

**UNIVERSITATEA „BABEȘ-BOLYAI” CLUJ-NAPOCA**  
**FACULTATEA DE ISTORIE ȘI FILOSOFIE**  
**ȘCOALA DOCTORALĂ DE RELAȚII INTERNAȚIONALE ȘI STUDII DE**  
**SECURITATE**

*The Big Five Personality Traits and Citizens' Attitudes towards State Surveillance*

**Summary of the doctoral thesis**

**Conducător de doctorat:**

**Conf. Univ. Dr. / C.Ș. II Sergiu Gherghina**

**Student-doctorand:**

**Paul Emanuel Țap**

**2024**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	VI
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	VII
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>A Subject of Interest for International Relations and European Studies</b> .....	6
<b>The Relevance of the Thesis: Empirical and Theoretical Contributions</b> .....	8
<b>Structure of the Thesis</b> .....	11
<b>CHAPTER 1</b> .....	15
<b>THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK</b> .....	15
<b>Introduction</b> .....	15
<b>A Chronology of Surveillance: Brief Overview</b> .....	16
<b>Surveillance: Definition and Theoretical Approaches</b> .....	19
<i>State Surveillance: Definition and Theoretical Approaches</i> .....	21
<b>Contemporary Surveillance: Four Categories</b> .....	23
<b>Conducting Contemporary Surveillance</b> .....	25
<b>Three Theories of Surveillance: Panopticon, Synopticon and Omnipticon</b> .....	29
<b>Perception: Conceptualization and Meaning</b> .....	32
<i>Perception towards Politics, Social Aspects and Threats</i> .....	34
<b>Personality: Conceptualization and Meaning</b> .....	36
<i>Personality, Politics and Participation</i> .....	40
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	43
<b>CHAPTER 2</b> .....	45
<b>ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES</b> .....	45
<b>Introduction</b> .....	45
<b>Individuals and the Acceptance of State Surveillance</b> .....	46
<i>State institutions and the acceptance of surveillance</i> .....	47
<i>Technological infrastructure and the acceptance of surveillance</i> .....	49
<i>Specific contexts and the acceptance of surveillance</i> .....	50
<b>Personality and the Acceptance of State Surveillance</b> .....	51
<b>The Big Five and the Acceptance of State Surveillance</b> .....	52
<i>Agreeableness</i> .....	53

<i>Conscientiousness</i> .....	55
<i>Extraversion</i> .....	57
<i>Neuroticism</i> .....	59
<i>Openness to experience</i> .....	61
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	66
<b>CHAPTER 3</b> .....	69
<b>RESEARCH DESIGN</b> .....	69
<b>Introduction</b> .....	69
<b>Case Study and Comparative Approaches: Theoretical Perspectives</b> .....	69
<i>Most similar / different systems design: An overview</i> .....	71
<i>Romania and Hungary: MSSD</i> .....	73
<b>COVID-19 and the Increased State Surveillance: The Relevance of Time Frame</b> .....	74
<i>State surveillance in Hungary and Romania during COVID-19</i> .....	76
<b>Data and Variable Operationalization</b> .....	78
<i>Variable operationalization</i> .....	78
<b>Methods of Data Analysis: Bivariate and Multivariate Statistics</b> .....	79
<i>Correlations and bivariate analysis</i> .....	80
<i>Regression and multivariate analysis</i> .....	81
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	82
<b>CHAPTER 4</b> .....	84
<b>STATE SURVEILLANCE IN POST-COMMUNIST HUNGARY AND ROMANIA</b> .....	84
<b>Introduction</b> .....	84
<b>State Surveillance in Authoritarian Regimes: Past Trauma Projected in Contemporaneity</b> .....	85
<i>Hungary and Romania: State surveillance under authoritarian governments</i> .....	87
<b>Transition to Democracy and the Challenge to Reform Intelligence Agencies</b> .....	90
<i>The reform of intelligence agencies in new democracies</i> .....	90
<b>Intelligence Agencies in Post-Communist Romania and Hungary</b> .....	92
<i>Hungary</i> .....	93
<i>Romania</i> .....	96
<b>Contemporary Intelligence Agencies in Hungary and Romania: An Overview</b> .....	100
<i>Hungary</i> .....	100
<i>Romania</i> .....	102

