Ethics and Integrity of Governance

Perspectives Across Frontiers

Edited by

Leo W.J.C. Huberts

VU University Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Jeroen Maesschalck

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

Carole L. Jurkiewicz

Louisiana State University, USA

with a foreword by John Rohr

NEW HORIZONS IN PUBLIC POLICY

Edward Elgar

Cheltenham, UK • Northampton, MA, USA

© Leo W.J.C. Huberts, Jeroen Maesschalck and Carole L. Jurkiewicz, 2008

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical or photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Published by
Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
Glensanda House
Montpellier Parade
Cheltenham
Glos GL50 1UA
UK

Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
William Pratt House
9 Dewey Court
Northampton
Massachusetts 01060
USA

A catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Ethics and integrity of governance : perspectives across frontiers / edited by
Leo W.J.C. Huberts, Jeroen Maesschalck, Carole L. Jurkiewicz ; with a
foreword by John Rohr.

p. cm.

Articles originally presented at the conference 'Ethics and Integrity of
Governance: Perspectives Across Frontiers' held in Leuven in June 2005.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Political ethics—United States—Congresses. 2. Political ethics—
Europe—Congresses. I. Huberts, L.W. II. Maesschalck, Jeroen, 1975–
III. Jurkiewicz, Carole L., 1958–

JK468.E7E83 2008

172—dc22

2007047864

ISBN 978 1 84542 854 9

Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall

14. Global perspectives on good governance policies and research

**Leo W.J.C. Huberts, Jeroen Maesschalck and
Carole L. Jurkiewicz**

INTRODUCTION

Moral challenges have confronted every society, regardless of locale or state of industrial development. Every political institution and civil society has had to contend with questions of ethicality. The failure to effectively resolve these challenges is not new. What is novel, as suggested here, is a shift in the public's capacity and desire for scrutiny and insistence upon adherence to moral standards defined by appropriate behaviors from those holding public authority and the public trust. These individuals are being held to increasingly higher standards in the past decade and this has fueled a concomitant interest in public ethics research.

This chapter will reflect on both the practice and study of ethical governance from a global perspective. The intent is to provide an overview of common dilemmas as well as a framework for continued theory development and empirical research. First, a synopsis of the scope and breadth of current research in this area will be examined along with its impact on policy development and its beneficiaries will be presented. Second, a overview of what aspects of good governance comprise the focus of current research, what areas are under-analysed, and how efforts should be directed in order to address these inadequacies in theory development. Further, this research will be examined within the context of practical application to countries experiencing a range of corruptive factors at all governmental levels; what does and can research do to address these problems directly, in a manner that is of value to those administrators faced with these challenges on a daily basis.

This purview of inquiry is important not only on a circumscribed level, but is essential to the international policy debate as well. It is frequently presupposed that there is agreement on the basic values of governance characterizing liberal democracies with private enterprise and market economies, though this remains to be proven. Similarly, the effectiveness of

anti-corruption and integrity policies and institutions shares a presumed agreement without substantiation. These underlying assumptions beg to be examined in light of current and future research. The trend toward culturally integrative and empirically-based research is encouraging and will no doubt play an essential role in further articulation of both the issues and the methods of inquiry used to examine them.

ETHICS AND INTEGRITY IN INTERNATIONAL POLICY

It can be argued that increasing attention has been paid to issues of ethics and integrity in politics, administration, economy and society on a global scale. Following the cyclical nature of such things, good governance appears to be back on the agenda of politicians, administrators, managers, interest groups, the citizenry and members of the research community in general. Stimulated by widespread reports of corruption typifying the era beginning in the 1990s, few countries have escaped the intensified oversight. The Italian political party system exploded in the early 1990s because of revelations of corruption. The regimes of Marcos in the Philippines and Suharto in Indonesia imploded for the same reasons (Klitgaard, 1988; Rose-Ackerman, 1999), as is happening explosively today in Bulgaria, Thailand, and to a lesser extent among factions in the United States. In point of fact scandal seems the norm and ethicality the exception, and the only variances among nations appears to be scope, size of impact and novelty of the violation. As few countries have been untouched by public scandals in the twenty-first century it must be asked whether corruption and scandal are endemic to all governmental systems and, if so, is it possible to enact change. Certainly there are no easy answers and any solutions must address the issue from both a macro- and micro-level. There are a number of global and international initiatives tackling this problem that are worthy of note.

United Nations

The United Nations General Assembly Resolution on Corruption in 1997 reaffirmed its commitment to address the problem of the adoption of the International Code of Conduct for Public Officials. The effort was expanded in 2001 during the UN Convention against Corruption at the Second Global Forum on Fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity at the Hague. Adopted by the General Assembly in October 2003, it completed the ratification process and was entered into force in December 2005,

to be monitored and evaluated by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).¹ As United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan said in his statement on the adoption by the General Assembly of the United Nations Convention against Corruption:

Corruption hurts the poor disproportionately by diverting funds intended for development, undermining a government's ability to provide basic services, feeding inequality and injustice, and discouraging foreign investment and aid.

Readers can access the full text of the Convention at <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption.html>. The points included in the Convention are intended to be both comprehensive and a statement of international consensus. These include a description of the values to be promoted among public officials, policies for prevention, legal remedies for violations and a clause promoting asset recovery from individuals convicted of using public funds for personal gain.

Annexed to a General Assembly Resolution of 12 December 1996 was the Code of Conduct for Public Officials,² whose general principles include:

1. A public office, as defined by national law, is a position of trust, implying a duty to act in the public interest. Therefore, the ultimate loyalty of public officials shall be to the public interests of their country as expressed through the democratic institutions of government.
2. Public officials shall ensure that they perform their duties and functions efficiently, effectively and with integrity, in accordance with laws or administrative policies. They shall at all times seek to ensure that public resources for which they are responsible are administered in the most effective and efficient manner.
3. Public officials shall be attentive, fair and impartial in the performance of their functions and, in particular, in their relations with the public. They shall at no time afford any undue preferential treatment to any group or individual or improperly discriminate against any group or individual, or otherwise abuse the power and authority vested in them.

Other articles of this Code encompass conflicts of interest, disclosure of assets, acceptance of gifts or other favors, handling confidential information, and engaging in political activities. Collectively, this effort on behalf of the UN is an optimistic initiative in combating a deeply entrenched global problem, that of mandating ethics and integrity in governance.

