Supplementary material

<u>Project title:</u> "Social context of corruption: analysis of macro, mezzo and micro factors" funded by Research Council of Lithuania (2016 – 2017).

The project included psychological, sociological, legal and economical analysis of corruption.

<u>Measured variables</u>

1. Encounter with corruption α=.65 (Dirzyte & Patapas, 2015)
2. Measure for bribery experience (questions created by authors for the purposes of the project)

Table 1.

Questions about bribery experience.

Items in Lithuanian	Items in English
Ar per pastaruosius penkerius metus kas nors tikėjosi iš Jūsų gauti kyšį?	During the past 5 years, has someone expected a bribe from you?
Ar per pastaruosius penkerius metus kas nors reikalavo iš Jūsų kyšio?	During the past 5 years, has someone demanded a bribe from you?
Ar per pastaruosius penkerius metus kam nors davėte kyšį?	During the past 5 years, have you ever given a bribe?

3. Positive/negative affect scale α=.79 (Watson, 1994, translated to Lithuanian and adapted by Dirzyte and Patapas, 2015)
4. Satisfaction with different life spheres α=.87 (Dirzyte and Patapas, 2015)
5. Money attitudes scale α=.82 (Yamouchi ir Templer, 1982 – translated to Lithuanian from English and vice versa by K. Stupnianek and V. Navickas).
6. Personal belief in a just world scale α=.88 (Dalbert, 1999) – translated to Lithuanian from English and vice versa by K. Stupnianek and V. Navickas.
7. General belief in a just world scale α=.82 (Dalbert, Montada, & Schmitt, 1987) – translated to Lithuanian from English and vice versa by K. Stupnianek and V. Navickas.
8. Demographic questions (age, gender, city a person lives in, workplace, occupation, education). We did not refer to the income directly, because people in Lithuania tend not to like reporting their income. Instead we asked whether participants can put aside some money from their income for

entertainment, relaxation, investment, insurance against accidents, unemployment, illness, etc.

9. Sources of information about corruption (created by authors for the purposes of the project). We asked participants to rate the main sources of information about corruption. The list included: personal experience, experience of family members, friends' experience, professional experience, media, and other. We also asked to name the media source from which information about corruption was obtained. These included: television, radion, press, internet, other.

10. We also asked participants what in their opinion is corruption. We used open-ended question for this purpose.

Factor analysis of the Belief in a Just World scale

The 13 items of the General and Personal Belief in a Just World scale (BJW) were subjected to a principal components analysis (PCA) using SPSS Version 24. Prior to performing PCA the suitability of the data for a factor analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed that several correlations were smaller than .3 (Table 2). However, the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin value amounted to .889 and the Barlett's Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance, which supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

Principal components analysis extracted 2 components with an eigenvalues exceeding 1. These components explained 44,66 % and 12,48 % of the total item variance respectively. Moreover, an inspection of the screeplot revealed a sharp break after the first component and a lesser break after the second. All items loaded strongly on this component (Table 3). The results of this analysis support the use of two factors as suggested by the original authors (Dablert et al., 1987).

Table 2.

Correlation Matrix of the Belief in a Just World Scale Items.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1												
2	.424	1											
3	.502	.583	1										
4	.250	.533	.559	1									
5	.359	.408	.487	.392	1								
6	.383	.360	.442	.282	.465	1							
7	.273	.434	.281	.235	.175	.176	1						
8	.414	.395	.323	.214	.288	.369	.468	1					
9	.316	.523	.327	.266	.232	.301	.631	.671	1				
10	.364	.417	.464	.225	.248	.346	.516	.583	.667	1			
11	.193	.213	.294	.163	.326	.300	.338	.420	.426	.446	1		
12	.335	.370	.421	.239	.268	.292	.523	.595	.586	.637	.546	1	
13	.419	.366	.416	.247	.323	.340	.390	.557	.476	.555	.378	.697	1

Table 3.

Factor Loadings of the Belief in a Just World Scale Items.

Item	Factor 1 loading	Factor 2 loading
1	.176	.543
2	.185	.652
3	.048	.812
4	-.142	.796
5	-.075	.770
6	.082	.613
7	.753	-.065
8	.786	.028
9	.846	-.019
10	.799	.043
11	.625	.007
12	.853	-.015
13	.666	.143

Logistic regression model for the prediction of bribery

Table 4.

Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Bribery (n = 310) With Age, Personal Belief in a Just World (PBJW), General Belief in a Just World (PBJW), Gender and Income as Predictors.

Predictor	B	S.E.	Wald χ^2	df	p	e^{β}
Constant	0.599	0.699	0.735	1	.391	1.821
Age	0.032	0.009	14.093	1	.000	1.033
PBJW	-0.608	0.170	12.748	1	.000	0.544
GBJW	0.059	0.163	0.134	1	.715	1.061
Gender	0.144	0.249	0.337	1	.562	1.155
Income	0.056	0.297	0.035	1	.851	1.057

	χ^2	df	p
Overall model evaluation	37.033	5	.000
Goodness of fit test			
Hosmer and Lemeshow Test	10.892	8	.208

Table 5.

Observed and Predicted Frequencies of Bribery

Observed	Predicted		% correct
	No bribe	Gave a bribe	
No bribe	120	43	73.6
Gave a bribe	63	73	53.7
Overall % correct			64.5