



Social Sciences Indexed

International
SOCIAL MENTALITY AND
RESEARCHER THINKERS JOURNAL
Open Access Refereed E-Journal & Refereed & Indexed
SMARTjournal (ISSN:2630-631X)



Architecture, Culture, Economics and Administration, Educational Sciences, Engineering, Fine Arts, History, Language, Literature, Pedagogy, Psychology, Religion, Sociology, Tourism and Tourism Management & Other Disciplines in Social Sciences

2019

Vol:5, Issue:23

pp.1400-1411

www.smartofjournal.com

editorsmartjournal@gmail.com

NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND THE PROCESS OF CHANGE IN ETHICAL UNDERSTANDING

YENİ KAMU YÖNETİMİ VE ETİK ANLAYIŞTA DEĞİŞİM SÜRECİ

Dr. Bekir TAVAS

Emekli Emniyet Müdürü, Ankara/TÜRKİYE



Article Arrival Date : 02.09.2019

Article Published Date : 30.09.2019

Article Type : Research Article

Doi Number : <http://dx.doi.org/10.31576/smryj.355>

Reference :Tavas, B. 2019. "New Public Administration And The Process Of Change In Ethical Understanding", International Social Mentality and Researcher Thinkers Journal, (Issn:2630-631X) 5(23): 1400-1411

ABSTRACT

In this study, the ethical problem in public administration is examined from a historical perspective and unethical behaviors in public administration are observed to be widespread in every period. In this study, it is understood that the concept of public interest which has developed in the process of building modern public management systems contributes to the development of public administration ethics. With the twentieth century, some countries have adopted the idea that ethical codes have been developed in public administration systems and that public employees will act in the public interest without deviating behavior. The center of this acceptance is that the behavior of public employees can be determined externally. However, in spite of all ethical coding and legal sanctions, unethical behaviors in public administration started to increase rapidly during the 1970s. This has led to increased academic curiosity in the field of public administration ethics. At the end of the study, it was seen that sensitivity towards ethics in public administration crossed national boundaries and gained an international character and states made great efforts to prevent unethical behaviors in public administration.

Keywords: New Public Management, ethics, society

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada kamu yönetiminde etik problem tarihsel bir perspektiften incelenmiş ve kamu yönetiminde etik dışı davranışların her dönemde yaygın olduğu görülmektedir. Bu çalışmada, modern kamu yönetim sistemlerinin kurulması sürecinde gelişen kamu yararı kavramının kamu yönetimi etiğinin gelişimine katkıda bulunduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Yirminci yüzyılda, bazı ülkeler kamu yönetim sistemlerinde etik kodların geliştirildiği ve kamu çalışanlarının davranışları saptırmadan kamu yararına hareket edeceği fikrini benimsemiştir. Bu kabulün merkezi, kamu çalışanlarının davranışlarının dışarıdan belirlenebilmesidir. Ancak, tüm etik kodlama ve yasal yaptırımlara rağmen, kamu idaresindeki etik dışı davranışlar 1970'lerde hızla artmaya başladı. Bu, kamu yönetimi etiği alanındaki akademik merakın artmasına neden olmuştur. Çalışmanın sonunda, kamu yönetiminde etik değerlere duyarlılığın ulusal sınırları geçtiği ve uluslararası bir nitelik kazandığı ve devletlerin kamu yönetiminde etik dışı davranışları önlemek için büyük çaba sarf ettiği görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yeni Kamu Yönetimi, etik, toplum

1. GİRİŞ

The emergence of the modern state brought with it the principle of separation of powers in state administration. The powers of the state are legislative, executive and judicial. Public administration, in its simplest form, corresponds to the executive power of the state. From this point of view, it is possible to define public administration as the realization of the aims of the state by hiring public officials and public goods. The most important aim of the state is to realize the public interest. The public interest is the production of all kinds of goods and services needed by the public by the public bureaucracy. Therefore, the state carries out some activities through public organizations in order to realize the public interest and produce the goods and services needed by the public. It is possible to examine the activities of the state in a wide range such as security, justice, education, health, social security and municipal affairs. The state carries out activities within its area of responsibility by means of public officials. Public officials are obliged to carry out public activities in accordance with the constitution, especially the laws, regulations, regulations, directives, circulars and similar legislation. The main principle on which all these legislation is based is to make the public benefit dominant. In other words, the spirit of the legal framework governing the functioning of public administration constitutes the assumption that the general interest of society is superior to the interests of individuals.

In practice, however, there is a widespread belief that public officials do not, in any case, act according to this fundamental principle. So much so that some public officials are involved in corruption, take bribes, embezzle money, bullying the citizens they serve, they favoritism and make lies and gossip are deviating behaviors accepted by almost everyone. This has increased the importance of discussions on ethics in public administration. So much so that a highly voluminous literature has also developed. In this study, first of all, the ethics of public administration is examined in terms of its causes and consequences, and then the suggestions for prevention of unethical practices in public administration are discussed. Finally, Turkey dimensions of the problem will be discussed.

2. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ETHICS AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

The assumption that organizations can be built and managed rationally is one of the main features of the traditional organizational model (Tsoukas and Knudsen, 2003: 199). This model sees employees as a mechanical part of the organization and assumes that all kinds of behaviors of employees can be realized according to predetermined rules (Cole, 1996: 22; Yüksel and Aykaç, 2003: 349). However, this pre-assumption of the traditional organizational paradigm regarding organizational behavior has not been supported by scientific data and has been subject to great criticism. An important part of the criticism consists of arguments that legal and legal norms, which are claimed to be the determinants of employee behaviors, may not be realized in all cases as planned and in some cases do not coincide with ethical principles (Cooper et al., 1998: 77). On the other hand, within the framework of the rule of law, public organizations aiming to realize the public interest have been commemorated with increasing corruption scandals in recent years (Shafritz and Russell, 2005). As a consequence of this, public administration seems to be dragged into an ontological paradox. These developments have led to a crisis of legitimacy in public administration, as well as the intensification of academic interest in solving ethical problems in public administration (Maesschalck, 2004; Menzel, 2005). The synthesis of the relationship between public administration and ethics seems to depend primarily on the analysis of these two areas. In the following, the concepts of public administration and ethics are examined and then the connection between the two fields is tried to be understood in the historical development process.

2.1. Public Administration

Public administration is a field of managerial action that seeks to realize the public interest in one aspect; on the other hand, it is a branch of science that makes it the object of studying this field of action (Dunsire, 1999: 360; Waldo, 1955: 3). Wilson (1961), who argues that public administration

should be examined independently of politics and thus plays an important role in its development as an autonomous science, defines public administration as the systematic application of public law. Public administration, which is identical with the executive power of the state, is organized with a centralist bureaucratic approach (Dunsire, 1999: 361). Traditional public administration is based on specialized and disciplined public bureaucracy, adopted the principle of merit in personnel management and is structured according to the understanding of division of labor and unity of command (Hood, 1990: 537). In other words, public administration is organized according to Weber's (1996: 81) bureaucracy model consisting of rules-based authority, hierarchy, writing, expertise, formalism and career principles.

Public administration, according to some scientists is not different from the private sector management and bears similar features (Murray, 1975: 364). However, some authors argue that there are differences between public and private administrations in terms of targeted outcomes. For example, Baldwin (1987: 181) states that the aim of public administration is to realize the public good, whereas the private sector's main purpose is to make profit. The reason for the existence of public administration is to realize the public interest. Public interest is defined as all kinds of public activities in the field of management law in order to meet the daily needs of the society and ensure the continuation of daily life (Günday, 2002: 14). In other words, the public interest is the production of the services and goods needed by the society by public organizations. Public goods and services are produced by public officials in public administration. Public officials, public administration is defined as the person connected to an organization (TUSIAD, 2005: 199). Public officials constitute the human element of public administration. Public officials do all kinds of work on the basis of certain principles. One of these principles is to prioritize the public interest over private interest. Therefore, public servants who work in public service have to work for the public good, not for their personal interests (Günday, 2002: 523; Hunbury, 2004: 187).

Public officials are expected to comply with a number of rules in the performance of their duties. These rules also define the areas of responsibility of public officials. Responsibility is generally defined as the individual's ability to perform his / her actions according to certain obligations expected from him and to account for himself / herself and others. Petter (2005: 197) classified the responsibilities of public officials as areas of moral, professional, financial, legal and public responsibility. The focus of ethical debates in public administration is on these areas of responsibility surrounding the behavior of public officials.

2.2. Ethics

The concept of ethics is derived from the Greek word *etos*, which means character and behavior, and is the branch of philosophy that examines moral values. Morality, which is the English equivalent of the concept of morality, is derived from the Latin *moralis* word, meaning etiquette and tradition (Thompson, 1985: 555). Morality is defined as the ability to distinguish between right and wrong behaviors. In this state, moral behavior, individual, society is considered to behave in accordance with some standards that are considered good or right (Wart, 2003: 331). Morality also means a collection of principles, a collection of rules, in which people generally live by themselves. Thus, it is possible to speak of a professional morality, a political morality and even a marriage morality. Ethics, on the other hand, is a field of philosophical investigation that examines such behaviors philosophically and tries to explain and evaluate in the last analysis (Arslan, 1994: 119).

Ethics is a set of values that advises people what to do or not to do. It is possible to examine these values in four clusters as assignments, virtues, principles and interests of society. Homework is the expected behavior from the role occupied by the person. Virtue is all that defines a good person. The principle is the fundamental truth that shapes behavior. The interest of society is all kinds of actions that benefit the society in general (Svara, 2007: 10). When examined as a whole, these values determine the framework of ethical behavior.

