

Social values, transparency and the Greek educational system at the era of the crisis. Attitudes of Greek university students.

Argyris Kyridis

professor, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, akiridis@nured.auth.gr

Nikos Papadakis

professor, University of Crete, papadakn@uoc.gr

Christos Tourtouras

assistant professor, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, htourt@eled.auth.gr

Ioanna Lytrivi

PhD Candidate, University of Crete, i.lytrivi@gmail.com

Abstract

For a very long time, the concept and practices of corruption have been dominating the public sphere and debate in Greece. It is even striking that the rhetoric about corruption has been incorporated in the rhetoric about crisis. Thus, in the era of the Greek crisis, corruption seems to occupy a certain role in the social, economic and political life.

The greater emphasis, concerning the international research on corruption, has been placed on its relation to the effectiveness of the public sector, the private sector, the political system, the local governance functions. Only a few relevant surveys are

value-based, i.e. corruption in relation to the moral values present in a given socioeconomic setting up and to the work done by the typical educational system.

Based on the abovementioned assumption, we proceeded in a quantitative research. Specifically, we developed a scale of attitudes, aiming at measuring the attitudes of female and male students at Greek Universities towards corruption and the moral values present at Greek society during the crisis.

The scale consists of three sub-scales. The total internal reliability of the tool was assessed based on Cronbach's alpha at 0.879, while for each sub-scale is bigger than 0.70. The sample consisted of about 400 students from 3 Universities in Greece and the results showed that the majority of the respondents believe that the moral values of Greek society are rather weak, the educational system is crucially responsible for this, while the political system is considered to be highly corrupted.

Key words: corruption, transparency, moral values, students, economic crisis.

1. Introduction

The rhetoric about corruption in Greece is not the result of the economic crisis, as it is broadly proclaimed, but relevant news and discussions, mainly in the media, had always had a fragmented presence. A presence, which for short period created a relevant median, social and political fuss, which in a reasonable period of time started to fade away, until it is totally vanished. And the social and political life started again, as if nothing had happened.

The Greek sovereign debt crisis and the following Memoranda of Economic and Financial Adjustment (accompanied with a variety of multilevel austerity measures), multiplied the social impact at the end of the day. Even now and despite the rescue efforts and the domestic reforms, the situation both in terms of economy and society has not been improved. In fact, the crisis is ongoing and its social impact is undoubtedly tremendous, while the recession in Greece deepens. Greece is the country most heavily affected by the economic crisis, more than any other European one (see Matsagganis 2013: 3).

All the above mentioned along with European reviews and criticism and the ongoing social turbulence brought to surface the issue of corruption and its impact on economic and consequent social collapse. Silence was not an option anymore, even for the ones previously pretending they had not a clue about it. In several cases, issues of corruption, as well as ethics and transparency, over-determined the public sphere. In this precise case, however, the rhetoric about corruption in Greek society has a qualitative and a quantitative feature that differentiates it from its earlier forms. The quantitative characteristic concerns the ones involved in corruption and on the other hand it is becoming apparent that corruption in Greek society has already been spread

more than we thought. According to the International Transparency, in 2015, Greece was the 58th less corrupted (out of 168) country in the world, thus it performs worse than Ghana, Cuba and Malaysia (see <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2015#results-table>). The qualitative characteristic concerns the context where corruption seems to "flourish". The Greek society begins to perceive that corruption has eroded from the daily routine to the high levels of distribution and management of power. If we could provide just one positive element of the economic crisis, that would concern the emergence of the magnitude and pervasiveness of corruption. This could be of vital importance for the society to understand that certain actions should be undertaken against corruption and to back-up anti-corruption initiatives.

Corruption has two main dimensions: there is an active dimension and concerns those actively involved in corruption and thus being (directly or indirectly) illegal or even trampling on important social and moral principles and values. On the other hand, there is the passive dimension, which (in our opinion) is equally important and concerns the issue of tolerance towards corruption. In the second dimension, we should be clear that while it is an absolutely negative element, which even offers a moral alibi for active participants, at the same time, it could also be the main "defense tool" of a society towards the determinants of corruption. The key anti-corruption means is the intolerance of the Society at Large to corruption, namely the ethical principles and civic values themselves that should characterize society and underpin its functions. The absence or obsolescence of moral values, yet in a context of freedom and solidarity, might lead to a great number of social pathology phenomena and, of course, among them the phenomenon of corruption.

