



GÖTEBORGS
UNIVERSITET

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

“IT’S NOT LIKE THIS IS A CORRUPTION SCANDAL...”

A qualitative content analysis of the link between
gender and corruption and the mechanisms at play

Hanna Jageklint

Master’s Thesis:	30 credits
Programme:	Master’s Programme in International Administration and Global Governance
Date:	25 th May 2020
Supervisor:	Helena Stensöta
Words:	19 589

Abstract

The link between gender and corruption has been studied since the beginning of this century and a number of theories have been suggested about why women seem to be more averse towards corruption than men. However, most of the studies are large-N and only look at the relationship on an aggregated level. There is thus a need for a closer examination of the actual mechanisms that link gender with corruption in real cases, which is what this thesis aims to contribute with. Looking at investigation protocols and court rulings from corruption cases in Sweden committed by men and women in typical male- and female areas, this allows for an insight in the motivations and reasoning that's behind these actions and the mechanisms at play. Using a combination of a comparative case study and a qualitative content analysis, this thesis presents both some new mechanisms as well as it elaborates on how already known mechanisms play out in actual cases. The results show that men don't seem to care about laws to the same extent as women do, who care more about morals than men. These findings could fit in to some of the existing theories on gender and corruption, such as the distinction between need and greed driven corruption, which will be discussed. Further, as the cases take place in one of the most gender equal countries in the world, Sweden, findings about gender differences here could most likely also be found in other parts of the world.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Definitions	5
2.1 Defining corruption	5
2.2 Defining gender	5
3. Previous research.....	6
3.1 Corruption and gender.....	6
2.2 Corruption in Sweden – review of literature and reports	10
3. Research gap, aim of study and research questions.....	12
4. Method and Material	14
4.1 Method	14
4.1.1 Comparative case study.....	14
4.1.2 Qualitative Content Analysis.....	16
4.2 Material	17
4.2.1 Case selection	18
4.3 Limitations, validity and reliability	21
5. Analysis in Practice	22
6. Results and findings	26
6.1. Research Question 1 – How do men and women motivate and reason about their corrupt acts in corruption cases found in the construction- and care sector in Sweden in 2017-2019? What are the mechanisms that make the actor commit a corrupt action?.....	26
6.1.1. Men in the Construction sector.....	27
6.1.2. Women in the Care sector	35
6.1.3. Men in the Care sector.....	43
6.1.4 Summary of the findings divided into the mechanisms that make the actor commit a corrupt act	48
6.2 Research Question 2 - Is there a difference in how men and women motivate and reason about their actions?	50
6.3 Research Question 3 – Is there a difference in how men and women motivate and reason about their actions in typical male versus female working areas?	51
6.4 Research Question 4 – Do the mechanisms found contribute to existing theories on mechanisms or do they suggest any new evidence, and if so, how?.....	52
7. Discussion	54
References:	57
Appendix	62

1. Introduction

The absence of corruption is an essential part of a country's quality of government and good governance, as the state resources are not being diverted into some people's pockets, but rather used as intended by the government for the public. Previous research have shown the detrimental effects that corruption has, such as that it leads to stagnated economic growth, loss in citizen's trust in public institutions and the legitimacy of rule of law and general impediments to social-economic and democratic development (Holmberg and Rothstein, 2012, Treisman, 2007, Andersson et al., 2010). These are all reasons why it is important to study the roots as well as remedies of corruption.

At the same time, there is also a growing literature on the positive links between gender and quality of government, such as provision of public goods, intra- and interstate peace, economic development, economic growth, rule of law, and not least – low levels of corruption (Hudson et al., 2012, Blackden et al., 2007, Branisa et al, 2010, Alexander, 2018, etc.). According to a growing literature, the inclusion of women is thus one of the remedies to corruption and this issue thus merit further investigation.

However, the state of the art in the field of gender and corruption is far from settled. There are several theories on why the presence of women seem to be correlated with lower corruption. Are they simply the fairer sex? Do they have fewer opportunities to engage in corruption due to a discriminatory system? Is it possible that they don't want to destroy the system that seem to protect them? Or are they just harder scrutinized than men and can't afford to engage in a particularistic way? These are some of the current theories that attempts to explain the why there seem to be a gender difference when it comes to corruption.

Previous studies have primarily had a quantitative approach, which have established that there is in fact a link between women and less corruption. However, how this link plays out in real cases and what the mechanisms are that actually link gender and corruption are less known and still needs to be explored.

This thesis aims at contributing to the existing literature by looking at how men and women reason and motivate their corrupt actions in real corruption cases and thus exploring the mechanisms that link gender with corruption. This will be done by looking at real corruption cases in Sweden and by conceptualising about gender in two ways – gender as the sex of the

individual and gender found in traditional male and female sectors. The material that will be used are investigation protocols and court rulings from all corruption cases in the construction and care sector in Sweden between the years 2017-2019, which will be analysed using a qualitative content analysis. Focusing the analysis on cases in Sweden, one of the most gender egalitarian countries in the world, will increase generalisability of the results as gender difference found here would likely also be found (and probably be even stronger) elsewhere in the world.

2. Definitions

2.1 Defining corruption

The common definition of corruption in both research and policy is “*the abuse of entrusted power for private gain*” (Transparency International, 2020), and is the definition that will be used in this thesis. In addition to this, the Swedish laws on corruption will also play a big part in the definition of corruption that will be used here, as that is central in the material that is used. In the Swedish law, the term corruption is used as an umbrella for different kinds of corrupt actions, such as giving and taking bribes, breaches of trust (swe: *troslöshet mot huvudman*), and taking advantage of one’s position in order to gain unfair advantages in favour for oneself or others. Further, it suffices that a person intends to do something of the above, the act does not need to be fully accomplished in order for the person to be found guilty of corruption (Polisen, 2019).

2.2 Defining gender

Gender refers to the social identity that is prescribed to men and women (although not exclusively) and which includes for example roles, activities, attributes, personality, behavioural tendencies (e.g. feminine and masculine) of a person. Gender as a social identity is related to, although different from, the binary categories of biological sex (WHO, 2020, Chrisler and Lamer, 2016). As gender is a construct of a social context that offers different opportunities and constraints based on sex, gender can be found not only on a personal level as described above, but also on an aggregated level in other parts of society as well, such as in organisations and institutions (Risman, 2004). For example, a historical separation of men and women into different spheres can come to affect the spheres themselves as the persons come to transmit their subjective identities onto the activities they carry out in that sphere. Moreover, gendered

roles in society can also come to affect the interests than men and women are vested in when it comes to for example politics (see Hirdman, 1990, Wägnerud, 1998).

3. Previous research

3.1 Corruption and gender

Although scholars have been conducting research on corruption since decades, it wasn't until the beginning of this millennia that researches discovered a link between corruption and gender.

Mainly, there were two path-breaking pieces of research that established the field and that has been well-cited in the field ever since. The first one is by Dollar, Fisman and Gatti (2001), who was a part of the World Bank's Development Researching Group. They drew on previous behavioural studies that argued that women are more "trustworthy" and "public-spirited" than men and argued that this explains why countries with more women in power leads to a cleaner government and less corruption. By using a large cross-section of countries they found a strong and significant relationship between higher percentage of women in power and less corruption. The second iconic piece that established the field is written by Swamy, Knack, Lee and Azfar (2001), and basically argues the same thing – that women in power, because of socialization of gender roles, are less corrupt. The difference between the studies is that Swamy et al. (2001) provided a range of different evidence that all pointed to this relationship. By using micro-level data with hypothetical scenarios, cross country data (basically replicating what Dollar et al. had already done) and country examples from employees and companies in Georgia they found that women were less inclined to engage in corrupt activities. In light of this new discovery, both set of scholars suggested that countries need to consider increasing women's presence in power and politics in order to combat corruption.

After the two sets of researchers established the field, many other scholars have built on as well as critiqued the initial findings. Sung (2003), for example, argued that the relationship between women and corruption is spurious, and that it is rather a question of "the fairer system" than the "fairer sex" as he puts it. In this case, he argues that the fairer system is liberal democracy which produces both more gender egalitarian societies with more women in power positions and more government accountability (which leads to lower levels of corruption). Although the previous research said that they controlled for liberal democracy, Sung (2003) argued that they did not

use a thorough and precise enough measurement for liberal democracy, but included too many measurements which watered out the effect.

In similar vein, Esarey and Chirillo (2013) argued that the relationship between gender and corruption depend on institutional and cultural settings and especially on democratic institutions. They argued that where corruption is the norm (such as in autocracies) women are as corrupt as men, but where it is not the norm (such as in democracies) women adhere to the domestic norms because they are held to higher standards than men and are more vulnerable to punishment for not adhering to the rules and thus cannot afford not to engage in corruption. In their cross-country analysis, they find support for their theory and find that the relationship is either weaker or non-existent in autocracies, but present in democracies. In another article by Esarey and Schwindt-Bayer (2017) they also underline the conditionality of the relationship. But instead of saying that it depends on a country's level of democratization, they reason that that it hinges on the strength of a country's electoral accountability. They claim that because women are more risk averse than men and because they are usually held to higher standards, they cannot afford not to abide by the country's norms. This would mean that women abide by the county's norms particularly in contexts where the risk of being exposed is high – which will be the case in countries with high electoral accountability (such as countries where corruption is the exception, with presence of free press, in parliamentary and personalistic systems etc.). Their findings are consistent with this argument and shows that there is a more subtle relationship that is mediated through electoral accountability.

Another piece of research by Stensöta, Wängnerud and Agerberg (2015) showed that it is not about institutions in general, as Esarey and Chirillo (2013) or Sung (2003) argued, but that there are certain types of institutions that matter more than others. Much as the research presented above, Stensöta et al. (2015) also argued that the relationship between gender and corruption is conditional on contextual factors. However, they argue that what matters is the extent of a country's welfare state. They theorize about the fact that women have a special interest in the country's welfare state and its functioning, as they are dependent on an expansive welfare state to assert themselves both in the public and private through the welfare state's services such as for example child care and provision of jobs, etc. In their research, which focuses on European countries, they find that women are more likely to punish corrupt politicians in countries with

more expansive welfare states (because they are vested in the interest in its functioning), than in states with less spending on welfare. Alexander and Ravlik (2015) also suggest that there is a “women’s interest” mechanism at play, which is shown in the policies that women in power support. Women in elected offices are more supportive of health- and family policies, and in general policies that favour the public good (rather than private gains).

Much of the research have focused on political institutions as the contextual factors which affects or mediates the relationship between gender and corruption. However, Goetz (2007) found that other contextual factors could also matter in explaining why we see a relationship between women in power and less corruption. She argues that the access to public life and politics is gendered in its nature and that this shapes the different opportunities for women and men to engage in corruption. Currently, corruption functions mainly through old-men networks and other sorts or arenas that women do not have access to. This would explain why women don’t engage as much in corruption, because they don’t have the opportunities to engage in it. Goetz also reasons that it could also be that women have not yet learned the system or that they, because they have been excluded from politics for a very long time, have too much pride or need to prove themselves worthy of being a part of politics. The bottom-line of this argument is that as women get more and more power the relationship between gender and corruption can fade away in the future. In practice, this would also mean that quotas for women will not be a long-term remedy for corruption, as earlier scholars have argued for.

More recent research by Alexander (2018, forthcoming) have built on the notion of impartiality, which Rothstein and other scholars have deemed to be crucial for good governance (Rothenstein and Teorell, 2008). Much like Swamy et al. (2001) and Dollar et al. (2001) she assumes that there is a socialization process, but instead of gender roles she argues that there is a socialization of impartiality that flourish more in societies with higher gender equality which affects both men and women to be more averse towards corrupt behaviour in the society. The reasoning behind this argument is that societies with low gender equality are based on patriarchal rules which favours some groups in society (primarily men) on the expense of other groups (women). When this exploitation is repeated over and over in the everyday life, these practices gets normalized and eventually creates a sort of legitimization of partial treatment in society. These, in effect, are major barriers to developing citizens values about the need to

advance high-quality governments that are universalistic and impartial, including a normative hostility towards corruption. Thus, Alexander (2018, forthcoming) argues that societies with more gender equality hosts citizens (both men and women) that in general inhibits norms of impartiality that also means that they are more reluctant to accepting corrupt behaviour, as that only favours some groups – mostly men since they are the ones in power (especially in less gender egalitarian countries). On the contrary, in societies with less gender equality and less impartiality, there are also less generalised trust and people therefore tend to favour only their in-groups instead of making decisions for the public good (the collective action problem).

