

Gift Giving As A Form Of Bribery In The Administrative Norms Of Pakistan

Dr. Ayaz Khan¹, Mr. Fazli Dayan², Zala Sareer³, Mr. Hakim Said⁴, Mr. Muhammad Aqeel Khan⁵, Mr. Riaz Ahmad Khan⁶, Sumayya Feroz⁷

¹Director Research and Analysis, Counter Terrorism Department Police Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

²Assistant Professor Department of Sharia& Law Islamia College University Peshawar

³M.Phil Scholar Department of Political Science Awkum

⁴Ph.D Scholar Department of Political Science AWKUM

⁵Assistant Professor, Department of Law AWKUM

⁶Research Assistant Legal, Department of Law AWKUM

⁷M.Phil Scholar Department of Political Science Awkum

Abstract

The current study was carried out with the main focus on determining the cultural contexts of corruption with specific reference to administrative norms in Pakistani society. A total of 384 interviewees were selected by stratified random sampling techniques from 4 public sector organisations in District Swat, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. The study consisted of eight independent variables (Culture Norms, Moral Norms, Religious Norms, and Cultural Declines, Customary Lavish Cost, Gift and Obligatory Nepotism), as well as a dependent variable (Corruption). Questionnaire on the Likert scale has been used in data collection. For the association in study variables, the Chi-square test was used. At the bi-lateralized level, the link between the perception of bribery and cultural rules was observed to be important for individuals and groups, and anti-corruption groups were established at the community levels to reduce bribery.

Corruption was likewise significantly linked to compliance with moral norms out of fear of disintegration into society, various norms of living based on the power of individuals; a decrease in moral costs of corruption due to greater acceptance by societies; employee

norms & values deformed by organizational norms; and foreign incentives to influence the moral standing of employees. Moreover, the perception of corruption is closely linked to the role played by religious leaders in raising awareness of corruption, encouraging religion in schools, imposing Islamic punishments and promotes corruption due to the silence of religious leaders. In the same way, the perception of corruption has a strong connection with the bias of cultural norms towards rich/elite, the power and prestige is superior to ethics and morality. In the corrupt environment material gains are preferred over good people. Also, the corruption perceptions of stigma, social promotion to honest deeds, the confidentiality of corruption to avoid stigma, changes in personality to stop fear from stigma, and debate on definitions of right and wrong were found to be a link to observing moral norms. Moreover, the perception of corruption was found in conjunction with an increase in the level of corruption, greater ceremonial expenses, admiration for excessive expenses, expensive customary expenses, competition for excessive usual expenditure, social fame through expensive expenses, the impression of honesty from people's consciences, an insufficient amount of fame. In addition, corruption perception had a significant association with gift giving as an acceptable way of getting favors, familial values of gift giving, social admirations for officer who don't accept gifts, accepting gifts but remaining fair and people who follow pure merit also receive gifts. Not different was the association of corruption perception with safeguarding corruption in personal interest, public servants are trained to prefer civil values over favoritism, society don't see favoritism as corruption, making bureaucracy independent of political pressure, politicians obliged to give a job to a party/family member, bypassing merit standings of top firms to award contracts and admirations for avoiding penalty to a personal friend. Redefining and revitalizing religious and moral values of honesty, dedication, uprightness and patriotism at family, educational and community level through active participation of all societal segments with specific emphasis on media, religious leaders, teachers and politicians, promotion of social equality in rights irrespective of power status of societal members, devaluation and demoralization of corrupt through legal punishments and social sanctions, promoting admirations and rewards for honesty, devising research based policies and legislation to discourage norms that promote corruption, and introduction of anti-corruption courses at all educational levels were some of policy level recommendations in light of the study findings.