2.3. Public Management Ethics

Two main factors play a role in the behavior of public officials. One of them is the laws and the other is ethical values. While the laws determine and control the behaviors of public officials externally, ethical values govern and control the behavior internally (Cooper et al., 1998: 91). Laws and rules that play a role in the external determination of behavior force public officials to act in the public interest. From this perspective, it is possible to define public administration ethics as conducting all kinds of behaviors of public employees in accordance with laws, ethical codes and various rules. When it is considered as the internal determinant of the behaviors of public officials, public administration ethics means that public officials conduct their actions with reference to individual moral values. In this perspective, what is important is the level of moral development of the public official (Maesschalcs, 2004: 21). These two different perspectives on public administration ethics are complementary or should be (Gilman, 1999: 175). In other words, it is possible to define the ethics of public administration as performing all kinds of actions related to the duties of public officials by dissolving laws and individual moral values in a pot.

On the other hand, it is possible to talk about an ethical hierarchy in public administration. In the first step of the hierarchy, there are individual moral structures of public officials. Individual morality is shaped by the subjective history of the public official. For example, family influence, religious belief, cultural and social values influence and individual experiences are the parameters that determine the moral structure of the public official. In the second step of the hierarchy, there is professional ethics. Professional ethics, on the other hand, is that the public official acts in accordance with the norms required by the profession. In the third step, there is organizational ethics. Organizational ethics is that public officials conduct their actions according to the rules determined in line with the realization of the organizational purpose. The last step of the hierarchy is social ethics. At the center of social ethics, public officials exhibit attitudes and behaviors that protect the individual on the one hand and behave in a way that contributes to the development of society as a whole (Shafritz and Russell, 2005: 186).

In this context, it is a general expectation that public officials internalize some ethical values in relation to their areas of responsibility and take actions accordingly. In this context, it is possible to list the main ethical principles that should be dominated by public administration as follows. First of all, public officials should be responsible to the law and the mission of the organization. Secondly, public officials should have the attitude and behavior towards the public interest, and therefore should not exercise some of their authority for their own benefit. Public officials, on the other hand, need to be committed to achieving the public interest and to be fair, honest, open and tolerant in doing so. In addition, it is important for public officials to take responsibility for their actions and to respect democratic values. In addition, public officials have to make ethical decisions, dominate all of organizational life and make decisions with reference to moral values (Svara, 2007: 155).

In some cases, public administrators may face some ethical dilemmas when making decisions. In this case, the rulers of the constitution, laws, nation, profession, family, itself, non-governmental organizations, the public interest, general prosperity and human values are bound to make decisions (Waldo, 1980: 103-107). On the other hand, it is possible to talk about different models that question the relationship between the structure of public organizations and ethics. The first model is a hierarchical organizational structure. According to this model, discipline is the determining factor in the behaviors of the members of the organization. All actions of the employees of the organization are under strict supervision. In this model, employees are obliged to keep the organizational interest above their own interests. This understanding constitutes the ethical understanding of hierarchical organizations. The second model is the pluralist organization structure. According to this model, there is competition between the groups in the organization. Ethical values in such organizations are determined as a result of inter-group competition in the organization. The third model is the egalitarian model. In this model, the motto for all of us and one of us is the essence of ethical

understanding. Unlike other models, the last model places the individual in the center. In this model, the essence of ethical behavior is the realization of the individual's self-realization and latent abilities (Hunbury, 2004: 187).

2.4. Development Of Ethics In Public Administration

The first examples of debates on ethics in public administration can be seen in the states of the ancient Greek city. For example, public officials who were placed in public service in the Athens city-state were obliged to take an oath to take the city even further than it was delivered to them before they started work. In the text of the oath, it was stated that public officials should be honest, respectful and tolerant towards others while performing their duties (Hunbury, 2004: 187). During this period, some thinkers, especially Aristotle, developed their thoughts on ethics. Aristotle (2000: 194) thought that happiness can only be realized through virtue. According to him, the factors that will lead to a happy life are reason, virtue and ethical behaviors. According to Aristotle, virtue is to achieve perfection in moral and intellectual fields. Therefore, it is not possible for people who have immoral and intellectual capacity to have virtue. The way to make man virtuous is through knowledge. Knowledge is a cognitive process that can be learned and taught. Because knowledge is a process that can be learned, virtue and ethics are learnable and teachable realities. Therefore, public administration ethics is also a value that can be learned because it is related to cognitive processes.