In sum, several theories suggest mechanisms that explain why women are more opposed to and engage less in corruption than men (see summary in table 1). However, these explanations are mainly based on aggregated data and little is known about how these mechanisms actually play out in real contexts and in real cases.

Table 1. Summary of theories and the suggested mechanisms.

Theory*	Suggested mechanisms
Socialisation of gender roles (Swamy et al., 2001, Dollar et al., 2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women are more risk averse, honest and public-spirited than men due to a socialisation of gender roles and thus engage less in corruption since these values/traits go against the core of corruption
Women’s interest in welfare state (Stensöta et al., 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women want to defend the welfare state which is important for their independence and do not engage in corruption since this negatively affects the proper functioning of it
Accountability and risk (Esarey and Chirillo, 2013, Schwindt-Bayer, 2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women are being more scrutinized than men, as well as held to higher norms and standards, which leads to a higher risk of engaging in a corruption than men

*The theories that have been summarised are the ones most cited and the ones who explain the mechanisms behind women's aversion towards corruption. Theories that argue that the relationship between gender and corruption are spurious and due to other factors that doesn't have to do with women (e.g. history, gender equality) have not been included.

2.2 Corruption in Sweden – review of literature and reports

Sweden often tops the corruption rankings as one of the world's cleanest countries. However, this does not mean that corruption in Sweden is completely absent. Research suggest that corruption in Sweden might actually have increased in the last decades (e.g. Erlingsson, et al., 2008).

Corruption takes different forms in different parts of the world (Johnston, 2005). In Europe for example, corruption is mostly found in the central government. However, in the case of Sweden corruption is most widespread at the local level in municipalities, which is not a surprise concerning the organisation of the Swedish welfare state and the decentralisation of many state functions (Bergh, et al., 2016). This in practice, means that the municipalities handle great sums of money, that can easily go into the wrong pockets. Also, some of the municipality's functions such as public procurement, issuing permits, urban planning and social services are particularly sensitive of improper use (Bergh, et al., 2016). At the same time, a critique is also echoed about the municipalities' audits and lack of sufficient revision which also is said to contribute to corruption at the local level. Researchers have for example pointed to the deficiency of independence. As municipalities are often quite small and control themselves (sometimes with the same political interests) there is high risk for arbitrariness and deviation from the formal process which negatively affects the democratic legitimacy and control on corruption (e.g. Andersson et al., 2010, Erlingsson, et al., 2008). Likewise, media also works as a form of control on the municipalities. However, research have also shown that journalists focus mainly on the traditional administrations within the municipalities, and not as much on the municipality owned companies (Citron, 2010), which could mean that the companies are more likely to be affected by corruption as they are not as strictly monitored.

One theory about why corruption in Sweden has presumably increased during the last decades argues that the organisational reforms related to New Public Management (NPM) have facilitated corruption. The changes that NPM has brought about are, among others, more relaxed supervision, weaker accountability mechanisms and more decentralisation with increased responsibility of the individual employee. This in practice, leads to more opportunities for the employee to engage in corruption, as well as fewer risks of being caught. At the same time, the revenues of corruption are also high at the municipal level. According to

Erlingsson et al. (2008) these are all things that could tempt the employee to engage in corruption as the stakes are high as well as the risk of being caught is relatively low. Although, they do not mean that the NPM will automatically increase the number of corruption cases, the organisations can still prevent this by implementing relevant and sufficient control- and accountability systems. It is important to note however, that this theory does not rely on any hard evidence or statistics which can strengthen these theoretical claims.

Although there is limited academic literature on corruption in Sweden, there are several reports from authorities and organisations on the topic. These reports have attempted to map some of the mechanisms at play in corruption cases in Sweden.

One report from The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (*Brottsförebyggande Rådet*) (2013) gave an overview of the state of corruption in Sweden and concluded that corruption can be found in all parts of the country, although more cases are found in the bigger city due to demographical density. Another report showed that unlike other European countries, most of the corruption in Sweden can be found on the local level and in municipalities (ESO, 2013). The same report also found that more people in Sweden compared to other similar countries (like the Nordics) see corruption more as an issue, which in turn affects people's trust in their country's democratic system.

Many of the reports have tried to map out risk factors and common traits and mechanisms in the corruption cases in Sweden. One common denominator that several reports find, is that it is mainly middle age men who are the ones committing corruption crimes (BRÅ, 2013, BRÅ 2014, Statskontoret, 2012). Part of this could be explained by the fact that is often men and people of a certain age who have reached a position that they can take advantage of for corruption purposes.

One report find that there are also other common traits in many of the corruption crimes, such as for example having a personality of excessive focus on achieving goals, high social competence, seeking adventure and status, but also having an underlying situation or crisis that has made the person morally lost (e.g. debts or addiction, etc.). A majority of the people also seem to have an economic motivation for engaging in corruption. Further, the report highlights that the ones committing corruption together with someone else have to have a very close

relationship, and that one prerequisite of engaging in corruption is trust to the other person (BRÅ, 2014). Another factor that plays a role in corruption in Sweden is also internal organisational cultures, where managers and employees do not care about others' businesses or even "close their eyes" to mistakes and wrongdoings. Thus can this create risks of corruption, as there is no real control on or repercussions for employees (BRÅ, 2014, Statskontoret, 2012). Another interesting thing, possibly related to this, is also that there are a lot of suspected corruption cases that are never reported to the police, but where the employer turn to other solutions (Statskontoret, 2012).

Moreover, there are certain sectors that seem to have more problem with corruption than others. One of the sectors in the risk zone of corruption that most reports point out is the construction sector. Part of the reason for this is probably that there is a lot of money in this sector, and also that a big part of the public sectors' procurements and purchases are found in this area. Other sectors in the risk zone are for example manufacturing, retail, technical management, truism but also the care sector (where bribes consist of mainly heritage and gifts) (Statskontoret, 2012, BRÅ, 2012).

In sum, the reports make a good job of mapping out some of the mechanisms at play in corruption cases in Sweden such as *who* commits corruption, in *what sectors* and *how* they do it (strategies) and also to some extent *why* they do it. However, these reports (much like previous literature on corruption and gender at large) are missing the men's and women's *reasoning* behind these acts – how they think of corruption, how they reason and rationalise about their actions which in turn will increase the understanding of the mechanisms that link gender with corruption. This is also something that one of the reports emphasises, as they say that there is a need for further research on corruption in Sweden that focus particularly on understanding the underlying reasons why corruption appears (Statskontoret, 2012).

3. Research gap, aim of study and research questions

The former chapter has presented previous research on the link between gender and corruption and how women seem to be less corrupt than men and punish corruption harder. Women, and/or gender equality, can thus be seen as a remedy towards corruption and its damaging effects on

societies, which makes the topic not only interesting to study but also important for actual policy implementation (e.g. quotas, women empowerment, gender equality policies, etc.).

However, there are some things that previous research is missing. Firstly, most of the studies in the field are quantitative or experimental. This implies that these studies can't say for sure what is causing the relationship between gender and corruption, but only make qualified guesses concerning possible explanations and causal effects as they don't look into specific real cases and examine the actual mechanisms at work. Quantitative data studies are important for finding and testing causal mechanisms at an overarching level, but the great amount of data leads to loss in contextual factors and a contextual understanding. One of the scholars in this field, Alexander, has emphasised that there is a need for empirical evidence that explores the actual mechanisms at work that link gender and corruption, and has called the current lack of understanding a 'black box' (Alexander and Bågenholm, 2018). Secondly, most of the studies are focused on women and on explaining why they engage less in corruption (e.g. socialisation theory, interest in defending welfare state theory, etc.). However, less focus has been on men and on understanding what makes them engage more in corruption relative to women.

This thesis aims at contributing to filling some of these gaps. The overarching research aim is to contribute to the existing literature on gender and corruption by exploring some of the mechanisms that link gender with corruption in real corruption cases. By conducting a comparative qualitative case study of real corruption cases committed by both men and women, this allows for an opening and exploration of the said 'black box'. If we can gain access to men's and women's motivation and reasoning about their corrupt actions and compare the logics they use, this will help understanding the mechanisms that link gender with corruption in real cases. Further, by doing this it also opens up for finding new possible explanations as well as fleshing out already existing theories and to possibly better understand how they work in real contexts. Also, by including cases by both men and women we gain insight in not only on why women engage less in corruption, but also why *men* seem to engage more in corruption.

This will be done by looking at real corruption cases in Sweden and by conceptualising about gender in two ways – gender as the sex of the individual and gender found in traditional male and female sectors. The material that will be used are investigation protocols and court rulings from all corruption cases in the construction and care sector in Sweden that has gone to court

(and been ruled guilty) between the years 2017-2019. This material allows for the kind of insights that is necessary for answering the research aim and the research questions.

Drawing on this, the specific research questions that this thesis will answer are:

1) How do men and women motivate and reason about their corrupt acts in corruption cases found in the construction- and care sector in Sweden in 2017-2019? What are the mechanisms that makes the actor commit a corrupt action?

2) Is there a difference in how men and women motivate and reason about their actions?

3) Is there a difference in how men and women motivate and reason about their actions in typical male versus female working areas?

4) Do the mechanisms found contribute to existing theories on mechanisms or do they suggest any new evidence, and if so, how?

4. Method and Material

4.1 Method

4.1.1 Comparative case study

I have chosen to conduct a case study with several cases, which is a suitable method since the aim of this approach is to test or develop, as in my case, theories and explanations that can be applied to other cases beyond the event in question and thus produce generalisable explanations (2008). Further, a comparative case study also allows for detailed insights into causal mechanisms, processes, motivations, decisions and beliefs of actors that large-scale surveys are often lacking the ability to provide (Hancké, 2009) which suits my research purpose perfectly since I want to complement to the field of gender and corruption by looking into mechanisms that explain the link between gender and corruption that large scale surveys already have found, and thus makes this a good method for me to use.

There are different kinds of case studies, and the one that best suits my research purpose is the comparable case study since this allow me to compare and contrast different cases (see more on the section case selection). Comparative case studies are usually used for deductive

purposes, however since I already know the outcome of my cases (all actors have in fact committed a corrupt action) my design also have similarities with the more inductive equal-outcome-design which purpose is to find new factors which explains a relationship or to develop causal mechanisms. The combination allow me to choose the cases I am interested in – cases based on a dual conceptualisation and where the outcome is a corrupt action – *and* find the causal mechanisms that link gender with the outcome. These are all strategical choices, which researchers recommend should always be the guiding principle of case selection in order to make the results more generalisable (Esaiasson et al., 2017, Levy, 2008, Bergström and Boréus, 2016).

Moreover, in theory the most-similar design holds as many things as possible constant, except the factors that one expects will affect the outcome – which in my case is also known. By holding as many things as possible constant, this allow the researcher to find differences between the different cases. However, in practice it is not always the reality that all things except the factor that one thinks will explain the relationship (gender in my case) can be completely constant and similar. Then it is important to choose cases which are as similar as possible, as well as being open and transparent about other things that might differ between the cases (Esaiasson et al., 2017). The cases in this study will all take place in the same country, Sweden, and during a set time period (they were all taken to court between the years 2017-2019) in order to ensure that they are as similar as possible and are affected by the same laws and rules. However, things may differ between the cases, as they for example take place in different parts of the country and in the private- as well as the public sphere, but it is not possible to find any cases which are more similar to each other to due to a limited amount of cases in a certain time period so this will still have to do.

One question that appears when choosing cases is how many cases are necessary in order to make comparisons between different groups as well as making generalisations to cases beyond the material. For starters, the strategic sampling of cases is one factor that strengthens the impact of the results (Esaiasson et al., 2017) and this is something that this thesis takes into account, see more on case selection section below. Moreover, while perhaps getting ahead of myself, Bowen (2009) recommends that when analysing documents, it is always better to include a wide array of documents but also emphasise that the researcher should focus on quality over

quantity. The number of cases and documents will further be discussed in the section below about limitations and ethical considerations. However, as I will look at all cases committed by men and women in the traditional female sector of care and the traditional male sector of construction in Sweden during the time period of three years, this can be seen as a rich amount of cases as I look at all existing cases within this frame and not only a sample.