Have the social institutions, education, politics, economy, family developed the mechanisms towards enhancing ethics and civic values? Or they are engaged in a

lonely process consolidating bureaucratic/ administrative goals which support their systemic objectives, ignoring their social mission? However, in a society that economy is dominant over any other social institution, anticipated outcomes are limited. At the same time, the (low performing- see European Commission, 2015: 2) Greek educational system has also been engaged in a hunt of cognitive-bureaucratic objectives having (in several cases) disclaimed the substance of its social nature and undermined the broader notion of “paideia/ Bildung”.

2. On corruption

Public sector corruption isn't simply about tax-payer money going missing.

Broken institutions and corrupt officials fuel inequality and exploitation -keeping wealth in the hands of an elite few and trapping many more in poverty

(Transparency International, 2015).

Corruption as a concept and as a practice offers a wide range of approaches, which vary depending on the epistemological dimension we choose to study it, and according to the sphere of social life that seems to affect (Johnston, 1996; Florini, 2002; Stasavage, 2004; Florini, 2007; Relly & Sabharwal, 2009). Thus, talking about corruption and even more reviewing corruption, as a phenomenon of social pathology (fundamental in our case), basically, we study corruption as a social phenomenon which appears and spreads through practices and its consequent results to almost any social institutions.

The UN (UNODC, 2011: 5) mentions that: «*Corruption can take the form of grand corruption or of petty corruption. The former involves high-level officials and has*

ultimately a destructive impact on governance and the rule of law in a country; the latter is defined as the day to day abuse of power that involves lower-level public officials in the performance of their daily duties. Corrupt behavior ranges from active involvement, such as violating duties, accepting or transferring bribes, facilitating transactions, to passive involvement, which can include simply ignoring or failing to follow-up on indicators that corruption may be taking place». Klitgaard (1997) defines corruption as «*a term of many meanings, and indeed the beginning of wisdom on the issue is to subdivide and unpack the vast concept. At the broadest level, corruption is the misuse of office for unofficial ends».* Transparency International (2011) defines corruption for both the private and public sector as “*the abuse of entrusted power for private gain*”.

According to Kyridis et al. (2015), corruption occurs mainly in two different ways in the social, political or economic life of a place (Theobald, 1999, Kunicova, & Rose-Ackerman, 2005). The first way concerns the personal benefit one can gain through the public sector (Caiden & Caiden, 1977), while the second is the consolidation of corruption in society that it becomes the norm rather than the exception (Williams, 1999). Especially, the first way is the one that exploits the structure and functions of the bureaucracy and the tight embrace of politics with the state structures. In this way, the personal benefit from the public sector is gained either with the complicity of bureaucrats, or with the mediation of politicians (Moody-Stuart, 1997; Rose-Ackerman, 1999). On these grounds, according to Papadakis “a code of ethics and the relevant ethics regulations in PA, even important, are not enough to prevent corruption and unethical behavior. Furthermore, more rules do not necessarily increase public trust and prevent violation of ethical rules” (Papadakis, 2015: 511).

It should be noted that the main corruption, as such, is not defined by a certain and indisputable definition, based on a solid epistemological documentation. On the contrary, it is the conceptual rendering of the findings of a wide range of focused or less focused researches on corruption issues (Shleifer & Vishny, 1993; Mocan, 2008; Olken, 2009). Let alone that the complexity of the institutions (in Thompson's terms/ 2007: 22) and even the reality in PA, per se, tend to pose ethical challenges (see Papadakis, 2015: 511).

The work of Mauro (1995) showed how corruption affects economic growth and since then a number of papers trying to show how and whether corruption affects other economic sectors or different areas of social life (Fisman, 2001; Bertrand et al., 2007; Hunt, 2007; Ferraz & Finan, 2008). Additionally, the efforts to corruption measurement focus on two fundamental aspects: on the one hand, it is studied the existence of appropriate institutions, rules and procedures that hinder the corruption phenomena (inputs), while on the other hand, the focus is on the results (in terms of combating corruption) created by the existence of such mechanisms (outputs) (Hyden, 2007). However, there is no (so far) acceptable and perfectly valid way to measure the levels of corruption.

The causes of corruption cannot be determined in a precise way. Anyway, if it was possible to be exactly defined, it would be much easier not only to measure the levels of corruption, but also to combat it more effectively. Usually, the causes are found in the policies pursued by the countries, the bureaucratic structure of public administration, the development of the political system, permissive traditions and social history. Assuming that the basic sociological position is that every society creates, maintains and reproduces the institutions that it really needs, not only to achieve progress and compete at the international level, but additionally to ensure the

reproduction of dominant interests (in terms of interest politics), then we can easily understand why corruption persists and (in some cases) expands. In other words, a society that would like to reduce the phenomenon of corruption could direct its actions as following: on the one hand to reduce "corruption opportunities" through the strengthening of institutional functions, the establishment of rules and relentless repression, on the other hand to change the permissive structures reflecting specific interests and discursive practices, via the education system, the civil society and the political system itself (Persson et al., 1997; Svensson, 2005; Freille et al., 2007; Treisman, 2007; Olken, 2009).

