



## **A GLOBAL PROSPECTIVE OF ADMINISTRATIVE CORRUPTION**

**BHAGWANSING M. BAINADE**

Assistant Professor &  
H.O.D of Public Administration  
MSS Arts Collage, Tirthpuri, Jalna  
(MS) INDIA

### **ABSTRACT**

*The pressure mounted by the international donor community on developing countries to improve their governance is not founded. Evidence has shown that efforts made by these countries to revive their economics cannot succeed because, among other things, of bad management and corruption. Certainly as The Times puts it, corruption is common place everywhere but the pace and degree at which it has been spreading its tentacles in the developing country has drawn the cons urn not only of the international donor community but governments of developing countries as well.*

### **Introduction**

A study of administrative corruption seeks unravel causes of preventable public Administration and helps in restoring public confidence in administrative ethics. While delivering lecture on morality and administration in 1957, Paul H. Appleby favored a coed of Administrative Ethics for US public service. Reporting in 1989 National Commission on the Public Service in USA in pursuance of identical prospective called for rebuilding Public trust on public officials by way of removing “Public perceptions for corruption, waste and ineffectiveness in government”. Today this is the acknowledged agenda of the government all over the world.

### **Definition of Corruption**

Because of global social and economic diversities, it is difficult to give a definition of corruption that will fit universally. What one community might see as a normal practice, to others it might be a corrupt practice? Nye’s definition quoted in Heidenheimer describes corruption as “..Behavior which deviates from normal duties of public role because of private regarding..Pecuniary or status games or violate rules against the exercise of certain types of private regarding influence. This includes such behavior as bribery..Nepotism...and misappropriation.. ”

**BHAGWANSING M. BAINADE**

1P a g e

Others describes corruption as “Illegal or unethical use of governmental authority as a result of consideration of personal or political gains”.(Benson,1978). “Illegal use of organizational power for personal gains”. (Sherman, 1978).

### **Administrative Corruption; Global Prospective**

Corruption is a global phenomenon (Statesman, Dec 6,1994). It is not confined to dictatorships or impoverished societies or capitalist countries alone. Corruption appears to be a regular, recitative, integral part of the organizational society and the Modern Beaurocratic State, common to all political systems. It is endemic, chronic and pervasive, a universal and enduring problem (Scott, 1972). It can only be tackled on global bases, as the corruption of one country spreads to its neighbor contaminates the international order. (Caiden in Ramesh K Arora’s et al Universe of Public Administration, 1994). Until global agreement on anticorruption activities is arrived at, it is perhaps not possible to adopt e. By and large there has been an agreement on Joseph Nye’s definition of corruption as behavior which deviates from the formal duties of a public role because of private- regarding influence. Exactly what kind of behavior should be covered by corruption is still a subject of contention between moralist and programetist. As the lying between acceptable and unacceptable practices varies in so many countries, the existence of a grey area in between cannot be ruled out.

Presently, attention is getting diverted from individual corruption to systemic corruption which is “cancerous and disintegrative to the administrative state, to the legitimacy of the polity and to the authority of government itself” (Johnston, 1986). Caiden has suggested the following efforts to fight against systemic corruption:

#### **1. Fostering of a Democratic Ethos**

Corruption breeds in a ground where people are made to feel alienated from public officials who refuse recognize the sovereignty of the people. The aim of fostering democratic ethos is to restore public identification with polity and to restore people’s sense of ownership at the same time impressing public responsibility and accountability on public officials. (Wright, 1973 and Marican, 1972) Not only should the political arena reflect public opinion but the public bureaucracy should also be a fair reflection of social structure. Representative bureaucracy should accompany the representative government (Krishlov, 1974). For socializing public integrity and propriety against corruption, the need for highlighting institutions cannot be ignored. Array of socializing institutions in this regard are: home, religion, school, youth club, Armed services and International mass media.

#### **2. Fostering of Universal Ideology of Public Services**

BHAGWANSING M. BAINADE

2P a g e

Together with the democratic ethos has arisen concerted attempts to internationalize an ideology of public service among professionals and career officials, ingrained in the declaration of the French Revolution consisting of following edicts: (a) Government is a public trust to be used in general interest not for a sect or an interest. (b) Public officials are to abide by the law in the same way as everybody else. (c) Public officials are servants of the people. (d) Public officials should be the embodiment of all public virtues. (e) Appointment to public office should be based on merit, not on privilege or discrimination. (f) Public officials should perform duties efficiently and economically and guard against corrupt practices.