4.1.2 Qualitative Content Analysis

In short, the material that will be used in this study is investigation protocols and court rulings from corruption cases in Sweden (more on this in the section on material below). However, in order to analyse these documents and find the mechanisms that are linking gender with corruption I will make use of the document analysis method *qualitative content analysis* (together with the comparative case study).

Qualitative content analysis is a method that is systematic, rule-based and flexible and which purpose and greatest strength is to generate broad descriptions about the subject of interest. This suits the research purpose of this study, as descriptive answers found in the texts can help find and explore the mechanisms that make men and women engage in corruption. Moreover, Disko and Maschi (2015) also emphasise that qualitative analysis is useful in inductive studies when one wants to describe complex phenomenon, compare and contrast group differences, describe patterns and regularities and discover new fields. This further shows the suitability of this method to the research problem, as its purpose is to describe, explore and contrast the mechanisms that make men and women respectively engage in corruption.

Furthermore, this method focuses on the meaning of the text, and not so much on the language like some of the other document analysis methods do (e.g. discourse analysis). However, it is still possible to find both manifest (more obvious) and latent (looking between the lines) meaning with this method, which will be meaningful also for my study as this results in a more holistic approach to the texts (Disko and Maschi, 2015, Schreier, 2014). The content analysis also underlines the importance of looking at the context in which the texts have been produced and to take this into account when analysing the texts, since this might have affected the content (Schreier, 2014, Bowen, 2009). This is extremely important in my case, because the special nature of investigation protocols and court rulings.

In practice, when working with document content analysis and the inductive approach the researcher will go about to analyse the texts by asking open questions to the material. This can for example be done by using a protocol of questions (see chapter on theoretical framework below) which opens up for descriptive answers. The difference between working inductively instead of deductively is that one does not have already defined codes and categories guided by theory, but instead one uses ‘open coding’ which means that the researcher is only guided by the answers found in the data. These are then systematically coded into different categories – both main categories and subcategories – as seen in the results (Altheide and Schneider, 2013). This inductive approach and the open coding are suitable because they allow me to find new mechanisms and explanations on why men and women engage differently in corruption, which is the research purpose.

4.2 Material

The material and sources that will be used in answering the research questions have been chosen with the purpose to find mechanisms that link gender and corruption by gathering information from men and women who themselves have been involved in corruption and understand how they express the reasons and motivations behind their actions. I have chosen the material of investigation protocols and court rulings from real corruption cases in Sweden.

Investigation protocols and court rulings allow for an insight in why men and women have engaged in corruption and how they have reasoned. Investigations are rather thorough and look at many different aspects. Furthermore, they also include interviews with witnesses which give a fuller and more just picture of the event, than if only the suspects tell their stories. Moreover, the interviewers are professionals and have much education and experience carrying out interviews and handling these situations. Another positive aspect of using these documents as material is that most of the investigations have been carried out relatively close to the actual event (the corrupt action) and thus increase the trustworthiness of the interviewees in the protocol. Possible negative consequences of using this material is that the interviewees may lie in order to get a lower punishment, but this problem would also exist if I would use another material, such as if I were to perform interviews of my own. Also, this issue could be at least partially solved by being careful and attentive in the analysis. Although the ones committing the act might lie, there are also witnesses and other information that might tell the truth and by

looking holistically at the material as well as reading between the lines it is still possible to overcome the obstacle with possible lies.

Alternative sources of information that could have been used to answer the research questions is for example interviews. The advantage with this material is that I, as an interviewer, could ask the questions I am interested in and also ask follow-up questions, which I can't do with my investigation protocols and court rulings. However, it would probably be a very difficult, if not impossible, task to find men and women who have engaged in corruption who are willing to participate in an interview. Also, the same issue with lying would probably appear in interviews too, due to social desirability of the person. Thus, the positive traits of the investigation protocols and court rulings, as mentioned above, as well as the availability of an already existing material is more suitable.

In order to find corruption cases, I have used a knowledge bank of corruption cases by a Swedish organisation called the "Institute Against Bribes" (in Swedish: *Institutet Mot Mutor*). This organisation has listed all the corruption cases according to sector since 2017 in their yearly reports (and their yearly reports) (IMM, 2017, IMM, 2018, IMM, 2019). This has been helpful, not only since they list all corruption cases in Sweden, but also because they refer to the case's document number at the court and the police.

In the gathering of the material I have made sure that all the cases have in fact been ruled guilty, as to make sure that it actually is a question of corruption (and also because of ethical reasons). After this, I have contacted the local courts and/or the police where each case belongs and asked for the court rulings as well as the investigation protocols. Eventually (sometimes after a secrecy process) I have received the documents either digitally or by postal service.

4.2.1 Case selection

4.2.1.1 Level of analysis – Sweden

Sweden ranks as number four on Transparency International's corruption perception index still only scores 85/100 on the same index, indicating that there are in fact unresolved problems (2020b). Even though 'mature democracies' are often relatively cleaner than other countries, this doesn't mean that they don't have problems which needs to be solved. Yet, there is very

little research made in these kinds of countries, the field of corruption studies thus need to complement with more studies and facts about these countries (Erlingsson, 2011). Moreover, some scholars would also argue that this research could also be used for developing countries, because if we understand what makes corruption less prominent in democracies, we can also understand what needs to be done and implemented in countries with more corruption (Andersson et al, 2010). However, maybe most importantly, Sweden is an interesting case because it is one of the most gender egalitarian countries in the world (World Economic Forum, 2018, World Economic Forum, 2019). This would imply that, if there are in fact differences in why and how women and men engage in corruption acts in Sweden, it is very likely that these differences persists – or are even greater – in other countries too, since Sweden is one of the most least likely cases where there would be gender differences. Moreover, Sweden’s “*Public Access to Information and Secrecy Act*” makes it a good country to study since the material is accessible which provides a basis for answering the research questions.

4.1.1.2 Analytical dimension and the cases

The thesis will rely on an analytical dimension that conceptualise about gender in two ways. Firstly, cases will be selected on the sex of the actors. Since previous literature suggest that men and women act and reason in different ways, it can be assumed that men and women are driven by a logic that is related to their gender and the socialisation thereof (see chapter on definitions). Secondly, cases will be selected on the structure of sectors, which can also be assumed to be gendered. Some sectors are traditionally male or female coded. Taking this to the extremes, the construction sector is one area that has and is still mostly dominated by men and it could thus be assumed that this male logic is transferred to the logic that governs the area. On the other end, the care sector is made up by a majority of women, which could transfer a female logic to govern in this sector. Also, the construction sector deals with typically traditional male tasks, such as the care of things (roads, houses, etc.) and the care sector deals with traditional female tasks such as the care of humans. This can thus be seen as a dual conceptualisation of gender, which will be used to explore differences in the mechanisms that link men and women to corruption. Looking at it this way, the impact of gender would theoretically be most visible in the cases where the logic of female sector and the logic of the female actor meets as well as where the logic of the male actor and the logic of the male sector meet, but could still be present in the other cases. Moreover, the care- and construction sector are also suitable focus of

analysis, as these are some of the risk zones of corruption in Sweden (as seen in previous section on corruption in Sweden).

Using this dual conceptualisation of gender, I will look at all cases committed by men and women in the construction- and in the care sector in Sweden over a period of three years, 2017-2019. However, unfortunately, these cases are not evenly distributed amongst sector and sex (see table 1). In fact, there are only a few cases in the care sector where men have been convicted (and in one of these cases there is a couple of a man and a woman acting together, however this case will still be coded as a male cases since they work together and the woman might be influenced by the man's logic more than she would if she acted alone in the care sector) and no women at all in the construction sector. Although, this is not ideally for the research purpose, it does strengthen the point that the construction- and care sector are still very much dominated by men and women respectively, and assumingly also by the logic of the gender. Further, there are eight cases where a man has committed a corruption crime in the construction sector (there were nine in total, but due to difficulties and delays accessing the last one related to secrecy, this one is not included in the material) and six cases committed by women in the care sector.

Figure 1: Analytical dimension on which case selection is based, including the number and coded names of the chosen cases.

		Logic of activities	
		Construction	Care
Actor's sex	Male	<u>8 cases</u> construction_men1 construction_men2 construction_men3 construction_men4 construction_men5 construction_men6 construction_men7 construction_men8	<u>3 cases</u> care_men1 care_men2 care_men3
	Female	<i>0 cases</i>	<u>6 cases</u> care_women1 care_women2 care_women3 care_women4 care_women5 care_women6

4.3 Limitations, validity and reliability

The method and material have many strengths, but they also come with some limitations:

Firstly, since the documents have not been produced for research purposes, it is sometimes hard to find the exact answers one wants or to get enough details (Bowen, 2009). For example, in the police investigations they have not always asked the questions that are interesting for research purposes (e.g. why-questions) but rather questions about how and when because they want to find out if the person is guilty. However, this could be overcome by looking at the latent meaning of the text, which means that the researcher reads between the lines, as well as to look at the holistic picture of the texts and cases. This can be done by moving between the parts of the text and the whole of it. Many scholars emphasise that it is the researcher that makes something out of the text and tells a story from it – and not the other way around – that the text tells researcher a story (Disko and Maschi, 2015, Schreier, 2014, Esaiasson et al., 2017).

Secondly, as the cases are unevenly distributed between the analytical dimensions this might also affect the result. Many researchers talk about theoretical saturation, which means that no

new information appears towards the end of the analysis stage and which thus increase the trustworthiness and generalisability of the results (Esaiasson et al., 2017). This has been accomplished in the male cases in the construction sector and also with the female cases in the care sector, as the analysis and coding processes has resulted in clear patterns amongst these cases. However, due to the limited amount of cases conducted by men in the care sector, the results and analysis could probably have benefitted from more cases in this dimension. Still, there are patterns in these cases. Also, all the results will be discussed in relation to previous findings and this will also help increase generalisability of the results (if they align with previous findings).

Lastly, something that merits discussion is also the validity and reliability of the research design. Briefly, validity is attained when the researcher measures what he says he is going to measure (that the design corresponds to the research problem) and reliability is attained when the researcher carries out the analysis without systematic flaws and mistakes (Bergström and Boréus, 2016). Regarding reliability in this study, there is always a risk with document analyses that the researcher transfers his or her previous knowledge and understanding into the analysis of the text. To avoid this, it is of outmost importance that the researcher strives for objectivity when interpreting and analysing the material as well as being transparent about his or her analysis (Bowen, 2009, Esaiasson et al., 2017, Erlingsson and Brysiewicz, 2017). For increasing the transparency, I have tried to be as clear as possible in how I have drawn my conclusions in the results chapter, and everything is supported by summaries and quotes from the cases.

5. Analysis in Practice

After having gathered all the material for the chosen cases, the analysis process itself starts. As this study takes an inductive approach, I have gone about to analyse the material in such a way. In practice, this means that the analysis stage is not guided by previous research and theories, but that the researcher instead is open to what the material tells her.

I have gone about the analysing process as follows. First, I started out reading some of the texts to get an idea of the material. Then, I put together a ‘protocol’ with open question which resulted in descriptive answers from the text (see figure 2). I have tried to form the questions to be open

and to give broad descriptions, in order to being able to answering my research question (Gibbs, 2007, Altheide and Schneider, 2013).

Even though it is mainly question 5-10 that has guided the analysis since these are focused on motives and reasoning which helps understand the mechanisms at play, all questions have been included in order to get a more holistic picture of the cases. The holistic approach to the cases is important since the parts of the text and the whole of it can't be analysed in isolation from each other. Both of them are necessary in order to gain a full understanding and meaning of each of them (Esaiasson et al., 2017). This is especially important for this research, as crimes investigations can be rather complicated and thus a whole picture is needed in order to actually understand what's at play.

In practice, I had a document for each text that I was analysing with all the questions from the protocol and added the answers I found as I proceeded with the reading (for a second time for some of them). For the material I read digitally I copy-pasted sections that answered the questions in the protocol, and for the analogue material I wrote the answers with my own words in the document I was using as well as marking the places in the text with the number of the question that the section answered so it would be easy to find if I needed to go back later.

Figure 2. The protocol with the open questions that has guided the analysis.

