by the state employees" (Carasciuc, 2003). Corruption usually includes breaking the law, but not necessarily – there are acts that are considered to be corrupt which are technically legal. Furthermore private gains can be of very different nature – from financial (taking bribes for example) to psychological (like discriminating the disliked parties), meaning that motives behind corrupt behavior can be very different. Such different motives can also lead to different types of activities, which are considered to be corrupt. One common feature of all such activities is that they include some form of abuse of power, but the matter is further complicated by the fact that people from different countries at least partly differ in what they consider abuse, and therefore in what they consider corruption, and the same is the case when different people from one country are concerned (Redlawsk & McCann, 2002). But of course, a large proportion of manifestations of corruption are such, that most people from most countries would agree present corruption.

Having all these things in mind we tried to further elaborate the phenomenon of corruption in a systematic way that would allow an operationalisation for the purposes of our research to be made. We will describe manifestations of corruption on two dimensions – one describing

motivation sources and the other describing the type of action. Without aiming to consider it a complete list of corruption behaviors or of corruption motives we constructed the following matrix:

Table 1. Corruption behaviors and motivational sources for corruption (the combination this study deals with is marked by an X – Unfair judgment caused by pressure of authority)

	Motivation sources ▶	Financial incentives (bribes)	Pressure of authority	Private connections (requests of friends, relatives etc.)	Personal attitudes/beliefs
Unfair Judgement			X		
Obstruction					
Diskrimination					

After introducing the discrimination of corruption behaviors based on motivation sources we find it necessary to distinguish corruption from two things that may produce similar or identical behavior but cannot be considered corruption: a) First of those things is what is commonly known as laziness, sloth and inefficiency – unlike corruption behaviors which are powered by positive motivation (motivation to do something), these behaviors are a product of a lack of motives. The behavioral difference might often not be very visible, but we believe the psychological is quite significant. b) The second thing is resistance to system – if public employees do not accept the system for some reason they can produce behaviors similar to corruption but again psychologically quite different. Corrupt people usually accept the system (even feel loyal to it) and look forward to its continued existence. They are often quite ready to defend the undisturbed continuation of existence of the system in its present form, especially if corruption behaviors that work in such system allow them significant personal gain. People who resist the system and who can often be members or sympathizers of resistance movements feel disloyalty towards the system, consider their behavior an effort in weakening it and look forward to its toppling and the establishment of a new system, which they would accept and where they would not behave in such a manner.

These people's actions are deliberate efforts to "hurt" the system, which is not the case with corrupt people.

What causes corrupt behavior? We see corruption behavior as the results of interplay between the environment (corruption behavior stimuli, dangers of behaving in a corrupt way) and personality. If corruption behavior stimuli are intense (high bribe offer for instance), dangers of behaving in a corrupt way low (nonexistent or inefficient anticorruption laws, inefficient legal system) and personality traits such to make the person prone to corruption the occurrence of corrupt behavior is very probable. In the opposite case (low bribe, efficient system, resilient personality) corruption behavior will most probably not occur.

We devised the term corruption resilience to describe the fact that different levels of environmental pressures are needed to cause different persons to behave in a corrupt way (that is to corrupt one person one needs a modest bribe, while, all other things being the same, another refuses to be corrupted even when offered a very large bribe).

Methodology

Aims and hypothesis

This study had two goals:

To examine the influence of authority requests for unethical behavior on subject's behavior in two situations: group and individual.

To establish if there are significant differences in the measured personality traits and other personal characteristics between subjects that accepted authority request without resistance and subjects that offered resistance (but still accepted).

Several hypotheses were formulated:

Influence of authority on subject's behavior in both situations will be manifested, but the groups in two situations will react differently.

Subjects that offered resistance but complied and subjects that complied without resistance differ significantly on at least some of the personality dimensions, in the configuration of their dominant conflict zones and at least on some of the socioeconomic status indicators.

Methods

Variables and Operationalization

In this experiment we used these variables:

Subjects reaction to authority request in the two situations- which is operationalized as:

- a. acceptance without resistance
- b. acceptance after a period of resistance and
- c. refusal to accept authority request.