<b>Citizens' Perceptions towards Intelligence Agencies in Post-Communism</b> .....	105
<b>Perception Formation towards Intelligence Agencies in Hungary and Romania</b> .....	108
<i>The image of intelligence agencies in Hungary</i> .....	109
<i>The image of intelligence agencies in Romania</i> .....	111
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	113
<b>CHAPTER 5</b> .....	115
<b>CITIZENS AND STATE SURVEILLANCE IN HUNGARY</b> .....	115
<b>Introduction</b> .....	115
<b>General Attitudes towards Accepting State Surveillance in Hungary</b> .....	115
<b>Bivariate Analysis: The Case of Hungary</b> .....	118
<b>Multivariate Analysis: The Case of Hungary</b> .....	121
<i>Personality traits and acceptance of state surveillance in Hungary</i> .....	121
<i>Control variables and the acceptance of state surveillance in Hungary</i> .....	128
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	135
<b>CHAPTER 6</b> .....	137
<b>CITIZENS AND STATE SURVEILLANCE IN ROMANIA</b> .....	137
<b>Introduction</b> .....	137
<b>The Romanians' General Attitudes towards State Surveillance</b> .....	137
<b>Bivariate Analysis</b> .....	139
<b>Multivariate Analysis: The Case of Romania</b> .....	142
<i>Personality traits and acceptance of state surveillance</i> .....	142
<i>Control variables and acceptance of state surveillance</i> .....	151
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	159
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	161
<b>Main Results</b> .....	161
<b>Contributions to the literature and lessons</b> .....	165
<b>Limitations</b> .....	171
<b>Avenues for further research</b> .....	173
<b>List of references</b> .....	176
<b>Appendix 1</b> .....	218
<b>Appendix 2</b> .....	219

Keywords: state surveillance, acceptance, perception, personality, Romania, Hungary

State surveillance is as long as human history. During centuries organizations or individuals used it as a mean through which they could understand the realities around them. The major purpose of surveillance – regardless of era – was and continues to be the data collection that could serve specific objectives for specific entities. Another factor that has remained constant during centuries is represented by the major element that is targeted by the state surveillance: the individual (Crowdy, 2006; Hughes-Wilson, 2017; Andrew, 2018). Although the contemporary understanding of state surveillance went beyond the traditional perspective that was linked mostly to security objectives, the individual continues to be the most important actor in the process of surveillance. The latter can be supervised by the state's authorities in the moment he / she represents a threat for the national security. Here, state surveillance has one major purpose: to pinpoint in due time the threat, to obliterate it and to achieve security objectives (Warner, 2014; Andrew, Aldrich and Wark, 2020).

However, the individual cannot be associated solely with negative activities that make him / her prone to be subjected to the state's supervision but the latter can be supervised by the state for the solely purpose of the latter to improve specific marketing policies that would help some companies to strengthen their sale strategies. In this case, state surveillance has nothing to do which achieving national security objectives but is conducted in order to build efficient policies that would help individuals to make better decisions when it comes to choosing a specific product (Ball and Webster, 2003; Ball, Haggerty and Lyon, 2012). The relation between state surveillance and individual is not limited by the two aforementioned objectives, i.e. national security and strategic marketing but it can be also used for supervising different sectors of society in order to streamline policies or organizations or even to collect data regarding specific people in the country such as celebrities and politicians (Ball and Webster, 2003; Slobogin, 2007).