Questions to the material:

1. What has happened? What is the criminal act? (activity (during longer time)/event (briefer))
2. Who has committed the act? Gender, age, situation. (agent)
3. What is the setting of the event? (place/context)
4. Is someone else involved or participating? In that case what is their relationship? Are they affecting the agent somehow? (relationships, participation, interaction and involvement)
5. What seems to be underlying reasons to the act? Was it committed by free will or where there any direct or indirect pressures that the agent was under? (conditions and constraints)
6. Why did the person commit the act? (motives)
7. How did the agent carry thorough the act? How did he or she manage? (strategies, practices, or tactics)
8. What concepts do the agent use to understand their world? What norms, values, rules and mores guide their action? What meaning or significance does it have for the agent, how do they construe events, what are their feelings? What symbols do they use to understand their situations? What names do they use for objects, events, persons, roles, settings and equipment? (Meanings and interpretations, including latent meaning)
9. How did the person think, reason or feel when the act was committed? (states, general conditions)
10. What happened after the act? How did the person respond to his or her act? How did she or he feel? (Consequences)

Many of the codes and categories appeared already in this stage, as I started to find patterns in the documents. However, ‘formally’ I started the systematic coding process after having finished filling in the protocol for each case, as I then read all the protocols (with the questions and answers) and started to code the answers. After coding the answers in the protocols, I started sorting these and dividing the codes into categories and subcategories. What emerged from the coding and categorising process was four main categories that more or less appeared in all groupings of the cases (men in construction sector, women in care sector, men in care sector) and with subcategories that somehow differed from each other between the groups. The four main categories are presented in table 2, together with a description of the category, the names of their subcategories and from which questions in the protocol that the categories have been derived from.

Table 2. Presentation of main codes, including their description and what questions they were derived from.

Category	Description of category	Derived from what question(s) in the protocol
<i>Motivation</i>	<p>Motivation in this sense refers to what was driving the person to commit the act. Simply why the person did it, his or her <i>motives</i> and what lays behind these motives.</p> <p>Subcategories: <i>wanting luxuries, help with personal and economic problems, spill-over-to-wanting, wanting more than one has</i></p>	Question 4-6
<i>Interplaying factors</i>	<p>Interplaying factors are things that have been a part of the situation or the context and have directly or indirectly played a role in why the person acted why they did. These factors have probably interacted with everything else that's going on in the person's world; motivations and other reasoning about whether or whether not to commit the corrupt act.</p> <p>Subcategories: <i>organisational culture, the situation presented itself/tempting situation</i></p>	Question 4, 5 and 7
<i>Justification</i>	<p>What justification means in this sense, is how the men that has committed corrupt crimes try and justify their actions, either before, during or after it was done.</p>	Question 8 and 9

	<p>Moreover, these justifications can be done to others (e.g. to get a lower punishment) or for oneself.</p> <p>Subcategories: <i>trivialisation of corruption, not caring about rules and laws, they offered me, win-win situation, grey area</i></p>	
<i>Reaction after the act</i>	<p>How a person reacts after having committed the corrupt action or when being caught, can also reveal something about the reasoning and intentions behind committing the act in the first place.</p> <p>Subcategories: <i>regrets being caught and afraid of reputation, regrets the act itself, nothing wrong</i></p>	Question 9 and 10

6. Results and findings

6.1. Research Question 1 – How do men and women motivate and reason about their corrupt acts in corruption cases found in the construction- and care sector in Sweden in 2017-2019? What are the mechanisms that make the actor commit a corrupt action?

The following part will present how men and women in the construction- and care sector motivate and reason about their corrupt actions. At the end of this section a table will be presented that summarise the findings, divided into the mechanisms that has made the actors engage in corruption.

6.1.1. Men in the Construction sector

I. Intentions / Motivations

Wanting luxuries

All of the benefits given and taken have been luxuries, things that the person does not need, but rather wants to have. In addition to this, the bribe is often specified by the taker in terms of his own wishes of what he wants.

As mentioned, all the bribes have been more or less ‘luxuries’ such as the following: a trip to New York with spouse, “business” aka friends’ trip to Copenhagen, fancy cars, free car rentals, jacuzzi, house constructions, expensive watch, iPads, money and more. Maybe the most eye-catching example of the motivation of greed and living a better life is a CEO of a hotel- and event-company that uses his position to live a good life. Amongst others, he throws his 40th birthday party which on the invitation is described as “*a magical evening of festivities*” and “*with entertainment of world-class*” (construction_men4) in the company’s facilities and lets the company take the whole bill. Moreover, he also lets the construction company that is hired by his company make renovations on his villa for more than 15 000 euro and lets the construction company send the bill under fake invoices to his company who then pays for it.

In addition to this, it all seems to be a question of greed since none of the men engaged in corruption activities had economic problems or other clear underlying reasons they needed money, favours or other possessions for. All of them had a good salary and a good position at their workplace, no loans or debts that they were running behind on, and in all they seemed to be in a sufficiently good place. There is only one case where one man might have had an underlying reason for requesting a bribe that is on the border between need and greed; he said that his wife had long been complaining about his absence at home and in the marriage due to long hours and much responsibility at work, and thus he wanted – or needed – to make this up to her by taking her on a trip in order to try and save their marriage. However, because of his position as a district manager he could probably have paid for this himself, and the motivation can still then be interpreted as greed for wanting more luxuries.

II. Interplaying factors

Organisational culture

In most of the cases, although not all of them, there seem to have been an organisational culture that has played a part in the corruption cases, in a way that it has facilitated the acts to take place and, for at least some time, go undiscovered.

Firstly, the culture can be seen in the character of the corruption acts. In all of the cases there are at least two people acting in concert, if not more. In addition to this, many of the people are not close friends (although some are), but rather work colleagues who know each other from their current or previous workplace. This would mean that they don't really have trust for each other, but instead that there is a culture of either doing things this way – or at least not telling about it if one discovers something that is not right. This can be seen in the example of an employee at a public sector organisation who repeatedly requested bribes from different contractors that the organisation hired, by sending out e-mails and text messages such as for example this message *“I wouldn't mind two tickets to Italy”* (construction_men5_man1) to a contractor who get their supplies from a manufactory in Verona. This man had been acting like this for years before someone stood up and reported him, which shows that there is a culture which allows or facilitates this kind of behaviour.

In many of the other cases, too, men say things that show that some degree of bribing is even the normal business of doing things in this sector. For example, one of the men says in the police investigations that *“of course I have gotten Christmas gifts and so”* and *“the Santa has been nice”* (construction_men_taker1), as if it was nothing wrong with accepting gifts although it's against the law and the company's policy. Another man who talked about giving money to a customer via fake invoices said that *“They have wanted to help their customers, you do not get anything for nothing”* and continued *“It's a bribe so that he will be on good terms with the clients”* (construction_men7_giver1). In these statements it is clear that is nothing unusual or weird about this kind behaviour – it even shows that it might be necessary to bribe in order to get work and contracts in the future, because that is how the organisation has come to work. Another case, the aforementioned CEO who lived a luxurious life at the expense of the company answered the police that *“You know how it is done in this business”*

(construction_men4_taker1) on a question if he saw nothing wrong with a contractor working for a company and the company's CEO at the same time. This shows that the same kind of reasoning is present in different companies, which supports the idea that this organisational culture is something that does play a role in how men do their jobs in the construction sector.

Acting in tune with this organisational culture might be both voluntarily (and people could even use this to justify their actions) and involuntarily. Let's look at the example of a whistle-blower who turned himself in for having engaged in corruption. This man had worked in the sector for 21 years under the same boss who has taught him everything and whose motto was that "*one has to give a little to get a lot*" (construction_men1_man1, talking about his boss). At first, he didn't really understand that what they had been doing, amongst other things giving gifts to employees at a public body, was something wrong. He just did as he had been taught. Eventually though, he understood that he had done something illegal and then he decided to take action and contacted a national TV program and told them everything, since he wished that "*the business should be free from shit*" (construction_men1_man1). This, together with many other men in the cases who have stood up against the men who wants to give or requests bribes and turned them in to the police, also shows that there are many people who strongly disagrees with this culture and fights against it. But it also shows that some people working in the sector might feel like they have no choice but adjust to the culture.

III. Justifications

By only the justifications themselves, one cannot detect if they try to justify the act for others or themselves, but it is likely that it is a bit of both. However, looking at the bigger picture and taking into account that very few men admits and regrets what they have done, together with the way they justify their actions – as if it was noting big, as if it wasn't corruption, as the rules are not always that important – it is likely that they try to justify their actions primarily to others, and only secondary to themselves.

It is also worth mentioning that many of the justifications over-lap to some extent, and that they are not clear cut. For example, by trivialising the corrupt act the person also does not see rules or laws as something fundamental, as the trivialisation leads to rules being broken. Some of the justifications could probably also be seen together with the aforementioned culture in some

parts of the construction sector, as all the justifications more or less showing that the men think that their acts are not that serious or that they can get away with them. However, in order to structure up the justifications and to make it easier for the reader, the different themes or strategies for justifications are somewhat separated into different headlines.

Trivialisation of corruption

Trivialisation of corruption in the cases can be seen in mainly two different ways, or by two different strategies. Firstly, many men trivialise the act itself and dismiss the act as something small and trivial and something not even worth talking about, especially not as a corrupt action. Secondly, many men also diminish the severity of the act, in these cases bribes, by calling it other names, but which in fact have the same meaning as a bribe.

As already mentioned, many of the men in the corruption scandals seem to diminish or trivialise their action by saying that it was nothing big – and definitely not a bribe. One man talks about the trip he went on to New York with his wife, and which another company paid for: “*It is not reasonable to call a trip for 110 euros to New York a corruption scandal*” and goes on “*there is no question that he made some wrong decisions, but it was never a question of bribing*” (construction_men6_taker1). What is interesting here, is that it shows that the man is somehow aware of what he is doing and that it is not completely in line with the rules, but still he thinks that it is nothing serious. It also shows some kind of twisted view on what corruption is. It seems like the man think that a corruption scandal is something much bigger and serious, and that “smaller” amounts (although 110 euro is not a small sum, according to me at least...) would not account as a bribe. This same conception seems to correspond to other men’s views as well, as a man who receives a car worth about 45 000 euro says that it is “*nonsense*” (construction_men8_taker1) and a project leader for a construction company says that construction costs for about 16 000 euro on a CEO’s villa is just a “*shit sum of money*” (construction_men4_giver1). These are even higher amounts of money, but the men still see it as nothing serious that needs to be dealt with. Another man who says that he has lend money (in reality it is not a question of lending, but rather giving or *bribing*) from the company where he works to others, he says that “*I could never imagine that the fact that I lent money would lead to suspicions of corruption*” (construction_men3_giver1). This too shows that the men think that what they are doing is nothing big, and that they see their actions of something else

than it being a bribe or other forms of corruption or illegal actions (for example just a way of working more efficiently, see below).

Many of the men use other words for what is actually the equivalent of meaning of 'bribe'. This is done both when requesting/talking about bribes both with co-workers and in the investigation protocols with the police. It can thus possibly be seen as a justification of taking and giving bribes both to others but possibly also for oneself. We find many names for those we love, and some of the words used by the men in the place of bribe are for example: "*sponsoring*" (construction_men5_man1), "*(CEO)bonus*" (construction_men4_taker1), "*discount*" (construction_men2_taker1) and "*back-bonus*" (construction_men8). To understand how these words are used, we can look at the example of "*back-bonus*". This is a system invented and agreed by two men employed in different companies, but whose companies were doing businesses with each other. One of the men describes it as "*a bonus that you get back after a long time working together*" and said it with such confidence like he thought it was nothing wrong about it (construction_men8_taker1). In practice, this meant that one man gave the other a Volvo XCV60 worth more than 40 000 euro and a trip to USA for him and his wife as a "thanks" when the man retired. The bills paid by the giver's company. It is clear for anyone that this "*back-bonus*" is in fact a bribe, and it becomes even more clear when the giver also says that the other man has talked well about his company in exchange. It is thus in fact a question of an illicit reward. The other words are used in a similar way, either when asking for a bribe (or sponsoring, bonus or discount) or when talking about it in hindsight.

Thus, it can be seen that men justify their unlawful actions by calling corruption or bribing other names or downplaying the seriousness of it. As mentioned before, this is probably both a strategy to facilitate corruption by not letting others think it is so serious and allow them or help them committing a crime and a way to justify the action to oneself.

Not caring about rules and laws

Many of the men actually admits their actions, although they strongly oppose to having committed a criminal act. Further, it seems like it is rather common to either seeing oneself to being above the laws and regulations, or to think that sometimes it is okay to bypass them.

Either way, this shows that the men who have committed a corrupt act doesn't feel that strongly about the importance of following laws.