Yet the ubiquitous nature of corruption is, sadly ironically, evidenced in the administration of the United Nations itself as the subject of accusations of corruption and various integrity violations (Rosett, 2006). The most prominent of these was the 1996 Oil-for-Food Program scandal ensuing when, under UN auspices, over \$65 billion worth of Iraqi oil was

sold on the world market in violation of the provisions that it was to be sold in quantities necessary only to exchange for food, medicine and other humanitarian needs. The Program was discontinued in late 2003 amidst allegations of widespread abuse and corruption when it was revealed by the Volcker investigation that the excess sales allowed the regime to rebuild its military in the wake of the first Gulf War. The Program director was suspended and then resigned from the UN when it was concluded he had accepted bribes from the Iraqi regime.

Beyond the UN in toto, Kofi Annan's son was implicated for allegedly procuring UN Oil-for-Food contracts on behalf of a Swiss company, Cotecna, in exchange for personal gain and India's foreign minister was removed from office because of his alleged direct role in the scandal.

Ethical policy developments almost always consequent to scandal and, true to form, the UN established an Ethics Office in 2006 with independent external oversight and auditing, as well as expanded provisions governing whistle-blowing and staff financial disclosures. Announcing the new office, Mr Annan stated:

Staff members expressed concern about the ethics climate within the United Nations in the 2004 integrity perception survey. Similar concerns were raised by the report of the Independent Inquiry Committee on the oil-for-food programme. In addition, recent events have created the imperative to establish new mechanisms to improve ethics within the organization. The creation of an ethics office is central to this effort.

The ethics office would foster a staff culture of transparency and accountability and set standards for training and appropriate professional conduct, the report adds. It would lead and manage the UN ethics infrastructure by taking such steps as administering the financial disclosure program, which would encompass about 1000 staff members, and protect the staff against retaliation for reporting misconduct.

The World Bank and IMF

Mirroring ethics growing importance in the world of politics, major international financial and economic institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund³ have also embraced corruption-prevention techniques as central criteria when determining questions of developmental aid and debt release in international relations. Essentially, the focus is on whether assisting a country will ultimately facilitate profiteering of the elites through bribery and fraud. The WB, in concurrence with the IMF, has identified corruption as among the greatest obstacles to economic and social development, distorting the rule of law,

and weakening the institutional foundation on which economic growth depends.⁴ As corruption sabotages policies and programs that aim to reduce poverty, confronting it is critical to the achievement of the WB's overarching mission of poverty reduction. The WB's anticorruption strategy builds on five key elements: increasing political accountability, strengthening civil society participation, creating a competitive private sector, mandating institutional restraints on power, and improving public sector management. As summarized by former World Bank President, Paul Wolfowitz⁵ in April 2006:

In the last half-century we have developed a better understanding of what helps governments function effectively and achieve economic progress . . . It is essentially the combination of transparent and accountable institutions, strong skills and competence, and a fundamental willingness to do the right thing. Those are the things that enable a government to . . . raise their national incomes by as much as four times . . . The World Bank first acknowledged corruption as a major impediment to development only ten years ago. But since then, it has been leading the development community in coming to grips with this very serious, but long-ignored problem. Fighting corruption is a long-term commitment, and results will not come overnight . . . That is why fighting corruption requires a long-term strategy that systematically and progressively attacks the problem, and . . . requires the commitment and participation of governments . . . citizens, and . . . businesses alike.

In 2006 the World Bank brought together 'over 250 leaders, thinkers, development practitioners, and youth from over 70 developed and developing countries' for what was termed a World Ethics Forum.⁶ Discussions focused on strategies to promote ethical leadership and public integrity as tools for better governance and accelerated development. Its goal was to develop, empower and support leaders at all levels who are committed to integrity. By raising awareness of and enhancing the capacity to recognize the issues, forming action coalitions across nations and sectors, engaging in capacity-building for ethical, effective leadership, and providing resources to facilitate these ends the Forum sought to operationalize many of the over-arching goals first articulated a decade earlier. The Global Integrity Alliance is but one of many products emerging from the Forum. Said Sanjay Pradhan, Director for Public Sector Governance in the Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Vice Presidency at the World Bank: 'The dynamics of ethical leadership are under-analysed, under-appreciated, and under-emphasized by the international community. Ethics and integrity are critical factors for development, and the World Ethics Forum allowed the exchange of views among public, private, and civil society leaders to create new joint initiatives and partnerships.'

OECD

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, comprised of 29 Member States representing the industrialized world, has made anti-corruption initiatives and ethics and integrity policies an important aspect of its work. Its main contribution has been the 1997 OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions. The Convention, signed by all member countries and a number of non-members, came into force in 1999 and for the first time made bribing a foreign public official a criminal offense. Another area of focus is evident in the OECD Guidelines for Managing Conflict of Interest in the Public Service which offers the first international benchmark in the field. A 'conflict of interest' was concretely defined as involving 'a conflict between the public duty and private interests of a public official, in which the public official has private-capacity interests which could improperly influence the performance of their official duties and responsibilities'.⁷ The Guidelines state that the proper objective of an effective Conflict of Interest policy is not the simple prohibition of all private-capacity interests on the part of public officials, but rather to maintain the integrity of official policy and administrative decisions and of public management generally, recognizing that an unresolved conflict of interest may result in abuse of public office. To achieve this objective public bodies must possess and implement relevant policy standards for promoting integrity. These include effective processes for identifying risk and dealing with emergent conflicts of interest, appropriate external and internal accountability mechanisms, aggressive management approaches that ensure that public officials take personal responsibility for complying with both the letter and the spirit of such standards.

Civil Society

Transparency International, based in Berlin, is the best known and most ubiquitous example of an international non-governmental organization fighting corruption. With branches in 99 countries (2006), TI favors a holistic approach to a national integrity system (Pope, 2000; Transparency International, 2001). Although each country or region is unique in its own history and culture, its political system and its stage of economic and social development, similarities do exist and experience and lessons are often transferable. TI proposes a National Integrity System as a comprehensive method of fighting corruption. It comprises eight interdependent pillars for research, action and dialogue: public awareness, public anti-corruption strategies, public participation, watchdog agencies, the

judiciary, the media, the private sector and international cooperation. Emergent from this initiative is the popular Corruption Perception Index, whereby countries are scored on a continuum based upon surveys among business persons and analysts. Additionally, TI monitors a Corruption Barometer which tracks public opinion on bribery and corruption and issues an annual report (TI, 2005). Collectively, those measures offer a glimpse of both the breadth and awareness of corruption in a sampling of countries across the globe. According to TI, the sectors most affected by corruption are political parties (especially in high income countries), and the legislature and the police (in many low income countries). When asked if corruption had gotten better or worse in their countries over the past three years, 57 percent of respondents stated corruption had increased, and 27 percent said it had stayed the same. While some regions (for example Africa) appear to be optimistic about the future, overall 44 percent of respondents expect corruption will increase over the next three years.