Psychological characteristics:

- Dimensions of personality operationalized by NEO-PR personality inventory (Serbian army version, P. Kostić, 2002)
- Dominant conflict zones- operationalized by DOMKO (J. Todorović, N. Milićević, V.Hedrih, 2003)
- Socioeconomic status of subjects- operationalized by PRAS (V.Hedrih, 2003)
- Experimental situation- which is operationalized like:
 - a) group situation (all subjects were together in the classroom)
 - b) individual situation (subjects were subjected to experimental procedure one by one)

Procedure

Our sample consisted of first and second year students of psychology of University of Nis. The experimental situation was created during the course of their regular classes, without informing the subjects that an experiment is taking place (the goal was to make them believe that they are in a real life situation where an authority is exerting pressure on them to behave unethically). We had two situations- group and individual. In both situations one experimenter brought five drawings and said that she worked for a non-government organization that supported children creativity and that there was some competition for the best child drawing. The best drawing and its author would go to an International exhibition of children drawings in Spain. The students' task was to value drawings and to select one that he or she means is the best. Each of the students got five drawings and a form for evaluation, but on that paper was written that there are six drawings and a statement to be signed by the subject saying that he or she evaluated the drawings sincerely and honestly. Then the first experimenter said to students that they must vote for drawing number six, because that drawing is from a child of very important men who is also very

important to us, and that his child must go to Spain. We applied this procedure in the group situation where students were together in the classroom (one of experimenters was their teacher and the experiment took place during his class) and individually when each of the students came to experimenter's office alone (the teacher, whose class they attended, asked them to come to the office of one of the experimenters one by one). Due to the fast sample "contamination"⁶ only responses obtained before the sample was contaminated were analyzed that is all the responses obtained afterwards were excluded⁷. The individual situation took place immediately after the group situation and all the subjects who participated in the group situation were asked, after being debriefed, not to contact any of the subjects from the second group before the experiment is over.

Participants

Students of first and of second year of psychology – total number of subjects involved in the experiment N=160 (divided into two groups – one with 79 and the other containing 81 subjects).

Instruments

- Five children drawings
- Paper for voting. On this paper was written: "With full material and moral responsibility I declare that I studied carefully all six drawings and that drawing number_____ is the one I liked the most". All subjects were supposed to sign this paper.

⁶ We noticed that immediately after pressure is exerted subjects start communicating intensively among themselves and that after some time (length of the interval depends entirely on how much the setting allows them to communicate effectively) a group decision on how to act is made and after that all further responses are, without any double thoughts, given in accordance with that decision.

⁷We used as the marker that sample is contaminated the moment when we could observe that subjects are responding without any visible signs of intense emotional arousal, and in the individual situation with drastically shorter reaction times (some subjects in this situation even said that they already know what they will be asked to do, and one even came in asking "Where do I sign?").

- Dominant Conflict Zones Questionnaire (DOMKO) (J. Todorović, N. Milićević, V.Hedrih, 2003) - measures dominant conflict zones that subjects have with:

parents
coevals
partners
professors and teachers

- Just Payment and Socioeconomic Status (PRAS) (V.Hedrih, 2003)
- NEO PI-R (Serbian army version, P. Kostić, 2002)

Ethical and experimental control matters

The properties of the devised experimental procedure brought two matters into focus – the ethical matter, whether it is ethical to expose subjects to experimental situation without informing them that an experiment is taking place and the matter of experimental control – whether it is possible to prevent the contamination of the sample and therefore secure that each of the subjects makes his own decision to comply or not to comply.

As for the ethical matter we think it necessary to note that the participants were at an earlier date asked whether they would like to participate as subjects in an experiment which might be temporarily stressful, and where they would not be informed that they are participating in an experiment until the experiment was finished and most of the subject volunteered. Immediately after the experiment the subjects were debriefed and their reactions to the experiment were positive. They congratulated us on the well-devised experiment and expressed their wishes to participate in further experiments. A number of participants came immediately after the experiment to the office of one of the experimenters and asked for his help in realization of their own research ideas. We also consulted a few of our colleagues on the matter of ethicality of the procedure and they gave their consent to the experimental procedure.

As for the matter of experimental control (mainly for the matter of whether it was possible to use randomly created groups and whether it was possible to prevent contamination) we should state that the experimental procedure as it was, was a trade-off between the need for the setting to be

ecologically valid (that is, the need to secure that participants do not realize that an experiment is taking place) and to prevent contamination. We found no feasible way of creating random groups without making subjects suspect that it is for experimental purposes or without significant risks that the procedure used to create groups would affect their behavior in the experiment, but we may note that we determined that the two groups were equal in aspects of their gender structure and social and economic backgrounds.