One man who took a trip with his friends on the company's account and called it "business trip" where in fact it was only pleasure and also gave money to a friend/colleague in another company which his company was hiring says that he doesn't see his actions as unethical. Further, he gets asked by the investigator if this can't be seen as a bribe and the man answers "*one could see it like this, yes*" (construction_men7_giver1). Further, he also confirms that he knows the rules about the procurement process policy in his company. All his actions and words lead to the assumption that he is highly aware of what he is doing, but that he just does not care about neither the moral issue nor legal issue of his actions. Another man acts in a similar way, and his words could probably give an idea to why they see it in this way. The CEO of the event- and hotel business lived a luxurious life at the expense of the company, as already mentioned. He did also not see anything wrong in his actions and justified it with saying that "*I am the main character in this company, so I am the one who is the main responsible here*" (construction_men4_taker1). By there worlds, it seems like he almost equalizes the company with himself, and because he is the CEO he has the right to do things his way. Thus, it seems like he is of the view that it is his rules that apply, instead of any other rules of the company or even the laws. And perhaps the other man also was thinking in a similar way, that in their companies and in their positions they did what they wanted to do with the money and the company.

Other men also seem to think that it is okay to bypass the rules, but only under certain conditions or circumstances. For example, an employee at a public organisation says figuratively that "*we get robbed by our contractors*" and "*I try to find shortcuts where we otherwise would lose millions of crowners (equals about 100 000 euros)*" (construction_5_man1). He thus tries to justify breaking the rules by saying that he serves his company doing this. Many other men say similar things, for example the CEO for the hotel- and event company says to the investigator that he has done everything for the company and "*I'm sure you know that during my two years the company's turnover has increased by 25%*" (construction_men4_taker1) and a man even asks his bosses to forget about his wrongdoings because he had saved his organisation so much money that this could compensate his actions. These statements all show that these men think

that it is okay to break the law if this leads to a better result than it would otherwise have been, or to put it shorter: that the ends justify the means.

Other circumstances when it is not important to comply by the rules accordingly to the men are when the company in some way “owe” them money or favours for previous “favours” they have done for the company. For example, one man said that he for years had travelled with his private car for work trips and never taken out allowances/compensation for this, and that the company owed him for this. He thus saw his bribe, taking his wife to New York on the cost of the company, as a “*compensation*” and “*a consolation*” and even expressed that it was cheap for the company compared to what they owed him (construction_men6_taker1). Yet another man, who got a car as a retirement gift from a colleague at another company said that he “*had paid it off by working for them*” for so many years (construction_men8_taker1). These examples show that these men think that they can somehow make their own rules of what is right or how it ought to be, and not really caring about formal laws and regulations.

To sum it up, these are probably only but some of the circumstances and conditions where men justifies breaking the rules. If there are these, then there are most probably other and more. This just show that there is a general indulgent view amongst men who partake in corruption that rules and laws are not always that important or does not apply to them and in every situation.

IV. Reactions after the act

Regrets being caught and afraid of their reputation

Even though most of the men in the cases denies what they have done or states that they have done nothing wrong, some men also seem to have regrets. However, it seems like most of them mostly regrets being caught, rather than regretting the act and wrongdoing itself. A couple of men also seem to regret the consequences of being caught, but still denies that they are guilty or have wronged.

A couple of men have said that they regret what they have done, however it seems like they still don’t realise the severity of the act, but that they are mostly sad that they have been caught and are sad that their reputation is damaged. For example, one man who is a branch CEO at a

big construction company says that his actions are shameful, but at the same time he committed the act knowingly he did something against the law and at the same time he says he regrets what he has done he also trivialises the act by saying that *“It’s an unnecessarily costly lesson”* (construction_men6_taker1). It seems like he hasn’t understood the severity of his actions, but rather responds with regrets because that is expected of him. In another case, it is even more clear that he only regrets being caught. Firstly, the man says that he is ashamed that he has gotten fired because his company thought that he had asked for things for his own benefit (in his world, he just tried to take “shortcuts” in order for the company not to lose money, see above.) and continues *“It was all in the papers, I was ashamed”* (construction_men5_man1). This shows that he only got feelings of shame when he was exposed in the local paper and when he had gotten fired. Secondly, another occasion also supports this interpretation; when the man was first called to the board and told he had done something wrong he thought it was because he had sometimes acted as a project leader (which was not his task) and had thus over stepped his responsibility and for this he said he was sorry. When they told him it was because of bribing, he instead apologised for this and said it was wrong of him. What this shows is that he could apologize for anything and it doesn’t seem to come from his heart but it is rather a reaction to other’s views and feelings. Moreover, he also thought his wrongdoings had to do with something else (acting as a project leader) and thus not thinking he had done something wrong asking for a few bribes (which he in the investigations also says he doesn’t see as bribes, but rather “sponsoring”, see above).

In addition to this, a few men are also afraid of their reputation, even though they never admit that they have committed the acts or done something wrong. One man says that *“It is very unpleasant to be accused of corruption”* (construction_men4_taker1), and he is later convicted for asking for and quiring bribes. Another man says that *“the work situation has felt unpleasant, I feel threatened because rumours are going around, for example in media, and this doesn’t feel very good”* (construction_men1_taker1). He was later convicted for accepting a bribe from a contractor. In sum, these men’s feelings also seem to evolve about what other people think of them and about their reputations being tarnished, while they see nothing wrong either morally or legally in their actions.

6.1.2. Women in the Care sector

I. Motivations

Help with personal and economic problems

The main motivation that women in the care sector has requested or acquired bribes is because they, of different reasons, have needed help and have been in a difficult personal and/or economic situation.

All of the women are in a rather exposed situation. All of them have some kind of economic problems such as big and lagging debts, debts at the bailiff (*swe: Kronofogden*), bills to pay for themselves and their children, no money for car to get to work, etcetera. In addition to this, many also seem to have personal problems, such as psychical and physical illness, death in the family, supposedly game addiction, and coping with being a single mom to their children with absent fathers which has led to, or at least strengthen the exposed situation that they have found themselves in when they accepted or requested the bribes.

In fact, all but one of the cases (which is a bit more unclear) have started out with the women using the corrupt money to pay their bills and/or their debts, or to buy themselves a car in order to get to work. This is also something that some of them admits. One woman bleeds her heart out as she says *“It was very though economically for me, I had a lot of debts. I told this to my caretaker. My mom passed away in cancer the year before and I had no one who supported me”* and later continues *“I wasn’t myself during this period. I only paid to make it work each month. It was never a question of buying any luxuries”* (care_women1_woman1). These quotes show that the women didn’t find any other options to her situation and that she was in desperate need for help, and that this is the only reason she accepted money. Another women who also had a very strained economy with lot of debts at the bailiff said that *“Because of various reasons I have found myself in a very exposed economic situation, and I acted in pure desperation”* (care_women4_woman1). This again, enforces the presumption that the primary – if not only – reason for these women to engage in corruption is because they felt that they had to. This is not something that they wanted to do or did voluntarily, but something that they felt they needed

to do because of their pressuring situation, which is seen in the way the women calls it a desperation act.

Spill-over-to-wanting-more

However, in a couple of cases it seems like need has been the initial motivation, but that it later also spills over to a motivation of greed as they have filled their initial needs but still continue to acquire more money and/or gifts. One example is a woman who, like the other women, had a tough economic situation and by the end of every month found her credits on minus. At the time when she required money from her caretaker her car had just burned down by an accident and she didn't get back as much money from the insurance company as she had hoped for. Because she lived far away from her work, she didn't have another option than to take the car, especially when she worked the early shifts. This is why she asked for a bribe, in forms of money to buy herself a new car. It was clear that she really needed a car to make her life and paying bills work, but as she started looking at the car options she said to the seller "*I want a nice and fancy car*" (care_women6_woman1). But eventually found out that she didn't have the means to make it work, and had to settle for a cheaper car that just did the work. This shows that even though the initial motivation for asking for a bribe was because she really needed a car, but that after she had gotten the money started to feel a bit greedy and wanted to look at nicer cars, which she eventually had to accept she couldn't afford.

Another example of this logic is another woman with economic difficulties who started letting her caretaker pay for her debt collection bills amounting to about 5 000 euros, which she several times have expressed her gratitude for in the investigations, showing that she felt relieved about the former pressure. However, later she also went on a trip to Greece with the caretaker, her daughter and their friend which the caretaker paid for and she also accepted a gift certificate of the caretaker's house worth about 250 000 euro. This also shows that although the corruption evolved from a state of need, later it evolved and eventually continued by the women's motivation of greed. Although this quote was said by another women who "only" took bribes to pay her debts, the same reasoning can probably apply to these cases as well: "*When you're in a crisis it becomes very tempting, and once you are dragged into it, it becomes hard to stop...*" (care_women1_woman1). What this woman meant was that it is very hard to control the situation once you are in it and you quickly lose control of it and it quickly gets out of hand,

as this women also felt that she accepted more money and gone further than she had initially had “planned” to or thought she would.

II. Interplaying factors

The situation presented itself/tempting setting

In some of the cases, all though not in all of them, the caregiver (who is also the perpetrator in these cases) and the caretaker (from whom she has gotten or acquired the bribe) seem to have gotten very close, which is in fact a risky situation because it can blur the lines between work and private. This is something that for example one of the district managers of a caregiving company acknowledges: *“Working in care giving service, we are in a power position. One often gets close to the caretakers and because of this it is of utmost importance to be able to draw lines of what is allowed and not”* (care_women1_manager1). This supports the claim that care givers sometimes get in difficult situations and that they have to be very careful.

These close relationships exist in many of the cases, as many of the women have worked with the caretaker daily for years. One woman for example, estimates that she has visited her care takers about fifty times, on average two times a week. Sometimes, the caregiver and caretaker also get closer of other reasons such as *“personal chemistry”* (care_women5_woman1) or that they *“had the same interests”* (care_women3_woman1). It is thus clear that for many of the women a close relationship had appeared, which accordingly to the manager can already be a difficult situation and create issues of setting boundaries. Supposedly, this can be even tougher if one is already in an exposed situation, such as economic or personal problems, as mentioned earlier.

Adding on this, some of the caretakers even seem to have offered the money to the women voluntarily, which assumingly makes it even more tempting to lower the guards on boundaries. This is just one example of the difficulties to uphold boundaries in this sector, because there the work situation itself leads to close relationships where boundaries can sometimes be difficult.

III. Justifications

Justifications could be done to others, such as to appear more socially desirable or to get a lower punishment. Taking into account all the different aspects of justifications used by the women, it seems likely that these are not only made to others but also to oneself. This can be seen in the moral aspect of the justifications. They focus mainly on minimizing the negative consequences of their actions or attempts to prove that they haven't overstepped the law which they seem to have respect for. It seems like even though they have done something criminal, they still want to make things right for themselves as much as possible.

“They offered me”

Something that some of the women do in order to justify their actions is underlining that the action – giving the bribe – was voluntarily made by the other person. Although this is still seen as a bribe, the women seem to think that this to some extent justifies their actions or at least makes it less serious as they often refer to the person's free will or agreement of giving the bribe. One woman admits that she has done everything wrong, but adds right after “*but he [the name of her caretaker] wanted this*” as to add that because it was also his will, it is not as bad (care_women1_woman1). Another woman also emphasises the caretaker's will to give her money and his house in the investigations. He even says openly (although he has dementia and the court rules that he is not really aware of what he is doing) that “*I want to help her to a 100%*” and “*As I see it, I have the full right to give to whomever I want to*” (care_women2_victim1). Even though he is not himself due to his illness, he acts normal and clear and the woman believes (at least so she says) what he says and that he is healthy enough to know what he is doing. It is not strange that she uses this to justify her actions, since he says that he is aware of what he is doing and that he is even insisting on how strongly he wishes to help her. Even though one could doubt his real intentions due to his illness, this is clearly something one could talk oneself into believing if one doesn't want to realise that one is doing something wrong. In other cases too (there is only a couple of cases where the women have clearly acquired money against someone's will), the caretakers have indeed expressed their will to give money or help the women, which all women emphasise in the investigations. The reason why they say this thus seems to be that they want to show that their actions are not as bad because

everyone involved agreed on it and it hasn't been done against someone's will. In sum, these women seem to care about the consequences of their actions and want, if possible, to minimize the negative consequences of their actions.