Conclusion

To the extent it is possible to summarize this sampling of initiatives and to generalize from those findings, one might conclude the following. First, international organizations over the past ten years have demonstrated a growing commitment to fight corruption. The topic holds a prominent agenda position in international politics and administration and is seen as essential in safeguarding integrity to promote political and economic progress. Second, an extensive framework of conventions, rules, monitoring guidelines and sanctions has been built and continues to grow. Third, these policies and practices are exercising increasing influence among the decision-making bodies determining who receives financial assistance, debt reduction, developmental aid, and political and economic favors; countries who seek such support and do not abide by nor recognize these anti-corruption initiatives are regarded much less favorably on the whole. Fourth, there appears to be a growing awareness among the international community that issues of integrity and ethics of government and governance encompass aspects beyond curbing and sanctioning corruption. Expanded interest in defining what good governance is on a global scale, integrating principles of ethical leadership across cultures and sectors and overcoming political and economic barriers to acceptance of global initiatives characterizes work in this field today and into the foreseeable future. The anti-corruption effort is in its infancy and as such is widely flawed, but areas seen as lacking are viewed as more urgent in the current move to align economic, political, and ethical philosophies.

CRITICISM OF THE DOMINANT GLOBAL POLICY FRAMEWORK

While efforts to combat corruption and enhance ethicality and integrity are growing in scope and popularity, criticism regarding who has the right to establish such precepts and who really benefits from the intended outcomes abounds (Caiden *et al.*, 2001; Fijnaut and Huberts, 2002).

A key question is whether the UN, WB, and IMF are the right organizations to address these questions, especially given the scandals those organizations face themselves; they advocate transparency, accountability, disclosure standards, and so on yet appear to violate their own dictates (Everett *et al.*, 2006: 8). Is it possible or even desirable to seek global consensus on what constitutes ethical political and public administrations? Since much of the existing research in this area was derived from Western thought, the frameworks may or may not represent the political and social best practices of the rest of the world (Benaissa, 1993; Punch *et al.*, 1993; Pieth and Eigen, 1999). While the moralist approach contends that all corruption is undesirable, the functionalist approach argues that there are conditions when bribing and corruptive acts are good for a society and that political, economic and social relationships might suffer if such behaviors are extinguished (Johnson, 2004: 155–63; Bardhan, 1997). Certainly more objective data is needed to make these determinations.

On the question of who are the beneficiaries of such efforts, one group states it is a win-win outcome for everyone from rich industrialized nations to developing countries. The other side of the argument states that institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund contribute to the development of a global free market capitalism which ultimately harms the poor and powerless and, thus, address the ethicality of forcing a developing country in the direction of a market economy and private enterprise (Heidenheimer and Johnston, 2002; Pieth and Eigen, 1999; UNDP, 1998). Doubt also exists regarding the purity of interest in anti-corruption efforts from countries with varying political agendas, from developing nations where dictators control public funds to international super-powers who use their economic might for political and military ends, to those in the middle of the global hierarchy who seek advantage over others of their ilk seeking economic development assistance. Are anti-corruption efforts simply a new, seemingly virtuous packaging of tools to exercise individualized agendas? Table 14.1 addresses that question in part.

The table presents the Corruption Perception Index scores of the first 30 countries among the full 159 to ratify the UN Convention against Corruption. The CPI score ranges from 10 (highly clean) to 0 (highly corrupt). Perhaps surprisingly, only two countries have a score above 5.0

Table 14.1 CPI score of the 30 first countries that ratified the UN Convention

Country	2005 CPI score	Country rank
Algeria	2.8	97
Belarus	2.6	107
Benin	2.9	88
Brazil	3.7	62
Croatia	3.4	70
Djibouti	Not on list	
Ecuador	3.5	117
Egypt	3.4	70
El Salvador	4.2	51
France	7.5	18
Honduras	2.6	107
Hungary	5.0	40
Jordan	5.7	37
Kenya	2.1	144
Libya	2.5	117
Madagascar	2.8	97
Mauritius	4.2	51
Mexico	3.5	65
Namibia	4.3	47
Nigeria	1.9	152
Paraguay	2.1	144
Peru	3.5	65
Romania	3.0	85
Sierra Leone	2.4	126
South Africa	4.5	46
Sri Lanka	3.2	78
Togo	Not on list	
Turkmenistan	1.8	155
Uganda	2.5	117
United Republic of Tanzania	2.9	88

(France and Jordan), and only five belong to the 50 least corrupt countries in terms of CPI. The more corrupt a country is perceived, the more quickly it acted to ratify the anti-corruption measure. Is this because the effort was viewed as a legitimate method to combat a pervasive evil in their society, or because the mechanics of ratification under a dictatorship are decidedly more efficient than under democratic regimes, or because these countries are eager to adopt a veil of proactivity in order to position themselves favorably in requesting economic relief?

Another key point of criticism lies in the anti-corruptive methodology. At the forefront in this regard is the Corruption Perception Index of Transparency International (Johnston, 2005; Sampford *et al.*, 2006). As these reputational scores are primarily based on the impressions of international business persons and risk analysts it is necessarily imprecise. Skeptical by nature, these individuals may not register as significant a country's effort to combat corruption with new policies or legislation, but may relatively overreact to new reports of scandals or convictions.⁸ Additionally, as the countries are ranked, an increase in one country's score forces a reduction in the score of another country although the downward placement and concomitant negative effect on economic aid may not be warranted. Further, most proposals and frameworks are based upon firsthand reports by anti-corruption practitioners rather than scientific evaluation. Although empirically-based knowledge in this area is increasing, rational policy choices simply cannot be supported at this time in the field of good governance⁹ (Andvig and Fjeldstad, 2001; Everett *et al.*, 2006).

ETHICS, INTEGRITY AND CORRUPTION THEORY

Theoretical models addressing the concepts and processes of ethical administration in the public sector are developing concomitant with the research in best practices referenced above. Cooper (2004), stresses that in order to frame the significant research questions and allow for sustained and systematic inquiry, the following precepts need to be clarified:

1. What are the normative foundations for PA Ethics? (constitutional thought, social equity, virtue or the public interest).
2. How do American administrative ethical norms fit into a global context?
3. How can organizations be designed to support ethical conduct?
4. When is it acceptable to treat people equally and when unequally?

While research in this area has generally adopted this set of unifying themes, the global intellectual community has understandably taken issue with the second question as posed by Cooper, an American. The question itself provides fodder to those who criticize efforts of the WB, IMF and UN as being simply the implementation arm of Western ethical culture. Setting aside that argument for the moment the question will be rephrased to one asking if there is a global context with which all countries' administrative reforms align.