Keywords: Corruption, Culture, Cultural Norms, Gift Giving

Introduction

The cultural prerogative of corruption, in some countries, makes corruption more acceptable to their own people (Olivier and Jean, 1999), so corruption officials justify their deeds by the consistency of local culture. In addition to these, strong flexible norms help corrupt officials and corrupt forces to maintain the prevalence of such corporate rules in the masses without any government or system fears. In such circumstances, the bureaucratic system is also a ghost, because the balance of the state should not determine the legitimacy or the illegitimacy of the actions. Gupta (1995) concluded corruption as a purely social phenomenon, with variations from culture to culture during his work in developed and underdeveloped nations. Bribery and other illegal contacts in most developed countries usually have a negative

effect. Without any other exit, payment was linked to the resolution of a problem. There are two obvious reasons for a feeling of mutual obligation: at first the notion that helping others means helping oneself or reciprocal self-interest is not met in the back of the mind. Corruption is usually suffered by a member of the organisation, because it causes a deviation for new generations and labels its ancestors deviant. In traditional societies where changes in value are rare, it is usually regarded as less acceptable. It is normally regarded, whether the current law is violated or not, as a result of a moral violation. Cultural perspectives generally include excessive or appropriate corruption actions. A losing culture can act as a precautionary to the growth of corruption through the cultural norm that corrupt practice takes. This sense of ownership of the people concerned results in legitimate, legal and consistent with the predominant culture of illegitimate actions. The social norms therefore approve of the prevalence of such behaviour as an increasing value for a prevalent culture to support and dissolve corruption (Yang, 1994; Chiabi, 2006; and Olivier and Jean, 1999).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Gift Giving

Some micro-level determinants of corruption were explained by Sheng-Lee and Guven (2013). Three outcomes of corruption could better identify the risk of corruption. On the bribe justification, only 3-4 percent are at risk of corruption. In addition, male dominant societies are more vulnerable to corruption when corruption is considered to be less serious. In addition, the view of individuals on corruption shapes their behaviour in the future.

The acknowledgement of corruption was called an opportunity cost by Guerrero and Oreggia (2008). These comparisons are inhibited by the norms of institutions. Every time the institutional norms are weak in implementation, the benefits for individuals are high by paying bribes and corruption is vibrant. Rich and trained people also have to pay bribe in such a situation. An employee, individual or company that refuses to commit bribery in such cases is likely to be excluded from society because of the current social dynamics. The increasing perception in this situation is that all institutions are corrupt, and so long as the institutions are changed, nothing can be done to prevent corruption in individual countries. The perceived ineffective institutions, mass beliefs and the prevailing social context therefore correlate the corrupt conduct of individuals. In these worst situations, only public awareness and media campaigns fail to control corruption. To make this work successful, additional additions are required. These can include institutional transparency, genuine law enforcement, and clarifying perceptions of corruption by the masses.

Hunt (2007) found bad luck patients and hostile events, mainly victims of crime, tending to pay bribe than non-victims. The bribe payments are conditioned by the behaviour of victims both individually and in the household. These victims need more support from government officials such as the police to make them more susceptible to bribes than non-victims. Other reasons to pay bribes are your vulnerability, your desperate access to a service, or your desire for corrupt services, such as being eligible for benefits. In most difficult times of their lives, the exposure of most people in need to corruption is unfortunate and causes inequality.

Millington et al. (2005) found that donating in UK-owned companies in China is a major problem. Gifting has to do with illegal payment, self-interest and corruption in China, particularly when institutional structures and traditions are in transition. Individual gains contribute more than corporate gains to corruption.

The determinants of corruption were analyzed by Swamy et al. (2001). Data from the World Values Survey were based on their analysis (WVS). Culture and value change is a global survey. The perception of the ten-level answer rates of bribe acceptance during performance. Employees, women, the middle class and the elderly are less willing to accept corruption. In addition, females are rare customers of both the offering and acceptance side in a corruption transaction.

Gift Giving

Corruption in certain cultures may find appropriate grounds for its development. Sometimes local culture promotes values which add to corruption. These cultural assets can include extremely flexible rules, contradictory regulations and changes in nomenclature, such as naming corruption as donation and solidarity. This section limits the perception of gifts to the characteristics given in Table.

