

Dark Triad Personality and Student Anti-Corruption Perceptions

Adi Heryadi^{1*}, Ariesta Wibisono Anditya², Diah Suci Rahmawati³

[1] Universitas Jenderal Achmad Yani Yogyakarta, Indonesia. [2] Jenderal Achmad Yani University Yogyakarta, Indonesia. [3] Jenderal Achmad Yani University Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Abstract

Several previous studies suggested that personality factors influence corrupt behavior (Abidin and Siswadi, 2015), Zhao et al. (2016). A survey by Matulesy et al. (2021) and research by Putri and Rahayu (2021) found that dark personality (Paulhus and Williams, 2002) is a factor that can influence corrupt behavior. The last two studies used civil servants and the private sector as research subjects. This research aims to determine the relationship between students' dark personality or dark triad personality and students' anti-corruption perceptions. This research involved 125 respondents who were students at the Unjaya Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences and were selected using a non-random sampling method. The data collection tool in this research was the Dark Triad Personality Scale. Adapted from the Jones and Paulhus Short Dark Triad (SD3) measurement instrument and has a coefficient value Cronbach alpha of .820, according to Hasanati & Istiqomah (2018), with a coefficient value Back alpha of .960. The findings show a relationship between dark triad personality and student anti-corruption attitudes. The correlation coefficient (correlation Pearson) is .220, and the significance level is .000. The correlation coefficient is more significant than .05 ($p < .05$), and the one-sided significance level is less than .05 ($p < .05$). Therefore, this relationship is considered vital.

Keywords: Dark Triad Personality; Anti-corruption Perceptions; Corruption; Students; Psychology of Corruption

Article Info

Artikel History: Submitted: 2023-10-06 | Published: 2024-03-30

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24127/gdn.v14i1.8844>

Vol 14, No 1 (2024) 14, No 1 (2024) Page: 10 - 20

(*) Corresponding Author: Adi Heryadi, Universitas Jenderal Achmad Yani Yogyakarta, Indonesia, Email: adiheryadi16@gmail.com



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

According to Ludigdo & Afala (2021), corruption is a widespread occurrence that affects everyone. Politicians, bureaucrats, businesses, and political parties have all been implicated in discussions about corruption thus far, but millennials like students and other youth organizations have received less attention. Because they are the generation that will hold key state positions in the future, this millennial demographic is fascinating to study. There are several research that explain why millennials engage in corrupt behavior.

A study conducted by Heryadi and Yuliasari (2019) at the Unjaya Faculty of Economics and Social Affairs found that FES Unjani Yogyakarta students tend to behave anti-corruption, 43% of the participants have an adequate understanding of corrupt behavior, and 57% still need to improve it, according to an index value of 3,33 on a scale of 5.

Research conducted by Heryadi and Jayanti (2021) at the Unjaya Faculty of Economics and Social Affairs also found that there was a positive correlation between academic honesty and students' anti-corruption perceptions. Research conducted by Heryadi, Prawita, and Wirandha (2022) also found a positive correlation between the religiosity of students at FES Unjaya and their anti-corruption perceptions. The more religious the students, the more anti-corruption they are.

Referring to research by Abidin & Siswadi (2015) who said that in looking at the factors that influence corruption, the personality variable is something that cannot be ignored because corruption is also about individuals, including personality, motivation and *locus of control*.

Meanwhile Zhao et al, (2016) said that dark personality or *dark triad personality* or what is known as the dark nature of humans will certainly influence deviant behavior such as corruption, academic cheating and bad behavior that benefits oneself and harms others. This is also supported by research by Matulesy, et al (2021) and research by Putri and Rahayu (2021) which found that dark or *dark triad personality* (Paulhus and Williams, 2002) is a factor that can influence corrupt behavior. The last two studies used civil servants and private employees as research subjects. The research results of Matulesy, et al (2021) show that *dark triad personality* has a positive correlation with employee intentions for corruption, meaning that the higher the dark personality, the higher the tendency for employees' intentions for corruption. Putri & Rahayu's research (2021) also found the same results and made *dark triad personality* as a predictor of corruption intentions.