Win-win situation

Another thing that women seem to justify their actions with, is the fact that they also did something good, which can be interpreted as that they hope it might weigh up or mitigate their wrong and illicit action. Perhaps this can be seen as their bad conscious speaking for knowing that they are doing something legally and/or morally wrong.

For example, one woman who let her caretaker pay for her debts had an agreement that benefited both of them (although not necessarily equally). The agreement was that he paid for what she needed and in return she would help him with what he needed and what wasn't covered by the home service. For example, she said that she privately helped him with "*buying things, such as glasses, microwave, and stuff*" and "*I bought things for him at the liquor store and everything that he wanted*" (care_women1_woman1). Other women also run errands to their caretakers, took them outside more and improved their life quality, all done on their free time. The caretakers seem to have been happy about this, as even witnesses say that they smiled more and said that they felt more alive because of the women's favours. Their positive impact on the caretaker's lives is probably also something that the women caught up on, and is thus a reason why they also use this to justify for their actions – for themselves and for others.

In addition, the women seem to see their agreements and their favours to the caretakers as even more important or good in the light of the fact the caretakers didn't have that many other social contacts who could help them or brighten their days. This is seen in the way women add these facts every now and then in the investigation interviews, as they say things like for example "*... he was very lonely, I never saw any relatives during the 1,5 years I worked*" (care_women1_woman1) and "*... he didn't have anyone else*" (care_women3_woman1). There are repeated times that women refer to the men's loneliness, and also sees this as a reason for their act to be more justifiable.

Grey area

Many of the women also attempt to justify their actions by saying that they thought it wasn't a bribe, because of different reasons such as; that it wasn't done during work time, or that it wasn't related to their work or that it wasn't a question of a gift but rather something else (such as a loan or a will). What all of them have in common is that the women thought – or at least wanted to think – that it wasn't a bribe or that it was a *grey area* not really covered by the laws and policies that they knew about.

Many of the women say that they separated the act of the corruption with their work, and thus try to justify their act. Several of the women say that they did everything outside of their working hours or after they had finished their position at the company, which they then thought would make it okay because it is no longer related to their work and position as a caregiver to the person in question. One woman, for example, had to quit because of her disregard for the company's policies as she made many wrongs (amongst them being too close with a care giver and accepting a TV from him). After her position ended she continued accepting money and things from her former care giver. The court ruled that this was a question of corruption since her relationship with the man was based on her time as a caregiver to him, but she tried to justify it as *"I thought it was only if you were an employee that you weren't allowed to accept things. As a no longer employee, I thought it was okay"* (care_women2_woman1). Yet another woman also said that her relationship with her care giver, who had paid for her bills and purchases, also was of private character since she was familiar with the man (through her grandmother who had known the man before she passed) since before she started working as his caregiver. Repeatedly she also said that all the purchases happened after working hours, as to say that she did nothing wrong. Both these women want to show that they did not directly violate the company's policy or the laws, since they thought that they had found loopholes. However, these cases and their justification do not seem very bullet proof against laws and rules, since they still had a working relationship with the men they acquired bribes from. Still, it could be that they thought it was somehow a grey area and that they used this to try and convince themselves or others that they tried to follow the rules and did nothing wrong.

However, some cases are more complicated and not as clear cut (although these too get court rulings that say that they are guilty). One woman was aware of the company's policies that forbid employees from accepting bribes from caretakers, but tried to find a loophole by instead

asking for a loan from one of her caregivers. She says that “*Since it wasn’t a question of a gift but a loan, I thought I didn’t do anything that wasn’t allowed*” (care_women4_woman1). She thus claims that she had never gotten any information about rules against loans, and says that she planned on paying back the money. It is possible that the company’s policy did not in fact explicitly mention loan (but that it rather went under some kind of umbrella of not accepting things from caretakers), and that the women wanted to interpret this as it justified her action. The case that is perhaps the most in a real grey area is a woman who without her knowledge got dedicated a will from a couple she had been taking care of. What’s more, the couple had written a special section in their will to ensure that their will would in fact be accepted: “*I, [name], worked as a sister/maid during the 60s and it happened that wills were dedicated to me. I wasn’t allowed to accept them at that time. We are both aware of these rules. It is thus our declared wish that, regardless that [the name of the woman] who works as our care giver, or her son will have all the full right to all our belongings*” (care_women5_victim1). The woman saw this as a moral dilemma and consolidated with her boss about this and claimed that it was “special circumstances” since it was the couples explicit wish. At first, even her boss said that he was unsure: “*It was in fact special circumstances, since we have a policy about not accepting gifts. The staff knows this, but now it was a question about a will and I got confused*” (care_women5_boss1). The boss said that she would talk to the legal department and get back to the woman. The legal department then recommended the women to not accept the will and warned her that it was in fact illegal and that she could go to jail for it. Eventually the woman did not want to listen to the lawyers but accepted the bribe and still claimed that it was special circumstances and that she had found another judge who agreed on this. However, this example show that women seem to want to justify their actions by holding on to the hope that their actions are a loophole in the laws and policies or that there is a grey area. At the same time this also proves that they do have respect for the laws and that they in reality think that they are important and should be followed. Instead of breaking the law – which they don’t want to, they try to find loopholes or grey areas not covered by the law.

IV. Reactions after the act

Regrets the act itself

Even though most of the women formally reject that they have committed a crime in the court rulings, they still seem to have regrets of what they've done. Some more and some less, according to their words and actions. The only one of the women who openly admits to the crime is also the one expressing her regrets the strongest. She says that *"I have waited for the police to call... I have waited and felt like shit about all this... I go to a psychiatrist and a doctor. I just want to be all over this. The worst part has been the waiting. I have just wanted to come here and admit. I have had so much anxiety because of this"* (care_women1_woman1). This clearly shows that she has regrets over what she has done, and not just because of the consequences since she felt really bad even before getting caught.

However, other women have also expressed regrets, which can be seen in the following quotes from two different women in two different cases: *"I think this is very hard, me and my family are feeling psychically bad about this. There are a lot of things I which I hadn't done"* (care_women3_woman1) and *"It didn't feel so bad at first. It hit me after a while. Of course, I know that this is wrong..."* (care_women4_woman1). This also show regrets and that they know that they have done something that is both morally and legally wrong, since this affects their well-being. One of the women also wants to make right the mess she has caused, by paying back the "loan" she has taken from her caretaker. This is something that she willingly commits to and she pays back with the little money she gets every month, which shows that she is dedicated to making things right, and that her regrets are not just empty words.

Other cases of regrets and bad conscious over their actions are more subtle, but can still be seen in how one women still visits her care taker to bake for him and take care of him, even after she has been caught and can't take advantage of the person. One neighbour interpret this as her bad conscious speaking. And thus this too can be interpreted as having regrets over the way one has acted, and wanting to make up for things.

6.1.3. Men in the Care sector

I. Motivations

Wanting more than one has

All the cases committed by men (or men and women together) in the care sector are a little harder to grasp, because a lack of information in the cases and/or contradictory stories told in the investigation protocols. However, accordingly to the existing information none of these persons seemed to have any urgent needs, such as money or debts problems, or other underlying pressuring problems (physical or psychological). Instead, they seem to have stable full-time jobs, stable partners with income, houses to live in, etcetera. The only thing that could appear as a motive, except of just wanting more than one has, is one woman (acting as a couple together with her husband) who sent money back to her family in Iran. However, according to the couple the family in Iran was well off and didn't need money, so if one should believe them, there are no motives for the convicted people to acquire bribes because they needed them. And, if they would actually need the money, it is the woman in the couple who talks about her family, and not the man in the couple. Given that, then if it was a question of need then it is the woman's action, and thus the motivation of greed of the men in these cases is still the same. Then, using the process of elimination we can just suspect that the actions came from a motivation of wanting more than one has.

II. Interplaying factors

The situation presented itself

Working in the care sector, the same logic of tempting situations and difficulties of setting boundaries persists for the men in this sector as well. However, looking at the cases committed by men, there seem to be a difference in the order of things. In two of the three cases, the people (the man and the couple) have become closer with the caretaker as a consequence of another tempting situation, namely seeing that the person has money and could be taken advantage of.

For example, the woman in the couple, says that her caretaker often talked about the money he had at the bank, and the care giver himself even referred to himself as "*generous George*" (the

name has been modified to protect privacy) (care_men3_victim1). Others in the man's surroundings also confirmed that he seemed to not know the value of money – or he simply didn't care, as he for example tipped a taxi driver 50 euro for a trip into the city centre. This man later came to offer money to the woman. This is an indicator that the man had a lot of money and that it could be tempting to take advantage of this situation, especially as he didn't have any other close relatives. However, this alone does not show that the tempting situation of taking advantage of the man came before the couple being close to the caretaker. Still, the caretaker's neighbours have testified that the woman in the couple always came dressed up to the caretaker, as "*if she was going to a party*" (care_men3_witness1) and that she took him out to the city and cafés, which made the caretaker happy. Eventually – and not at first – the neighbours saw that he had started to fall in love with the woman and he even started telling his neighbours about her. This supports the claim that the couple first saw a situation that they could use, and then getting close to the man, which is not a difficult thing having this job and spending so much time with the caretakers.

In the other case too, it seems to have been the same order of things – first seeing a lonely and old woman with money that the man could take advantage of, and then following a strategy to get closer and acquire the money. Also in this case, neighbours and friends knew about the woman's economic situation and that she was well-off, so it would not be surprising if the man and the caregiver had gotten to know this, too. Further, a witness and a friend to the caretaker also said that he thought that "*They didn't have a relationship, but just took the chance to get money*" (care_men3_witness2). It also seemed like the man had a strategy to get closer to the caretaker. This can be seen as his act to take her out in his car driving around, which she was very happy about as she had had an interest of cars in her youth, and also complementing her cloths and appearances (which friends says that she hadn't).

These both cases show that there are tempting situations in the home care service part of the care sector, however the context also facilitates that people take advantage of and use this. Further, it also shows that the order of temptations are a little different than for the women in this sector. Most women came closer to their caretakers first and then saw that they could take advantage of that situations, although many of the women also took advantage of this by creating strategies to acquire bribes.

III. Justifications

Some of the same justifications that women in the care sector used, is found in the cases committed by men too. This is not strange considering that they are working in the same context. However, there is one difference in the nature of the justifications. Looking at the whole picture of these cases, it seems like these justifications are used mainly – or *only* – to justify the acts to others and not to oneself. This is for example seen considering the former part: that these people themselves to a large extent created these situations and that it wasn't a question of getting offered the bribe but rather asking for it or acquiring it against someone's complete free will. This will also be seen in the examples below.

“They offered me”

The “excuse” or justification that it was the caretaker who offered the gift, is used also in these cases. However, it seems like this is something that the persecutors just say in the investigations to justify their actions and not really something they believe themselves. Let's look at some supporting claims of this argument.

One man says that it was the caretaker's will to give him her house: “*It was her will, not mine*” (care_men1_man1). However, the manager at the home care company says that her signature doesn't look the same as on other papers that they have, and the police also does not exclude the possibility that the man have possibly written the gift certificate himself. Further, friends to the caretaker also says that the women cried over the gift certificate and that it seemed like she felt fooled and was full of regrets. Taken all these things together, and adding what's been said earlier about the man probably having planned and strategized about how he could acquire her property, it seems like it wasn't the caretaker's free will, but rather the boy who had forced his will on her. If he has planned to make her do this (and possibly also writing the gift certificate himself), then it is little likely that he thought it was her free will and could use this to justify his action for himself. Further, the same logic seems to apply to the case of the couple as well. The women in the couple also says that it was the caretaker's wish and idea for her to be his inheritor, but here as well the couple seem to have planned (see above) to make him want to give all his belongings to the woman, by making him fall in love with her. Further, witnesses have also said that the caretaker was worried that the women would stop taking care of him

(excluding work tasks) if he didn't give her money, and that he also eventually understood that he had been fooled and got very hurt and upset. These things also show that although the persecutors say that it was the other person's will, they know themselves that this isn't the case, and that's why they have a strategy to acquire what they want from the person. Thus, they can't justify their actions to themselves, but they rather do this to justify their actions to others.

Grey area

The justification using the concept of a grey area, or saying that they thought that they weren't breaking the law also seem to be more or less empty words and just a justification that these persons use in order for other people to believe that they are innocent or that they did it the action in good faith.