Most 94% reported that the gift to a government official is the same as that of giving him bribes, with 4.2% refuting it and 1.8% not knowing about it. Similarly, 92.7% of respondents said the demand for a gift is an acceptable behaviour as a gift; 6% annulled the perception, and 1.3% did not know it. However, the 84.6% of respondents disagreed with the view that someone who gave a gift for the background was justifiable, 11.5% confirmed this view and 3.9% were unsure. Similarly, most 78.1 percent disagreed that when offering donations, 19.5 percent retained that position and 2.3 percent were uncertain that masses themselves were active perpetrators of corruption than victims. In addition, 85.2 percent of those who participated confirmed that donating was socially acceptable, 9.1 percent decreased and 5.7 percent were uncertain. Similarly, 74.2% of respondents said that the official who accepted a gift was compelled to favour the donor, 20.8% denied this position and 4.9% were uncertain. Gifts are taken as an event in most cases to create harmony and confidence between the persons interacting. The experts have little to explain in connection with the spread of corruption and the use of donations. These results are consistent with Yang (1994) who has shown that corruption is a concept that has been socially produced. In traditional societies such as China, the author affirmed that traditional gifts are a source of mutual obligation. In the absence of a reply for a given gift, the 'loosing face' in society will be exposed. In addition, self-interest is in the form of helping others to be helped when they are in trouble.

59.1 percent also denied that the family value of donation was driven by corruption, 13.5 percent affirmed this perception, and 27.3 percent were uncertain about it, without taking into account the economic standing of the family. In addition, 84.6% of respondents denied, 9.6% and 5.7% of respondents were uncertain of stressing education in order to gain materials through all moral or immoral means within their families. But most of 94.8% of those interviewed agreed that in society, 3.9% disagreed and 1.3% were ambiguous with a cop who did not accept gifts. Similarly, similarly, 90.1% respondents affirmed that an officer

who accept gifts but remain fair is admired in society 3.9% disagreed to this perception and 1.3% was idealess. Conversely, majority of 94.3% respondents refuted the idea that people who followed pure merit received gifts in same number as those who favor undeserving, 3.9% accepted this view and 1.8% didn't know about it. However, any culture speaking dubious over gifts exchange, usually has a high degree of awareness and sensitivity towards corruption and had some sound parameters of checking the practices out of the societal fabric. The cultural root causes of corruption are quite obvious, as Olivier and Jean (1999) have stated. The donation element is justified because it corresponds to the culture with a moral obligation to reciprocate. The nomenclature of corruption is turned into donation and solidarity etc. In such societies. These countries are the countries where people learn to live in a natural environment.

Frequencies and Percentagewise Distribution of Respondents on the Basis of their Perception of Gift Giving

Statements	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
Giving gift to a government servant bears same meaning as giving bribe to him.	361(94.0)	16(4.2)	7(1.8)
Asking for gift is becoming acceptable behaviour as giving gift.	256(92.7)	23(6.0)	5(1.3)
Someone giving gifts with background motive of getting favour is justifiable.	44(11.5)	325(84.6)	15(3.9)
Masses themselves are active perpetrators of corruption than victims when they offer gifts.	75(19.5)	300(78.1)	9(2.3)
Gift giving is a socially acceptable way of getting favours.	327(85.2)	35(9.1)	22(5.7)
An official who accepts gift is obliged to favour the person offering gift.	285(74.2)	80(20.8)	19(4.9)
Familial values of gift giving without considering economic standings of family pushes for corruption.	52(13.5)	227(59.1)	105(27.3)
Stressed training for material gain by all moral or immoral means inside families causes corruption.	37(9.6)	325(84.6)	22(5.7)
An officer who doesn't accept gifts is praised in society.	364(94.8)	15(3.9)	5(1.3)
An officer who accepts gifts but remain fair is admired in society.	346(90.1)	32(8.3)	6(1.6)
People who follow pure merit receive gifts in same number as those who favour undeserving.	15(3.9)	362(94.3)	7(1.8)

Association between Perception of Gift Giving and Corruption

On the basis of their patterns and features in various societies, culture varies. Similar deeds therefore have different significances in various cultural contexts. The same applies to

perceptive changes in East and West gifts. In a particular situation offering some material object to an official is perceived in the East as a gift and in the West as corruption. The gift offers a social interaction chain which can end with the promotion of the person who gives the gift. An officially classified person who accepts a gift is obliged to offer a favour or ridicule. Gift donation has therefore become a social way of gaining benefits. The concept of giving gifts was limited to a few statements in the section below to determine the association between corruption perception and the offering of gifts.