Corruption in Indonesia is still a big issue covering this nation, especially when international transparency released the Indonesian Corruption Perception Index score for 2022 which was just released in early 2023 and said that Indonesia's IPK score was the lowest score since the reform era. In terms of psychoeducational efforts or efforts to prevent corrupt practices, the Corruption Eradication Committee has also done no less, but in fact corruption continues to be rampant.

Seeing this phenomenon and the results of previous research, researchers wanted to see the relationship between dark personality or *dark triad personality* with students' anti-corruption perceptions. This research is important as an effort to prevent actual corrupt practices in the future when students have assumed various positions of authority.

METHOD

Design

This research begins by considering the problem to be solved and using appropriate methods to analyze and map the solution. This research uses quantitative methods with a correlational research approach. *Non-probability sampling* is a method *sampling* is the method used in this study.

Instruments

Data will be collected using an anti-corruption perception scale. This corruption perception scale consists of 42 items, 21 items *favorable* and 21 *unfavorable*. While scale *dark triad personality* consists of 27 items *favorable*.

Data Analysis

The collected data will be processed with the help of statistics through the SPSS program *product moment correlation technique*.

Participants

The respondents for this research were 125 FES Unjani Yogyakarta students. Around 82.4% of participants were female, with around 17.6% male.

Table 1. Percentage of Subjects Based on Gender

Gender	Percentage
Woman	82.4%
Man	17.6%

Respondents in this research were dominated by psychology study programs, namely 63.2%. Other study programs, namely the Law study program 18.4%, Management 11.2%, and Accounting 7.2%.

Table 2. Percentage of Subjects by Study Program

Faculty of Economics and Social Affairs	Percentage
Accounting	7.2%
Management	11.2%
Law	18.4%
Psychology	63,2%

Respondents aged 18 years were 2.4%, 19 years were 21.6%, 20 years were 37.6%, 21 years were 20%, 22 years were 16%, and 23 years were 2.4%.

Table 3. Percentage Distribution of Subject Age

Age	Percentage
18	2.4%
19	21.6%
20	37.6%
21	20%
22	16%
23	2.4%

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The distribution of research data is depicted in the table below both empirically and hypothetically.

Table 4. Description of Research Data

Variabel	Data Hipotetik				Data Empirik			
	Skor Min	Skor Max	Mean	SD	Skor Min	Skor Max	Mean	SD
<i>Dark Triad Personality</i>	17	85	51	11.3	30	66	48	6
Persepsi Anti Korupsi	28	140	84	18.6	88	130	109	7

Empirical data is research data, while hypothetical data explains the data before data collection. Because of *scaled dark triad personality* consists of 17 items with scores ranging from 1 to 5 each, the minimum and maximum ranges are $17 \times 1 = 17$ to $17 \times 5 = 85$. This is shown in the table above. Hypothetically, the value (μ) is $(85 + 17) : 2 = 51$ and the spread distance is $85 - 17 = 68$. *Scaled dark triad personality* has the smallest value of 30 and the largest value is 66, meanwhile *mean* The empirical value (μ) is 48 and the standard deviation (σ) is 6.

Apart from that, the table above can explain that hypothetically, the anti-corruption perception scale contains 28 items with scores ranging from 1 to 5, it can be concluded that the smallest value of this scale is $(28 \times 1) = 28$ while the value The largest of this scale is $(28 \times 5) = 140$. Hypothetically, the value (μ) is $(140 + 28) : 2 = 84$ and the distribution distance is $140 - 28 = 112$. Meanwhile, the anti-corruption perception scale empirically has the smallest value is 88 and the largest value is 130; *mean* The empirical value (μ) is 109 and the standard deviation (σ) is 7.

Therefore, research participant data will be broken down into high, medium, and low categories, respectively.