The social meanings of corruption are many and various. However, corruption is synonymous, in one sense, with social inequality, since eventually its results are in favor of those who should not be favored, while some others lose their real possibilities to gain, in a broader sense, something they deserve (Uslaner, 2008). Societies are over-determined by multi-parametric inequalities (see Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009). Within this context where corruption is strengthened, inequalities are multiplied, deepened and strengthened, as well.

3. Social and moral values

“The real political task in a society such as ours is to criticize the workings of
institutions
that appear to be both neutral and independent”

(Michael Foucault, in *The Chomsky/Foucault Debate: On Human Nature*, 2006)

The literature, in general, suggests four actions to address corruption (Klitgaard, 1988; Kotter, 1996; Stapenhurst & Langseth, 1997; Jones, 2004; Quah, 2005): (a) reforms

(b) economic development, (c) a strong civil society with access to information and supervision of the State and (d) strengthening of legislation.

Past practice in many countries has shown that efforts to combat corruption have focused precisely on those points where the most intense symptoms were reported, i.e. in financial transactions mainly with the public sector, the central public administration, local government, police, etc. (indicatively, Doig & Riley, 1998; Jackman & Montinola, 2002; Kidd & Richter, 2003; Andvig, 2006). In fact, it is about responsive actions aiming at dealing with the phenomenon, since it has been already reported and measured or, in any event, determined. These are, therefore, rather suppressive actions focusing on areas of social life and mostly concerning the relations between the state and citizens. Additionally, a series of anti-corruption activities and initiatives are centered/focus on transparency, particularly at the level of politics and public administration (Rose-Ackerman, 2006).

Nevertheless, in many cases the emphasis is not given on projects that primarily focus on combating corruption in the social basis, i.e. by embedding attitudes and values to younger people in society, people that in a few years will be required to govern, to do business with the public administration, to participate in the political arena and in any case to manage the social daily routine educating and socializing their successors. Thus, Politics should act to avert and suppress corruption phenomena. And the most important step to be done is to nurture to the new and succeeding generations' attitudes, perceptions and beliefs (Greenwald et al., 1964; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Higgins & Sorrentino, 1990; Petty & Krosnick, 1995; Petty et al., 2009) that would prevent the occurrence of the phenomenon in any facet of social life. Furthermore, surveys have documented that, when attitudes change, they tend to get strengthened, according to the Dual Process theories of persuasion (Kruglanski & Thompson, 1999;

Wilson et al., 2000; Rydell & McConnell, 2006) or according to the Meta-Cognitive Model (MCM) (Gilbert et al., 1993) (see Kyridis et al. 2015).

In other words, the nurturing of basic social and moral values is of vital importance, thus it should be developed in the entire range of social life and especially through organized or less organized structures in every social institution. The task of increasing public trust and preventing violation of ethical rules requires “mainstreaming of the value- judged rules and mainly the development of a “collective ethos” in favor of the ethical behavior, that can be easily individualized” (Papadakis, 2015: 512). Obviously, in any social formation a broad spectrum of social values is present, which is defined as social morality that is, at some extent, driven and controlled by the dominant ideology. And in this sense, the system of social values does not entirely reflects the broad social body, but it is also extremely difficult to change. Of course, we should note that social values in any society derive and feed back their moral status by the moral values that usually originate from religious institutions, while the grid of social and moral values is shielded and protected through their the ideological mechanisms of the state (see Althousser, 1999).

Dönmez & Cömert (2007) believe that social value is a force that shapes human behavior according to options that may exist under which each behavior is judged. For Güngör (1993: 18) if something is [socially] desired or not consists the notion of [social] value.

According to Chiang Wai Fong (2013: 1), social values and norms serve several functions in the society:

1. They provide a guideline for expected modes of social behavior
2. They hold the society together by providing some form of stability and uniformity

3. They create a sense of belonging and bonding with members of the social group and promote cohesiveness
4. They facilitate legal rules making and maintain social order.

Accordingly, it is easy to understand that social values are the key regulators of human behavior in a society and at the same time they regulate the structures, functions, social hierarchy, the productive relations and of course the reproduction processes of the social system itself. However, it is exactly the same social system, that created and consolidated the social and moral values, coming to quest them when it feels that the interests of the dominant interest groups are not effectively served or when it is deregulated through endogenous or exogenous factors. In other words, facets of corruption could be the means of violating social and moral values that the social system itself deploys when it is deregulated or perceives that the dominant interests are not well served. At the same time, it is the main mechanism for gaining clientele.

