Corruption: Its Definitions and Typologies

Dr. Shafiq-ur-Rehman
Registrar, Quaid-i-Azam University (QAU), Near Diplomatic Enclave,(Islamabad, Pakistan)
Email: shafiq64@yahoo.com

Abstract
Corruption is one of the central issue facing developing state, be that dictatorship or democracies. Once seen as a problem largely confined to the low paid people, the explosion of scandals in well established politicians, bureaucrats and businessmen over the last two decades has demonstrated that no one is immune to the corrosive impact of corruption. This paper is an effort to bring together the developed and developing state, which approaches the issue of corruption from a variety of different analytical perspectives. Attention is devoted to such questions as how corruption is to defined, how it operates in practice, what its impact on the society.
Keywords: Corruption and its typologies, Social problems, Government and society, United States of America, Pakistan.

1. Introduction and Background

Definitions are tools, not truth, their values determined in use, not in term of their approximation of some transcendental ideas…… Disputes over appropriate definitions are thus political conflicts[1].

This study was consisted of two phases. First phase was conducted in Pakistan, where as the other one was in the United States of America. The study focuses attention on the different ways in which certain putative conditions are constructed as the problem of corruption by key actors in society. These actors are the elites from the term of public discourse about the problem. At the center of this approach is an examination of the definition of corruption employed by various elites group, with an emphasis on the social contingency of knowledge.

This paper gives a brief review of some definitional models and typologies available in the literature on the corruption, with a demonstration, using interview and some textual data, of the ambiguity involved in defining corruption and the fluidity of the phenomenon over time. The paper then goes on to the include a discussion of the degree of important given by the various elites groups to the problem of corruption, seeking to show how the differential ranking of the problem, like the different definitions, depends to the large extent on the configuration of power.

2. Legalistic or Narrow Definitions

The definition appearing in the paper can be categorized in several ways. They can be grouped according to their degree of functionality or specificity and according to the extent to which they emphasize causes and consequences, the concept of the illegal exchange, the morality of the act, and the violation of the public trust. There are a number of other statements, which define corruption in terms, which are imprecise, or otherwise unsatisfactory.

1. "Corruption is a many-faceted concept, not necessarily to do with money changing hands. It may be abuse of position, nepotism. Suppose you are in some position in government services, and you use that position for private interests that is corruption. If you abuse your power top further your private interest that is corruption."[2]
2. "Corruption in my opinion is any transaction in which a man gets benefits which are not due."[3]
3. "Corruption is the taking of some remuneration or benefit of some kind in order to do some thing that you are supposed to do any way as part for your job."[4]
4. "Corruption includes asking for money expecting money, reciprocal favor of some kind-basically we are talking of quid-pro-quo, whether in cash or kind. Nepotism is a different matter-there's is no quid-pro-quo primarily."[5]
5. "There are rules that govern the conduct of government servants. There is something called GSCR (Government Servant's Conduct Rules) which deals with a number of things, including accepting gifts beyond a certain value. So its amount to corruption when you deviate from that code of conduct."[6]
6. "Corruption is something which you are legally not entitled to get-whether it is posted facto or not is

---

[1] Sederberg, Petter C. "The Politics of Meaning, Power and Explanation in the Construction of Social Reality" Tucson Arizona, University of Arizona Press 1984.
[2] A senior bureaucrat in Services and General Administration, Government of Balochistan, Quetta.
[3] An Industrialist, Karachi
[4] An Industrialist
[5] Member, Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Quetta.
[6] A Retired Bureaucrat, Government of Balochistan, Quetta

irrelevant. It is understood that to do a duty assigned to you for which you are paid, you should not expect anything beyond that salary."[1]

7. "The meaning of the corruption is quite evident from the law. It is something indulges in by a public servant. A public servant is said to be corrupt when he does something or does not do something for a consideration, usually a material consideration. This is beyond the legal wage he earns."[2]

