Symposium Introduction

Jeroen Maesschalck, Carole I. Jurkiewicz, Leo W. J. C. Huberts

There is an emerging tradition of international comparative research in administrative ethics. The topic is both timely and much needed, as reports of corruption appear to be widespread in governments across the globe, from the richest nations to the poorest. This research has four identifiable strands. First, a large number of studies describe the institutional measures in place in a country to prevent corruption and foster ethical behavior. Examples include the analyses of “national integrity systems” by Transparency International (Pope 2000), the work on “ethics infrastructure” by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD 1996, 2000), and Rohr’s articulation of the constitutional foundations of public servant ethics (Rohr 1978, 2001, 2002).

Second is a group of studies that illuminate the incidence, process, and consequences of (perceived) corruption and unethical behavior (Della Porta and Mény 1997; Lambsdorff 1999; Pujas and Rhodes 1999). Third, a modest but increasing number of studies look beyond straightforwardly unethical behavior by doing comparative survey-based research on public sector values (De Vries 2002) and survey-based measurement of ethical decision-making in different countries (Stewart, Sprinthall, and Shafer 2001). Fourth, as usually follows in the wake of a new paradigm built on empirical evidence, is the budding of theoretical models supported by these empirical findings and bolstered by case studies aimed at identifying causal mechanisms for variations in norms, values, and (un)ethical behavior among various countries. This symposium contributes to the understanding of comparative administrative ethics through the research of the scholars whose works it presents. Rohr builds upon his established tradition of research into the constitutional basis of administrative ethics. Through a lively account of his first-hand experiences in the United States and France, he points at some important but often overlooked differences between the American and French constitutional traditions that influence administrative ethics. These differences can serve as alternative frameworks for administrative or policy ethics, as illustrated by his discussion of the normative foundations of affirmative action policies and the independent variables in accounting for variance in ethics policy or practice.

Behnke, like Rohr, contributes to the first strand of comparative research in administrative ethics in her studies of ethics policies and institutional arrangements. As this is done in the theory-driven format of an empirical comparative study, she also provides an important contribution to the fourth strand. Her in-depth analysis shows how studying the making of ethics policy in the United States and Germany can lead to conclusions of a much more general nature regarding the nature of legal and political systems in these two countries.

Schwartz’s contribution fits neatly into the fourth strand, as he compares the form and impact of regulatory oversight in two cases (one in Canada and the

other in Israel). In an attempt to account for important differences in ethical responses to regulatory failure, he observes that the traditional theories of regulatory capture have only limited explanatory value. By suggesting alternative explanations from the policy-analysis literature, he sows the seeds for a much broader explanatory framework for future research. Lewis delivers an insightful contribution to the first strand of research through an innovative field report wherein she reports on the first-hand experiences of four accomplished practitioners as they directed the implementation of administrative ethics policies. Her synthesis of their experiences provides useful guidelines of immediate use to practitioners; moreover, by combining these accounts from four countries and three continents, she directs the reader to consider the contextual and cultural factors that influence comparative research.

The symposium concludes as it started with a commentary from a central figure in the field. As someone who has made classical contributions to the first and second strands of the comparative literature (Transparency International's "national integrity system" and corruption perception index, respectively), Pope critically reflects upon these contributions, coloring his commentary with telling examples from his broad experience. He emphasizes the value of going beyond the Western world and including developing countries in our comparative research, with the focus of moving beyond awareness-raising toward implementation of ethics management practices.

These articles collectively add important building blocks to the burgeoning new research field of comparative administrative ethics—not just in adding to what has come before, but, perhaps more important, in forging a path for future research. Where will this path lead? One could suggest a number of directions. Administrative ethics constitutes an ideal field for comparative research within the broader academic traditions of political science, public administration, and psychology. As the ethics of public service are the core of administrative systems, it can serve as both an independent and dependent variable for examining between-country differences. Recent work to specify and operationalize the core variables that constitute administrative ethics (e.g., ethical infrastructure, national integrity systems, ethical climate, integrity violations, ethical decision-making) provides the conceptual grounding for such comparative analyses. As ethics is viewed as a more concrete concept than culture, administrative ethics is likely to avoid the conceptual problems and theoretical roadblocks (e.g., circular causal accounts) associated with research on national culture and related concepts (political culture, administrative culture). Refining survey and other instruments of measure for administrative ethics, developing a framework to build the paradigm, demonstrating predictive qualities and consequences of administrative ethics, and exploring methods of integrating individual ethical orientation with administrative policy are areas in which this field is anticipated to bloom. As the evidence mounts, and administrative ethics can be classified within a typology of culture and politics, theoretical development will expand along a parallel track to the empirical research. Each track should inform the other

toward the end of both furthering knowledge and providing practitioners with the tools they need to be effective.

