Joint Dissertation Review

Name of the student:	Aygul Salmanova
Title of the thesis:	Understanding Corruption Tolerance: Does Personality Matter?
Reviewer:	Toni Rodon

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD
(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The dissertation tackles the classical topic of tolerance towards corruption, but about which there are still many important question marks that need to be addressed. In particular, the student examines the relationship between the personality traits of an individuals and his/her corruption tolerance. Moreover, the dissertation includes a comparison of the results in Germany and the Netherlands.

The research question is relevant, especially from an empirical point of view. The student takes existing debates and attempts to test some of them empirically. Therefore, the research objective is clear. Having said that, the dissertation could have been more ambitious, from an empirical point of view, but especially from a theoretical point of view. It is true that the student faced a hard task, as the literature in corruption tolerance and the big five, both in political science and psychology, is massive. However, a richer and more critical discussion could have strengthened its contribution.

As for the literature review, the most important works are included, especially from psychology. However, a deeper discussion of the findings in the political science literature is missing. For instance, there are many findings in polisci about the effect of corruption on voting that would have helped the student to enrich her theoretical discussion.

2. ANALYSIS
(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

The research design is based on a quantitative exercise using the 6th wave of the WVS, but restricted to Germany and the Netherlands—because, as stated by the study, they are the only ones that comply with the WEIRD categorization. The empirical analysis is well-executed and the decisions taken by the student (operationalization, treatment of the missing values...) are well justified. The analysis includes a bivariate and a multivariate part.

The statistical analysis is well executed, but it could have gone a bit further. For instance, the student could have compared a bit more the substantive effects of the variables—commenting on them or even plotting the coefficients.

The weakest part of the empirical analysis—but also the theoretical ones—is the comparison between Germany and the Netherlands. Although the student specifies that the goal is to study the overall effect of the big five on attitudes towards corruption, there is a theoretical and an empirical tension about the different observed effects in both cases that is not properly addressed.

3. CONCLUSIONS
(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

> The conclusions are interesting and can enrich existing studies on the relationship between the big five and attitudes towards corruption. With the exception already mentioned about the country comparison, findings are discussed and properly situated within the literature.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE
(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

> The dissertation is well written and follows the academic standards from the beginning to the end.
>
> There are a few minor errors in a few citations.
>
> The layout is correct, although the tables could have been formatted and additional visualizations of the effects could have been plotted.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT
(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

> This is a good dissertation. The strongest point is its clarity and its research objective. The empirical endeavour is simple, but well explained and executed.
>
> The weakest points are the following: a) the dissertation misses a deeper theoretical discussion, especially on the comparison between cases; b) the empirical analysis could have gone a bit further.

Grade (A-F)	B (8.25)
Date	Signature
DD/MM/AAAA	22/06/2021

Classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
A (91-100)	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7.5-8.4	16.4%	8-8.9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6.5-7.4	36,2%	7-7.9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6.9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6.4	42,1 %	5-5.9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';
Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';
Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';
Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';
Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';
Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.