In order to prevent contamination in the group setting we would have needed to prevent the subjects from communicating and we could think of no way to do that without subjects realizing that they are in an experiment. The option for preventing contamination in the individual setting would require us to prevent subjects from returning to class after responding (which would mean locking them up in a room till the end of the experiment) and would also require us to take any communication devices (primarily, cell phones) away from them. However, even if we could accomplish something like that there was no doubt that seeing that their peers are not returning and that they cannot be contacted would raise suspicions that an experiment is going on, and than the ecological validity of the setting would again be compromised. Apart from that, it was our opinion that locking students up, searching them and confiscating (although temporarily) their property would be too an adverse course of actions to be applied even if it could be done. Therefore we decided it would be best to relay on attempts to suppress communication with verbal instructions (in the group situation) and with taking the students off of class (individual situation) as sole means of preventing or slowing sample contamination.

Results

Experimental results

We obtained the following results:

In the group situation (where the pressure of authority was exerted during the course of the regular class) all but one of the subjects rejected the request and did not give their vote to the non-existent drawing number 6. 54 out of 81 possible responses were obtained before the sample was contaminated.

In the individual situation (where the pressure was exerted on subjects individually in the experimenters office), although 9 subjects offered a level of resistance to the request, all but one of the subjects complied (including 8 of those 9 who resisted). 20 out of 79 possible responses were obtained before the sample was contaminated.

Observing the experimental situation we noticed that, in the group situation, immediately after the pressure was exerted (that is instruction to vote for the non-existent drawing was given), intense communication between subjects started and did not stop until the group decision was reached (that is the sample was contaminated). The communication channels in the first phase followed the rule of proximity (subjects communicated to those close to them), but, very soon after, the (sociometric) stars of the group started rallying the subjects and requesting them loudly not to give in to the pressure and to resist. The sample was completely contaminated some 10 minutes after the instruction was given⁸. This sample was contaminated faster than the sample exposed to the other situation but due to the nature of the response procedure we were able to obtain a higher proportion of responses prior to contamination.

In the individual situation subjects who passed through the situation also intensively communicated with those who did not (both face-to-face and by using cell phones), although communication was made difficult by the fact that the subjects were sent to the experimenters office one by one from a class (which was ongoing). Some of the subjects returned to class after responding, but some did not. Contamination was again not noticeable before (sociometric) stars of the group gave their responses (compliance), and very soon after, the entire sample was contaminated. The only difference was that this time the group decision was to comply with the experimenter's request. Although all but one of the subjects from this group complied, a number of subjects offered resistance and additional pressure had to be applied (asking, persuading and threatening) to get them to comply. After the application of additional pressure only one of the subjects refused to comply⁹. The sample was contaminated some 40 minutes after

⁸ The experimenter, who tried to suppress communication, slowed the contamination and the subjects initially refrained from speaking loudly because everything was happening during a class.

⁹ It should be noted here that in the first situation additional pressure made no difference in the subjects' responses.

the start, but due to the nature of the procedure only 20 subjects responded during that time.

Differences between subjects who resisted the pressure and those who did not

After the experiment we wanted to determine whether there are differences in personality traits and other personal characteristics between subjects who offered resistance and those who complied without question. Since, in the group situation almost all of the subjects refused to comply, we restricted ourselves to examining the differences between subjects who participated in the individual situation phase of the experiment and gave their responses before contamination. For measuring the mentioned things we used NEO PI-R, DOMKO and PRAS questionnaires (which subjects answered to during the course of the previous semester that is a few months before the experiment) and obtained the following results.

On NEO PI-R measured traits the following differences were significant at the level 0.1¹⁰ or less:

Table 2. NEO PI-R dimensions on which statistically significant differences between subjects who offered resistance to pressure of authority¹¹ and those who did not were found. Mann-Whitney U test was used for testing the difference significances

Dimension	N4	N6	E1	E3	E4	O5	A4	E	O
Sig.	0.008	0.016	0.053	0.012	0.056	0.08	0.003	0.009	0.009
Effect Size*	0.599	0.546	0.461	0.562	0.48	0.411	0.633	0.534	0.691

* Point-biserial correlation between resistance-compliance without resistance and NEO PI-R dimensions were used as effect size measures

¹⁰ Due to the very small size of the analyzed sample we decided to take this significance level as the threshold. It should also be noted that for the same reasons the differences mentioned here are also quite large.

¹¹ The subject who refused to comply was also included in this group.