In the Eastern Mesopotamia, Susa, which was founded eight thousand years ago by the Persians and was one of the first known city states in history, was determined as a legal obligation to act in accordance with ethical values of public officials. For example, during this period, public officials were forbidden to lie and accepted as a crime. The ethical behaviors of the managers formed the spirit of all kinds of managerial practices; the principles of justice and equality have become the basis of public service (Hunbury, 2004: 187). However, despite the efforts made to ensure that the public administrators and officials adhered to the ethical principles in the antiquity, some studies revealed that some public officials were involved in corruption in some cities such as Babylon and Rome and that they entered into behaviors that could be defined as unethical (Palmier, 1983: 207). . This shows that the history of unethical behavior is as old as the history of public administration.

Traces of ethical behavior in public administration can also be seen in Turkish history. For example, the leaders of the guilds (Kethüda), who had assumed important functions in the traditional Ottoman social order, were required to adhere to ethical values by law. Kethüda, during his duty, in any way entered into a bad attitude and behavior sanctions in the direction of the removal of the duty was applied (Çadırcı, 1997: 123). However, despite all these sanctions, it is understood that unethical behaviors are common in Ottoman public order. For example, the Divan poet Fuzuli's greetings, they did not say bribes are not bribes, shows that unethical practices such as bribery are becoming increasingly common in public order. In fact, it is suggested that one of the reasons for the collapse of the Ottoman Empire was the spread of bribery in the administration and the judiciary (Mumcu, 1969: 308).

However, ethical debates in public administration gradually gained momentum with the development of modern public administration systems. For example, in the nineteenth century in America, the looting system was the basis of public administration. According to the plundering system, the political party that came to power has the authority to change the public bureaucracy as it wishes (Ergun, 2004: 20). The looting system has gradually deteriorated over time and a major moral corruption has started in the public administration system. As a result of this development, a climate of reconciliation has been formed in the USA to abolish the looting system and establish a public administration system independent from politics. As a matter of fact, the plundering system was ended in 1883 and important steps were taken in establishing a professional public administration system independent from politics. Expectations that some unethical practices, especially corruption, will be eliminated have been increased especially with the rule of merit in the public personnel system (Cohen and Eimicke, 1998: 1).

Lawton and Doig (2005: 11) think that the ethics of public administration that developed at the end of the nineteenth century had some basic characteristics. These are; (1) the dominance of the public interest, (2) the professionalization of professions, (3) mutual trust between the citizen and the state, and (4) impartiality. As a result of this understanding, there has been a tendency to develop ethical codes in order to ensure that public officials do not disregard their own interests and discriminate in public service (White, 1955: 461). As a matter of fact, ethical codes were first developed in 1924 by the International Union of City Administrators (UŞYB) in order to guide public employees and these codes were revised and finalized in 1952. Accordingly, the UŞYB requires its members to adhere to the following ethical principles (see Cohen and Eimicke, 1998: 12); (1) employees should perform their jobs with the best performance and develop themselves in the best way in relation to their field of duties, (2) employees should be evaluated according to the merit principle, (3) any decisions about the city should be taken by the city council which has come to power by election, (4) honesty, respect, public service and social responsibility should be internalized as important values, and (5) employees should keep the public interest above the individual interest.

However, the legal-rational bureaucratic public administration system, which was dominant in the aftermath of the Second World War, especially in America, has gradually become the focus of criticism. Particularly in the late 1960s, some corruption scandal reflected to the public led the traditional public administration system to a crisis of legitimacy (Shafritz and Russel, 2005: 179). In this period, there has also been a growing criticism that the centralist bureaucratic system of public administration ignores individual and social differences and tries to create a uniform person (Marcuse, 1997). On the other hand, the economic crisis that emerged as a result of increasing public expenditures during the same period has deepened and led to the questioning of the main premise of legal-rational public administration (Alber, 1988: 187; Pierson, 1998: 139).

All these developments have increased the demands and expectations of democratization and transparency of public administration. As a result of this, some scientists have initiated an approach known as Neo-Public Administration in the early 1970s. As a result of the adoption of this understanding, some changes have been observed in the understanding of public administration ethics. First of all, the traditional ethics of public administration, which takes shape within the hierarchical order of command with the understanding that public officials act in accordance with the law, has begun to be abandoned. The essence of the new era of public administration ethics constituted the understanding that public officials were primarily responsible for themselves. According to this understanding, healthy people have the aim of self-realization and have the potential to carry subjective ethical values to the public sphere (Cohen and Eimicke, 1998: 11).

In recent years, Fredericson has brought a different dimension to the debate on ethics in public administration. Fredericson saw values as the most important element of public administration and highlighted the importance of adherence to laws, honesty, professionalism and individual morality, particularly the constitution. According to him, the real reason for many unethical practices observed in public administration is the attitude and actions of politicians. However, professional public officials are the ones who have adopted high ethical values and perform all kinds of actions in line with these ethical principles. The author criticized efforts to control public officials by means of ethical laws and codes, and argued that contrary to expectations, public officials would undermine their individual sense of responsibility (see Cohen and Eimicke, 1998).