### **3. Fostering of Public Service Codes of Ethics**

Codes of right officials conduct which have been established in many countries are remarkably similar. A list is provided below regarding public service laws. Nearly every country has an anticorruption department, but complains of its inherent inadequacy, first because of prevailing climate of corruption in the society the department itself becomes corrupt and second such a department tends to be ill equipped for thorough and rigorous investigation. Perhaps the single greatest advantage of code of conduct expected from civil servants.

### **4. Fostering of Public Services Ethics Education and Training**

As Public Administration schools and institutes vary widely in their purposes and arrangements the study of public service values and ethics has different applications in different countries. Yet the IASIA has discovered substantial international agreement that private gains in the public service should not be pursued at the cost of public interest. During the last two decades, the IASIA has emphasized the need for the inclusion of values and ethics in education and training programmes for public managers. Despite the plea for cultural distinctness and maintenance of traditional institutes and moves the majority of association members maintain that the IASIA should propose international public management training standards for value and ethics. The adopted standards include.

(a) Instruction in governmental system which fosters and protects the responsiveness and accountability of public servants to direction and control by the public through its representatives.

(b) Instruction in a system of public communication which fosters citizen understanding and participation in the process of governance.

(c) Instruction in the purpose and limitations of government as an institution for fostering economic and social progress and cultural values. And

(d) Instruction in the rights, obligations and responsibilities of individuals and groups within the social and political systems. (Dwivedi and Englebert, 1983).

The IASIA's Ethics Working Groups offer an ongoing unique international forum for dialog about bureaucratic ethical standards including systemic corruption. According to the IASIA, instruction of public administration should include;

(a) The prevailing system of laws, regulations and practices governing the conduct of all public officials and employees.

(b) Standards of conduct which prohibit the use of public office for self interest or private gain or for improperly giving preferential treatment or disclosure of confidential information.

(c) Standards of conduct embodying respect, fairness and justice by public officials and employees in their individual and group relationships and in their contact with the public.

(d) Modes of behavior by public officials and employees which reflects need for responsiveness and loyalty to professional colleagues and for the support of legitimately established governmental and departmental policies and programmes within a framework of conscientious observance of established rules and procedures ensuring that public resources are utilized in an effective and efficient manner.

An attempt has been made for presenting a close study of corruption identifying specific corruption contexts and strategies adopted for sustaining it. This is intended not to foreclose other possibilities of theorizing but to sensitize theorists to undertake studies with suitable alterations.

## REFERENCES

1. Agarah T., "Checks & Balances of Bureaucratic Excess & Corruption in Nigeria an Assesment of the public complains commissions" In African Administrative Studies, pg.no. 35, 1990
2. Arlucchi.P. "corruption, Organized Crime and Money Laundering World Wide a Paper Presented in the Fifth International Anti-Corruption Conference, Amsterdam", 1992.
3. Arora Dolly, "Conceptualizing the Context and Contextualizing the Concept: Corruption Reconsidered "in IJPA, Volume XXXIX, No.1, 1993



4. Banfield, E. , “Corruption as a Feature of Governmental Organizations” in M.Ekpo.ed. Bureaucratic Corruption, 1979, :75-99
5. Bailey Stephen K. “Ethics and Public Services “in Stillman ed. Public Administration: Concept and Cases, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1986
6. Bayley, D. , “The Effects of Corruption in a Developing Nation” in Heidenheimer ed. Political Corruption: Readings in Comparative Analysis. Holt , New York, 1970.:521-533.
7. Caiden, G. E. and N.J. Caiden. “Administrative Corruption” in Public Administration Review, No.37 , 1977.
8. Caiden, G. E. and N. J. Caiden , “More on Official Misconduct” in IJPA, Volume XLI, No.3, 1995
9. Johanston Michael, “The Political Consequences of corruption : Reassessment in Comparative Politics, Volume 18, no. 4, 1986”
10. Marican- Y. Marsoom, Burocratic Power in India & Japan in Philippine, Journal of Public Administration.