Dark triad personality

The division of subjects in the study was categorized into three categories, including high, medium and low. To calculate category scores, the following divisions are used:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Height} &= (\mu + 1\sigma) \leq X \\ &= (48 + 1 \times 6) \leq X \\ &= 54 \leq X \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Currently} &= (\mu - 1\sigma) \leq X < (\mu + 1\sigma) \\ &= (48 - 1 \times 6) \leq X < (48 + 1 \times 6) \\ &= 42 \leq X < 54 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Low} &= X < (\mu - 1\sigma) \\ &= X < (48 - 1 \times 6) \\ &= X < 42 \end{aligned}$$

Information:

μ : Empirical Mean

σ : Standard Deviation (Azwar, 2011)

X : Subject Score

In this study, research participants will be categorized into three categories: high, medium, and low. To calculate category scores, the following divisions were used

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100 \%$$

From the formula above, the following anti-corruption perception criteria can be obtained:

Table 5. Categories *Dark Triad Personality*

Category	Norma	Score	Σ	%
Height	$(\mu + 1s) \leq X$	$54 \leq X$	46	36.8%
Currently	$(\mu - 1s) \leq X < (\mu + 1s)$	$42 \leq X < 54$	68	54.4%
Low	$X < (\mu - 1s)$	$X < 42$	11	8.8%
TOTAL			125	100%

From the table above, it can be seen that 36.8% of students in *dark triad personality* had a high score, 54.4% had a medium score, and 8.8% had a low score.

Anti-Corruption Perception:

The division of subjects in the study was categorized into three categories, including high, medium and low. To calculate category scores, the following divisions were used:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Height} &= (\mu + 1\sigma) \leq X \\ &= (109 + 1 \times 7) \leq X \\ &= 116 \leq X \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Currently} &= (\mu - 1s) \leq X < (\mu + 1s) \\ &= (109 - 1 \times 7) \leq X < (109 + 1 \times 7) \\ &= 102 \leq X < 116 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Low} &= X < (\mu - 1s) \\ &= X < (109 - 1 \times 7) \\ &= X < 102 \end{aligned}$$

Information:

m : Mean Empirical

σ : Standard Deviation (Azwar, 2011)

X : Subject Score

After knowing the high, medium and low category values, the following formula will be used to calculate the percentages

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100 \%$$

In this way, the following criteria for academic honesty can be obtained:

Table 6. Categories of Anti-Corruption Perceptions $116 \leq X$

Category	Norma	Score	Σ	%
Height	$(\mu + 1s) \leq X$	$116 \leq X$	27	21.6%
Currently	$(\mu - 1s) \leq X < (\mu + 1s)$	$102 \leq X < 116$	75	60%
Low	$X < (\mu - 1s)$	$X < 102$	23	18.4%
TOTAL			125	100%

According to the aforementioned data, 21.6% of respondents had high anti-corruption perception scores, 60.0% had medium anti-corruption perception scores, and 18.4% had poor anti-corruption perception scores.

Hypothesis testing

Prior to putting the research hypothesis to the test, assumption checks were made using the following data normality and linearity tests

Normality test

The normality test examines if the distribution of the data is normal. It also establishes if the regression model's residual or confounding variables follow a normal distribution. One sample of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) normalcy test was used in this study. In this study, if the value of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) is more than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), the data is assumed to be normally distributed.

The results of this research's normality test after the data was processed using SPSS Version 25 Windows are as follows.

Table 7. Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		125
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	,0000000
	Std. Deviation	8,22362678
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,066
	Positive	,066
	Negative	-,053
Test Statistic		,066
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,200 ^{c,d}
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.		

From the table above, it can be seen that the scored *dark triad personality* and anti-corruption perceptions are in the normal distribution, with values *Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)* of 0.200 ($p > 0.05$).

Linearity Test

To ascertain if the relationship between two variables is linear or not, the linearity test is used. The two variables in the research are linearly associated if the deviation value from

linearity is more than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), in accordance with the rationale for decision-making employed in this study.