3. NON-ETHICAL BEHAVIOR IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND ITS TYPES

Among the most common unethical behaviors encountered in public administration, unfair property acquisition, misbehavior, misappropriation, embezzlement, smuggling, mischief in official procurement, abstention from duty, abuse of power, abuse of power (intimidation and torture), nepotism and discrimination, neglect, exploitation (flattery), insults, bad habits, gossip and intermediaries, such as conducting business through actions and practices (Aydın, 2002: 60-68; Bozkurt and Ergun, 1998) 117, Eryilmaz, 2002: 241; Jhonson, 2004: 3). However, when people talk

about unethical behavior in public administration, many people think of corruption and bribery, a common form of corruption. For this reason, it is seen that corruption and bribery are discussed in more detail in the literature. Corruption is one of the most important problems of all developed and developing countries. This degeneration tendency observed in public administration has aroused academic curiosity on the one hand and on the other hand it has become the most important propaganda of political parties in the fight against corruption (Robinson, 1998: 1; Theobalt, 1999: 491).

It is possible to mention two definitions of corruption, one general and the other legal sociological. According to the first of these, corruption means improper, irregular, improper work. In the legal or sociological sense, corruption is the use of public authority, duties and resources for private interests contrary to the legal and social norms and standards that form the basis of social order (Bozkurt and Ergun, 1998: 264). Eryilmaz (2002: 241) considered corruption as an organizational problem of the public bureaucracy and defined the actions that should not be done and not to do the things that should be done. According to the author, all kinds of attitudes and behaviors such as bribery, embezzlement, extortion, abuse of office are included in the concept of corruption. Ergun (1978: 24), on the other hand, defines corruption as the diversion of normal duty behaviors in order to provide private material interests or status gains by individuals or groups who serve the public. Palmier (1983: 207) likewise defines corruption as the use of public authority for self-interest. It is understood that corruption is one of the main problem areas of public organizations. Based on the above definitions, it is possible to define corruption as the exercise of some public authority of public officials for their own personal interests outside the public interest. Therefore, it is possible to determine that corruption constitutes the center of ethical discussions in public administration.

The most common form of corruption encountered in public administration is bribery. Bribery is more common in less developed and developing countries than in developed countries. This is because the wages of public employees in these countries are relatively low. In fact, public officials in these countries do not even have enough income to sustain their lives. This situation encourages public officials to take bribes (Shaftriz and Russell, 2005: 177).

A bribe is usually given for the purpose of either recovering from a loss or gaining an interest or expediting a business. Therefore, bribery, the bureaucratic mechanism is considered as a tool to work in favor of one's own (Eryilmaz, 2002: 241). A bribe can be defined as money, gift or opportunity given to an officer to perform his / her duty in a manner that provides unfair benefit to a natural or legal person or to ignore his / her actions. According to another definition, bribery is defined as the type of corruption in the form of people who have the authority to make decisions or make transactions on behalf of the public in return for the advantages they provide or sometimes they want to receive or request money or gifts (Bozkurt & Ergun, 1998: 214).

3.1. Causes of Unethical Behavior

There are many reasons for unethical behavior in public administration. One of the main reasons is low employee wages. This is followed by opportunities for unethical behavior and relatively low punitive practices. On the other hand, in cases where wages are relatively satisfactory, there are not many opportunities to lead to unethical behaviors and sanctions are deterrent, the incidence of other unethical behaviors, especially corruption, decreases (Palmier, 1983: 209). The reason is the failure of the state to produce public services in the new era which started with the end of the cold war. Privatization and deregulation (liberalization) policies, which came to the forefront as a dominant understanding in this period, have brought some problems together. One of these problems is the increasing number of corruption cases. Because some of the services previously produced by public organizations have started to be transferred to the private sector before the infrastructure is well prepared. In other words, while the state has contracted public service areas in favor of the private sector, it has not established the legal framework to regulate the functioning of the new system based on the market mechanism; moreover, it did not sufficiently strengthen public institutions to supervise

and regulate the new order (Jhonson and Sharma, 2004: 3). As can be seen, this perspective considers the spread of unethical behaviors as a result of the political and economic turmoil that emerged in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

In addition, the large volume of the state is one of the most important reasons that feed corruption. According to this, while the state allocates large funds for the survival of its large-scale public organizations, it disposes them at very low prices during the privatization process. In this process, some public officials use public resources for their own interests, but they ignore the public interest (Ackerman, 1999: 38).