Toward that end Cooper and Yoder (2002, 2005) examined a large number of international treaties, pacts, agreements, conventions and programs going back to the 1970s. They attempted to identify the core values explicitly advocated or implicitly assumed and examined the reasoning underlying such values. They surmised their findings suggested an 'emerging global standard for public ethics' that consists of five core values:

1. The right to self-determination (with transparency as a requisite for people to secure this right individually and collectively).
2. Freedom (including freedom of information, autonomy of economic choice, and autonomy of political choice).
3. Honesty by government (making accountability possible).
4. Trust as the essential glue that holds democratic governance and market economies together (in essence a product of freedom and honesty).
5. Stability (and predictability), as a by-product of freedom, honesty, and trust.

Recognition of an increasingly interdependent world and a growing global commitment to market economies and democratic governance were the reasons given to support the five recurring core values.

Other scholars heeded Cooper's call and strove to replicate and expand this research in other venues. Menzel (2005) reviewed and assessed the research on ethics and integrity in governance published in ten US print journals from 1999 till 2004. He identified five interrelated themes: ethical decision-making and moral development; ethics laws and regulatory agencies; organizational performance; ethics management; and the ethical environment.

Frederickson's and Ghere's (2005) book, *Ethics in Public Management*, organized the seminal research to date in this area into four clusters: organization designs that support ethical behaviour; market forces that compromise administrative ethics; unintended outcomes of anticorruption reforms; and administrative ethics in global perspective. The themes indicate that greater attention is being paid to the interconnection between market and government ethics, and that further development of integrity and ethics policies is needed. Ghere (p. 352) concludes:

the prospect of adopting a global ethic – a framework for defining right and wrong that knows no social, economic, or political borders – remains far in the future. In the meantime, public administrators can reprofessionalize their ethics in a manner that incorporates global humanitarian concern. To do so, practitioners need researchers to map globalization's ethical terrain and to recommend approaches for globally pertinent actions that are just, prudent, and feasible.

Lawton and Doig (2006) reviewed the body of European ethics research much in the same way Menzel did, focusing on journals articles published between 1999 and 2003.¹⁰ Common themes identified were the public service ethos; regulation of individual (ethical) behavior; role of professionals; and cultural and political influences. They found the literature rife with real-world accounts (by the European Commission, the OECD and others), contributing to a plethora of descriptive studies on a broad range of topics. They concluded that what is needed for the next step is enhanced comparative research and a method of unifying the knowledge thus far collected, such as is being enacted by the EGPA Study Group established in 2003.¹¹

Bossaert and Demmke's (2005) effort mirrored in part that of Cooper and Yoder in their examination of EU member policies regarding ethics and integrity. Their main conclusions address the challenges faced in the microcosm of assimilation EU states are experiencing with attempts to develop a uniform European Code of Ethics. Issues regarding reconciliation of differing views, who has the authority to oversee the effort, and what force should be incorporated into any potential code are all questions facing such a project. They advocate that a first step might be to establish a voluntary, non-legally binding European code of ethics to increase awareness of the issues at hand and stimulate dialogue. One surprising similarity they report is that, despite differences in general ethical perceptions, the obligations of civil servants regarding ethical behavior are remarkably similar in all 25 national public services of the enlarged EU. This is evident in the ethical requirements determined by laws as well as in disciplinary actions. Moreover, the traditional values of national civil services (neutrality, respecting the rule of law, confidentiality, impartiality, avoiding conflicts of interest, etc.) have remained unchanged for decades. These values are echoed in Palidauskaite's (2006) research on Eastern European countries that concludes the values purported for public servants are legality, serving the public, loyalty to the constitutional government, impartiality, competence, professionalism, honesty, integrity, disinterestedness, political neutrality, transparency and openness.

The study of ethics is not, of course, limited to US and EU researchers and it would be informative to have a global perspective on these and other issues (the significant contributions of Australian scholarship, to name just one additional country, such as Miller *et al.* (2005); Preston and Sampford (2002); Sampford and Preston (1998); Sampford *et al.* (2006) should be noted here). This text, however, will not attempt to speak for the worldwide community but does offer some unique insights into integrating a cross-Atlantic dialog on ethics in the public service. Those insights have emerged from a conference in 2005 jointly sponsored by the

EGPA group and the Section on Ethics of the American Society for Public Administration.¹²

PERSPECTIVES ON ETHICS AND INTEGRITY OF GOVERNANCE

An overview of the research presented at this joint conference offers the following new perspectives to add to the summaries of research and action provided above.

First, the international academic dialog on these subjects has become more cooperative, intellectually challenging, vigorous, and substantive. The field is yet dominated by American scholars and American themes (Cooper, 2001; Frederickson and Ghore, 2005), although a shift toward greater balance is evident. This bent toward American research is in part a reflection of the sheer number of scholars at work in that area in comparison to the European academic community, as well as the history of scholarship on which the Americans can build. But it is also a function of the international academic community where English is the dominant language, American journals proliferate, and the American ethos of publish or perish motivates US authors to aggressively pursue publications in the few international journals that do exist. This book and other like-minded symposia (Menzel and Jurkiewicz, 2006), we hope, effectively demonstrate that the non-American voice is essential in advancing scholarship for all ethics researchers. As the World Ethics Forum and the Global Integrity Alliance illustrate, there is a trend toward global networks and the international academic community is well-positioned to be in the forefront of developments involving politics, economics, health, education and ethics.

In addition to bridging geographical and cultural boundaries, creating a collective knowledge base requires the integration and clarification of some key dimensions. One is the integration of varying disciplines into the ethics arena, as illustrated in (Figure 14.1). The need to speak a common language goes beyond English to the nuances a specialized vocabulary of terms if ethics researchers are to be able to unify their work and generalize their findings. Some examples here may accentuate this need.

Kaye, a political scientist, wonders why ethics researchers neglect the significance of politics, while Lewis searches for the foundations of ethics in a rich variety of disciplines, and Vandenabeele and Horton are historians and institutional theorists, Hoekstra *et al.* symbolize the link between public and proprietary administration, and Emery and Wyser focus on integrity in governance. Each of these scholars is engaged in related research yet each area of study is defined by a separate paradigm and

Figure 14.1 Many related disciplines and aspects

bodies of publication and theoretical concepts. Speaking English is clearly not enough to bring these different theoretical dialects together and in synchronicity moving in the same direction. It is that goal toward which the efforts presented in this book as well as at the conference focus, to advance a multidisciplinary and eventually interdisciplinary cumulative theory of ethical administration. It is the challenging conclusion of the scholars and practitioners previously cited to do just that.