Following these lines of argumentation, the relation between state surveillance and individual cannot be neglected or diminished since both are interconnected, influence one another and does not really exist as individual factors. Large bodies of research explained the relation between individuals and state surveillance from the perspective of what make individuals to accept state surveillance and which should be the state institutions' policies, strategies and values in order to conduct efficient surveillance within the society. Accordingly, to date there are three major

bodies of research that explain this relation by focusing on: 1) institutional matters, 2) technological infrastructures and 3) specific contexts (Nakhaie and de Lint, 2013; Trüdinger and Steckermeier, 2017; Kininmonth *et al.*, 2018; Nam, 2019; Wester and Giesecke, 2019; Westerlund, Isabelle and Leminen, 2020; Viola and Laidler, 2022). All these bodies of research explain the relation between individuals and state surveillance by underlining that the latter is accepted due to external factors: institutional actions and values, technological efficiency or contextual threats. However, what all these bodies of research miss is represented by the fact that the acceptance of state surveillance is not explained by referring to the internal psychological mechanisms that make individuals shape perceptions regarding external realities – they only take external facts to explain what determines the acceptance of surveillance.

This thesis aims to fill this gap in the literature by answering the research question: How the personality traits of individuals influence the acceptance of state surveillance? This is a relevant question since no study to date explained the role of internal mechanisms – that make individuals to shape perception towards external realities – when it comes to state surveillance. Here, state surveillance is not described by a holistic approach of the concept (since contemporary surveillance is a multi-faceted process that is used in many places and sectors of the society) but it is described as a process through which the state's institutions strive to achieve national security objectives. This definition is in line with the traditional understanding of state surveillance which wants to fulfil national security objectives. The personality of individuals is measured by using the Big Five Personality Traits since this is one of the more used taxonomies in social sciences.

To answer the research question, the thesis focuses on two cases: Hungary and Romania. The cases are analyzed comparatively by using the most similar systems design. Both countries are typical cases for studying the individuals' attitudes towards state surveillance because of several reasons (e.g. their authoritarian past, both are countries that strive to improve the quality of their democracies and they are not sufficiently analyzed in the literature of state surveillance). The data for the analysis is provided by two national representative surveys that were conducted between November-July 2022 in Hungary and Romania. The surveys were completed by roughly 1,000 respondents for each case. The data is analyzed by using quantitative approaches – statistical analysis (correlations, bivariate and OLS analyses).

The thesis has an introduction which is followed by six chapters and conclusions. Chapter 1 deals with the clarification of the concepts that represent the cornerstone of the book:

surveillance, perception and personality. It discusses the historical evolutions of state surveillance, its types as well as the features of contemporary surveillance and the most impactful theories that influenced the literature on state surveillance. After this, there are explained the other two concepts: perception and personality and the conclusions summarize the main findings. Chapter 2 focuses on the analytical framework of the thesis. It starts with a literature review that explained to date what determines individuals to accept state surveillance: 1) institutional matters, 2) technological infrastructures and 3) specific contexts. This discussion is followed by a general presentation of how personality could be linked with state surveillance and discusses possible elements that justify how the acceptance of state surveillance could be determined by the personality of individuals and after this it is presented the analytical framework. The last section of this chapter is dedicated to the conclusions.

Chapter 3 is divided between five sections which present all the methodological aspects of the thesis and conclusions and include a discussion about the most similar / different systems design it shows how Hungary and Romania fit in the category of the most similar systems design. After this, it is explained the relevance of the timeframe as well as the data for the analysis, how it was coded and analyzed. Chapter 4 discusses in detail the state of the art of intelligence sector in Hungary and Romania since the instauration of the communist regime in both countries until today. Chapter 5 is the first analytical chapter of the thesis and presents the case of Hungary while Chapter 6 does the same for Romania. The last chapter is dedicated entirely to conclusions and it presents the main results of the thesis, its empirical and theoretical contributions as well as its limitations and further research avenues.