8. "In the strictly legalistic and administrative sense, which I think is a reasonable approach; the definition of corruption is given in the prevention of corruption ordinance. One of the ingredients of that which constitutes a criminal offense is called criminal misconduct. That is defined there are various forms of criminal misconduct are catalogued illustratively. Others may differ, but I feel that to the puritan, all things seem impure. If you are looking at it from the point of Puritanism, then everything will look corrupt."[3]

9. "The simplest yardstick I used is that if someone misuses an office he occupies for personal gain, then that is corruption.[4]"

10. "As far as I am concerned, it is quite obvious what one means by corruption it is exchange of money for doing something that is prohibited by the law or not doing something which the law requires one to do."[5]

11. Suppose an inspector of a restaurant or of a construction project a building inspector overseeing a project is behaving wrongly and take a bribe and extort someone who is engaged in performing a service for a government. That type of misbehavior is corruption."[6]

12. "It is basically the manipulation of the government programs/system/organization by people who are familiar to the system, usually internally. Some time working in collusion with people external personnel who have vested interest in that organization."[7]

13. "Misuse of official of government position."[8]

14. "Dishonesty is the major source of corruption, violation of penal code, state and federal laws, violation of any public policy that governs the conduct of public employee or elected official is corruption."[9]

15. "Someone who abuses the trust that is been placed upon him by the tax payer and paying your salary for doing work."[10]

16. "Corruption is proper motivated policy misconduct. Generally people talk about them arrangement of policy license illegal operation and take a regular pass off and there is extortion where the police shake people down to avoid arrest or not arrest them."[11]

The narrow or legalistic definition lists a limited number of acts under the category of corruption and approximates the definition of corruption given in law. this definition may sometimes be simple reflection of the legal provisions, but more commonly it is an expression of only of the sentiments and ideas, i.e. the sprits (as against specific provisions) of the law , and is there for legalistic, in a technical sense.

A better understanding can be head of what is kind of definition entails by examining the actual laws concerning corruption. Historically, all societies are engaged to some extent in what duster calls 'the legislation of morality' and Pakistan is no exception.

In the study, about two third of the bureaucrats almost all the industrialist and about three quarter of the politicians offer some form of narrow or legal definitions. Among all the elites who gave narrow legalistic definitions, only a few identified more than three acts that deserve the corrupt label. Bribery, misuse of office and misappropriation of public resources, kick backs and commissions embezzlement were the most frequently cited example of corruption.

---

[1] Director, Institute of Public Administration, Quetta.

[2] Joint Secretary (Establishment), Government of Pakistan, Islamabad

[3] A Senator from Balochistan, Islamabad.

[4] A Politician and high ranking office bearer of Pakistan Peoples Party.

[5] A Politician and high ranking office bearer of Pakistan Peoples Party.

[6] Dennsion Yong, Jr. Counsel to the Mayor, City of New York.

[7] Benjamin J. Redmond, Inspector General, City of Philadelphia.

[8] Michael L. Levy, First Assistant United States Attorney

[9] Jonathan Saidel, City Controller, Philadelphia

[10] Anthony R. Radwanski, Director of Special Investigations, City of Philadelphia

[11] Professor James J. Fyfe, Department of Criminal Justice, Temple University.

Elites who offer a narrow/ legalistic definition	Examples of corrupt acts cited by them
• Bureaucrats • Industrialists • Politicians	• Bribery • Misappropriation of public resources • Kickback and commissions • Embezzlement • Gifts, beyond a certain value • Sale of public office

The most frequent types of corruption mentioned by the respondents contain a financial or monetary component and in that sense suggest a narrow definition of corruption. For example a senior bureaucrat who is the head of the public sector corporation says;

"Corruption means it is illegal gratification, that is, I have a power to use my discretion in man's favor. Suppose without keeping public interests in mind, I help some buyer from whom I am buying things and he gives me some money for that. So I am benefiting by that and I am letting the corporation lose through that deal. My act has resulted in a pecuniary loss to the corporation so that is corruption.