For example, the man who had gotten the house of his caretaker, says that he thought he had done nothing wrong since he was no longer employed as the woman's caregiver at the time she signed the gift certificate of the house and also because the gift didn't have a connection to his former employment. Still, the gift certificate was signed only nine days after he had to quit his job and eventually he also stopped visiting the caretaker (probably when he had already gotten what he wanted), which shows that the only connection they had to each other was through work, and it is thus little likely that it is a grey area. Moreover, once he and his mother also get caught visiting the caretaker after they are no longer working for her, which is something that the care company has warned them to do. They then ask the staff to not tell the company that they had been there visiting the woman. This also show that they knew they were doing something wrong. If they did nothing wrong, they wouldn't have had anything to worry about. It thus seems like they *know* they are doing something wrong and just try to justify their actions towards others as to not get caught. In the case with the couple too, they try and justify their actions by saying that they only thought it was illegal to accept a will if the person was not aware of what he was doing or was forced, but not otherwise. However, considering the woman's educational background in the care sector and her long work experience in the field, she would have to be aware of the rules. This too, is just an attempt to justify their actions in the investigations, and have nothing to do just justifying it for themselves since they where highly aware of what they were doing.

IV. Reactions after the act

Nothing wrong and afraid of reputation

Most of the people in these cases react like the other men and women in the other cases – by denying that they have done something wrong or committed a crime and by putting up lies about a parallel story of what they say actually happen (although these are all proven wrong in court). The only one who reacts differently is one man who works as an administrator at the Swedish Social Insurance Agency. He still denies that he has committed the crime of asking a man for a bribe in exchange of giving him higher social assistance allowance, but he is still devastated that he has been caught. He cries and asks his boss not to do anything about it. But what seems to upset him the most is how his wife and family will react as he says things like “*please don't tell my wife*” (care_men2_man1) and asks them not to send any papers to his house. It thus seems like what he is most afraid of is of his reputation amongst his close ones and that he feels shame for this. However, it is not possible to know if he is sorry for the act he has committed because he knows it's wrong, or if he is sorry for his reputation because he knows his family thinks it's wrong. Although, his reaction is a bit similar to some of the men in the construction sector who also regretted their reputation being ruined, but has no similarities with how the women in the care sector reacted. It thus seems like men are more afraid of their reputation than other moral consequences of their actions.

6.1.4 Summary of the findings divided into the mechanisms that make the actor commit a corrupt act

Table 3: The analytical framework with summary of the results, divided into mechanisms.

	The Construction sector	The Care sector	
	Men*	Women	Men
<i>Motivation</i>	Wanting luxuries: new car, construction-work on villa, travels abroad	Help with personal and economic problems: troubles paying bills and debts, taking care of children, single mom, no car to get to work Spill-over-to-wanting-more: accepting more gifts after economic situation has recovered thanks to received bribes	Wanting more than one has: No economic or personal problems
<i>Intervening factors</i>	Organisational culture: <i>“You know how it is done in this business” and “one has to give a little to get a lot”</i>	The situation presented itself/tempting situation: <i>“Working in care giving service, we are in a power position. One often gets close to the caretakers and because of this it is of utmost importance to be able to draw lines of what is allowed and not”</i>	Tempting situation: <i>“Working in care giving service, we are in a power position. One often gets close to the caretakers and because of this it is of utmost importance to be able to draw lines of what is allowed and not” (but, using this situation strategically)</i>
<i>Justifications</i>	Trivialisation of corruption: <i>“It is not reasonable to call a trip for 110 euros to New York a corruption scandal”</i>	They offered me: “but he wanted this” and “As I see it,	They offered me: “It was her will, not mine” (but lie)

	<p>and calling corruption for other names such as “sponsoring”, “bonus” or “discount”</p> <p>Not caring about rules and laws: “I am the main character in this company, so I am the one who is the main responsible here” and “We get robbed by our contractors... I try to find shortcuts where we otherwise would lose millions of crowners”</p> <p>Justifications mainly to others: to get lower punishment</p>	<p><i>I have the full right to give to whomever I want to</i></p> <p>Win-win situation: “I bought things for him as well, such as glasses, microwave, and stuff” and “I bought things for him at the liquor store and everything that he wanted”</p> <p>Grey area: “I thought it was only if you were an employee that you weren’t allowed to accept things. As a no longer employee, I thought it was okay”</p> <p>Justifications mainly to oneself: not wanting to break rules and their morals</p>	<p>Grey area: “only thought it was illegal to accept a will if the person was not aware of what he was doing or was forced, but not otherwise” (also lie)</p> <p>Justifications mainly to others: to get lower punishment</p>
<p><i>Reactions after the act</i></p>	<p>Regrets being caught and afraid of reputation: “It was all in the papers, I was ashamed”</p>	<p>Regrets the act itself: “I have waited for the police to call... I have waited and felt like shit about all this... I have just wanted to come here and admit. I have had so much anxiety because of this”</p>	<p>Nothing wrong and afraid of reputation: “please don’t tell my wife”</p>

**Due to aforementioned absence of convicted women in the construction sector in my material, there are no cases of women to look at in this sector.*

6.2 Research Question 2 - Is there a difference in how men and women motivate and reason about their actions?

There are differences in how men and women think, as can be seen in the previous chapter and in the summary of the results in table 3. I would argue that there are three main differences between men and women. Firstly, there is a difference in the motive they have for engaging in corruption as men, regardless of the sector, seem to be driven by some sort of greed as they want more than what they have and want to use corruption as a way of living a better and luxurious life. Women on the other hand don't seem to be driven by the same motivation, at least not initially, as they only turn to corruption for helping them out of a difficult economic and/or personal situation. It thus seems like it's the women's last choice (or at least not the first) to turn to corruption, and not something they would do voluntarily if they really didn't have to whereas the men don't find themselves in a pressuring situation and thus choose to engage in corruption voluntarily. The only thing that could pressure men to engage in corruption could be an organisational culture in the construction sector where one might feel pressured to engage in corruption since it is 'the normal business' of things. However, the men in these cases have all used bribes for luxuries such as fancy cars, construction works on their villas, travels, etc. and therefore the choice of engaging in corruption still seems very much voluntary. Moreover, it is unlikely that these differences have to do with the area they work in, because all men regardless of the sector have no pressuring economic or personal situations and thus seem to want to use the money to get a better, more luxurious life. Also, anyone regardless of sex and working sector can have economic problems at some time and not everyone in the care sector need money – but still, there are a clear difference in the motivation that men and women have for engaging in corruption.

The second biggest difference is that men don't seem to care about laws, whereas women want to follow them as far as it is possible. Women try to find loopholes in the laws or grey areas, which they hope will make their actions right in the eye of laws. Also, they only break the law if they feel like they really had to, as their motivation is guided by an exposed and difficult personal and economic situation they feel like they don't know how to handle. Men on the other hand, don't seem to care about laws because, to begin with, they break the law voluntarily as explained above. Also, men in the construction sector clearly show that they don't care about

laws and rules as they think it is okay to commit corruption under certain conditions and feel like the rules don't apply to them and men in the care sector show that they don't care about rules since they seem to know that what they do is not legal or right, but only try to use the excuse of 'grey area' to get a lower punishment and justify their actions to others.

Thirdly and lastly, women seem to be guided by morals in a way that the men don't show. This is shown in for example the way they don't want to break the laws, as discussed above. But what's more, it also shows in the way that women want to make up for their actions by giving back to the person they take the bribe from by helping them with things they need and also in the way that they want to make sure that the person giving the bribe actually wants to do it. This is something that is not seen in the men's actions, as men in the care sector for example, are actively trying to get a bribe from the other person even against this person's will. Also, women show that they regret their actions and that they feel bad about what they have done, since they know it was wrong. However, this is something that is not apparent in the cases committed by men. They either don't seem to regret their actions at all, or they regret being caught and what it is going to do with their reputation. Also, women seem to primarily justify their actions to themselves whereas men's justifications seem to be primarily to others, which also supports the claim that women are driven by morals more than men.

6.3 Research Question 3 – Is there a difference in how men and women motivate and reason about their actions in typical male versus female working areas?

The biggest difference in how men and women motivate and reason about their actions in typical male versus female working areas is that they are all affected by the context they find themselves in, if it's an allowing internal organisational culture or a tempting situation that comes with the work tasks. Men in the construction sector are either actively a part of or indirectly affected by an organisational culture that is sometimes allowing or even encouraging of corruption. The same thing can't be found in the care sector. Instead, men and women in the care sector find themselves in tempting situations as they come very close to the people they care for and have to draw limits. An interesting difference between these contextual factors is that the tempting situations in the care sector come with the actual work tasks and this is something that individuals can't affect or change, the situation will still be there. An allowing

organisational culture, on the other hand, is not something that comes with the special work tasks but is rather something that is created by people. Thus, it could be then that this is affected by the gendered structure of the work area, although we can't know for sure from these results alone.

6.4 Research Question 4 – Do the mechanisms found contribute to existing theories on mechanisms or do they suggest any new evidence, and if so, how?

The mechanisms found in the results (question one) could fit in and be explained by some of the existing theories on gender and corruption, and thus flesh out these theories by showing how the mechanisms work in real cases.

For example, the socialisation theory suggest that women are more risk averse, honest and public spirited than men due to a socialisation of gender roles (Swamy et al., 2001, Dollar et al., 2001). As stated earlier, women seem to care about morals which can be seen both in their reluctance to engage in corruption in the first place and in their reasoning when they actually commit the act (e.g. by making up for their actions in other ways). On the contrary, this is something that men don't show at all. It can thus be assumed that this behaviour could be a result of socialisation of gender roles and that morals are also something that women are taught more than men. This becomes especially apparent when seeing that women try to justify their actions to primarily themselves, and not to others as men do. This shows that it doesn't (at least only) have to do with other external factors, such as risk, but also with one's own feelings or values, which can be taught through a socialisation process.

Moreover, the finding that women only engage in corruption when they feel that they have no other choice could possibly be understood with the help of Stensöta's (2010) theory that states that women have an interest in protecting the welfare system because it protects and helps them in their daily lives (both at home and in the workplace). Moreover, does it seem like women actually care about laws and regulations in contrast to men who don't seem to care about laws and don't mind breaking them (except when it leads to them being caught). This further show that men don't have an interest in protecting the laws and the proper functioning of the welfare state, perhaps because they are not as dependant on it as women are.

The last theory that the results also could help explain with these real cases is the increased risk for women to engage in corruption as they are often held to higher standards and being harder scrutinized than men (Esarey and Cherillo, 2013, Esarey and Swindth-Bayer, 2017). Although the previous literature on this topic focus mainly on women as politicians, it is not unlikely that the same logic goes for women in general. This can in fact be seen in the result-part, especially regarding the organisational culture in the construction sector where most of the manly cases are found, which is more allowing to wrongdoings. As mentioned in the result chapter, this is shown in both the nature of corruption in this sector where men cooperate with each other in the corrupt actions and that they do not tell on each other if someone does something wrong but rather just “waves it off”. This culture facilitate corruption and minimize the risk of getting caught. It is thus less risky for people (men) in this sector to engage in corruption than for others (women) in a sector (care) that does not have the same culture. In addition to this, the fact that women, unlike men, only engage in corruption as a last resort could be a sign of women’s unwillingness to engage in a risky behaviour because they know they are held to high standards and are likely to get caught and thus only do this if they feel like they have no other choice. If this organisational culture exists only in traditional male dominated areas due to gender structures, it could be suggested that it’s not only women in politics that are held to higher standards and are harder scrutinized, but that women in workplaces are held more accountable, too.

Lastly, something that could be seen as a new mechanism that doesn’t really fit into existing theories, is the difference in men and women’s motivation to engage in corruption. There is a clear difference in the motivation, as women are driven by wanting or even needing help with economic and/or personal problems and men wanting to live a better and more luxuries life. None of the previous theories on gender and corruption look at the motivation that men and women are driven by when they chose to engage in corruption in the first place. Most of them only talk about what holds women back (e.g. their interest in the welfare state, high risk). This could thus be seen as a new finding that needs to be further explored and theorised about.

7. Discussion

The research aim of this thesis was to contribute to existing literature on gender and corruption by exploring the mechanisms that link gender with corruption in real corruption cases by looking into the motivation and reasoning of both men and women who have engaged in corruption.

This thesis has shown how *both* men and women in traditionally male- and female sectors reason and motivate their corrupt actions and explored some of the mechanisms that make men and women respectively engage in corruption.