This thesis has some relevant findings. First, it was revealed that most of the citizens in Hungary and Romania accept much and very much state surveillance. These results indicate that after more than 30 years from the breakdown of communism, citizens in Hungary and Romania left behind the authoritarian trauma inflicted by the repressive surveillance machineries in the authoritarian regimes and became open to the idea of accepting state surveillance. Moving to how personality traits influence the acceptance of state surveillance, the data found empirical support for some of the later. In both countries, conscientiousness has the strongest impact over the acceptance of state surveillance when we look solely to personality traits. In other words, an increase in conscientiousness influence an increase in the acceptance of state surveillance. Apart from this, in the case of Romania, extraversion plays a role in accepting state surveillance in the

sense that the more individuals are associated with this trait the more likely they are to accept state surveillance. Similarly, emotional stability – the opposite of neuroticism – influence the acceptance of state surveillance in the case of Hungary. In the moment individuals are characterized by emotional stability they are likely to accept more state surveillance. These results are important because they show the impact of personality traits over the acceptance of state surveillance for national security objectives.

Although the thesis shows that personality traits influence the acceptance of state surveillance for national security objectives, the statistical models underlined that other socio-demographic variables are likely to influence stronger this relation. Therefore, in both cases, the engagement in the community, subjective information and age influence the acceptance of state surveillance in the sense that the more individuals engage in the life of their communities, possess higher levels of information and have higher ages the more likely they are to accept state surveillance. These findings show indirectly that the acceptance of state surveillance is motivated by a combination of self-preservation instincts, care for their communities and high level of subjective information.

Although the thesis shows that personality traits influence the acceptance of state surveillance for national security objectives, the statistical models underlined that other socio-demographic variables are likely to influence stronger this relation. Therefore, in both cases, the engagement in the community, subjective information and age influence the acceptance of state surveillance in the sense that the more individuals engage in the life of their communities, possess higher levels of information and have higher ages the more likely they are to accept state surveillance. These findings show indirectly that the acceptance of state surveillance is motivated by a combination of self-preservation instincts, care for their communities and high level of subjective information.



## List of references

- Andrew, C. (2018) *The Secret World: A History of Intelligence*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Andrew, C., Aldrich, R. J. and Wark, W. K. (eds) (2020) *Secret Intelligence: A Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Ball, K., Haggerty, K. D. and Lyon, D. (eds) (2012) *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ball, K. and Webster, F. (eds) (2003) *The Intensification of Surveillance. Crime, Terrorism and Warfare in the Information Age*. London: Pluto Press.
- Crowdy, T. (2006) *The Enemy Within. A history of espionage*. New York: Osprey Publishing.
- Hughes-Wilson, J. (2017) *The Secret State. A History of Intelligence and Espionage*. New York: Pegasus Books.
- Kininmonth, J. *et al.* (2018) 'Privacy Concerns and Acceptance of Government Surveillance in Australia', *Australasian Conference on Information Systems*, pp. 1–11.
- Nakhaie, R. and de Lint, W. (2013) 'Trust and Support for Surveillance Policies in Canadian and American Opinion', *International Criminal Justice Review*, 23(2), pp. 149–169.
- Nam, T. (2019) 'What determines the acceptance of government surveillance? Examining the influence of information privacy correlates', *Social Science Journal*. Western Social Science Association, 56(4), pp. 530–544.
- Slobogin, C. (2007) *Privacy at Risk. The New Government Surveillance and the Fourth Amendment, Privacy at Risk*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Trüdinger, E. M. and Steckermeier, L. C. (2017) 'Trusting and controlling? Political trust, information and acceptance of surveillance policies: The case of Germany', *Government Information Quarterly*, 34(3), pp. 421–433.
- Viola, L. A. and Laidler, P. (eds) (2022) *Trust and Transparency in an Age of Surveillance*. London: Routledge.
- Warner, M. (2014) *The Rise and Fall of Intelligence: An international Security History*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Wester, M. and Giesecke, J. (2019) 'Accepting surveillance – An increased sense of security after terror strikes?', *Safety Science*. Elsevier, 120(March), pp. 383–387.
- Westerlund, M., Isabelle, D. A. and Leminen, S. (2020) 'Citizen acceptance of mass surveillance? Identity, intelligence and biodata concerns.', *Proceedings of ISPIM Conferences*, (December), pp. 1–11.