In the available literature, Kotecha and Walker, for example, discuss administrative vigilantism as a form of corruption characterized by "corruption of the spirit" and resulting from a lack of commitment to democratic principles.[1] Statements such as this represent interpretations of the phenomenon which are somewhat specialized specialized and for this reason will not be considered here. Legal definitions are prescribed and descriptive. They are also problematic, in that they are difficult to use as a basis for comparison between different jurisdictions. Because laws, regulations, and enforcement policies change periodically, they do not even provide a basis for comparison of conditions within one agency during different historical periods.

Legal definitions are not widely used in the literature. Most definitions commonly applied do, however, include a legal element in that they state or imply a lower limit to corruption. The point at which a gift is considered to represent a bribe demonstrates this limit.

Definitions emphasizing the concept of "illegal exchange" tend to define this limit according to the motivation s of the people involved in the exchange. Misner presents a typical definition of this sort and defines corruption as: "the abuse or illegal use of office for the direct or indirect pecuniary gun of the individual." The illegality of a gift is determined by whether friendship or the official position of the recipient was the motivation factor in the exchange.

"The main element of a corrupt transaction is the agreement to commit an illegal act or, at least an, ethical act of commission, omission, or forbearance."[2]

McMullan's definition states that: "a public official is corrupt if he accepts money or money's worth for doing something that he is under a duty not to so, or to exercise a legitimate discretion for improper reasons."[3]

The best definition of this type is provided by Nye, "it is a functional one and is specifically intended for comparative use on cross-cultural situations, it is potentially valuable in describing some forms of corruption".

A number of definitions recognize the importance of non-monetary factors in the corruption. Price, who places heavy emphasis on motivation, rather than action, states that: "corruption is typified by the behavior directed towards the goal of financial advantages (and sometimes tangentially enhanced status)". Souryal notes that: "A corrupt act must be recognized as a violation of common interest for special advantage",[4] but does not suggest that this advantage must be financial. Ault man's definition includes behavior designed to obtain money "or any other personally desirable rewards".

Many definitions of the "illegal exchange" variety recognize the notion of corruption as violation of the public trust. Legal definitions fall into this category in that they conceive of corrupt practices as those, which violate the law of a regulation carrying the force of the law. Violating of the public trust may be considered in a more general sense as violation of rules, or formalized norms, of behavior. Manning and Redlinger apply this kind of definition in stating that, "By corruption we mean a departure from idealized norms of procedures and, in addition, a departure from the officially presented version of the procedure". According to this concept, corruption does not necessarily involve either an illegal act or financial gain to any party. Justification to this approach is given is a discussion, which suggests that behavior involving departures from official procedures, is, in fact, the basis of more obvious forms of corruption. In the above definition, the emphasis is on the corruption, which is administratively induced. To Manning and Redlinger, corruption is seen as a logical consequence of a requirement that officers attain goals, which are unrealistic in terms of the inappropriate rules, which are

---

[1] Kotecha, Kanti C. and James L. Walker. "Police Vigilantes", Society, 1976
[2] National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Law, Enforcement Council. "Official Corruption: A Position Statement," Crime and Delinquency, 1974.
[3] McMullan, M. "A Theory of Corruption," Sociological Review, 1961.
[4] Souayal, Safwat S. "Stages of Corruption," , 1975.

prescribed for the achievement of those goals.

Most of the definitions of the "causes and the consequences" variety result from organizational and other structural theories. These discuss corruption in the context of deviant behavior brought about by bureaucratic dysfunction, the impossibility of police mandate, and the contradictions inherent in the role of the police in society. The most important feature of these analyses is that corruption is not considered or defined in and of itself. Rather it is viewed as a consequence of a much broader problem – the "police problem."[1] These analyses tend to discuss corruption as one form of police criminality, and they either do not present concrete definitions at all, or present those, which are loosely defined in terms of their upper or lower limits. Because of this, they are not generally useful within a specific operational framework.

3. Broad or Moralistic Definitions

Another group of definitions focuses on the "morality of an act". They are primarily concerned with moral choice and the particular set of values used to sanction or condemns a corrupt act.