We should note, however, that the social and moral values inherent in a society, even when they are dominant ideologies, they do not lose their importance as mechanisms to protect society and as tools to safeguard social cohesion. In this context, we should mention that social, economic and political practices historically tend to either justify regimes of truth or even get de-moralized in the name of sovereign imperatives that are essentially designed to achieve specific goals and less on the moral strengthening of the social web (see Foucault, 2001; Foucault, 2002: 39). On these grounds, social values with universal targeting should be cultivated, aiming at shielding the communicants and the formations that they shape against corruption and moral collapse, through the entire grid of socialization processes placing greater emphasis on mass institutions, such as education.

The massiveness of the educational system and the educational tools available may be the basic set of actions to foster attitudes and beliefs that could discredit the corruption in the eyes of the new generations in order to eliminate it, both as a practice per se and as a negative social practice and value. However, the educational system is made to create collegialities through "suppressive" actions and practices primarily attributed in the range of assessment and school competition (see Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990 and Bernstein, 2000). Thus, in this way, many times students experience the school activities and their results as the results of suppressive procedures with dubious transformational capabilities. In other words, what is required, are more holistic educational activities with softer features than the ones of the formal educational system and more adaptive in the cognitive, meta-cognitive and social characteristics of children and adolescents (Kyridis et al., 2015).

4. Research methodology

The aim of our research is to record the attitudes inherent in the Greek society and especially in a specific segment of the population, such as the student population, with particular social and metacognitive features towards corruption, social values and the role the educational system plays or can play on this issue. The capacity of formal abstract thinking has already made its appearance at the age of 12-13 years (Piaget, 1970), while the hallmark and the key challenge for the young adults attending the University is the systematic process of critical evaluation for the knowledge provided. Specifically, many studies (Pascarella, 1989; Tan, 1995; Hagedorn et al., 1999) highlighted that young adults having graduated from the university had had more opportunities for the development of critical thinking and the related skills which

strengthen the life-long learning contrary to young adult non-university graduates. In addition, another research (Flowers et al., 2001) argued that even in the first year of university studies, students have significant cognitive and learning benefits. According to the theories of leading developmental psychologists (Perry, 1970; King & Kitchener, 1994; West, 2004; Baxter-Magolda, 2006; Thompson, 1999), who studied the cognitive development in early adulthood, university attendance allows the transition from naive and absolute certainty of acquiring knowledge in complex sophisticated probabilistic evaluation of systems and institutions. All these cognitive-developmental approaches, in spite of their individual differences, stress that contemplative knowledge approach enables the determination of the nature and its limitations, and lays the foundation for the mental preoccupation with modern composite intractable problems (Baxter-Magolda, 2004; King & Kitchener, 2004). Specifically, the students begin to leave the binary model of problem solving ("right" - "wrong") in favor of a "multiple" probabilistic approach. Thus, the conditions for facilitating critical thinking are being established with a view to interpret modern socio-cultural situations, but also a substantial need for dealing with hypothetical and ideological problems (see Thompson cited in Kyridis et al., 2011).

Given all the above-mentioned, we developed a scale of attitudes which aims to measure female and male students' attitudes in Greek universities towards corruption and the moral values inherent in Greek society during the ongoing crisis. The scale consists of three sub-scales: a. Greek educational system and moral values, b. moral values within the Greek society and c. corruption in Greek society. The total internal reliability of the tool was assessed based on Cronbach's alpha at 0.879, while for each sub-scale is bigger than 0.70. The sample consisted of about 400 students from three universities in Greece

What mainly matters is the way the society perceives the phenomenon of corruption, its attitude towards it, but also the ideological and associative collocations the society makes associating corruption with social and moral values and the role of education.

5. Conclusions

5.1. *Descriptive data*

The majority of the individuals of the sample is female (68%), aged between 18 and 22 (62%) and some 44% of them work while studying. In their majority, their families reside in Athens or Thessaloniki (56%) or in another urban centre (18%), while some 14% reside in a town and some 12% live in a rural area. As far as the professional background of the families is concerned, some 8% on average come from parents who are scientists, the 31% come from parents who are public officers, the 18% are private officers, 9.5% of them are craftsmen, 3.5% retailers, 7% and 8.5% come from workers' and farmers' families. Further, the 14% of them come from unemployed parents or parents dealing with the household (1% of them have unemployed fathers and 27% have mothers doing solely the household). Additionally, 11% on average come from families with parents either illiterate or primary school graduates, 47% with parents who are secondary education graduates, 38% higher education graduates and 4% coming from parents holding master degrees. The individuals of the sample excelled in the secondary education (26%) or got very good marks (34%), good marks (26%), or good enough marks (14%). Finally, 18% declares that they belong to the Right political-ideological area (only 4 people on the extreme right), 43% in the Center area and 39% on the Left (the vast majority left, while there are respondents

self-defined as extreme left and anarchist). 74% stated that they are not at all or little politicized or completely indifferent politically, while only 26% responded that they are quite or very politicized. Concerning their answers in the various statements and proposals of the questionnaire, we should mention that:

- In terms of the first category/ thematic area concerning school and its role in shaping values, 56% of the sampled individuals neither agree nor disagree, while 43% agree or fully agree on the relevant statements.
- In the second subject, 36% choose on average neutral positioning in terms of society and the values it advocates, and those who agree or agree totally amounting to 61%.
- Finally, regarding the corruption of the state/ society, those who agree or completely agree with the average of the relevant statements of the specific thematic reach only 37%, while the majority chooses neutral positioning "neither agree nor disagree".

5.2 Results of inquiry- based statistical analysis

A) Analysis highlights that the more politicized sampled respondents agree to a greater extent with the least conservative positions of the thematic category A, which concerns the role of the school and the family in the formation of values. In addition, the differences in the averages of the level of agreement on many of the relevant statements, range at statistically significant levels comparing to the ones of their less politicized colleagues. The results concerning the political affiliation of the sampled individuals are equivalent. Thus, the more conservative, as well as the more idealistic,

positions are adopted by respondents belonging to the political sphere of the right and center and less to the left.

Similarly, in the B category, which refers to values in relation to society, the more politicized individuals tend to agree (statistically significantly) more with those positions involving critical attitude and engage, at a greater extent, the role of society, while the ones self-identified as left tend to adopt a more internationalist dimension to the debate on values.

Finally, in thematic C, the responses of the sampled individuals differ significantly in relation to the degree of politicization and their political area. Thus, the more politicized as well as the left and anarchist individuals prefer the statements including collective and anti-structural features, with political economic analysis elements, as regards the detection, description and the ways to combat state corruption, while their less politicized colleagues of the rest political areas outweigh in more conventional statements adopting more individualized solutions against corruption. Tables 1 and 2 of the Annex include individual positions where politicized from non-politicized sampled persons differ significantly.

B) The responses of individuals sampled in most sub questions in all three thematic categories, do not differ, statistically significantly, in relation to their employment status. Thus, people who work do not differ from those who do not work in the positions adopted on the role of the school and the values it transmits. The results concerning the third thematic category, referring to the State and the corruption, are similar. In this theme, people who work take a somewhat opportunist angle, answering more often that for them it does not really matter how they will achieve their purpose (*"the end justifies the means"*). Probably, situations that lead them to be early engaged in the labor market along with their studies may contribute to the

formation of such an attitude. Also, some few statistically significant differences are detected in the second theme in positions related to social and moral values. It seems then, that people who do not work, embrace in a greater degree some positions which are characterized by a latent pessimism and trend towards depreciating the institutional functioning of society in the level of moral values (see table 3).

C) It is quite interesting that there are significant differences in the statements adopted by undergraduate in relation to the graduate students of our sample. Therefore, undergraduate students prove themselves more ideologically-driven, attached to ancestral principles and ideals in the debate on corruption (third thematic category), in contrast to their graduate colleagues placed more pragmatic and on the basis of an utilitarianism and a prominent individualism. The latter also seem more moderate than their younger colleagues in terms of adopting positions that refer to moral values within the context of society (i.e., the second theme). Finally, regarding the first thematic category, the few differences between the two sub-categories, in relation to the school's role in shaping values, cannot be assessed (see table 4).

D) The individuals coming from families of higher educational backgrounds choose in a greater extent and in a statistically significant level the most radical positions questioning the school in general and the role it has taken on towards the formation and cultivation of moral or national values, although they continue to consider it as the prime institution combating state corruption. Moreover, they are espousing, as far as statistics is concerned (namely at a significantly greater degree), statements involving internationalist, global and highly social character, attributing individual and collective responsibilities for fighting corruption. However, it is surprising that concepts such as: *"the end justifies the means"* or *"since everyone is corrupted, why should I be honest"* find them consistent and even in a significantly greater extent than

their colleagues from lower educational environments. In contrast, the latter (those who come from lower educational family backgrounds) express more moralistic opinions, with intensified formalistic features and a pervasive sense of determinism in pathogenic phenomena of the function of the state and society (table 5).