The results have shown that men seem to care little about rules and laws and that women are more guided by morals in their actions. Also, men and women seem to be motivated by different logic when engaging in corruption. Women only engage in corruption if they feel like they have to due to personal economic problems whereas men are driven by a desire for a better and luxurious life. There is a structural difference between the traditional male and female sectors, which also seem to affect the actors working in them. In the construction sector, there is an allowing organisational culture which ‘close their eyes’ on or even encourage corruption.

The finding about differing motivations is somewhat similar to, although still different from, Bauer’s conceptualisation of need and greed in relation to corruption (2012, 2016). For Bauer, need corruption is when citizens pay bribes for services that they are legally entitled to (e.g. healthcare) but couldn’t get without paying a bribe, and greed corruption is when a person bribes in order to gain personal advantages that the person is not entitled to. This does not really fit into the Swedish case or other countries with functioning welfare. However, the women in my cases still perceive that they *need* help with money for their economic situation whereas men are driven by their *greed* to live a luxury life, and perhaps this could be a ‘Swedish’ version of these concepts. It is possible that this, in part, is due to still prevailing gender roles. Even Sweden, one of the most gender equal countries in the world, still have clear gender roles where the woman is often the main caretaker of children and the family’s wellbeing. It could thus be that women feel more responsible and the *need* for taking care of children and the family and that this is what motivates them to engage in corruption (if they feel that what they already have to tackle this responsibility is not enough and can’t be dealt with in another way), whereas men

don't have the same responsibility and thus think of and focus on other things, such as greed motivations.

In the same way, it's possible that Bauer's definition of need and greed corruption could be gendered also in other states lacking functioning welfare. Especially considering that these gender roles are even stronger in other parts of the world. Thus it is the women that take care of children and thus also having to pay for bribes related to for example access to basic needs such as healthcare or education, which is what Bauer calls *need corruption*. Men on the other hand, don't have the same responsibility and are possibly not as exposed to situations where they would have to pay bribes for need motivations. Instead, they are often the ones working a job, where situations of greed corruption can appear.

The consequences of need and greed corruption, according to Bauer (2012, 2016), is that need corruption sparks a public movement against corruption because the negative effects of it are immediately present and that the fight against it is in everyone's interest, whereas the effects of greed corruption are delayed (e.g. stagnated economic growth) and the people committing it have an interest of keeping the system (as it leads to relative personal benefits), which hampers any mobilisation against corruption. Putting this in the context of gender roles, it is thus not surprising that previous studies show that women are more likely to be opposed to and fight corruption since they are possibly the ones directly affected by need corruption. This would be an interesting aspect for future research to look closer into; to see if Bauer's conceptualisation of need and greed could be gendered, like the motivations shown in my study, and thus explain why women are more averse to corruption than men.

Another possible way for future research, drawn from these results, would be to look into the organisational culture that exists in some part of the construction sector and examine if this is a product of the gendered structure of the area, which could be done by using for example process tracing. As said earlier, this is important to look into, since it might make it less risky for men to engage in corruption. Also, by knowing what is causing the culture, it also becomes easier to address.

Lastly, I will just say something brief about policy implications of my results. As the findings show that men engage in corruption because they don't care or feel affected by the laws, it

would be suitable to address this issue. This could perhaps be remedied with higher punishments or more and better education about policies and laws and the severities of breaking them.

References:

- Andersson et al. (2010) *Korruption, Maktmissbruk och Legitimitet*. Nordstedts: Smedjebacken.
- Alexander, A. (2018) "Micro-perspectives on the Gender–Corruption Link: Gender, Gender Egalitarian Values and Public Opinion on Honest Elections" in *Corruption and Norms*, pp. 53-68. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Alexander, A. and Bågenholm, A. (2018) "Does Gender Matter? Female Politicians' Engagement in Anti-corruption Efforts", in *Gender and Corruption*, ed. Stensöta, H. and Wängnerud, L. London: Palgrave.
- Alexander, A. forthcoming. "The Historical Roots of Quality of Government: Gender Equality in the Household". In *Gender and Corruption*, ed. Stensöta, H. and Wängnerud, L. London: Palgrave.
- Althiede, D. and Schneider, C. (2013) "Process of Qualitative Document Analysis" in *Qualitative Media Analysis*. SAGE Publications: London.
- Bauer, (2012) "Need or Greed Corruption?" in *Good Government: The Relevance of Political Science*, eds. Holmberg, S. and Rothstein, B. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited: Cheltenham.
- Bauer, M. (2016) "Need or Greed? Conditions for Collective Action against Corruption" in *Governance*, Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 529-735.
- Bergh, A., Erlingsson, G., Sjölin, M., & Öhrvall, R. (2016). *A Clean House? Studies of Corruption in Sweden*. Nordic Academic Press.
- Bergström, G. and Boréus, K. (2016) *Textens Mening och Makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. Studentlitteratur: Lund.
- Blackden, M., Canagarajah, S., Klasen, S., & Lawson, D. (2007). *Gender and growth in Africa*. In G. Mavrotas & A. Shorrocks (Eds.), "Advancing development: Core themes in global economics" (pp. 349–370). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Bloor, M., Frankland, J., Thomas, M., & Robson, K. (2001). *Focus Groups in Social Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bowen, G.A. (2009) "Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method" in *Qualitative Research Journal*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 27-40.
- Branisa, B., Ziegler, M., & Klasen, S. (2010). *The institutional basis of gender inequality*. Proceedings of the German Development Economics Conference, Hannover.
- Brottsförebyggande rådet (2013) "Den anmälda korruptionen i Sverige. Struktur, riskfaktorer och motåtgärder". Rapport 2013:15
- Brottsförebyggande rådet (2014) "Korruption i myndighetssverige". Rapport 2014:4
- Chrisler, J. and Lamer, S. (2016) "Gender, Definitions of", in *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Gender and Sexuality Studies*, by John Wiley & Sons.
- Citron, B. (2010) "Vem kontrollerar de lokla makthavarna?" in *Korruption, Maktmissbruk och Legitimitet*, eds. Andersson et al. Nordstedts: Smedjebacken.
- Dollar, D., Fishman R., and Gatti, R. (2001) "Are Women Really the Fairer Sex? Corruption and Women in Government", in *Journal of Economic Behaviour & Organization*, Vol. 46, pp. 423–429.
- Drisko, J. and Maschi, T. (2015) *Qualitative Content Analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Esaiasson, et al. (2017) *Metodpraktikan: Konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*. Wolters Kluwer: Visby.
- Erlingsson, G., Bergh, A., & Sjölin, M. (2008) "Public Corruption in Swedish Municipalities - Trouble Looming on the Horizon?" in *Local Government Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 5, pp. 595-608.
- Erlingsson and Brysiewicz (2017) "A hands-on guide to doing content analysis" in *African Journal of Emergency Medicine*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 93-99.
- Esarey, J., and Chirillo, G. (2013) "'Fairer Sex' or Purity Myth? Corruption, Gender, and Institutional Context", in *Politics and Gender*, Vol. 9, pp. 361–389.

Esarey, J. and Schwindt-Bayer, L. (2017) "Women's Representation, Accountability, and Corruption in Democracies" in *British Journal of Political Science*, 26 January, pp. 1–32. Published online.

Expertgruppen för studier i offentlig ekonomi (2013) "Allmän nytta eller egen vinning? En ESO-rapport om korruption på svenska". Rapport 2013:2.

FCPA Blog (2019) "An Africa success story: Anti-corruption efforts in Rwanda produce results". Accessed 2019-10-10, at: <https://www.fcpublog.com/blog/2019/3/13/an-africa-success-story-anti-corruption-efforts-in-rwanda-pr.html>

Gibbs, G. (2017) "Thematic Coding and Categorizing" in *Analysing Qualitative Data*, ed. Gibbs, G. SAGE Publications: London.

Goetz, A. (2007) "Political Cleaners: Women as the New Anti-Corruption Force?" in *Development and Change*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 87–105.

Hancké, B. (2009) *Intelligent Research Design; A Guide for Beginning Researchers in the Social Sciences*, OUP.

Hirdman, Y. (1990) "Genussystemet", in *Demokrati och Makt i Sverige*, Stockholm: Fritzes.

Holmberg, S., & Bo Rothstein (eds). (2012). *Good Government: The Relevance of Political Science*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Hudson, V., Ballif-Spanvill, B., Caprioli, M., & Emmett, C. (2012). *Sex and world peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Institutet Mot Mutor (2017) "Mutbrott i Sverige". Rättsfalssamling 2017. Accessed 2020-05-22, at: http://www.institutetmotmutor.se/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/IMM_mutbrott-i-sverige2017.pdf

Institutet Mot Mutor (2018) "Mutbrott i Sverige 2018". Rättsfalssamling 2018. Accessed 2020-05-22, at: <http://www.institutetmotmutor.se/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Mutbrott-i-Sverige-2018-3.pdf>

Institutet Mot Mutor (2019) ”Mutbrott i Sverige 2019”. Rättsfallsamling 2019. Accessed 2020-05-22, at: <http://www.institutetmotmutor.se/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Mutbrott-i-Sverige-2019.pdf>

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

Levy, J. (2008) ”Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference” in *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, Vol. 25, pp. 1–18.

Polisen (2019) ”Korruption – lagar och regler”. Accessed 2020-05-21, at: <https://polisen.se/lagar-och-regler/lagar-och-fakta-om-brott/korruption/>

Risman, B. (2004) ”Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism” in *Gender and Society*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 429-450.

Rothstein, B. and Teorell, J. (2008) ”What Is Quality of Government? A Theory of Impartial Government Institutions” in *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 165–190.

Schreier, M. (2014) ”Chapter 12: Qualitative Content Analysis” in *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Document Analysis*, ed. Flick, E. SAGE Publications: London.

Statskontoret (2012) ”Köpta relationer. Om korruption i det kommunala Sverige”. Rapport 2012:20.

Stensöta Olofsdotter, H., Wängnerud, L. and Agerberg, M. (2015) ”Why Women in Encompassing Welfare States Punish Corrupt Political Parties.” In *Elites, Institutions and the Quality of Government*, ed. Dahlström, C. and Wängnerud, L. London: Palgrave.

Sung, H. (2003) ”Fairer Sex or Fairer System? Gender and Corruption Revisited” in *Social Forces*, Vol. 82, No. 2, pp. 703–723.

Swamy, A., Knack, S., Lee, Y. and Azfar, O. (2001) ”Gender and Corruption” in *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 64, No. 1, pp. 25–55.

Transparency International (2020a) “What is corruption?”. Accessed 2020-05-21, at: <https://www.transparency.org/en/what-is-corruption#>

Transparency International (2020b) “Country Data”. Accessed 2020-05-22, at: <https://www.transparency.org/en/countries/sweden>

The Conversation (2019) “Rwanda’s economic growth could be derailed by its autocratic regime”. Accessed 2019-10-30, at: <https://theconversation.com/rwandas-economic-growth-could-be-derailed-by-its-autocratic-regime-114649>

Treisman, D. (2007). What have we learnt about the causes of corruption from ten years of crossnational empirical research? in *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 10, pp. 211–244

World Health Organisation (2020) “Gender”. Accessed 2020-05-22, at: <https://www.who.int/health-topics/gender>

World Economic forum (2018) “The Global Gender Gap Report”. Accessed 2019-10-10, at: http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2018.pdf

World Economic Forum (2019) “These countries have the most women in parliament”. Accessed 2019-10-10, at: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/02/chart-of-the-day-these-countries-have-the-most-women-in-parliament/>

Wängnerud, Lena (1998) *Politikens andra sida. Om kvinnorepresentation i Sveriges riksdag*. Göteborg: Göteborg Studies in Politics 53.

Appendix

Appendix 1. List of cases including all people quoted from the specific cases.

Construction sector, male cases:

- Construction_1: man1, taker1
- construction_men2: taker1
- construction_men3: giver1
- construction_men4: taker1, giver1
- construction_men5: man1
- construction_men6: taker1
- construction_men7: giver1
- construction_men8: taker1

Care sector, female cases:

- Care_women1: woman1
- Care_women2: victim1
- Care_women3: woman1
- Care_women4: woman1
- Care_women5: woman1, victim1, boss1
- Care_women6: woman1

Care sector, male cases:

- Care_men1: man1
- Care_men2: man1
- Care_men3: victim1, witness1, witness2