17. "According to me, Corruption is anything that is deceptive, that is violation of a basic human code of conduct. Within this kind of a broad definition we can include giving or taking of bribes doing undue favors to your family members, misuse of office for personal gain, embezzlement, fraudulent behavior, all this is corruption."[2]

18. "Corruption includes a whole lot of illegal and moral activities including taking of bribes. Favoritism, nepotism, misuse of office machinery embezzlement, all these things would be corruption."[3]

19. "Any consideration or remuneration or anything else quid-pro-quo for anything done by a public servant amounts to corruption. And corruption needs not to be purely money."[4]

20. "Corruption means much more than taking a bribe. Favoritism and nepotism are both part of corruption. Corruption can't be simply confined to taking of money."[5]

21. It occurs in widely varying forms. Corruption does not mean just exchanges of money. Helping one's relatives, getting them jobs or doing those favors of some kind or the other, all come under corruption."[6]

22. "Corruption does not confine only to giving or taking money. There are various forms of corruption which area usually indulge in. e.g. nepotism are separate categories, these are part of corruption."[7]

23. "Corruption for me is violation of moral conduct. It can come in various forms. Bribery is only one form but corruption does not have to involve money. Doing an out of turn favor to a friend or a family member by misusing one's position is also corruption."[8]

24. "Corruption is abuse of power for personal gain. Sometimes it is related to financial gain, sometimes related to advancement of position. It is violation of trust and oath of the office where there is a clearly an obligation to perform certain degrees of responsibility."[9]

25. "Corruption is where any public official whether it is a traffic agent, judge or a commissioner of agency uses government system to benefit him or herself illegally at the expense of taxpayers. Whether it is taking a bribe or giving undue favor."[10]

26. "Corruption to me means persons engaged in unlawful acts to benefit themselves."[11]

27. "One who accepts something of value in return for his own personal benefit?"[12]

28. "Whenever a power holder who is charged with doing certain things i.e. who is responsible functionary or office holder, is by monetary or other rewards not legally provided for, induce to take actions which favor whoever provides the reward and thereby does damage to the public and its interests."[13]

29. "When you talk about corruption, you are looking at public official and public servants regard to what level, performing a tasks, outside of the guideline, outside the polices and procedures, outside the law and they are doing it for illegal purposes for self gratification."[14]

30. "It is a lack of moral character, lack of integrity, integrity that public has entrusted with in civilized society,

---

[1] Wilson, James Q. "Corruption: The Shame of the States, New York Vintage Books, 1966.
[2] Chief Reporter, Urdu News Paper, Pakistan
[3] Editor, Urdu News Paper, Pakistan
[4] Honorable Judge, Balochistan High Court.
[5] Retired Judge, Supreme Court of Pakistan
[6] A Senior Judge, Supreme Court of Pakistan.
[7] Retired Judge, Balochistan High Court.
[8] Resident Editor, English News Paper
[9] Charles V. Camposo, Chief of Internal Affairs, Police Department, City
[10] Robert Brackman, Special Counsel to Comptroller, City of New York.
[11] John B. Holmes, Jr. Harris County District Attorney
[12] Donald K. Hollingsworth, Director, Office for Public Safety and Drug Policy, City of Houston
[13]. David Burke, Corruption Prevention, Department of Investigation, City of New York
[14] C.O. "Brad" BRADFORD, Chief of Police, Houston

and the individual whatever reason abuses that integrity trust, which is imposed by the community."[1]

31. "Corruption is systematic illegality in public employment. Breaking a law being paid by tax payers whether it would be an employee in the city department of licenses and inspections who accept a payoff to approve a building permit or a police officer who accept a payoff from a motorist to avoid a ticket."[2]

32. "Corruption is defined as misuse of authority towards personal gain. So if a officer use his office to make money himself, use his office to get into movie theater for free or get free good services."[3]

33. "Corruption is defined as misuse of the public power, office or authority for private benefit through bribery, extortion, influence peddling, nepotism, fraud, speed money or embezzlement."[4]

Professor Jack Green, for example, discusses corruption within the broader framework of integrity and views corrupt acts as reflecting the moral standards of society at large. Although legal codes are usually products of complex negotiation, among dominant elites over issue of morality and moral boundaries, the arrow definition is expressed in language that is often instrumental, rationalistic, and evens a moralistic. The board definitions, on the other hand, includes aspects identify by the law as corruption, but often goes beyond a legalistic view articulating an abstract, amorphous morality, and list a large number of acts under the category of corruption.