E) Women and men adopt positions/ statements on all three themes that do not differ significantly as far as statistics is concerned in their entirety. In cases, however, where significant variations are identified, women seem to adopt more processed and advanced progressive positions than their male colleagues. The latter often seem to be characterized by a leveling and pessimism trend, possibly correlated with the adoption (by their side) of an individualistic survival logic/ strategy, including facets of opportunism (table 6).

F) There are not particularly clear differentiations in the choices of the sampled individuals in relation to the professional status of their families. We would say, in general, that those coming from rural families, choose more traditional positions with preservative content that retain the family or the school as the "absolute institutions shaping moral and national values," while blaming society for poor cultivation of similar values to its younger members. Individuals coming from families of retailers or scientists adopt more processed positions, blaming school itself for poor socialization of students. Further, they blame the educational system for its *"inability to deploy events in recent history to consolidate basic social values"*. They are the ones mainly considering the fight against corruption as a collective stake in a society where *"democracy should be an essential social value."* Finally, positions of extreme opportunism and individual success are being adopted by individuals coming from families of workers, private officers and engaging in household.

G) Students coming from rural areas adopt more traditional positions/ statements deriving from a general concept found in the triptych "Home nation-Religion-Family", which is also adopted from some of the respondents coming from urban centers, but in a significantly smaller degree of agreement. The latter often choose more radical positions that challenge the traditional norms, such as the one that wants the Greek society "(...) *to be obsessed with historical and religious facts*" or that "*the persistence in traditional moral values does not allow the consolidation of newer values.*" Finally, despite their broader concern, those coming from urban centers, do not avoid to coincide with some individualistic and utilitarian considerations, letting the impact of the urban lifestyle on individual mentality emerge. The erosion of the system itself seems to addict the members of society in a way to address the social issues, based on a rather alienating filter of distorted vision of the world, nature and themselves (table 7).

Discussion

First, it should be noted that the analysis yielded a wide range of results that can lead to multiple interpretations, not only for their ideological approach direction but also in their level of complexity. So, we have to reiterate that we attempted survey that is not based on a specific and grounded theory, since we intended to record the attitudes of that specific population towards corruption and social and moral values that lie behind it.

The analysis showed that despite the fact that corruption is a phenomenon of social pathology towards which students are placed, in general, in a negative way, it is also linked to the broader net of social and moral values inherent in the Greek society. However, this connection is not organic and unbroken. For example, the traditional values of Greek society associated with the homeland, the nation, the religion and the family seem to find a position in accordance with the attitudes of a certain part of the population in Greek schools, and basic social universal values about equality and social rights do not enjoy such strong acceptance from the same population group. On the other hand, more politicized students seem to experience in a more positive way those social values, while expressing more negative positions towards the traditional Greek values considering them as elements of the superstructure and its dominant ideology, which the education system has undertaken to maintain and to consolidate.

On the issue of corruption, it seems, as mentioned above, a general negative attitude, without missing positive attitudes in clichéd phrases like «The end justifies the means», or «because everyone is corrupt, why should I be honest». On the other hand, the age of the population, and primarily the level of education seems to influence their attitudes, as undergraduate students appear to be more ideologues and to show a more

pronounced negative attitude towards corruption. The crisis is inherent in the capitalist socioeconomic formation and corruption issues could be considered (in given cases) as the result of a broader pathogenesis of the above system. Legitimization of practices resulting to broader de-moralization result in corruption pandering to consciousness and affected by the alienation of man himself.

We believe that, among others, our research highlighted the "fight" between two dynamic poles of Greek society. On the one hand, we have a segment of the population adhering to traditional Greek social and moral values, which "resists" towards social change and global social values, while on the other hand, there is a segment of the population that wants the detachment from these values and seeks to consolidate wider and discolored social values. The role of the education system in the fight against corruption, in some cases, seems to be inconspicuous, since there is an agreement in principle on what the school should make towards the nurturing of social values, especially those based on panhuman rights.

Corruption remains, in one way or another, an ingredient of Greek social life as a side- effect of chronic, fixed and insisting policies and social practices, backed by clientelism.

References

(G in Greek)

- Althousser, L. (1999), *Theseis* (“Θέσεις”). Athens: Themelio.
- Andvig, J.C. (2006). Corruption in China and Russia compared. Different legacies of central planning. In S. Rose–Ackerman (ed). *International Handbook on the Economics of Corruption*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Baxter-Magolda, M.B. (2004). Evolution of a constructivist conceptualization of epistemological reflection. *Educational Psychologist*, 39(1), 31-42.
- Baxter-Magolda, M.B. (2006). Intellectual development in the college years. *Change*, 38, 50 - 54.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bertrand, M., Djankov, S., Hanna, R., & S. Mullainathan (2007). India: An Experimental Approach to Studying Corruption. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(4), 1639-1676.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-Cl. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (Theory, Culture & Society)*. London: Sage.
- Caiden, G.E., & Caiden, N. (1977). Administrative Corruption. *Public Administration Review*, 37(3), 301-309.
- Chiang Wai Fong. (2013). *Social Values and Norms for Inclusiveness: A Report on Dialogues among Community Leaders*. Singapore: Institute of Policy Studies.
- Chomsky, N., Foucault, M., & Rajchman, J. (2006), *The Chomsky-Foucault Debate: On Human Nature*. N.Y.: New Press.