Association between Perception of Gift Giving and Corruption

Statements	Perception	Corruption		Total	Chi-Square (P=Value)
		Agree	No		
Gift giving is a socially acceptable way of getting favors.	Agree	299(77.9)	28(7.3)	327(85.2)	$\chi^2=12.578$ (0.002)
	Disagree	32(8.3)	3(0.8)	35(9.1)	
	Don't know	15(3.9)	7(1.8)	22(5.7)	
Familial values of gift giving without considering economic standings of family pushes for corruption.	Agree	45(11.7)	7(1.8)	52(13.5)	$\chi^2= 8.946$ (0.011)
	Disagree	213(55.5)	14(3.6)	227(59.1)	
	Don't know	88(22.9)	17(4.4)	105(27.3)	
An officer who doesn't accept gifts is praised in society.	Agree	335(87.2)	29(7.6)	364(94.8)	$\chi^2= 30.842$ (0.000)
	Disagree	9(2.3)	6(1.6)	15(3.9)	
	Don't know	2(0.5)	3(0.8)	5(1.3)	
An officer who accepts gifts but remain fair is admired in society.	Agree	319(83.1)	27(7.0)	346(90.1)	$\chi^2=18.372$ (0.000)
	Disagree	22(5.7)	10(2.6)	32(8.3)	
	Don't know	5(1.3)	1(0.3)	6(1.6)	
People who follow pure merit receive gifts in same number as those who favor undeserving.	Agree	13(3.4)	2(0.5)	15(3.9)	$\chi^2= 8.975$ (0.011)
	Disagree	329(85.7)	33(8.6)	362(94.3)	
	Don't know	4(1.0)	3(0.8)	7(1.8)	
Giving gift to a government servant bears same meaning as giving bribe to him.	Agree	326(84.9)	35(9.1)	361(94.0)	$\chi^2=2.192$ (0.334)
	Disagree	13(3.4)	3(0.8)	16(4.2)	
	Don't know	7(1.8)	0(0.0)	7(1.8)	
Asking for gift is becoming acceptable behavior as giving gift.	Agree	320(83.3)	36(9.4)	356(92.7)	$\chi^2=0.605$ (0.739)
	Disagree	21(5.5)	2(0.5)	23(6.0)	
	Don't know	5(1.3)	0(0.0)	5(1.3)	
Someone giving gifts with background motive of getting favor is	Agree	37(9.6)	7(1.8)	44(11.5)	$\chi^2=2.121$ (0.346)
	Disagree	295(76.8)	30(7.8)	325(84.6)	
	Don't know	14(3.6)	1(0.2)	15(3.9)	

justifiable.					
Masses themselves are	Agree	71(18.5)	4(1.0)	75(19.5)	$\chi^2= 3.435$

active perpetrators of corruption than victims when they offer gifts.	Disagree	266(93.3)	34(8.9)	300(78.1)	(0.180)
	Don't know	9(2.3)	0(0.0)	9(2.3)	
An official who accepts gift is obliged to favor the person offering gift.	Agree	255(66.4)	30(7.8)	285(74.2)	$\chi^2= 0.651$ (0.722)
	Disagree	74(19.3)	6(1.6)	80(20.8)	
	Don't know	17(4.4)	2(0.5)	19(4.9)	
Stressed training for material gain by all moral or immoral means inside families causes corruption.	Agree	33(8.6)	4(1.0)	37(9.6)	$\chi^2= 0.765$ (0.682)
	Disagree	292(76.0)	33(8.6)	325(84.6)	
	Don't know	21(5.5)	1(0.3)	22(5.7)	