Another reason for unethical behavior is that public officials have good intentions. Sometimes public officials, in their opinion, are able to flexibly apply the rules to protect the interests of the state. This puts the state of law in jeopardy. Another reason is that public officials do not know the rules well. This is because public officials are subject to laws, regulations, directives and various regulatory procedures. This situation may sometimes push public officials to act out of legislation. Another known cause is self-demonstration. From time to time, public officials believe that the way they know is the best, especially when it comes to concepts such as the state, the nation and the country, and they may deviate from illegal ways. The fact that public officials are greedy is also an important variable. In other words, some public officials may be involved in some immoral actions in order to become rich in a short way. Friendship is another important reason that forces public officials to exhibit unethical behavior. Some public officials may sometimes run public equipment, materials, and materials to help a friend, unlawfully. On the other hand, some public servants may adopt an attitude and behavior to benefit from public administration after retirement or other reasons. Some private sector organizations, especially those working in a state-related sector, are able to do their jobs faster by hiring these public officials. Apart from these, some public officials have adopted to go the same way as their superiors and to act with them. Another reason that pushes public officials to behave unethical is that these public officials engage in all kinds of immoral attitudes and behaviors in order to maintain their administrative positions at any cost (Ergun, 2004: 360).

3.2. Prevention Of Unethical Behavior

Many scientists in the field of public administration think that monitoring is an important factor in preventing many unethical behaviors, especially corruption. There is a common belief that this will reduce the frequency of unethical behaviors and have a deterrent effect (Anechiaryco and Goldstock, 2007: 117). The most important step in the monitoring of corruption on a global scale was taken in 1993 with the establishment of Transparency International (TI). The purpose of the establishment of TI is to monitor corruption worldwide and to rank countries with the dimensions of corruption. TI is preparing an annual report; this report provides information on corruption in many countries and lists the countries in terms of corruption. According to the Corruption Perception Index published by the University of Göttingen since 1995, the countries rated below five points are considered problematic and dirty in terms of corruption. According to TI data, the corruption score is observed to be relatively lower in developed and developing countries, whereas in underdeveloped countries the corruption score is high (Ergun, 2004: 335; Robinson, 1998: 107).

It is understood that corruption is one of the fundamental problems of the world, although there are important differences between the public administration systems of developed and less developed countries. Because corruption corrupts the public administration system, which operates in many areas from education to health, and leads to some bad practices in the production of public goods and services (TI, 2006). If this is the problem, how can ethical principles be applied in the most effective way in public administration? raises the question. As a matter of fact, various opinions have been put forward in the field of prevention of unethical behaviors in public administration and transformation of ethical values into a general understanding that shapes the system.

At the forefront of the views on minimizing corruption in public administration is the liberalization of the economy. According to this view, minimizing the production of goods and services by the state is considered as the most important parameter in the elimination of corruption. In addition, the preparation and implementation of some state-led anti-corruption programs; raising awareness and raising public awareness in this field; Some public administration reforms that will be made in order to dominate the understanding of transparency and accountability in public administration and finally the establishment of public institutions responsible for monitoring, evaluating and preventing unethical behaviors are among the measures that can be taken to prevent unethical behaviors (Robinson, 1998: 106). Ackerman (1999: 39) thinks that there are six different methods of preventing unethical behaviors of public officials. The first is that the state restricts or never engages in the production of goods and services that the state is carrying out, but which is conducive to corruption. Another measure is a comprehensive privatization. However, while privatization is in progress, the infrastructure that will regulate the functioning of the privatized sector needs to be well established. Otherwise, the place of unethical practices will change from public sector to private management. However, the state needs to make reforms to further improve functioning in various areas where privatization is not possible. On the other hand, the restructuring of the bureaucratic structure conducive to corruption in public administration with a competitive understanding will largely prevent corruption. In addition, aggravating criminal sanctions to deter public officials with a tendency to corruption will significantly reduce incidents of corruption. Finally, as much transparency as possible in the procurement of goods and services required by the public administration will play an important role in establishing an ethical climate in public administration.

4. ETHICS IN TURKISH PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

One of the biggest problems of Turkish public administration is the widespread of unethical activities. unethical activities in Turkey, began to be institutionalized beyond individual sizes. This situation undermines citizens' trust in the state. The main reasons behind the spread of unethical activities in Turkish public administration are lack of ethical standards of conduct, lack of accountability mechanisms, lack of established rule of law in public, lack of ethical culture in public, centralized and status quo structure of bureaucracy, and the effect of politicians on bureaucratic structure, appreciation. arbitrary use of authority, lack of transparency in public administration, economic reasons, lack of education and lack of attention to ethics (TÜSİAD, 2005: 24). Turkey, lags in international research on unethical activities in the public sector. In the TI corruption index is published every year, Turkey ranks 65th among 159 countries. The World Bank's Global Investment Climate According to the report of 2005 firms in Turkey as a gift to 6 thousand of annual revenues, to escape from the inspectors and inspection, permit or license to buy or to speed up the bureaucratic process or to win a tender an informal manner they spend on their payments (TUSIAD, 2005: 17).