Doig, A., & Riley, S. (1998). Corruption and anti-corruption strategies: issues and case studies from developing countries, in UNDP, *Corruption and Integrity Improvement in Developing Countries*. New York: UNDP.

Dönmez, B., & Cömert, M. (2007). Value systems in primary school teachers. *Journal of Values Education*, 5(14), 29-59.

Dreyfus, H.L., & Rabinow, P. (1982), *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

European Commission (2015), *Education and Training Monitor 2015. Greece*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Ferraz, C., & Finan, F. (2008). Exposing Corrupt Politicians: The Effects of Brazil's Publicly Released Audits on Electoral Outcomes. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(2), 703-745.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison -Wesley.

Fisman, R. (2001). Estimating the Value of Political Connections. *American Economic Review*, 91(4), 1095-1102.

Florini, A. (2002). Increasing Transparency in Government. *International Journal on World Peace*, 19(3), 3 - 37.

Florini, A. (2007). *The Right to Know. Transparency for and Open World*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Flowers, L.A., Osterlind, S.J., Pascarella, E.T., & Pierson, C.T. (2001). How much do students learn in college? Cross-sectional estimates using the College BASE. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72, 565-583.

Foucault, M. (2001). *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Vintage. London: Routledge.

- Foucault, M. (2002), *Society Must Be Defended*. Athens: Psychogios (G).
- Freille, S., Haque, M.E., & Kneller, R. (2007). A Contribution to the Empirics of Press Freedom and Corruption. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 23(4), 838–62.
- Gilbert, D. T., Tafarodi, R. W., & Malone, P. S. (1993). You can't n believe everything you read. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 221 - 233.
- Greenwald, A.G., Brock, T.C., & Ostrom, T. M. (Ed.) (1964). *Psychological foundations of attitudes*. New York: Academic Press.
- Güngör, E. (1993). *Values Psychology. Moral psychology, moral values and moral development*. Amsterdam: Hollanda Türk Akademisyenler Birliği Vakfı Publishing House.
- Hagedorn, L.S., Pascarella, E.T., Edison, M.I., Braxton, J.M., Nora, A., & Terenzini, P.T. (1999). Does institutional context influence the development of critical thinking? A research note. *Review of Higher Education*, 22, 247-263.
- Higgins, E.T., & Sorrentino, R.M. (Eds.) (1990). *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hunt, J. (2007). How Corruption Hits People When they are Down. *Journal of Development Economics*, 84(2), 574-589.
- Hyden, G. (2007). The Challenges of Making Governance Assessments Nationally Owned. Paper presented at the 2007 Bergen Seminar on *Governance Assessments and the Paris Declaration*, UNDP Oslo Governance Centre and the Chr. Michelsen Institute, Bergen, September 24-25.
- Jackman, R., & Montinola, G. (2002). Sources of Corruption: A Cross - Country Study. *British Journal of Political Science*, 32, 147 - 170.

- Johnston, M. (1996). The Search for Definitions: The Vitality of Politics and the Issue of Corruption. *International Social Science Journal*, 149, 321-335.
- Jones, P.C. (2004). *Fraud and Corruption in Public Services: A Guide to Risk and Prevention*. Burlington, VT: Gower.
- Kidd, J., & Richter, F. J. (Eds.) (2003). *Fighting corruption in Asia: causes, effects and Remedies*. Singapore: World Scientific.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (2004). Reflective judgement: Theory and research on the development of epistemic assumptions through adulthood. *Educational Psychologist*, 39(1), 5-18.
- Klitgaard, R. (1988). *Controlling Corruption*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Klitgaard, R. (1997). *International Cooperation against Corruption*. Internet Center for Corruption Research, November, http://www.icgg.org/downloads/contribution02_klitgaard.pdf.
- Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading Change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kruglanski, A.W., & Thompson, E.P. (1999). Persuasion by a single route: A view from the unimodel. *Psychological Inquiry*, 10, 83 – 109.
- Kunicova, J., & Rose-Ackerman, S. (2005). Electoral Rules and Constitutional Structures as Constraints on Corruption. *British Journal of Political Science*, 35(4), 573–606.