In the study only the third of the bureaucrats, about one quarter of the politicians and a negligible number of industrialists give a board definition in contrast judges and journalists overwhelmingly presented broad definitions of corruption and on the average listed about five different acts under the corrupt category. In their view gift giving nepotism, cheating, fraud, lying, lobbing and adulteration of food all amounted to corruption. Some of them introduced another type of corruption "intellectual corruption of soul" and moral corruption. In their view "doing anything against your conscience for a consideration is corruption, whatever is the consideration. Sometime there wouldn't be anything changing hands, but you take decisions because somebody belongs to your religion, your caste, your tribe, etc that is intellectual corruption."

A journalistic sought to widen the nation of corruption beyond most other elites understanding of the term as expressed in interviews for the study: "we need to talk about corruption in the ordinary people. Our politicians and bureaucrats have increased the peoples dependence on the state, converted our people into parasites. People have to come to expect the state to provide them everything cheap and subsidized, without even demanding it. Somebody comes and says, "I have faced a calamity, my houses is gone. Give me a hundred thousand rupees. People have turns into beggars that are corruption of soul. So what our politicians and administrators have done is instead of stopping with corrupting themselves, they have corrupted the soul of Pakistan, corrupted our people at the grassroots level."

Politicians did not think, for obvious reasons, that interest lobbing is a type of corruption, while many of the media elites tended to refer to a wide range of deviations from what is considered to be normative behavior as corrupt. A senior judge with experience of dealing with corruption cases similarly expressed the following understanding of corruption, "it is implies anything that is not straight forward. In nature there are corrupted things from which arises corrupted mentality. A person who is not thinking straight or acting in a straight forward manner is considered corrupt."

Elites who offered a board/moralistic definition	Example of corrupt acts cited by them
• Judges • Journalists	• Bribery • Nepotism/favoritism • Gift giving • Cheating, fraud, dishonest • Embezzlement • Kickback and commissions • Intellectual corruption • Corruption of the soul

In the development literature, Bell best states this view by describing various forms of the corruption as being limited to 'petty gifts', and describe such practices as bring sanctioned by values of sub-culture. Sourayal discusses the use of definition of corruption drive from political science, but, in rejecting, concludes that the principal identifying the characteristics of the phenomenon is that it involve individual choice. A distinctive feature of this structuralist approach to the morality of corruption is the considerable emphasis placed on a distinction made in administrative subculture between 'clean' and 'dirty' graft. This distinction is generally considered in the thesis to be of fundamental importance in describing how official value systems are able to countenance certain forms of corruption.

---

[1] Jorge G. Cruz-Aedo, Director, Finance and Administration Department, City of Houston.
[2] Thomas Gibbsons junior, Philadelphia Inquirer
[3] Professor Jack. Greene, College of Criminal Justice, Northeastern University, Boston.
[4] Pauline Tamesis, Program for Accountability & Transparency, Management Development and Governance Division, United Nations Development program, New York.

Because of the many difficulties involved in the construction of the workable definition of corruption, many important authorities have simply avoided any attempt to formulate a precise definition. Although problem exist in determining how corruption differ from other forms of misconduct, the real problem lies in the inability of any of the definitions currently used to delineate the lower level of corruption. Until this difficulty is resolved, the question, crucial to the development of any set of corruption control polices, of whether the acceptance of a tip or gratuity constitutes a corrupt practice, will be unanswered.

Many of the definitions cited above recognize that corrupt act can be typed in a number of ways. The distinction made between 'clean' and 'dirty' grafts, for example, represents a categorization according to how the administrative subculture judges a corrupt act.

