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The Quality of Government Institute (QoG) at the University of Gothenburg

- Independent academic research institute in political science
- About 20 researchers, 5 Ph.D. students and 5 assistants
- Major funding from Swedish Research Foundations for research from 2007 and 2009 (about €8 million).
- Also part of large scale EU funded project started in 2012 – ANTICORRP – €8 million, five years, 21 research groups in 16 EU countries
Aim of the QoG Institute

To carry out and promote research about the importance of trustworthy, reliable, competent, non-corrupt, non-discriminatory = impartial government institutions = QoG

Impartiality = public employees do only pay attention to circumstances previously prescribed in law
QoG’s main three questions

1. What is Quality of Government? – defining the institutional characters
2. How do we get it? – building the institutions
3. What do we get? – outcomes
QoG Resources

- Very user friendly website ([www.qog.pol.gu.se](http://www.qog.pol.gu.se))
- Two open access major cross-country and over time databases
- QoG Expert Survey, 1053 experts from 135 countries
- Two large scale surveys about QoG in Europe, 34,000 and 84000 respondents
- About 200 working papers, published articles, books.
Gender and corruption
Worldwide women are less corrupt:
27% of men and 22% of women say they have paid a bribe to public officials during last year.
Global corruption barometer 2013
Initial research

- Initial studies showed general correlation between more women in legislative arena and lower levels of corruption (Dollar, et al. 2001; Swamy, et al. 2001).

- Similar findings from studies of individual behavior in experimental settings (Frank, Lambsdorff and Boehm 2011; Dhaudhuri 2012; Alhassan-Aloho 2007)
Why? – Proposed mechanisms

– **Newcomers to power** – women are not integrated in old boys network - “clean outsiders”

– **Stereotyped expectations** - women are not asked/offered bribes as often as the environment stereotypes them as less corrupt - “the fairer sex”

– **Different set of values and priorities** – women’s greater responsibility for example, experiences related to care, give rise ro different values or priorities
Recent models: Institutions and/or context mediate the effect between women and corruption

- Recruitment patterns (gender)
- Institutions
- Levels of corruption
Recent findings using mediating models

- The relationship between gender and corruption is spurious and due to basic democratic structures (Sung 2003)
- Regime: In democratic regimes there is a norm against corruption which women are more receptive to, due to belonging to a discriminated group (Esarey and Chirillo 2013)
Our argument: institutions

• Different institutional arenas *within* countries mediate the relationship.
  – The *electoral arena* enforces the relationship whereas
• the *bureaucratic* arena, constrains it
• *Interaction effects* between bureaucratic strength and a lowering effect of women on corruption (Stensöta and Wängnerud, under review)
Table 2. Dependent variable: Corruption. Effect of share of women at different organizational strengths measured as formal examination systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bivariate analysis</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3: full model</th>
<th>Model 4: Interaction model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of women</td>
<td>0.317***</td>
<td>0.322**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.05)</td>
<td>(03.07)</td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
<td>(2.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal examination systems</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.10)</td>
<td>(-0.42)</td>
<td>(-0.72)</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial origin</td>
<td>-0.87***</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-4.38)</td>
<td>(-0.30)</td>
<td>(-0.34)</td>
<td>(-0.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrollment</td>
<td>0.03***</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.97)</td>
<td>(-0.22)</td>
<td>(-0.48)</td>
<td>(-0.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Fractionalization</td>
<td>-1.84***</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-4.15)</td>
<td>(-0.78)</td>
<td>(-1.09)</td>
<td>(-0.87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (logged)</td>
<td>0.78***</td>
<td>0.60***</td>
<td>0.58***</td>
<td>0.60***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.70)</td>
<td>(5.14)</td>
<td>(4.92)</td>
<td>(5.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rights</td>
<td>-0.36***</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-8.43)</td>
<td>(-3.15)</td>
<td>(-3.16)</td>
<td>(-3.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction, share of women, and formal examination system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>-0.970*</td>
<td>-4.41***</td>
<td>-6.32***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-4.73)</td>
<td>(-1.80)</td>
<td>(-3.16)</td>
<td>(-4.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy recommendations

• *Yes*, women lower corruption but not generally
  – Women are more important in the legislative sphere but
  – …less important in bureaucratic sphere especially as its organizational strengths increases

• ”Newcomer” hypothesis might be more important in lower levels of government, such as law enforcement
Thank you!

Helena.stensota@pol.gu.se