Kyridis, A., Zagkos, Ch., Vamvakidou, I., Alevriadou, A., & Fotopoulos, N. (2011), The most important Greeks due to the HEIs students' views. In the 2nd *Hellenic Sociological Society Conference Proceedings*. (G)

Kyridis, A., Christodoulou, A., Vamvakidou, I. & Pavlis – Korre, M. (2015). Fighting Corruption: Values Education and Social Pedagogy in Greece in the Middle of the Crisis. *International Journal of Social Pedagogy – Special Issue 'Social Pedagogy in Times of Crisis in Greece'*, 4(1), 24 - 42.

Matsaganis, M. (2013). *The Greek Crisis: Social Impact and Policy Responses*. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Mauro, P. (1995). Corruption and Growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(3), 681 - 712.

Mocan, N. (2008). What Determines Corruption? International Evidence from Microdata. *Economic Inquiry, Western Economic Association International*, 46(4), 493-510.

Moody-Stuart, G. (1997). *Grand Corruption*. Oxford: Worldview Publishing.

Olken, B. (2009). Corruption Perceptions vs. Corruption Reality. *Journal of Public Economics*, 93(7-8), 950-964.

Papadakis, N. (2015), Human Resource Development within Public Administration: Civil Servants' Capacity Building-Reskilling towards an Ethical Behavior and an Effective Daily Practice in PA. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*.
Volume 3, Issue-3,
December 2015, pp. 502- 514.

Pascarella, E.T. (1989). The development of critical thinking: Does college make a difference?

- Perry, W. G., Jr. (1970). *Intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme*. Austin, Tex.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Persson, T., Roland, G., & Tabellini, G. (1997). Separation of Powers and Political Accountability. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(4), 1163–1202.
- Petty, R. E., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Petty, R. E., Fazio, R. H., & Briñol, P (Eds.) (2009). *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Structuralism*. Basic Books: New York.
- Quah, Jon S., (ed) (2005). *Corruption and Accountability in Selected Countries*. New York: Marshall Cavendish Corp.
- Relly, J.E., & Sabharwal, M. (2009). Perceptions of transparency of government policymaking: A cross - national study. *Government Information Quarterly*, 26, 148 – 157.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (ed.) (2006). *International Handbook on the Economics of Corruption*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (1999). *Corruption and Government. Causes, Consequences and Reform*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenson, B.A. (2006), The Costs and Benefits of Ethics Laws. D. Saint-Martin & T. Thompson (eds), *Public Ethics and Governance: Standards and Practices in Comparative Perspective (Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management, Volume 14)*. U.K.: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 135-154.
- Rydell, R. J., & McConnell, A. R. (2006). Understanding implicit and explicit attitude change: A systems of reasoning analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 995– 1008.

- Shleifer, A. & Vishny, R. (1993). Corruption. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 108(3), 599-617.
- Stapenhurst, F., & Langseth, P. (1997). The role of the public administration in fighting corruption. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 10(5), 311 - 330.
- Stasavage, D. (2004). Open - Door or Closed - Door? Transparency in Domestic and International Bargaining. *International Organization*, 58, 667 - 703.
- Svensson, J. (2005). Eight Questions About Corruption. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(3), 19 – 42.
- Tan, D.L. (1995). Do students accomplish what they expect out of college? *College Student Journal*, 29, 449-454.
- Theobald, R. (1999). So What Really is the problem about Corruption. *Third World Quarterly*, 20(3), 491-502.
- Thompson, J. M. (1999). Enhancing cognitive development in college classrooms: A review. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 26(1), 56-63.
- Transparency International, (2011). What Is the Corruption Perceptions Index? http://www.transparency.org/cpi2011/in_detail.
- Transparency International, (2015). 2015 Corruption Perceptions Index. https://www.iaca.int/images/news/2016/Corruption_Perceptions_Index_2015_report.pdf.
- Treisman, D. (2007). What Have We Learned About the Causes of Corruption from Ten Years of Cross-National Empirical Research? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10(1), 211–244.
- UNODC (2011). *The Role of Corruption in Trafficking in Persons*. Issue Paper, Vienna: UN.

Uslaner, E.M. (2008). *Corruption, inequality, and the rule of law: the bulging pocket makes the easy life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

West, E.J. (2004). Perry's legacy: Models of epistemological development. *Journal of Adult Development, 11*(2), 61-70.

Wilkinson, R. & Pickett, K. (2009), *The spirit level*. London: Penguin.

Williams, R. (1999). New Concepts for Old? *Third World Quarterly, 20*(3), 505-513.

Wilson, T. D., Samuel, L., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review, 107*, 101– 126.