Following data processing using SPSS Version 25 Windows, the findings of the linearity test of this research's data are as follows:

Table 8. Linearity Test

ANOVA Table							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Perception_Anti_Corruption *	Between	(Combined	2829,82	29	97,580	1,54	,05
	n	)	9			9	9
Dark_Triad_Personality	Groups	Linearity	427,755	1	427,755	6,79	,01
		Deviation from Linearity	2402,07	28	85,788	1,36	,13
			3			2	7
	Within Groups		5983,80	95	62,987		
			3				
	Total		8813,63	12			
				2			4

The linearity test indicates that the linearity difference is 0.137 above 0.05 or 0.137 above 0.05, as shown in the above table. These findings indicate that there is a connection between the two factors. Anti-corruption perceptions and dark triad personality are linear, with a F coefficient of 1.362 and a significance of 0.137.

The prerequisite tests carried out showed that they were met, thus the hypothesis was tested to determine the correlation between the two variables using the correlation technique *Pearson Product Moment*. Program *SPSS version 25 for Windows* used to perform this analysis. A correlation coefficient is considered positively correlated if it ranges from 0 to +1. If it moves from 0 to -1, it is considered negatively correlated (Pratisto, 2005).

The results of the hypothesis test are shown in the following table based on data that has been processed by the researcher:

Table 9. Test Hypothesis

Correlations			
		Dark_Triad_Personality	Anti-Corruption_Perception
Dark_Triad_Personality	Pearson Correlation	1	-,220*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,014
	N	125	125
Anti-Corruption_Perception	Pearson Correlation	-,220*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,014	

N		125	125
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			
Correlations			
		<i>Dark triad personality</i>	Anti-Corruption Perception
<i>Dark triad personality</i>	Pearson Correlation	1	.655**
	Say. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	132	132
Anti-Corruption Perception	Pearson Correlation	.655**	1
	Say. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	132	132
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The findings of the hypothesis test demonstrate that dark triad personality and anti-corruption attitudes are strongly correlated. With a correlation coefficient more than 0.5 ($p < 0.05$) and a one-tailed significance level less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), a correlation coefficient (pearson correlation) of 0.220 and a significance level of 0.000 are used.

The direction of the relationship between these two variables is negative, as indicated by the negative sign on the correlation coefficient. That is, if students have *dark triad personality* if the dark triad personality is low then the anti-corruption perception will be high.

The coefficient of determination, the size of which is the square of the correlation coefficient (r^2), is called the determining coefficient. This is due to the fact that variations in the dependent variable can be compared with variations in the independent variable. The coefficient of determination = $r^2 = 0,220^2 = 0.048$. This shows that *dark triad personality* in explaining the variance of anti-corruption perceptions is 4.8%. This means that 95.2% (100%-4.8%) of the variance in anti-corruption perceptions is explained by other factors.

This research data can provide an illustration that it is indeed a variable *dark triad personality* or a student's dark personality has a strong relationship with his anti-corruption perception. The lower the dark personality, the better the anti-corruption perception. Likewise, if a student has a high dark personality, this will make their anti-corruption perception low. Even though the results of this research also show that the dark personality variance is only able to explain the anti-corruption perception variance of 4.8%, this means that there are still other factors 95, 2% have not been identified which also influences anti-corruption perceptions.

Triana and Heryadi (2020) explain that anti-corruption perception is further processing of anti-corruption values obtained through personal perspective or experience, enabling us to identify what is right, good and constructive in order to avoid actions that are detrimental to the country. From this research data, there are still 18.4% of students who have a low anti-corruption perception score and there are 36.8% of students who have a low score of anti-corruption perception. *dark triad personality* the highest.

According to Phaulus & William, 2002, the dimensions of the dark triad personality are (a) *machiavellianism*, *machiavellian* depicted as someone unconcerned with personal

relationships and ideology, ignoring conventional ethics. People who have a tendency to act deceitfully, are selfish, cold, and do not care about other individuals. Someone who adheres *machiavellianisme* high, also known as "*mach*", have a greater intrinsic drive for things such as sexuality, possessions, position, authority, rivalry, and lack of social interest.