The stimulation of such comparative research was the aim of the First Transatlantic Dialogue on the Ethics and Integrity of Governance, a conference in Leuven, Belgium, in June 2005, from which all but one of the contributions to this symposium were drawn. The conference was jointly organized by the Study Group on Ethics and Integrity of Governance (within the European Group of Public Administration) and the Section on Ethics (within the American Society for Public Administration), and hosted by the Public Management Institute of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

The guest editors are grateful to the chairs of these conference workshops for providing a first selection of the papers that were presented in their areas. A selection of these papers was submitted to a blind peer review. The guest editors sincerely thank the reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions: Janos Bertok (OECD), Sanford Borins (University of Toronto, Canada), Stuart Gilman (UN Global Programme Against Corruption), Sylvian Horton (University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom), Thomas D. Lynch (Louisiana State University, United States), Patrizio Monfardini (University of Siena, Italy), Sarah Scheepers (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium), Frankie Schram (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium), Jolanta Palidauskaite (Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania), Andrew Stark (University of Toronto, Canada), Paul 't Hart (Australian National University, Australia), André van Montfoort (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands), Jonathan West (University of Miami, United States), Howard Whitton (Tiri), and Carole Wyser (Institut de Hautes Etudes en Administration Publique, Switzerland).

REFERENCES

- De Vries, Michiel S. 2002. "Can You Afford Honesty? A Comparative Analysis of Ethos and Ethics in Local Government." *Administration and Society* 34, no. 3:309–334.
- Della Porta, Donatella, and Yves Mény. 1997. *Democracy and Corruption in Europe*. London: Pinter.
- Lambsdorff, J. G. 1999. "Corruption in Empirical Research: A Review." Transparency International Working Paper.
- OECD. 1996. *Ethics in the Public Service: Current Issues and Practices*. Paris.
- . 2000. *Trust in Government. Ethics Measures in OECD Countries*. Paris.
- Pope, Jeremy. 2000. *TI Sourcebook 2000. Confronting Corruption: The Elements of a National Integrity System*. Berlin: Transparency International.
- Pujas, Véronique, and Martin Rhodes. 1999. "A Clash of Cultures? Corruption and the Ethics of Administration in Western Europe." *Parliamentary Affairs* 52, no. 4:688–702.
- Rohr, John A. 1978. *Ethics for Bureaucrats: An Essay on Law and Values*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- . 2001. "Constitutionalism and Administrative Ethics: A Comparative Study of Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States." In

Handbook of Administrative Ethics (2nd ed.), edited by Terry L. Cooper, pp. 671–694. New York: Marcel Dekker.

———. 2002. *Civil Servants and Their Constitutions*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Stewart, D. W., N. W. Sprinthall, and D. M. Shafer. 2001. "Moral Development in Public Administration." In *Handbook of Administrative Ethics* (2nd ed.), edited by Terry L. Cooper, pp. 457–480. New York: Marcel Dekker.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Jeroen Maesschalck is a lecturer at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium) and director of the Leuven Institute for Criminology. His teaching and research interests include public sector ethics, criminal justice administration and policy, and public personnel management. He is also a research fellow in integrity of governance at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and co-chair of the Study Group on Ethics and Integrity of Governance of the European Group of Public Administration. He has published in such journals as *Public Integrity*, *Public Administration*, and *Western European Politics*, and earned his Ph.D. at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven in 2004.

Carole L. Jurkiewicz, Ph.D., is the Women's Hospital Distinguished Professor of Healthcare Management in the Public Administration Institute of the E. J. Ourso College of Business at Louisiana State University. She has published numerous articles and books in the areas of organizational and individual performance, ethics, power, and leadership, bringing to her academic career many years of experience as a key executive in private and nonprofit organizations. She speaks across the United States and Europe on issues of ethics and organizational integrity, and has held key leadership roles in the American Society for Public Administration. Dr. Jurkiewicz has served as a consultant to many organizations, including IBM, the U.S. Postal Service, National Public Radio, the American Marketing Association, and government departments at the federal, state, and local levels.

Leo W. J. C. Huberts is professor of public administration and integrity of governance in the Department of Public Administration and Organisation Science of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam in the Netherlands and director of the Research Group on the Integrity of Governance. From 1997 until 2004 he was professor of police studies and criminal justice in the same department. His research concerns political, administrative, police power, and power abuse (including corruption and fraud). He is author or editor of ten books on integrity, corruption, and fraud, and has published articles in *Public Integrity and Crime*, *Law and Social Change*, and other journals.

Copyright of Public Integrity is the property of M.E. Sharpe Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.