The most important step taken in the process of developing ethical behaviors in Turkish public administration is the Law No. 5176 on the Establishment of an Ethics Committee for Public Officials and Amendments to Some Laws. The law aims to determine and apply ethical conduct principles such as transparency, impartiality, honesty, accountability and public interest that public officials should abide by. The implementing regulation of the Law is the Regulation on the Code of Ethics of Public Officials and the Procedures and Principles of Application. The Regulation sets out the principles of conduct to which public officials are subject, compliance with public service awareness, citizen focus, compliance with service standards, impartiality, honesty, commitment to the mission, dignity and trust, adherence to respect and courtesy rules, legality, accountability, transparency and information, conflict of interest. cases in the public interest. Law No. 4982 on Right to Information, which came into force in 2003 to achieve transparency in Turkish public administration, is another important step. The law sets out the principles and procedures for the exercise of the right to information by individuals in accordance with the principles of equality, impartiality and openness as required by democratic and transparent management (art. 1).

Another law regulating the ethical behavior of public officials is the Civil Servants Law No. 657. According to the law, civil servants are obliged to perform their duties impartially and to protect the interests of the state (art. 7). Again, according to the Law, civil servants cannot fulfill an order that is a criminal offense and the person who fulfills such an order cannot be relieved of responsibility (art. 11). In addition, civil servants declare property for themselves, their spouses and children (art. 14). Furthermore, civil servants may not engage in any activity that requires them to be considered merchants or tradesmen in accordance with the provisions of the Turkish Commercial Code (art. 28). Again, according to the law, public officials are prohibited from receiving gifts and providing benefits (art. 29). Criminal sanctions for unethical behavior in the Turkish public administration system are regulated in the Turkish Penal Code No. 5237. According to the law, cases such as bribery, corruption, embezzlement, bidding, buying and selling fraud and mischief are defined as crimes of corruption. In addition to these, crimes such as neglect of duty and abuse of public duty which constitute important conflict of interest situations are not regulated by the Law. For example, one of the situations of conflict of interest is to regulate Article 255 of the Turkish Penal Code. According to this article, a civil servant who does not enter his / her duty and benefits by making the opinion that he / she can do or get a job that he / she is not authorized is punished with imprisonment and judicial fine from one to five years.

5. CONCLUSION

In this study, the issue of ethics in public administration has been examined within the historical development process and it has been understood that ethical debates are held in every age. However, it was observed that some public officials maintained their unethical attitudes and behaviors despite the measures taken. It has been argued by some researchers that some unethical attitudes and behaviors, especially bribery, refute states from within and have an important role in their disappearance. In the modernization process, the rule of law and the idea of public interest formed the spirit of public activities and public officials were expected to comply with this principle in all their actions. However, it is understood that some public officials have been involved in various kinds of corruption and these corruption has continued to increase. All these developments have led to intensification of academic interest in the problem of public administration ethics. As a result of the researches, it has been determined that the incidence of unethical behaviors in public administration is higher in underdeveloped countries than in developed countries. Some academics and politicians have linked many corruptions, particularly bribery, with the overgrowth of the state, and argued that during the privatization process, some public officials ignored the public interest by infecting corruption. In this study, it is concluded that a number of measures will be decisive for the transformation of ethical principles into a dominant understanding in public administration. These measures can be summarized as follows; public administration should be freed from political pressure and autonomized; public personnel employment and wage policy should be structured so as not to require public officials to engage in such attitudes and behaviors; transparency and accountability mechanisms in public administration should be made operational; public employees' sensitivity to ethical behavior through in-service training activities should be kept alive.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, S. R. (1999), *Corruption and Government*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Alber, J. (1988), "Is There a Crisis of the Welfare State? Cross-National Evidence from Europe, North America, and Japan", *European Sociological Review*, 4, ss. 181-207.
- Anechiaryco, F., Goldstock, R. (2007), "Monitoring Integrity and Performance", *PublicxIntegrity*, 9, ss. 117-132.
- Aristotle (2000), *Nicomachean Ethics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Arslan, A., (1994), *Felsefeye Giriş*, Vadi Yayınları, Ankara.