So, how to begin? First, it is necessary to reach an agreement upon which of the many research topics available should be chosen for intensified international and multi-disciplinary cooperative work. Thus, initiatives such as the 'Transatlantic Dialogues' have been undertaken, but much more needs to be done in this regard. Second, the collective research process needs organization and resources, meaning that individual researchers need to reach out to colleagues in other disciplines and countries to work together on mutually beneficial projects. Again, conferences such as the Transatlantic Dialogue meetings provide an opportunity to meet potential fellow researchers and discuss commonalities of interests and resources. Interestingly, in Lawton's and Doig's (2005) synopsis one would expect that European scholars at this conference would focus on theoretical, conceptual, and definitional issues, and based upon Menzel's (2005) claim we would anticipate American scholars would emphasize the empirical. Yet as Figure 14.2 illustrates the scholars' contributions to this book contest that theory. Europeans in this book are more focused on empirical research while the Americans seek to explain and develop theory. Not to say that

Figure 14.2 Research orientation

observation is problematic. On the contrary, it offers greater evidence of the need for cross-dialog and a shedding of preconceived limits on what we need to know and how we should go about knowing it.

A SHARED LANGUAGE: TOWARD CONCEPTUAL CLARITY

Fruitful social science requires that the problem first be delineated and, given the ambiguous nature of ethical studies, this must begin with a definition of terms. Communication can be challenging enough when speaking the same language, and to be able to forge a common rubric for research and dialog the field needs to come to an agreement regarding terms. Conceptual clarity is essential for public debate, policy-making and theory development in ethics on an international level, particularly with the commonly relativistic interpretations of concepts such as corruption, integrity and governance. A review of the more commonly used terms and their definitions is useful here.

The concept of corruption is often at the heart of the debate about the moral quality of government and it can be understood to mean any number of things. The legal definition states it is acting in the interest of an actor because of the advantages promised or given. Pope (2000) suggests it should include all abuses of office for private gain, such as fraud and theft. Yet another defines corruption as synonymous with all types of wrongdoing by functionaries, thus encompassing all vices, maladies, and weaknesses of politics and bureaucracy. Referring to bureaucracies, Caiden once distinguished 179 types of what he called bureaupathologies, including corruption, deceit, discrimination, fraud, injustice, mediocrity, red-tape and waste (Caiden, 1991: 490).

Employing the word integrity can represent a range of perspectives by both the author and the reader (Montefiore and Vines, 1999; Dobel, 1999).¹³ Integrity can be seen as 'wholeness' or completeness, as one specific value (incorruptibility or righteousness), as acting in line with

constitutional or regime values (Rohr, 1989), as complying with the relevant moral values and norms, or as complying in an exemplary way with moral standards. Typologies of integrity violations are frequently used as well, resulting from theoretical and empirical analyses of particular professions. Such typologies generally include behavior both internal and external to the organization and contain a range of relevant (laws, rules, codes, informal norms). Table 14.2 illustrates an integrity typology for police conduct, with nine distinct clusters. Each integrity violation is associated with a continuum of behaviors from most to least serious, as determined by how far these behaviors are from normative value expectations. Corruptive behavior such as bribing, for instance, can vary from cents to billions, and also the impact of the decisions taken in exchange for the bribe can differ enormously (for example, from doing a friend a favor by sharing

Table 14.2 Types of integrity violations related to police behavior

Corruption: bribing

misuse of public power for private gain; asking, offering, accepting bribes

Corruption: favoritism (nepotism, cronyism, patronage)

misuse of public authority to favor friends, family, party

Fraud and theft

improper private gain acquired from the organization (with no involvement of external actors)

Conflict of (private and public) interest

personal interest (through assets, jobs, gifts and so on) interferes (or might interfere) with public interest

Improper use of authority (for noble causes)

to use illegal/improper methods to achieve organizational goals (within the police for example illegal methods of investigation and disproportionate violence)

Misuse and manipulation of information

lying, cheating, manipulating information, breaching confidentiality of information

Discrimination and sexual harassment

misbehavior towards colleagues or citizens and customers

Waste and abuse of resources

failure to comply with organizational standards, improper performance, incorrect or dysfunctional internal behavior

Private time misconduct

conduct in one's private time which harms the public's trust in administration/government

Source: Huberts *et al.*, 1999: 449–51.

a tidbit of information, to shoddy policies and projects with disastrous economic consequences for populations). Sexual harassment, for example, can vary between a sexist remark and rape.

Typologies can be especially useful in comparative research. For instance, central integrity problems in the Netherlands might be very different from those in Italy or the US (or the UK as Fawcett and Wardman clarify Chapter 8 of this book). By applying a typology, scholars can define the integrity issues such that even while speaking cross-culturally apples are being compared to apples and oranges to oranges, so to speak.

The word governance is frequently used in contemporary social sciences with a general understanding that it refers to something broad in scope and includes a division of power and authority (Van Kersbergen and Van Waarden, 2004; Pierre and Guy Peters, 2000; <http://europa.eu.int/comm/governance>). Frederickson and Smith (2003: 210) summarized as the central question of governance as being 'how can public-sector regimes, agencies, programs and activities be organized and managed to achieve public purposes?' Common agreement surrounding the term is that it speaks to the political and administrative process and institutions and does not encompass policies and results. The ethics and integrity of governance addresses the morality of those who govern rather than evaluating the quality of the decision or policy. To use a current example, questions of governance do not concern themselves with whether the invasion of Iraq was ethical, but instead examine the decision-making processes that led to the invasion of Iraq and make determinations as to whether the decision-makers and involved public servants acted with integrity.

Integrity is but one aspect of governance, although one that permeates almost every other aspect. It is necessary, for the sake of scientific inquiry, to separate the application of moral principles to the conduct of officials in organizations and other areas of competence such as financial, legal, or democratic principles (Thompson, 2001: 79, 91). This framework for the qualities of governance is summarized in Figure 14.3 (based on Bovens *et al.*, 2001). We realize that integrity is interconnected with democracy, lawfulness and economy, but the attractiveness of the framework as a heuristic device is that it points out a number of dilemmas in the study of the integrity of governance. Such a model enables practitioners and scholars to reflect more systematically on the limitations as well as possibilities of the mentioned criteria, including integrity.

Underpinning this model is the presumption that those who govern can make errors and demonstrate incompetence in any one of the four criteria, but violations in only one of the four areas constitutes the potential for evil (Adams and Balfour, 2004). Simply put, an individual can do wrong

Figure 14.3 Quality of governance criteria

without committing an integrity violation. Blurring this distinction is not uncommon, particularly in cultures where politics and religion are intertwined, but doing so can lead an organization to lose sight of what is morally important and what is not. This can have very negative consequences such as employees becoming so afraid to take any risk for fear of committing a moral violation and are thus paralyzed into inaction. No one wants their integrity questioned on the basis of a technical inefficiency. They are also more likely to cover up errors when they occur, potentially compounding the problem for the organization into the long-term, but protecting their individual reputation at the time.

As a consequence, organizations need to clearly define their central moral values and norms; these will serve as the basis for determining whether or not to initiate an integrity investigation. This is never an easy endeavor, but it is an important one for organizations that take ethics and integrity seriously. As a start for those organizations to whom this is foreign, Caiden (1999) had elucidated principles such as the provision of public benefits, enforcing the rule of law, ensuring public responsibility and accountability, setting an example, improving professional performance and promoting democracy that may prove helpful. Reviewing these or those suggested by OECD, ASPA, or another associative body, or by engaging in a dialog with your organization (Jurkiewicz, 2001), the process can provide key elements in the development of a mission, goals and ethical standards that reflect the organization as a dynamic and honorable institution.

Some of the questions that frustrate ethics researchers can be interpreted in terms of this framework. In this book for example, Adams, Balfour, Reed, Emery and Wyser concentrate on the possible tension between economy and effectiveness (including technology) and integrity. Kaye points out the limitations of integrity when the logic of politics and re-

sponsiveness is taken seriously. Bowman and West confront the logics of politics and integrity regarding employment and appointment in the public sector. Six and Huberts attempt to relate the norms of the public, legal norms, and the norms of the political system with the integrity of public functionaries. In all cases, clarity of language can serve as a common denominator in discussing and measuring these variables which can lead to new directions in the study of ethics and governance.

NEW DIRECTIONS: INTEGRITY AND ETHICS MANAGEMENT

Management issues have been among the topics most extensively researched and debated in administrative ethics. What strategies and instruments are available to protect the integrity of an organization and its members? What institutions succeed in curbing corruption within and stimulating the integrity of a country's civil service system? Questions regarding leadership and management styles; codes, procedures and rules; training and education (the pedagogy of ethics); and national integrity institutions were all addressed at the Leuven Conference. Additionally, a number of chapters in this book describe and evaluate the development of integrity policies, such as Hoekstra *et al.*, Maesschalck, Lamboo *et al.*

How to evaluate the state of the art in ethics management research? After numerous attempts to present inventories of policies and policy instruments, the time seems ripe to move into the study of the effectiveness of those policies. What has caused changes in values, views and behaviors? How have changes in the actual integrity of a public organization, a politician or a civil servant impacted the trust of the people in the individual and his or her organization?

These are key questions for the future. Research models will need to be developed that separate the strategic and effectiveness dimensions. Strategies can be compliance or value based (to simplify the types of intervention), and effectiveness can be assessed by recording values and views as well as actual behavior.

One of the important issues here is the relationship between the integrity of governance and the public trust in governance. Van de Walle's chapter in this book demonstrates that this relationship is complex and that the directionality of effect remains unknown: do perceptions of trust determine views on integrity and corruption or does corruption and disintegrity determine level of trust? Fawcett and Wardman give voice to the commonsensical notion that inappropriate behaviors by those who govern can damage public confidence.

NEW DIRECTIONS: LINKING THE GLOBAL POLICY AND RESEARCH AGENDA'S

A lot has been said to this point regarding global integrity *policies* on the one hand and the development in the *research* on (global) ethics and integrity of governance on the other hand.

These two developments are interconnected, as evidenced by the fact that international organizations do or subsidize much of the empirical research that has been done. This relationship of course encourages reflection on whether we as researchers tailor our questions or methodologies and findings to address their concerns or do we speak truth to power. This question is becoming more urgent now that the international community seems to realize, more than in the past, that the integrity and ethics of government and governance has other implications beyond curbing and sanctioning corruption. There is more interest in attempting to define what good governance is as more than simply a lack of corruption. Attempts to focus more on integrity, values, and leadership are indicative of this development.

Given the above, four clear areas of research present themselves. First is what constitutes good governance in an international context. The research to date assumes the universality of the values of western democratic market economies and has been used to justify a top-down approach. This is in line with much criticism on cultural relativism as a justification of corruption in 'non-western' contexts. International treaties, conventions, policies and conferences have been studied to establish a basis for common values and principles, and has concluded that much commonality is present. Not surprisingly, then, research on the values of the elite has led to support for the values articulated by that elite. Although cultural relativism is not adequate in itself to frame the discussion of what constitutes good governance, credible evidence for cultural monism let alone cultural imperialism is lacking as well. As some chapters in this volume argue, we will have to explore further what the populations, ideologies, and religions of this world really see as good governance. Bottom-up research is necessary, with empirical as well as theoretical work. What do people in developing countries see as good governance when they are able to decide themselves?¹⁴ What of Asian nations? We know that Europeans appear to be more pluralistic than Americans in their orientation toward good governance, which should not be surprising given the diversity of countries (transitional in Eastern Europe, varying political systems in Western Europe, and fundamental differences in political systems and administrative traditions between the North and the South). These differences need to be acknowledged and addressed in moving forward toward a synthesis of understanding.

Second, is the measurement of corruption and integrity (Sampford *et al.*, 2006). It is rather easy as well as justified to criticize the corruption perception index, but what might replace that score? What would be a more accurate way to determine the content of a national iceberg of integrity violations? (Huberts *et al.*, 2006).

Third, the extensive framework of international conventions, rules, monitoring and possibly sanctioning that has been built over the past decade needs to be examined. The number of instruments that have been produced to measure corrupt practices and regimes is impressive, but no objective study has been done on their validity, reliability, or effectiveness. Clearly there are times when policies with good intentions resulted in bad outcomes, but why this is the case remains unexamined. Studies on the effectiveness of anti-corruption and integrity institutions and policies are very much needed in the present state of policy development.

The fourth topic concerns what is known about the extent of corruption in countries and the effectiveness of national anti-corruption methods and strategies. Most proposals and frameworks are based on the experiences and knowledge of anti-corruption practitioners and not on scientific evaluation. Although systematic inquiry has intensified, what scant evidence there is available does not seem to permit or support rational policy choices in the field of national, regional and local good governance. This, of course, stands in contrast to the far-reaching policy prescription to which international organizations adhere.

CONCLUSION

In summary, research on public sector ethics is essential to the understanding and practice of good governance. Further, such research is dominated by the American perspective and, although progress has been made, much more effort is required on both sides of the Atlantic to achieve a balance between the European and American perspectives and beyond to include the voice of nations across the globe. Finally, we need a common language as a basis to bring about this fusion of ideologies and epistemologies toward the end of substantive, generalizable research. Summarized here is a reflection on the practice and study of good governance from a global perspective as it exists today, along with suggestions on where it needs to move into the future.

Anti-corruption activities were a reactionary and necessary first step to address ethics in governance on a global scale. The discipline must now move beyond that toward collective theory-building based on empirical evidence. The most important first step in this regard is to connect the

international policy and research agendas more explicitly. The communities of researchers and policy makers are committed to contribute toward curbing corruption and safeguarding integrity. For researchers it is at the same time important to keep some distance from policy makers and institutions, to protect their independence and to be eager to question what seems obvious.

NOTES

1. <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption.html>.
2. <http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/resins.htm> with *Conventions, Declarations and Other Instruments Found in General Assembly Resolutions*.
3. While both organizations are significant to the global shift in corruptive awareness, the emphasis given the World Bank herein over the IMF is due to their scope of operations: 'The IMF places great emphasis on good governance when providing policy advice, financial support, and technical assistance to its 184 member countries. It promotes good governance by helping countries ensure the rule of law, improve the efficiency and accountability of their public sectors, and tackle corruption. In so doing, the IMF limits itself to economic aspects of governance that could have a significant macroeconomic impact. The IMF also has strong measures in place to ensure the integrity of its own organization.' Since 1996, the IMF's role in promoting good governance has expanded considerably, while still being limited to economic aspects of governance that could have a significant macroeconomic impact. <http://www.imf.org/external/np/gov/guide/eng/index.htm> (15 May 2006). Significant macroeconomic impact. <http://www.imf.org/external/np/gov/guide/eng/index.htm> (15 May 2006).
4. www.worldbank.org -> anticorruption website.
5. <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/NEWS/0,,contentMDK:20883752~pagePK:34370~piPK:42770~theSitePK:4607,00.html>.
6. Forum details can be accessed at: <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/NEWS/0,,contentMDK:20885902~menuPK:34463~pagePK:34370~piPK:34424~theSitePK:4607,00.html>.
7. OECD Guidelines Art. 10.
8. Alternatives such as the Public Integrity Index of the Centre for Public Integrity cannot really compete with the TI Index for only a limited number of countries are indexed (www.publicintegrity.org).
9. For an interesting exception with an evaluation of World Bank strategies concerning African countries, see: Klein Haarhuis, 2005 and Klein Haarhuis and Torenvlied, 2006.
10. For more on this topic see: Chapman (2000); Della Porta and Vanucci (1999); Heywood (1997); Lawton (1998).
11. For more information on the Study Group on Ethics and Integrity of Governance of the European Group on Public Administration (EGPA), see: www.egpa-ethics.eu.
12. The conference program and presented papers are accessible through: www.egpa-ethics.eu (go to previous conferences, Leuven, 2005) as well as through <http://soc.kuleuven.be/io/ethics/> (May 2006).
13. See Six and Huberts (Chapter 5 this volume).
14. Within administrative ethics more attention is being paid to the relationship between ethics and religion or spirituality (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003) but this is much less the case for the exploration of the relationship between non-Christian and non-western religion and spirituality on the one hand, and views on good governance on the other.

REFERENCES

- Adams, G.B. and D.L. Balfour (2004), *Unmasking Administrative Evil*, revised edn, Armonk, NY and London: M.E. Sharpe.
- Agha, Hussein and Robert Maley (2006), 'Hamas: the perils of power', *The New York Review of Books*, **53** (4), accessed at www.nybooks.com/articles/18789.
- Andvig, J.C. and O. Fjeldstad (2001), *Corruption: A Review of Contemporary Research*, Oslo: Norsk Utenrikspolitisk Institut.
- Anechiarico, F. and J.B. Jacobs (1996), *The Pursuit of Absolute Integrity. How Corruption Control Makes Government Ineffective*, Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Annan, K. (2006), Statement to the General Assembly of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, accessed at www.unodc.org/unodc/corruption.htm.
- Bardhan, Pranab (1997), 'Corruption and development: a review of issues,' *Journal of Economic Literature* **35** (September), 1320–46.
- Benaissa, Hamdan (1993), 'Corruption and the socio-cultural context', in M. Punch, E. Kolthoff, K. van der Vijver and B. van Vliet (eds), *Coping with Corruption in a Borderless World*, Deventer, Netherlands: Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers, pp. 59–72.
- Bossaert, Danielle and Christoph Demmke (2005), *Main Challenges in the Field of Ethics and Integrity in the EU Member States*, Maastricht, Netherlands: European Institute of Public Administration, accessed at www.eipa.nl.
- Bovens, M.A.P., P. 't Hart, M.J.W. van Twist and U. Rosenthal (2001), *Openbaar bestuur. Beleid, organisatie en politiek*, 6th revised edn, Alphen aan den Rijn, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Caiden, G.E. (1991), 'What really is public maladministration?', *Public Administration Review*, **51** (6), 486–93.
- Caiden, G.E. (1999), 'The essence of public service ethics and professionalism', in L.W.J.C. Huberts and J.H.J. van den Heuvel (eds), *Integrity at the Public-Private Interface*, Maastricht, Netherlands: Shaker, pp. 21–44.
- Caiden, G.E., O.P. Dwivedi and Joseph Jabbra (2001), *Where Corruption Lives*, Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Chapman, Richard A. (ed.) (2000), *Ethics in Public Service for the New Millennium*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Cooper, Terry L. (ed.) (2001), *Handbook of Administrative Ethics*, 2nd edn, New York and Basel: Marcel Dekker.
- Cooper, Terry L. (2004), 'Big questions in administrative ethics: a need for focused, collaborative effort', *Public Administration Review*, **64** (4), 395–407.
- Cooper, Terry L. and Diane Yoder (2002), 'Public management ethics in a transnational world', *Public Integrity*, **4** (4), 333–52.
- Della Porta, Donatella and Alberto Vanucci (1999), *Corrupt Exchanges. Actors, Resources, and Mechanisms of Political Corruption*, New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Dobel, J. Patrick (1999), *Public Integrity*, Baltimore, MD and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Doig, Alan and Robin Theobald (1999), *Corruption and Democratisation*, London: Routledge.
- Everett, James, Dean Reu and Abu Shiraz Rahaman (2006), 'The global fight against corruption: a Foucaultian, virtue-ethics framing', *Journal of Business Ethics*, **65**, 1–12.

- Fijnaut, Cyrille and Leo Huberts (eds) (2002), *Corruption, Integrity and Law Enforcement*, Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Law International.
- Frederickson, H. George and Kevin B. Smith (2003), *Public Administration Theory Primer*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Frederickson, H.G. and R.K. Ghore (eds) (2005), *Ethics in Public Management*, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Giacalone, R.A. and C.L. Jurkiewicz (2003), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Government of Malaysia (2004), *National Integrity Plan*, Putrajaya: Integrity Institute of Malaysia.
- Heidenheimer, Arnold and Michael Johnston (eds) (2002), *Political Corruption. Concepts & Contexts*, 3rd edn, New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction.
- Heywood, P. (ed) (1997), *Political Corruption*, Blackwell: Oxford.
- Huberts, L.W.J.C., D. Pijl and A. Steen (1999), 'Integriteit en corruptie' ['Integrity and corruption'], in C. Fijnaut, E. Muller and U. Rosenthal (eds), *Politie. Studies over haar werking en organisatie*, [The Police. Studies on its Activities and Organisation], Alphen aan den Rijn, Netherlands: Samsom, pp. 433–72.
- Huberts, L.W.J.C. (2002), 'Global ethics and corruption', in J. Rabin (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy*, New York: Marcel Dekker, pp. 546–51.
- Huberts, L.W.J.C. (2005), *Integriteit en Integritisme in Bestuur en Samenleving. Wie de schoen past . . .*, 23 February, Amsterdam: Oratie Faculteit der Sociale Wetenschappen.
- Huberts, Leo, Karin Lasthuizen and Carel Peeters (2006), 'Measuring corruption: exploring the iceberg', in Charles Sampford, Arthur Shacklock, Carmel Connors and Fredrik Galtung (eds), *Measuring Corruption*, Aldershot, UK and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, pp. 265–93.
- Johnson, Roberta Ann (ed.) (2004), *The Struggle Against Corruption*, New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnston, Michael (2005), *Syndromes of Corruption. Wealth, Power, and Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kersbergen, K. van and F. van Waarden (2004), 'Governance as a bridge between disciplines: cross-disciplinary inspiration regarding shifts in governance and problems of governability, accountability and legitimacy', *European Journal of Political Research*, **43**, 143–71.
- Klein Haarhuis, Carolien (2005), *Promoting Anti-corruption Reform. Evaluating the Implementation of a World Bank Anti-corruption Program in Seven African Countries (1999–2001)*, Utrecht, Netherlands: ICS Dissertation Series.
- Klein Haarhuis, Carolien and René Torenvlied (2006), 'Dimensions and alignments in the African anti-corruption debate', *Acta Politica*, **41** (1), 41–67.
- Klitgaard, R. (1988), *Controlling Corruption*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lawton, A. (1998), *Ethical Management for the Public Services*, Buckingham, UK and Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Lawton, A. and R.A. Doig (2005), 'Researching ethics for public service organizations: the view from Europe', *Public Integrity*, **8** (1), 231–43.
- Maesschalck, J. (2005), 'Approaches to ethics management in the public sector: a proposed extension of the compliance-integrity continuum', *Public Integrity*, **7** (1), 21–41.

- McKinney, J.B. and M. Johnston (eds) (1986), *Fraud, Waste and Abuse in Government*, Philadelphia, PA: ISHL.
- Menzel, D.C. (2005), 'State of the art of empirical research on ethics and integrity in governance', in H.G. Frederickson and R.K. Ghore (eds), *Ethics in Public Management*, New York: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 16–46.
- Menzel, Donald C. and Carole L. Jurkiewicz (2006), 'Introduction to the symposium on ethics and integrity in governance', *Public Integrity*, 8 (1), 5–9.
- Miller, Seumas, Peter Roberts and Edward Spence (2005), *Corruption and Anti-Corruption. An Applied Philosophical Approach*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Montefiore, Alan and David Vines (eds) (1999), *Integrity in the Public and Private Domains*, London: Routledge.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2002), *Trust in Government. Ethics Measures in OECD Countries*, Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2000), *No Longer Business as Usual. Fighting Bribery and Corruption*, Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2004), *Managing Conflicts of Interest in the Public Service. OECD Guidelines and Country Experiences*, Paris: OECD.
- Palidaukskaite, Jolante (2006), 'Codes of ethics in transitional democracies', *Public Integrity*, 8 (1), 35–48.
- Pierre, J. and B. Guy Peters (2000), *Governance, Politics, and the State*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Pieth, Mark and Peter Eigen (eds) (1999), *Korruption im internationalen Geschäftsverkehr. Bestandsaufnahme. Bekämpfung. Prävention*, Neuwied and Kriftel, Germany: Luchterhand.
- Pope, J. (2000), *Fighting Corruption: The Elements of a National Integrity System (TI Source Book 2000)*, Berlin: Transparency International, also accessed at www.transparency.org.
- Preston, Noel and Charles Sampford, with Carmel Connors (2002), *Encouraging Ethics and Challenging Corruption. Reforming Governance in Public Institutions*, Sydney: The Federation Press.
- Punch, M., E. Kolthoff, K. van der Vijver and B. van Vliet (eds) (1993), *Coping with Corruption in a Borderless World. Proceedings of the Fifth International Anti-Corruption Conference*, Deventer, Netherlands: Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers.
- Rohr, John A. (1989), *Ethics for Bureaucrats. An Essay on Law and Values*, 2nd edn, New York and Basel: Marcel Dekker.
- Rose-Ackerman, Susan (1999), *Corruption and Government. Causes, Consequences and Reform*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosett, Claudia (2006), 'How corrupt is the United Nations?', *Commentary*, April, accessed at www.commentarymagazine.com/article.asp?aid=12104031_1.
- Sampford, Charles, Noel Preston, with C-A Bois (eds) (1998), *Public Sector Ethics. Finding and Implementing Values*, Annandale, Australia: The Federation Press, and London: Routledge.
- Sampford, Charles, Arthur Shacklock, Carmel Connors and Fredrik Galtung (eds) (2006), *Measuring Corruption*, Aldershot, UK and Burlington VT, USA: Ashgate.
- Thompson, Dennis F. (2001), 'The possibility of administrative ethics', in Willa Bruce (ed.), *Classics of Administrative Ethics*, originally published in 1985, Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 79–92.

- Transparency International (TI) (2001), *The National Integrity System. Concept and Practice*, report by Transparency International for the Global Forum II on Fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity, prepared by Alan Doig and Stephanie McIvor, Berlin: Transparency International.
- Transparency International (2005), *Report on the Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2005*, Berlin: Transparency International Policy and Research Department.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1998), *Corruption & Integrity Improvement Initiatives in Developing Countries*, New York: UNDP.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) (2005), *Compendium of International Legal Instruments on Corruption*, New York: United Nations.
- Williams, R. and A. Doig (eds) (2000), *Controlling Corruption*, Cheltenham, UK and Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar.
- Yoder, Diane E. and Terry L. Cooper (2005), 'Public-service ethics in a transnational world', in H. George Frederickson and Richard K. Ghere (eds), *Ethics in Public Management*, New York: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 297–327.