A highly goal-oriented, manipulative nature and an amoral and unprincipled belief system have been associated with *Machiavellianism*. A cynical worldview and the belief that controlling others is the key to success is normal and natural. They are self-serving and seek to gain and maintain power in group behavior. These people use deception, dishonesty, and flattery, and they can also be charismatic leaders. (b) *Nacissistic*, selfishness or self-interest, a need for attention, control, and a sense of entitlement are signs *narcissism*. Two types *narcissism* is *grandiose narcissism* and *vulnerable narcissism* (Tracy, 2017). *Grandiose narcissism* is a type of narcissism characterized by someone who is selfish, self-confident, arrogant and exhibitionist. These people suppress negative aspects of themselves and distort information from outside sources, which often results in a poor self-image lacking in accomplishments and skills. Sensitive *narcissism* almost the same as *grandiose narcissism*, but is more hypersensitive, hostile, and experiences a lot of shame. *Narcissism* being weak makes a person defensive and sensitive, therefore vulnerable about interpersonal issues. (c) *psychopathy*, *psikopathy* characterized by a lack of deep emotions, such as remorse, exploiting others, and empathy (Giammarco & Vernon, 2015; Jones & Paulhus, 2013). Inconsistent, impulsive, and have a tendency to seek pleasure or look for interesting situations or things (Glenn & Sellbom, 2015; Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Southard et al., 2015). *Psychopathy* is defined as someone who does not follow social standards, likes to lie, is irresponsible, and has shallow emotions (no fear), which causes them to be impulsive and aggressive, and easily give up hope. This suggests that people with high levels of psychopathy are particularly sensitive to stressful events, such as those that can cause anxiety or frustration (Noser, Zeigler-Hill, & Besser, 2014).

In this study, the limitation is that it only looks at the dark triad personality scale as a whole without being able to display individual data for each trait or trait so that it is possible to study it further.. This research is also in line with research by Dayakisni (2015) which produces personality that is correlated with intentions to commit bad actions and attitudes towards corruption, where personality can indicate a person's tendency to commit corruption. Limanago (2020) examined the relationship between personality *dark triad* and employee corruption tendencies and found that there is a significant correlation between the two.

Although each characteristic or quality in the "dark triad" may have an own set of characteristics, all three share the following characteristics: The propensity to benefit at the expense of others is the first connection between these three characteristics (Jones, 2013). People with dark triadic tendencies—those who are high—use clever methods to further their own objectives with little regard for the interests of others (Linton & Power, 2013). Second, a range of deliberate misbehavior is positively predicted by the dark triad feature, which includes manipulation, callousness, and selfishness (O'Boyle et al., 2012; Jones & Fugedo, 2013).

Meanwhile, according to Feldman (2011), the definition of perception is an act of sorting, interpreting, analyzing and integrating stimuli carried out by the senses and the brain. Perception is a combined and continuous activity, everything within humans will actively participate in perception, including feelings, thinking power and human experience which are very influential in the perception procedure, Walgito (2010).

Anti-corruption perception, as explained earlier regarding perception, perception is further processing of detected signals so that we can become aware of our surroundings or an individual's perspective on the world. Anti-corruption is defined as something that is right, good and constructive and does not support efforts that are detrimental to the State.

CONCLUSION

This research found a strong relationship between dark personality or *dark triad personality* with anti-corruption perception. When students have *dark triad personality* If it is high, the perception of anti-corruption will be low *trait* Dark personality, which is generally a tendency to bad behavior, will make students' anti-corruption perception low, however, this research still has limitations in that it does not explain in detail each trait and only provides general trait scores.