Typologies are actually schema by which distinction can be made within groups of corrupt acts. Typologies are useful in identifying relationships, which exist between different forms of corrupt act or behavior. Many typologies, which are stated, implicitly or explicitly, in the literature fall into five principal groups. These are typologies formulated according to the actors involves, the acts themselves, and the degree of organization of the acts, the source of illegal payments, and the social and organizational conditions, which support corruption. As with categories of definitions, these grouping overlap and can in no way be considered as mutually exclusive.

Many of the typologies focusing on the actors involves in an illegal transaction classify acts according to whether the corrupter was a fellow officer of a private citizen. Beigel's typology, for example, considers corrupt acts as either internal or external. External acts involve private citizen and are subdivided into pay-off to the police from otherwise respectable citizens who have violated the law, pay-off professional criminals, and gratuities. Internal acts involve corruption within law enforcement agencies and concern pay-off of one kind or another between officers and bribes paid as a prerequisite for joining the force. The internal acts of corruption that begel describe is "strict adherence to the code of silence concerning external corruption". To Beigel, secrecy is a definitive feature of corruption.

The typologies which pay particular attention to the actors involved in corrupt transactions are those which emphasize motivations. The outstanding typologies in the group are those view corruption of the individual as a consequence of cooptation into a deviant subculture or as a behavior encourage by ongoing pressure exerted by an immediate reference group.

Most sociological and interactionist theories emphasize the importance of a 'code' of behavior as the outward manifestation of group values. Many interactionist theories stress the importance of a gradual acceptance of group values and behavior, which are elsewhere considered as deviant. These theories have been used as a basis for the concept of a 'moral career' which is used to trace the progress of the corrupt officer through a series of stages which representing increasing level of deviance.

A number of typologies focus on the actors involved in the corrupt practices by listening offenses according to their seriousness. Most of these recognize the 'moral career' concept, at least implicitly. All such typologies are moralistic in orientation. The major typologies which can be grouped within this classification are those where:
1. Act and actors involved,
2. Norms violated,
3. Degree of peer group support,
4. Extent to which deviance is organized, and
5. Nature of department reaction.

The last major typology, used to draw attention to the motivations of the actors, which includes an essentially psychological view of the corruption process. Distinguishing between corruption and inefficiency, it states that corrupt acts are, above all personal experiences and that evolvement in them requires the exercise of personal choice. This typology is a psychological one, which reflects attitude of mind. Categories range from a 'pre-corruption' stage, in which an honest officer becomes susceptible, to ": benediction," at which point the officer has made a complete adjustment to a corrupt life style. Other stages are "experimentation", "accustoming", "conceptualization" and "improvisation".

The latter two are characterized by acceptance of corruption as widespread social phenomenon and development of a state of mind receptive and require the involvement of other officers.

4. Conclusions

A constituent part of the definitions is the allocation of space of problem of corruption by various elites in their respective agendas of societal problems. This is so because the elites selection of a particular problem fir special attention (from a large universe of social problems) along with actual definitions of the debated phenomenon, suggest possible variations in policy approaches. As pong suggests, conflicts between various claim makers are sometimes not over whether a condition should be identified as a social problem, but over which problem is 'more critical, more urgently in need of official attention, but more deserving of resource allocation'. Further the degree of importance accorded to the problem serves specific instrumental as well as symbolic functions for the

different elites."[1]

Approximately three quarters of the entire 60 respondent in this study either considered corruption to the most important problem or one of the major problems. While a majority of judges, journalists, and politicians labeled corruption as the 'most important' problem facing the country, a large numbers of bureaucrats and industrialists denied that it was a major problem.

Embedded in this designatory activity is what calls as amplification and euphemization practices by which influential elites attempt either to elevate or diminish the seriousness of a problem. The term amplification and euphemization are not used to suggest any debunking of the elites claims by comparing them to some 'objective truths'. They are merely meant to indicate the framing device by some groups in order to emphasize the perceive undesirability of certain conditions in society.