Tables 3 and 4. Means on dimensions mentioned in table 2.

Response		N4	N6	E1	E3	E4
Complied	Mean	0.405	0.139	-0.341	-0.571	-0.779
	SD	1.058	0.634	1.206	0.634	0.672
Offered resistance but complied	Mean	-0.694	-0.541	0.61	0.296	0.005
	SD	0.502	0.594	0.909	0.881	1.001
Refused to comply	Mean	-1.434	-1.456	1.595	1.475	1.868
	SD	-	-	-	-	-

Response		O5	A4	E	O
Complied	Mean	-0.866	0.859	-0.331	0.885
	SD	0.918	0.819	0.694	0.396
Offered resistance but complied	Mean	-0.276	-0.383	0.191	0.156
	SD	0.71	0.928	0.917	0.788
Refused to comply	Mean	1.214	-1.857	1.926	1.175
	SD	-	-	-	-

* Dimension values were computed as scores on the first principal component extracted from responses of the entire group of participants (both of those whose responses were analyzed and of those whose responses were not analyzed) computed by using Anderson-Rubin method for estimating factor score coefficients. The values represent deviations from the group mean expressed in standard deviation units (z-scores).

** Number of cases – Complied – 11, Offered resistance but complied – 8, Refused to comply – 1.

Comparing the answers of these groups on the PRAS questionnaire yielded the following results (Mantel-Haentzel Chi Square statistic was computed):

Subjects who offered resistance, more often than those who did not, possess a computer and have Internet access from their homes. In the first case the significance level was 0.043 and 0.081 in the second.

Subjects who offered resistance also more often come from families with unsettled debts for electricity - significance level – 0.008. In fact, none of the subjects who complied came from families with electricity debts and more than half of the subjects who resisted came from such families.

When we compare the answers of subjects on the DOMKO questionnaire we obtain the following results (Mann-Whitney U test):

Subjects who offered resistance named the difference of views as a subject of their conflict with their parents less often than did subjects who complied without question (sig. 0.001). They also claimed to be less bothered by such conflicts (sig. 0.073). The same topic was also claimed to be less important when conflicts with their peers are considered (0.02 for differences in attitudes and 0.073 for differences in views between them and their peers).

Results also showed that they (those who offered resistance) also claimed to less often conflict with their parents (sig. 0.072) and those they conflicts with peers and teachers bother them less (although they claim to conflict with them as often as those who complied without question) (sig. 0.051 for teachers and 0.022 for peers).

Discussion

Our first hypothesis that influence of authority on subjects behavior in both situations will be manifested, but the groups in two situations will react differently is confirmed. In the group situation all but one of the subjects rejected the request and did not give their vote to the non-existent drawing number 6, and in individual situation nine subjects offered a level of resistance to the request, all but one of the subjects complied (including eight of those nine who resisted) and 11 subjects gave their vote to the drawing number 6. Evidently, in the group situation we can see a collective decision to refuse authority request forming and subjects conforming to it. But, in individual situation where subject is alone, we can see obedience to authority request and in this situation we can look for differences between subjects on personality dimensions. Actually, that was our second hypothesis which is that way also confirmed. This hypothesis stated that subjects that offered resistance but complied and subjects that complied without resistance differ significantly on at least some of the personality dimensions, in the configuration of their dominant conflict zones and at

least on some of the socioeconomic status indicators. As we can see on the tables above, there are significant differences between subjects who offered resistance to pressure of authority and those who did not on the following subdimensions of personality measure by NEO PI-R : self-consciousness, vulnerability, warmth, assertiveness, activity, ideas, compliance and on general dimensions extraversion and openness.

Subjects that complied without resistance had positive result on self-consciousness subdimension, which means that they had discomfort in contact with others, they are anxious, with feeling of inferiority and sensibility for defamation. On the other hand, subjects that offered resistance (but at the end complied) had negative result on this dimension, which means that they aren't feeling inferior in contact with others. These two groups had different results - while subjects in the first group are on the positive side of this dimension, the subjects in the second group are on the negative side of this dimension. This difference can be explained - it is clear that subjects who complied without resistance do what authority want them because of the way they see themselves toward the others. They are sensitive to opinions of other people and have a negative picture of themselves (have feeling of inferiority) so they will do what others want them, especially when an authority is in question. When we look at results we can see that the subject who refused to comply had very high negative result on this subdimension (much higher then subjects which offered resistance but complied), which means that this person is not anxious, had positive self-concept without feeling of inferiority. All this can be connected with conformism (lets recall Ash's experiments) and fear of not being accepted in society.

Second dimension where we found differences is vulnerability. This dimension of personality is defined as sensibility to stress, with feeble ability for overcoming stress situation, dependence from other people. Subjects that complied to authority request without resistance had positive results on this dimension, which means that they had feeble ability for overcoming stress situation (and our experimental situation was definitely a stressful one) and that they are dependant of others. Subjects that offered resistance but complied had negative results on this dimension, so they had ability for overcoming stress situation, but less then the subject who refused to comply (as we can see results of this subject reveal high ability for overcoming stress and independence). Here we can conclude that independent persons with ability to overcome stress are more individual, nonconformistic and resistant to authorial pressures. These two

subdimensions of personality belong to general dimension of neuroticism. Our conclusion is that subjects who had high results on neuroticism are more sensitive to influence of authority.

Third dimension is warmth which is defined as the ability to contact with the other people, emotionality and reverence for others. Subjects that complied to authority request without resistance had negative results on this dimension, instead subjects that offered resistance which had emotionality in first group (subjects that complied without resistance) can be connecting with positive results on this dimension. This means that their ability for contact with other is reduced and also reduce emotionality that is connected to their neuroticism and conflicts they have. On the other hand subjects that offered resistance had better ability for contact with others and they are more emotional which can be connected to low results on dimension of neuroticism. This does not mean that people who are neurotic are not emotional, instead, they are very emotional but not in a normal way (this emotionality is neurotical) so they had more problems to restore normal communication with others.

Fourth subdimension with differences is assertiveness that is defined as domination, strength, social ramping. Subjects from the first group had negative result on this dimension, instead subjects from the second group are positive on this dimension (and subject that refused to do what authority wanted her had much more positive result then subjects from second group on this dimension). This difference can be explained when we look at results of this two groups on dimension of self-consciousness. It is clear that subjects who had feeling of inferiority cannot be assertive. These dimensions are in opposition.

Fifth subdimension is activity defined as endeavor to do something continually, where subjects that complied without resistance had negative results and the other group of subjects had positive results (again subject that refused to comply had the most positive result on this dimension of personality). This dimension is connected with assertiveness, because people who are dominant and have strength usually have tendency to work continually and have fast pace of life (which can be connecting with A type of people in psychosomatic classification), unlike the other group of people that had slow pace of life. The conclusion is that subjects that complied without resistance are more introverted and that subjects who offered resistance are more extraverted. Here we see that dimension of extraversion is connected with resistance to authority pressure.

Sixth dimension where we find difference is ideas defined as intellectual curiosity, openness of mind, wish to consider new, informal ideas. It is evident that negative side of this dimension in first group and negative side of this dimension in second group is something that can be explained with knowledge that both of groups at the end complied with the authority request, unlike the person that refused to do what authority requested and who had a positive result on this dimension. Openness is evidently connected with extraversion and neuroticism, so we can conclude that people who are more open minded will tend to be less susceptible to authority pressure than people who are less open minded.

At the end seventh dimension on which these two groups are different is compliance defined as inhibition of aggression, tendency to forget and to forgive, clemency. Subjects that complied to authority request without resistance held the positive side of this dimension, what we expected. On the other hand subjects that offered resistance had negative side of this dimension which means that they don't have inhibition of aggression and that they will fight for their opinion and be less liable to authority request. As we see the most positive result on this dimension had person that refused to comply with authority request.

General conclusion is that subjects who complied without resistance to what authority demanded are more neurotic, more introverted, less open and more agreeable, and those who offered resistance to authority request are less neurotic, more extraverted, more open and less agreeable. The most important thing, which should not be forgotten is that authority, in this experiment, requested subjects to do something unethical and that all of these findings refer to resistance to authority pressures for unethical behavior (that is the ability to resist to an authority that pressurizes the person to do something unethical).

The part of the second hypothesis was that subjects that offered resistance but complied and subjects that complied without resistance differ significantly in the configuration of their dominant conflict zones. This hypothesis is also confirmed. Results show that subjects who offered resistance named the difference of views as a topic of their conflicts with their parents much less often than did subjects who complied without question. They also claimed to be much less bothered by such conflicts. This result concurs with our finding obtained in the case study (the subject who complied when all others refused had much worse family relations than did the subject who refused when everyone else complied) and we

believe should be taken as a manifestation of the worse quality of family relations of the group who complied without resistance.

On PRAS results show that subjects who offered resistance, more often than those who did not, possess a computer and have Internet access from their homes. People who have a computer and Internet, because of the quantity of information with which they have contact, have opportunity to obtain different picture of reality, new ideas of life and science etc. When we are acquainted with these things we can be more open and much often be prepared to accept new ideas and manifest our intellectual curiosity. On the other hand cognition that subjects who offered resistance also more often come from families with unsettled debts for electricity is something that can be explained very logically. Because of unsettled debts for electricity and all consequences of it, like suing the electricity company, people acquire some kind of resistance towards unethical things (and also a habit of openly confronting authorities). If that is the case than it is possible that the experience subjects had in our experiment will be of use to them when and if they ever need to fight for their legal rights. Interesting thing is that some of socioeconomic variables can be used to predict a persons resistance to authority.

Finally, we should notice that in the individual situation the group decision to comply with the experimenters request was made only after sociometric stars of the group complied. This points to the great significance group leaders have in determining group reactions to unethical requests, that is to proneness to corrupt behavior.

At the end we can conclude that we confirmed our hypothesis and that this result can be used very practically. The most important thing here is that authority request was something unethical, some kind of corruption and that subjects that complied to that request are different in personality traits, dominant conflicts zones and socioeconomic status. Because of these results, we believe our experiment can be a base for further research efforts that can help produce psychological instruments and developing methods for fighting corruption.

References

Blass,T(2000). *Obedience to Authority - Current Perspectives on the Milgram Paradigm*. Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc, Manwah, NJ.

Carasciuc, L. (2002). *Fighting Corruption to Improve Governance: Case of Moldova*,. Working Papers. Transparency International.

Knežević, G., Radović, B., Opačić, G.(1997). Evaluacija "Big Five" modela ličnosti kroz analizu inventara ličnosti NEO PI-R. *Psihologija*. DPS. Belgrade. pp. 7-40.

Kroll, M.A. et al.(1970). *Carrer Development: Growth and Crisis*. John Wiley & Sons inc. New York.

McCann, J et al.(1999). Heeding the Call: An Assesment of Mobilization for H. Ross Perot's 1992 Presidential Campaign. *American Journal of Political Science*,43. pp. 1-28

Redlawsk, D.P., McCann, J.(2002). How Voters See Political Corruption: Definitions and Beliefs, Causes and Consequences. *Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Organization*. New Orleans. LA.

Sharf, R.S.(1997). *Applying Carrer Development Theory to Counseling*, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company. An International Thompson Publishing Company

Weisburd, D., Greenspan, R.(2000). *Police Attitudes Toward Abuse of Authority: Findings from a National Study*. US National Institute of Justice. US Department of Justice.

**Vladimir Hedrih
Jelena Želeskov-Đorić**

PSIHOLOŠKI KORELATI OTPORNOSTI NA PRITISAK AUTORITETA ZA NEETIČKO PONAŠANJE

Apstrakt

Cilj ovog istraživanja bio je ispitivanje psiholoških ličnosnih korelata otpornosti na pritisak autoriteta za neetičko ponašanje. Kako je pritisak autoriteta jedan od važnih podstrekača ponašanja koje nazivamo koruptivnim i imajući u vidu dobro poznatu činjenicu da ne reaguju svi ljudi na isti način na takve pritiske, pokušali smo da ustanovimo razlike u osobinama ličnosti između onih koji popuštaju pod takvim pritiscima i onih koji se opiru. Koristili smo eksperimentalnu situaciju u kojoj su ispitanici podvrgavani pritisku autoriteta sa ciljem da ih se navede da donesu sud koji je očigledno neetički. Rezultati su pokazali da se oni koji su popustili bez otpora i oni koji su otpor pružali razlikuju po nizu crta ličnosti (merenih NEO-PR inventarom ličnosti), kao i na određenim merama dominantnih konfliktnih zona, te po različitim aspektima socioekonomskog statusa.

PSIHOLOŠKI KORELATI OTPORNOSTI NA PRITISAK AUTORITETA ZA...

Rezultati takođe ukazuju da vođe grupe (tj. Sociometrijske zvezde u našem slučaju) imaju veoma značajan uticaj na određivanje načina na koji će grupa reagovati na neetičke zahteve.

Ključne reči: *korupcija, pritisak autoriteta, zloupotreba moći, ličnost, dominantne konfliktne zone.*