REFERENCES

- Abidin, Z., & Siswadi, A., G., P. (2015). *Psikologi Korupsi*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Azwar, S. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Edisi I Cetakan XII*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Dayakisni, Tri & Hudaniah. (2015). *Psikologi Sosial*. Malang: UMM Press
- Feldman, R.S. (2011). *Pengantar Psikologi Jilid 1*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- Giammarco, E. A., & Vernon, P. A. (2015). Interpersonal Guilt and the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 81, 96–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.10.046>
- Glenn, A. L., & Sellbom, M. (2015). Theoretical and Empirical Concerns Regarding The Dark Triad As a Construct. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 29(3), 360–377.
- Hasanati, N., & Istiqomah. (2018). Validasi Alat Ukur Short Dark Triad (SD3). Penelitian Blockgrant Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang.
- Heryadi, A., & Jayanti, A. M. 2021. Persepsi Anti Korupsi dan Kejujuran Akademik Mahasiswa. Penelitian: Fakultas Ekonomi dan Sosial Unjani Yogyakarta. *Laporan Penelitian*
- Heryadi, H., Prawita, E., & Wirandha, A. L. (2022). Religiosity and Anti-Corruption Perceptions of Students. *Bisma The Journal of Counseling* 6(2), 152-161. DOI: 10.23887/bisma.v6i2.52454
- Heryadi, A., & Yuliasari, H. (2019). Indeks Perilaku Anti Korupsi Mahasiswa. Penelitian: Fakultas Ekonomi dan Sosial Unjani Yogyakarta. Laporan Penelitian
- Jones, N. D. (2013). What's mine is mine and what's your is mine: The dark triad personality and gambling with your neighbor's money. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(5), 563-571. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.04.005>
- Jones, D. N., & Figuerdo, A. J. (2013). The core of darkness: Uncovering the heart of the Dark Triad. *European Journal of Personality*, 27, 521-531. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1893>
- Jones, D. N & Paulhus Delroy L. (2014). Introduction The short Dark Triad (SD3): A Brief Measure Of Dark Personality Traits. *Journal of assesment* Vol.21 (1), 28-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191113514105>
- Limanago, Y. (2020). Hubungan Antara Dark Triad Personality Dan Kecenderungan Korupsi Karyawan. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengukuran Psikologi* Vol. 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.21009/JPPP.091.04>

- Linton, D. K., & Power, J. L. (2013). The personality traits of workplace bullies are often shared by their victims: Is there a dark side to victims?, *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol 54, Issue 6, 738-743, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.11.026>.
- Ludigdo, & Afala, L. O. M. (2021). *Memotret Potensi Korupsi di Kalangan Mahasiswa*. Malang: UB Press
- Matulessy, A.; Rini, A.; Limanago, Y.; Elentina, M.; Pandin, M. The Causing Corruption Factors of Private Employees and Civil Servants. Preprints 2021, 2021010197
- Noser, A. E., Zeigler-hill, V., & Besser, A. (2014). Stress and Affective Experiences : The Importance of Dark Personality Features. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 53(12), 158-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.10.007>
- O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 557-579. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025679>.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36, 556–563. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6)
- Putri, W., W., K., Rahayu, Y., P., & Ajuni. (2021). Dark Triad Personality as a Predictor of the Corrupt Intention of the State Civil Apparatus in District X. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology*, Vol 10, No 2.
- Southard, A. C., Noser, A. E., Pollock, N. C., Mercer, S. H., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2015). The Interpersonal Nature of Dark Personality Features. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 34(7), 555–586. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2015.34.7.555>
- Tracy, R. (2017). *The Dark Tetrad and Depressive Symptoms: Exploring the role of Rumination*. Thesis: University of Tasmania.
- Triana, N., & Heryadi, A. (2020). Kecintaan Pada Uang dan Persepsi Anti Korupsi. *Psyche 165 Journal*, 13 (1), 44-52.
- Walgito, B. (2010). *Pengantar Psikologi Umum*. Yogyakarta: CV. Andi
- Zhao, H., Zhang, H., Xu, Y. (2016). Does the Dark Triad of Personality Predict Corrupt Intention? The Mediating Role of Belief in Good Luck. *Frontiers in Psychology*. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12401>