Summary

The perception of respondents regarding gift giving unveil that majority of 94% respondents stated that giving gift is to a government servant bear same meaning as giving bribe to him, 92.7% affirmed that asking for gift is becoming acceptable behavior as giving gift, 84.6% disapproved the view that someone giving gifts with background motive of getting favor was justifiable, 78.1% disagreed that masses themselves were active perpetrators of corruption than victims when they offer gifts, 85.2% confirmed that gift giving was socially acceptable way of getting favor, 74.2% affirmed that an official who accepted gift was obliged to favor the person offering gift. Moreover, 59.1% respondents refuted that familial value of gift giving without considering economic standings of family pushed for corruption, 84.6% negated that stressed training for material gains by all moral or immoral means inside families caused corruption, 94.8% agreed that an officer who didn't accept gifts was praised in society, 90.1% affirmed that an officer who accept gifts but remain fair is admired in society, 94.3% refuted that people who followed pure merit received gifts in same number as those who favor undeserving.

The association between perception of gift giving and corruption showed that corruption perception was significantly associated with gift giving as a socially acceptable way of getting favors ($p=0.002$), familial values of gift giving without considering economic standings of family ($p=0.011$), social admirations for officer who don't accept gifts ($p=0.000$), officer who accept gifts but remain fair is admired in society ($p=0.000$) and people who follow pure merit receive gifts in same number as those who favor undeserving ($p=0.011$). Conversely, corruption perception was non-significantly associated with giving gift to a government servant bears same meaning as giving bribe to him ($p=0.334$), asking for gift is becoming acceptable behavior as giving gift ($p=0.739$), someone giving gifts with background motive of getting favor is justifiable ($p=0.346$), masses themselves are active perpetrators of corruption than victims when they offer gifts ($p=0.180$), an official who accepts gift is obliged to favor the person offering gift ($p=0.722$) and stressed training for material gain by all moral or immoral means inside families causes corruption ($p=0.682$).

Conclusion

In short, corruption has its roots in the local culture, where donations are offered and accepted. It is named a gesture of solidarity with the masses that such gifts are accepted. However, not all officials accept donations or favour the person after accepting his gift, but people appreciate their honesty for these officials and send their gifts as a token of their respect.

References

- Chiabi, D. K. (2006). Corruption As A Consequence Of Changing Social Values In Transitional Societies. Paper Presented At The Annual Meeting Of The American Society Of Criminology (ASC), Los Angeles Convention Center, Los Angeles Retrieved From http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p126004_index.html
- Guerrero, M.A. and Eduardo, R.O. (2008). On The Individual Decisions To Commit Corruption: A Methodological Complement. *Journal Of Economic Behavior & Organization*.
- Gupta, A. (1995). Blurred Boundaries: The Discourse Of Corruption, The Culture Of Politics, And The Imagined State, *American Ethnologist: Journal of the American Ethnological Society*.
- Hunt, J (2007). How Corruption Hits People When They Are Down. *Journal of Development Economics*.
- Millington, A., M, E. and B, W. (2005). Gift Giving, Guanxi And Illicit Payments In Buyer–Supplier Relations In China: Analysing The Experience Of UK Companies. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Olivier D. S. J. P.. (1999). A Moral Economy Of Corruption In Africa, *Journal Of Modern African Studies*.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods For Business*. USA, Hermitage Publishing Services.
- Sheng-Lee, W and C. G. (2013). Engaging In Corruption: The Influence Of Cultural Values And Contagion Effects At The Micro Level. *Journal Of Economic Psychology*.
- Swamy, A. K. S. L, Y., &Azfar, O. (2001). Gender and Corruption. *Journal of Development Economics*.
- Yang, M. M. H. (1994). *Gifts, Favors And Banquets: The Art Of Social Relationships In China*. London: Cornell University Press.