

## **STANDARDS AND SANCTIONS FOR EVALUATING CORRUPTION**

**Legal   Political   Moral**

**PROFESSOR RICHARD ROSE FBA**

University of Strathclyde Glasgow  
[www.cspp.strath.ac.uk](http://www.cspp.strath.ac.uk)

PSA CONFERENCE ON CORRUPTION AND POLITICAL MISCONDUCT

University of Sussex, 27 August 2015

This presentation is supported by a grant from the British Economic & Social Research Council (ES/13482X/1) for a global analysis of The Experience of Corruption and prepared during my tenure as a visiting research professor at the Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin.



## FORMS OF CORRUPTION

\*Generic definition: Corruption is a departure from a specified standard e.g.

Rule of law: Officials should apply laws impartially, not take bribes

Behavioural: Elected politicians ought to carry out promises

Moral: Politicians ought not to behave in ways that are shameful

\*To be effective, policy actions need to target each forms' different causes of corruption.



## **PARADIGM FOR ANALYSING CORRUPT ACTIVITIES**

Definition of standards: Who sets them? Consensual or disputed?

Measures: Valid as well as reliable

Enforcement mechanisms

Sanctions for corrupt behaviour

Consequences for society

Policy actions appropriate to diagnosis



## **CORRUPTION AS VIOLATING BUREACRATIC STANDARDS**

Standards: Laws and regulations dictating how public officials ought to deliver social services and enforce obligations on citizens

Bribery: Official violates law to deliver service in return for a material benefit

Measured by sample surveys, I paid a bribe web sites.

Enforcement. Police and prosecution services. Courts.

Sanctions. Fine. Suspension. Loss of office. Jail.

Consequences for society:

Grand bribery produces inefficient macro-economic decisions

Petty bribery reduces popular support for political institutions

Policy actions:

More pay, training in ethics for officials

Strengthen prosecution, audit services

Supply more services where scarcity encourages bribery

Redesign services to reduce opportunities for bribery



## FAILING TO MEET POLITICAL EXPECTATIONS

### Behavioural Standard:

Trustworthy parties ought to do in office what they promise when seeking votes.  
Individual politicians should act in private as they prescribe in public.

Measures: Expectations set by violators compared public record, leaked documents  
Party manifestos, leader's speeches.  
Individual politicians highlight issues by which they are then judged

Enforcement. Partisan adversaries. Media vs. Party loyalists

Sanctions: Electoral: Lose votes and lose office

Consequences: Decline in trust in parties, elections. Protest parties erupt. Cynicism

### Appropriate policy actions:

Parties learn to avoid raising expectations, Learning risks of raising expectations  
Politicians change public prescriptions or private behaviour



## VIOLATING MORAL NORMS

Standard: Inappropriate, morally wrong for individuals to behave privately in ways that would bring their office into disrepute if made public.

Measures: Media, leaked documents expose private activities involving sex, drugs, drink, money inconsistent with moral norms of a significant sector of society.

Enforcement: Self-awareness: individual does/ does not accept norms

Colleagues

Public opinion polls

Sanctions:

None: Colleagues rally round (e.g. Clinton)

Minor: Apology accepted

Colleagues force out of office—especially if rally round fails

Shame: Loss of public standing

Consequences for society: Loss of respect for politicians

Appropriate policy actions: More private warning to individual that their inappropriate behaviour cannot be defended if exposed.