- Aydın, İ. (2002), *Yönetmel Mesleki ve Örgütsel Etik*, Pegema Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Baldwin, J. N. (1987), "Public versus Private: Not That Different, Not That Consequential", *Public Personnel Management*, 16, ss. 181-193.
- Bozkurt, Ö., Ergun, T. (1998), *Kamu Yönetimi Sözlüğü*, TODAİE Yayınları, Ankara.
- Cohen, S., Eimicke, W. B. (1998), *Trends in 20th Century United States Government Ethics*. www.columbia.edu/~sc32/ethicalsur1.html, (Erişim Tarihi: 13.06. 2019).
- Cole, G. A. (1996), *Management; Theory and Practice*, Continuum Publishing, London.
- Cooper, P., Brady, L., Hardeman, O. H., Hyde, A., Naff, K. C., Ott. J. S., White, H (1998), *Public Administration for the Twenty-First Century*, Harcourt Brace College Publishers, Fort Worth.
- Çadırcı, M. (1997), *Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentlerinin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapısı*, TTK Yayınları, Ankara.
- Dunsire, A. (1999), "Then and Now Public Administration: 1953-1999", *Political Studies*, 47, ss. 360-378.
- Ergun, T. (1978), "Yönetimde Yozlaşma Olgusu Üzerine", *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, XI, ss. 24-30.
- Ergun, T. (2004), *Kamu Yönetimi: Kuram, Siyasa, Uygulama*, TODAİE Yayınları, Ankara.
- Eryılmaz, B. (2002), *Kamu Yönetimi*, Erkam Matbaası, İstanbul.
- Gilman, S. C. (1999), "Public Sector Ethics and Government Reinvention", *Public Integrity*, 1, ss. 175-192.
- Günday, M. (2002), *İdare Hukuku*, İmaj Yayınları, Ankara.
- Hunbury, G. L. (2004), "A Pracademic's Perspective of Ethics and Honor: Imperatives for Public Services in the 21st Century!", *Public Organization Review*, 4, ss. 187-204.
- Hood, C. (1990), "Public Administration: lost an empire, not yet found a role", In R. A. W. Rhodes, *Theory and Methods in British Public Administration: the view from Political Science*, *Political Studies*, Vol:XXXIX, 1991, s. 537.
- Jhonson, R. A., Sharma, S. (2004), *The Struggle Against Corruption: A Comparative Study*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York.
- Lawton, A., Doig, A. (2005), "Researching Ethics for Public Services Organizations", *Public Integrity*, 5, ss. 11-33.
- Maesschalck, J. (2004), "Approaches to Ethics Management in the Public Sector", *Public Integrity*, 7, ss. 21-41.
- Menzel, D. C. (2005), "Research on Ethics and Integrity in Governance", *Public Integrity*, 7, ss. 147-168.
- Marcuse, H. (1997), *Tek Boyutlu İnsan*, İdea Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Mumcu, A. (1969), *Osmanlı Devletinde Rüşvet*, A.Ü. Hukuk Fakültesi Yayını, Ankara.
- Murray, A. M. (1975), "Comparing Public and Private Management: An Exploratory Essay", *Public Administration Review*, 35, ss. 364-371.
- Palmier, L. (1983), "Bureaucratic Corruption and Its Remedies", *Corruption*, (Der. M. Clarke), Frances Pinter Ltd, London, ss. 207-219.
- Peter, J. (2005), "Responsible Behaviors in Bureaucrats", *Public Integrity*, 3, ss. 197-217.
- Pierson, C. (1998), *Beyond the Welfare State*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

- Robinson, M. (1998), *Corruption and Development*, Frank Cass, London.
- Shafritz, J. M., Russell. E. W. (2005), *Introducing Public Administration*, Pearson Education Inc, New York.
- Svara, J. H. (2007), *The Ethics Primer for Public Administrators in Government and Nonprofit Organization*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Arizona.
- Theobald, R. (1999), "So What Really is the Problem About Corruption", *Third World Quarterly*, 20, ss. 491-502.
- Thompson, D. F. (1985), "The Possibility of Administrative Ethics", *Public Administration Review*, 45, ss. 555-561.
- TI (2007), http://www.transparency.org.about_us, (Erişim Tarihi: 14.06.2019).
- TÜSİAD (2005), *Devlette Etikten Etik Devlete: Kamu Yönetiminde Etik*, TÜSİAD Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Tsoukas, H., Knudsen, C. (2003), *The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Waldo, D. (1955), *The Study of Public Administration*, Random House Inc, New York.
- Waldo, D. (1980), *The Enterprise of Public Administration*. Chandler & Sharp Publisher, Novado.
- Wart, V. M. (2003), "Codes of Ethics as Living Documents", *Public Integrity*, 5, ss. 331-346.
- Weber, M. (1996), "Bureaucracy", *Classics of Organization Theory*, (Der. Shafritz, J. and Ott, J.S.), Harcourt Brace College Publishers, New York, ss. 81-86.
- White, L. (1955), *Introduction to Study of Public Administration*, MacMillan Company, New York.
- Wilson, W. (1961), *İdarenin İncelenmesi* (Çev. Nermin Abadan), Türk Siyasî İlimler Derneği Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Yüksel, Ö., Aykaç, B. (2003), "Frederick Taylor'ın Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesinde Yeni Bir Yaklaşım", *Türkiye'de Kamu Yönetimi*, (Der. B. Aykaç, Ş. Durgun ve H. Yayman), Yargı Yayınevi, Ankara, ss. 349-363.