Judges and journalists, who largely give moralistic definitions of corruption, tended also to engage in amplification by providing seemingly exaggerated accounts of corruption and by depicting it the most important problem. In this case who amplified the problem articulated a 'doctrine of horrible consequences'[2] judges and journalists considered it to be the most important problem because among other things it destroys civilized life; threatens democratic institutions and very way of life; and undermined the value system. A judge of high court explains in the following words.

"Corruption is increasing rapidly in all walks of life and has become the most serious problem. An attempt to underestimate corruption is not a wise thing and will have an adverse affect on democracies. Also the entire moral fabric of our country is torn to pieces because of corruption; our values have eroded to a great extant."

Most of the politicians too expressed an amplified view of corruption as a corruption. The opposition politicians, by contracting a magnified image of the problem seek to delegitimize the existing regime, while the ruling party leaders, also by according corruption similar importance, try to sustain continued legitimacy. The latter objective is often achieved by portraying themselves as moral crusaders and allies of the under privileged classes who are committed to the cleaning of public life.

Bureaucrats and industrialists, neither whom are particularly concerned about their legitimacy in the eye, overwhelmingly asserted that corruption is not a major problem. Further, by joining the anti corruption rhetoric they would be acting against their own interests – the bureaucrats, because when ever corruption gains importance in the public discourse, it is their group that becomes the target of clean up campaigns, and the industrialists, because the status-quo according to their own statements, help them in achieving their financial objectives without the procedural hassles of government control. Actually corruption is seen only as an additional price on services; and it is claimed that corruption has, infect, beneficial consequence for overcoming other 'more important problem' such low productivity and inefficiency. Bureaucrats have also, similarly, elevated to a more important status then corruption, issue in which they have no personal or group interest at stake, such as ethnic and religious conflicts.

---

[1] Pong, Raymond W. "Social problems as a conflict process" in James Holstem and Gale Miller (eds) (1989), perspectives on social problems: A Research Annual , Vol. 1. Green Which, CT: JAI Press pp. (59-76).

[2] Schur, Edwin M, "The Politics of Deviance: Stigma contest and the uses of power, Englewood Cliffs NJ Prentice Hall 1980 p 145

Table 1: Rating of corruption as a social problem by elites

Elite group	Not a major problem/other major problem	One of the major problem/other major problems	Most important problem
Bureaucrats (n=25)	15; religious conflicts, ethnicity	5; poverty; overpopulation; illiteracy	5; reasons corrodes our cultures; retard progress
Industrialists (n=05)	2; corruption has positive effects. Other major problems Low productivity, unemployment, inefficiency	2; poverty, overpopulation, underemployment	1; makes country in competitive in the global market
Judges (n=10)	0;	4; regionalism, separation movements, over population, unemployment	6; destroys civilized life, threats democracy, threatens the value system
Journalists (n=08)	0;	3; poverty, inflation	5; Disaster for democracy, threatens our ways of life, subversive rule of law, evil facing the nation
Politicians (n=12)	2; poverty, communal violence	4; under employment, ethnicity,	6; Threatens our very existence, marginalized development, distorts welfare goals.
N=60	19	18	23

5. References

McMullan, M. "A theory of Corruption." Sociological Review, 1961.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Law Enforcement Council. "Official Corruption: A Position Statement," Crime and Delinquency, 1974.

Pong, Raymond W. "Social problems as a conflict process" in James Holsterm and Gale Miller (eds) (1989), Perspective on social problems: A Research Annual, Vol. 1. Greenwich, CT:JAI Press pp(59-76)

Schur, Edwin M, "The Politics of Deviance: Stigma contest and the uses of power, Englewood Cliffs NJ Prentice Hall 1980 p 145

Sederberg, Petter C. "The Politics of Meaning, Power and Explanation in the construction of Social Reality" Tucson Arizona, University of Arizona Press 1984.

Souayal, Safwat S. "Stages of Corruption," , 1975

Wilson James Q. "Corruption: The Shame of the States, New York Vintage Books, 1966

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: http://www.iiste.org/journals/ All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: http://www.iiste.org/book/

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar