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INTRODUCTION

There is an emerging consensus among donors and their development partners that unethical and corrupt practices within the public sector not only result in ‘a crisis of confidence’ and erodes the rule of law, but also undermine development (UNDP, 2001). Sound public management and good governance have, by extension, been highlighted as prerequisites for sustainable development (UNDP, 2001). As a result, donor commitment to tackle public sector corruption has become evident, as witnessed by a proliferation of anti-corruption initiatives in the public sector of most sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries. These include market, socio-political and legal initiatives aimed at ensuring ethics, accountability and transparency in the public sector. Despite these efforts, corruption remains entrenched in much of SSA, as born out by Transparency International’s Corruption Perception Index of 2004.

Failure of past anti-corruption initiatives is paving way for a new truism in the anti-corruption discourse: integrating women into the public sector is a possible panacea to corruption. That the World Bank, in particular, is currently advising the integration of
women into the public sector underscores this paradigmatic shift in the anti-corruption scholarship. Incorporating gender analysis into governance initiatives is being acknowledged as critical for good governance, which implies that attempts at addressing corruption should pay critical attention to the role of women in the public sector (World Bank, 2001).

Two influential studies, which associate women with less corrupt behaviour in the public sector, are at the core of the new gender-corruption debate (Dollar et al, 1999 and Swamy et al, 2001). In the first study, Dollar et al (1999) use existing behavioural studies to examine the hypothesis that women are more effective in promoting honest governments, and conclude that higher rates of participation of women in government are associated with lower levels of corruption, with greater levels of participation of women in parliament corresponding to lower levels of corruption. In the other study, Swamy et al (2001) use World Values Surveys to measure the relationship between women in government and corruption. They conclude that countries with larger numbers of women in parliament have lower levels of corruption. Attributable to women being trustworthier than men, the policy implication of their findings is that “increasing women’s presence in public life can reduce levels of corruption” (Swamy et al, 2001:31).

Though the afore-mentioned studies fall short of empirically exploring why gender impacts corruption, explanations generally offered for female probity presuppose an imagery of female integrity. These influential studies employ the female gender as an explanatory variable to posit that women are more likely to behave with integrity in the public realm. The fundamental presumption is that females are associated with womanly virtues, either acquired from their socialization or inherent in their femininity, which translates into less corrupt behaviour in the sector. In essence, female imagery of virtuousness or higher moral values manifests in higher ethical standards, and, ultimately, less corrupt behaviour in the public domain.
The gender-corruption debate is gradually gaining currency among the donor community and their development partners. The World Bank, for instance, argues that “… A commonly held belief is that increasing women's representation might reduce corruption in an organization and its environment… if raising the percentage of women is associated with reduced levels of corruption, then actively promoting women's employment could be part of the World Bank's strategy to improve governance” (World Bank Website). In a World Bank policy document, *Engendering Development*, the Bank draws on the relationship between gender and corruption, established by the aforementioned studies, and concludes that the findings of these studies lends “additional support for having more women in politics and in the labor force– since they could be an effective force for good government and business trust” (World Bank, 2001:96).

On their part, many development partners are not only embracing the notion of women exhibiting higher ethical standards, thus less corrupt behaviours, but are also employing this argument to justify women’s inclusion in the public sector. In so doing, concerted efforts are made to incorporate women into the sector, through quotas, reserved seats and other affirmative action measures, as a probable tool to fighting corruption. In Ghana, for instance, attempts to achieve transparent and accountable governance has led to the issuance of a directive, by the Government, to increase the quota of female appointed representatives in key areas of the public sector, such as cabinet, local government and the security services (MWCA, 2004:34-35). In Uganda, Ahikire (2003) reports that key treasury positions in the new local government system are apportioned to women, in anticipation that women will transfer their feminine experiences of controlling the domestic purse-strings into local public office to curb misappropriation of public funds. According to Simmons and Wright (LA Times 23/02/2000), President Museveni of Uganda- widely celebrated for his pro-women policies, including a new national gender policy- is on record as having said that “women have irrevocably changed local politics. [They] have stabilised politics in a way because they tend not to be opportunistic… they tend to go after the interests of stability… they are not so reckless like men”.
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As this gender-sensitive approach to corruption is gradually endorsed on the basis of presumed higher ethical standards of women, fundamental questions arise pertaining to the efficacy of women in serving as public sector watchdogs. Could gender, as a social construct, possibly inform corrupt behaviours of men and women in the public realm? In much of SSA where the collectivist nature of the cultures imposes certain obligations on public officials, would women uphold public sector ethics at the expense of social ethics?

This paper discusses the gender-corruption nexus vis-à-vis the afore-raised questions. Relying primarily on empirical data from Ghana, the paper examines how gender, as a social system, generates moral dilemmas in the public sector, which in turn, forces female and male officials to choose private (family/social) requirement of morality over public sector ethics. Employing as its theoretical base, Carol Gilligan’s (1982) moral development theory, the paper also demonstrates that the very same gender- which delineates behavioural personalities and used to justify women’s higher ethical standards- could potentially be the source of corruption, as women attempt to fulfil expectations of femaleness in the conduct of public duties. In essence, the paper shows that gendered ethics- which requires women and men to exhibit an ethic of care and justice respectively- could perpetuate behaviours that negate public sector ethics (corrupt behaviours), but conform well to social ethics.

Structurally, this paper is divided into three sections. First is a presentation of Gilligan’s moral development theory, as an overarching framework, to provide theoretical underpinnings for male-female responses in the empirical data presented. This is followed by a summary of the methodology adopted for data collection as well as the requisite findings. The paper concludes with the implications of the findings on policies to integrate women into the public sector on the basis of their higher ethical standards.

**GILLIGAN’S (1982) MORAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY**

Gilligan’s (1982) theory of moral development advances that women tend to think and speak in a different voice than men when confronted with ethical dilemmas. She argues
that gender differences in moral perspectives are not only present in males and females, but are attributable to contrasting images of the “self”. Contrasting a feminine ethic of care with a masculine ethic of justice, Gilligan finds that for men, a moral behaviour is that which is fair play or lawful whereas for women, a moral behaviour is behaviour which prevents others from feeling hurt. Under an ethic of justice, men judge themselves guilty if they do something wrong, while under an ethic of care, women feel guilty when they allow others to feel pain when they can do something to prevent or alleviate the pain. According to Gilligan, the distinctive feature differentiating an ethic of justice from an ethic of care is the quality and quantity of relationships, in that individual rights, equality before the law, fair play and square deal all reflect ethical goals that can be pursued without personal ties to others (i.e., justice is impersonal). Conversely, sensitivity to others, loyalty, responsibility, self-sacrifice and peacemaking are all reflective of interpersonal involvement, which implies that care evolves from connection with others. Contrary to popular biological explanations offered for the development of a given moral voice, Gilligan argues that the greater need for relationships, by women, is due to a distinct feminine identity formed early in life, which leads women to an ethic of care.

Gilligan argues that gender differences in identity are grounded in early childhood experiences with the person who provides primary physical and emotional nurture, usually the infant’s mother. Early in life, girls discover that they are like their mothers. Hence for girls, growing up means relinquishing freedom of self-expression in order to protect others and preserve relationships, while for boys, their first psychic task is to understand that they are not (and never will be) like their mothers. Maturity, for boys, therefore means renouncing relationships in order to protect freedom and self-expression. The result is an adult population of men who see themselves as separate from others, and of women who think in terms of connectedness. Since distinctions of identity shape the selection of moral perspectives, the link between gender and moral judgment is particularly strong in teenage years when young men and women are highly self-conscious. For the adolescent male therefore, justice is the ultimate moral maturity, as he perceives himself as autonomous, while for the adolescent female, care is the ultimate responsibility as she sees herself linked to others.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study, from which this paper is drawn, was designed as a sample survey to gather data on public officials attitudes towards corruption in environments rife with opportunities and networks of corruption. As a sample survey, the study adopted primarily quantitative approaches to discern male and female attitudes towards corruption. Using vignette-styled scenarios, the sampled officials (140 participants) were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with hypothetical public servants engaged in diverse forms of corruption. The survey relied on questionnaire data as its principal data collection instrument. However, owing to the fact that questionnaires are limited in their ability to deconstruct gender in a corruption study, follow-up interviews were conducted to appreciate male-female attitudes towards corruption from a gender perspective. A total of 140 questionnaires were administered to randomly selected public officials of the Ghana Police Service (GPS) and Ghana Education Service (GES). In all, 136 questionnaires were returned and 132 of these were usable.

KEY FINDINGS

This section presents findings from the study to address three specific questions: (a) Underwriting taxes in return for kickbacks: gendered ethics? This question teases out the underlining justifications for male and female officials condoning corruption, and highlights how gendered ethics could explain corrupt attitudes. (b) Using public funds for private gain: gendered dialectics? This question elucidates how gender, as a social construct, could possibly inform officials’ attitudes in a particular corrupt situation. (c) Public versus private requirement of morality: are there gender differentials in attitudes towards corruption. This question demonstrates how conflicting codes of ethics could lead male and female officials towards corrupt behaviour.
Gendered ethics in this paper primarily refers to societal or communal expectations of ethical behaviours of males and females. For women, gender ethics encompass the exhibition of personality traits that define femininity, such as emotion, compassion and care in the exercise of judgements, while for men, gendered ethics, manifest in expectations that males should conform to idealized notions of exercising logic, being factual and practical in their judgements. These expectations, and their consequent manifestations in male and female moral orientation, fall under Gilligan’s ethics of justice and care. Under ethics of justice, men are identified with concepts such as equal treatment to all, fair-play and square deal, whereas under ethics of care, women are associated with concepts such as caring about everyone’s suffering, portraying sympathy and responsibility towards others.

Given this background, this paper argues that these gendered ethics could ultimately underpin both male and female officials’ attitudes towards public sector corruption in much of SSA countries. In support of this argument, this paper draws on male and female officials’ attitudes toward a hypothetically corrupt scenario where a Tax Officer underestimated taxes for female traders, as he felt their tax code was too high, in return for which he received kickbacks- in the form of gifts- from the traders. It should be mentioned that corrupt conduct here manifest in the receipt of kickbacks (gifts) in the conduct of public duty. This practice is criminalised under Section 2 of the Corrupt Practices and Prevention Act (Act 230) in the 1992 Constitution of Ghana (Gyimah-Boadi and Asamoah, 2001). When the sampled officials were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with under-estimating taxes in return for kickbacks, the questionnaire data recorded that about 67% of female officials and 71% of male officials supported this conduct. While these proportional differences between the sexes are not significant when statistically calibrated, the focus of this paper is not their relative
statistical differences, but rather the justifications given in support of the corrupt conduct. These justifications are uncovered from the follow-up interview data presented below.

Interrogating the interview data does not only reveal a discernible difference in the justifications provided by male and female officials, but also reveals a genderized response pattern in support of underwriting taxes in return for kickbacks. While the majority of male officials supported the hypothetical Tax Officer’s corrupt conduct on the basis of a perceived mutually beneficial act, female officials justified their support on the basis of the Tax Officer’s assistance to the women traders. To the majority of male officials, through the Tax Officer’s action, the government, at least, receives a fraction of the taxes, which would otherwise have gone unpaid. The traders are able to pay what they can afford without risking bankruptcy and the Tax Officer himself departs with handsome rewards from the traders. Some male officials believed that since the Constitution, which is the only institutional framework currently addressing public corruption in Ghana, fails to stipulate whether or not hospitality is lawful, the Tax Officer’s action could be subsumed under the general rubric of hospitality, which is constitutionally neutral.

Conversely, the majority of female officials based their argument on the Tax Officer’s sympathy for the traders. Some argued that the gender dynamics and socio-economic realities in Ghana are harsher for female traders than their male counterparts. To many, the dual roles of women- as domestic caretakers and traders simultaneously- conspire against women’s ability to effectively generate profits in the trading sector, relative to men. Explanation offered was that female-identified roles, which define women as mothers and therefore consigned to the domestic sphere, have been the bane of women’s marginalization in the trading sector. As mothers and traders, especially within the Ghanaian context, females are doubly disadvantaged. First, by fulfilling their domestic obligations of managing the home in addition to trading, these traders are overburdened. Second, as these traders are mandated by their gender to execute household production functions, such as cooking, fetching water and other domestic chores, they are often last

1 Male-identified roles are intricately interwoven with their domestic positions as breadwinners, which offer them greater social rewards than women.
to open their shops/stalls and first to return home. Not only do these female traders lose important customers in the process, but they also make marginal profits relative to their male counterparts.\(^2\) Hence, the majority of female public officials, interviewed, pledged their support for what they termed as the Tax Officer’s “positive use of his position”. After all, “no one would like to do business and lose, so if payment of high taxes will leave the women traders bankrupt... then it [the Tax Officer’s action] is the best alternative” (Ms. DR).\(^3\)

Women’s justification of the corrupt conduct on the basis of sympathy and men’s justification on the basis of a perceived mutually beneficial act, tends to support Gilligan’s theory that men and women speak in different voices when confronted with ethical dilemmas (corrupt situations in this case). The contrasting reasons given by both sexes fall under Gilligan’s classification of men and women under masculine and feminine ethics of justice and care, respectively. For male officials, this was a calculated decision to benefit all parties involved: the traders pay what they can afford, the government receives a fraction of the taxes which would otherwise have been defaulted, and the Tax Officer receives some handsome rewards. This perception of male officials depicts a fair-play or square deal for all parties involved, which underscores Gilligan’s masculine ethic of justice. Conversely, the expression of sympathy from female officials, as a basis for supporting the Tax Officer’s corrupt conduct, underlines Gilligan’s feminized ethic of care, whereby women feel guilty if they fail to help, in this case sympathize with, others when they can. It should be highlighted here that these masculinized and feminized behavioural traits could ultimately be the source of corruption, as both sexes justify their corrupt actions along genderized traits.

\(^2\) It should be mentioned here that this author disagrees with the feminization of motherhood roles and the domestification of women as these are used to legitimize and perpetuate female subjugation and oppression at both the private and the public sphere.

\(^3\) For purposes of anonymity, pseudonyms are attached to direct quotations and institutional affiliations of respondents are deliberately omitted.
In fact, that most female officials justified their support for Seas on the basis of sympathy does not entirely come as a surprise, as sympathy is feminized in Ghana (i.e. perceived as a feminine trait). Feminization of sympathy within the Ghanaian context implies that females should explicitly express sympathy and compassion for people, and more so in desperate situations. Transgressing this gender trait risks being stigmatized and stereotyped as a “male in female body”, implying an abnormal or deviant gender behaviour. Perhaps female officials subconsciously justified their argument on this feminine trait without realizing the gendered implications of their response. However, whether this is a deliberate or inadvertent reflection of this feminized trait, the question remains, shouldn’t women rise above the gender system rather than, apparently, contributing to its perpetuation? The evidence here suggests that rather than radically challenging the male-centric existing order, many Ghanaian women have not only accepted the status-quo, but have also provided a support system for the furtherance of the gender system.

USING PUBLIC FUNDS FOR PRIVATE GAIN: GENDERED DIALECTICS?

This question is intended to highlight how gender, as a social system, could explain male and female officials’ attitudes towards utilizing public funds for private gain. To answer the question above, responses of officials to a hypothetically corrupt scenario is utilized. In this scenario, the sampled public servants were asked to register their agreement or disagreement to the conduct of a hypothetical Chief Director who hired a cheap contractor for a state building project in order to use the difference in cost to pay for his son’s medical treatment. While the questionnaire data revealed a total of 37% of female officials and 55% of male officials supporting the use of public funds for private gain, this paper is less concerned with the statistical differences in male and female responses, but rather interested in the justifications advanced by the two sexes.

From the interview data, the majority of male officials justified their support based on the argument that by engaging the service of a low cost contractor to save cost, the hypothetical Chief Director was, more or less, at liberty to use the difference in cost for
other purposes. Summed up by a male respondent, “Why cry foul when the building was effectively executed? Once the building was well constructed, there is no course for alarm. After all, auditors are not checking him and he is able to save some money” (Mr. DD). Conversely, the majority of female officials, interviewed, argued that saving life is the most important human endeavour and therefore, the hypothetical Chief Director was right to have used public funds to save his son’s life. To some female officials, so long as there is a life at stake, any means could be employed to secure funds for treatment, even if such means deviate from conventional methods, as “human life is more valuable than a project. Nobody will sit and watch their son die when they have [the] means to save them” (Ms. BE).

The fact that women justified their support for the Chief Director on the basis of his ability to save a life, while men justified their support on the basis of his ability to save cost resonate Gilligan’s (1982) distinction of men and women’s moral imperatives. Gilligan argues that while women would assist others to prevent them from pain, as a moral obligation, men, on the other hand, would engage in fair play or fair deal, as a moral duty. Given this, it can be deduced that female officials demonstrated an ethic of care, as they pledged their support for the Chief Director’s action on the basis of his ability to save a life- thus, preventing pain. Male officials, on the other hand, exhibited an ethic of justice, as they supported the Chief Director on the basis of cost he saved, by hiring a cheap contractor for the state building project.

The larger implication of this finding is that, while male officials might be influenced by an ethic of justice in their attitudes towards using public funds for private gain, female officials are more likely to be influenced by an ethic of care. It should, however, be noted that the binary distinction in justifications provided by male and female officials underscores a masculinized and feminized construction of behaviour. The notion of gendered personalities advancing women as compassionate, sensitive and emotional, while men, by contrast, are logical and objective (Steans, 1998:11) is clearly depicted in these justifications, as male officials tended to be “(i)logical” by stressing the cost factor, while female officials tended to be sensitive and compassionate by emphasizing the life
factor. This researcher’s attempts to find reasons behind the meanings ascribed to these gender behavioural differences have unearthed polarized theoretical views. While the majority of psychosexual development discourses tend to posit these behavioural differences as innate (Freud, 1961), feminist social theorists opine that behavioural differences are culturally influenced by societal factors rather than biology (Chowdrow, 1978:43-45).

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE REQUIREMENT OF MORALITY: ARE THERE GENDER DIFFERENCES IN MALE-FEMALE ATTITUDES TOWARDS CORRUPTION?

In many sub-Saharan African countries, the collectivist nature of societies often impose certain roles on public officials to fulfil as a moral obligation. As such, behaviours of public officials are usually determined by societal expectations. Price (1975:15) argues that “for a variety of reasons- the need for social validation of personal belief, a desire to obtain tangible resources controlled by the group, as well as a concern for the intangible rewards of group membership, such as affection, affiliation, security, esteem and identity- the individual [public servant] will tend to mold his behaviour to the norms of [the social group s/he belongs]” even if such behaviours negate public sector ethics. Owing to the communal nature of many SSA societies, public officials are often faced with competing codes of ethics, as to whether to act in congruence with public sector ethics or conform to social ethics in moral dilemma situations. In most instances, social pressures exerted on officials by their ‘significant others’- i.e. people with whom they identify- often force them to fulfil private requirements of morality (social ethics) at the expense of formal ethics when faced with conflicting codes of ethics.

Drawing on the empirical study to substantiate this, the sampled public officials were asked to provide their level of agreement or disagreement to a scenario where a hypothetical Chief Director was pressurized by kinship networks to use her position within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to influence decisions on visas for them to travel abroad. Visa was used in this scenario because there is currently tremendous pressure
exerted on public officials, from the general public, to obtain travel visas for kinship groups. In Ghana, where society’s yardstick for measuring successful bureaucrats is the extent to which a bureaucrat uses his/her position to extend favours to kinship networks, this scenario was designed to capture attitudes of male and female officials towards societal pressure to use public positions unlawfully. When asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the Chief Director’s use of her position to secure Visas for kinship ties, a total of 48% of female officials and 51% of male officials supported this action.

Reasons behind male and female officials’ supporting the use of public positions to grant favours to kinship groups are exposed in the interview data. The interview data revealed that while the majority of male officials generally focused their reasons on visa problems to Western countries, the majority of female officials generally supported this scenario on the basis of gendered kinship and the repercussions of defying the gender system.

To the majority of male officials, recent tightening of controls to Western countries has led to denials of Visas for many Ghanaians, regardless of whether or not they meet the Visa requirement. As a result, they were willing to use their positions to influence Visa decisions when called upon by kinship networks. This is succinctly captured in the statement, “I would do the same if I were in her position, even if it seems wrong. For me, the reasons given for refusing visas to most Western countries are frivolous and therefore I will see it as a way of getting back at them... (Mr. TJ).

On the other hand, the majority of female officials generally placed their responses within the wider social problems faced by public servants. To many, a public servant cannot disconnect from societal pressures and its collectivist concept of “help-thy-neighbour”. The concept of “help-thy-neighbour” (as I have chosen to call it) is a social responsibility bestowed on public servants by virtue of their position to influence decisions. This is concisely captured in the statement, “[the Chief Director] is fulfilling her social responsibility to her community. This could have been in any other area, so if her people need Visas, so be it” (Ms. SS).
Some female officials asserted that though the concept of “help-thy-neighbour” is a social requirement for both male and female public servants, the impact on women who defy it is generally more profound than men due to the stigma associated with women who transgress familial or societal expectations. Women who refuse to compromise their positions for societal or familial obligations are often stereotyped as wicked, evil, cold-hearted iron ladies. As these “unfeminine” attributes are perpetuated over time, some women tend to internalize the fear of defying social systems, and as such, will fulfil their societal obligations, even if they deviate from public sector ethics.

However, unlike women, “wickedness” and “iron-heartedness” are judged as masculine traits, and as such, expected of the male gender. In fact, these traits are sometimes celebrated as attributes of a “proper” man. As a result, men may not feel the impact of defying the gender system as women would. To a particular female, “even though there is some element of abuse of public office... the socio-cultural environment of the Ghanaian is such that a woman must be helpful to her relatives both close and extended. If she [the Chief Director] failed to help her people, she will be deemed as wicked, and no woman wants to be called wicked, at least in the Ghanaian sense”(Ms. KL).

These assertions underscore the importance of societal obligations and expectations on public servants, which may interplay to influence attitudes towards corruption. The fact that defying the gender system carries profound ramifications, especially for women, could lead many female officials to break public sector ethics in order to fulfill societal and familial ethics. Questions this provokes are: should female officials conform to public requirements of morality, by limiting their actions in accordance with the law, or should they conform to private requirements of morality- i.e. transgressing public sector ethics in favour of kith and kin? These are fundamental questions that ought to be considered if integrating women into the public sector of Ghana, and for that matter SSA, is to reduce public sector corruption.
With the above evidence demonstrating that societal or familial expectations and pressures could impel public officials to engage in actions that negate public sector ethics, some African theorists corroborate this finding. Many emphasize that traditional African socio-cultural systems undermine the effective functioning of public servants in accordance with bureaucratic or formal roles. In African cultures, and within the social environments in which bureaucrats and politicians attempt to function, the corporate nature of the cultures creates a situation in which pressures exerted on public officials, by members of their kin groups, are geared towards helping members at the expense of public sector ethos. Price (1975:30), for instance, argues that:

“Social pressure in such societies, rather than permitting the separation of personal roles from official roles, demands that… personal criteria enter into the performance of official roles. Pressures of this kind come not only from the individual bureaucrat’s extended kinship group, but also from other members of his [or her] society, whose interaction with him [or her] is shaped by generalized personalistic expectations founded in [the] corporate nature of their society and culture”.

Relatedly, Werlin (1972: 247-266) argues that certain acts of corruption, such as nepotism, are widely expected and respected in society, even when illegal. These expectations could compel female officials to use public positions in favour of societal networks. As nepotism is socially compulsory and binding on African public servants, women, in the performance of public duties, could be deluged with “a proliferation of duties and obligations owed to relatives known and unknown who may spring up and demand attention” (Quansah, 1966:47).

In essence, within the African context, particularistic⁴ behaviour of a public servant is regarded as highly rational, at least from the individual’s personal point of view, “since to violate social expectations in a society where social relations are centrally valued and in which individual existence outside of group membership is practically unthinkable, would be to court social, psychological, and even material disaster” (Price, 1975: 30). Hence, institutionalising a policy to integrate women into the public realm- as a potential

---

⁴ Particularistic behaviours are actions based on standards of personal relationships between a public official and various actors, as opposed to actions that conform to public sector ethics (Price, 1975).
anti-corruption remedy without addressing the collectivist cultures is likely to prove futile, as women may succumb to these social ethics at the expense of public sector ethos.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Given the findings above, it is essential to return to the questions raised at the introduction of this paper: Could gender, as a social system, possibly inform corrupt behaviour of women and men in the public realm? Could societal expectations of femaleness and maleness explain public official’s attitudes towards corruption? This paper concludes that the gender system which demarcates certain behavioural traits such as compassion and sympathy for females, and traits such as objectiveness and aggressiveness for males, could inform men and women’s attitudes towards corruption. These traits are motivators of corrupt behaviour in both sexes, as men and women attempt to conform to their genderized behavioural expectations in the conduct of public duties.

Since women and men’s experiences are mediated by ideologies of masculinity and femininity, rather than being allowed to shape their own behaviours (Abbott and Wallace, 1990), both sexes find themselves in socio-cultural environments that dictate their gender stereotypic behaviours, roles and responsibilities. These behaviours, roles and responsibilities could translate into corrupt conduct, as evidenced by the gendered response patterns that emerged from the interviews. For instance, the fact that women are, or fear to be, socially “ostracized” and called stereotypic names when they defy their gender expectations, could inform women’s attitudes towards public sector corruption. Fears of social ostracism, associated with defying gendered social ethics, create moral dilemmas in the public realm where officials on the one hand are expected to pursue public sector codes of conduct and on the other hand, are expected to fulfil certain social contracts that negates these codes of conduct.

The policy implication of these findings is that integrating women into the public sector, as a potential anti-corruption strategy, in and of itself, does not suffice to sustainably
reduce public sector corruption. Clearly, the gender and social systems, which define behaviours and expectations of men and women, need reforming. Such reforms ought to ensure that both the general public and public officials are sensitized on the need to demarcate boundaries between public and private spaces. In Ghana, and in many other SSA countries, where societal obligations and familial expectations require female and male officials to engage in certain acts of corruption, such as nepotism, paternalism and cronyism, it is fundamental for anti-corruption initiatives to include socio-cultural reforms, lest both female and male officials engage in various corrupt conducts.

Also, as the social cost of defying the gender system is more profound on women than men, anti-corruption interventions must target lowering the social cost. If this is not done, most women may not only succumb to societal and familial pressures in the conduct of public duties, but may also compromise public sector ethics in their attempts to fulfil their gender/societal expectations. Hence, without addressing and reforming socio-cultural institutions that perpetuate and nurture the gender and social system, any policy to integrate women as a potential anti-corruption remedy could prove unsuccessful. This is because gendered social ethics are often conflictual with bureaucratic ethos in most collectivist cultures found in much of SSA. This in turn provokes role conflicts or competing codes of ethics for public officials, be they men or women. Thus, regardless of sex or gender, public servants are likely to face conflicts emerging from whether to pursue either private or public (bureaucratic) requirements of morality. Unless mechanisms are institutionalized to address these competing codes of ethics, women may not necessarily ascribe to their idealized notion of exuding higher public sector ethics at the expense of social ethics.

It should emphatically be stated here that it is not the aim of this paper to challenge the policy of integrating women into the public realm. Indeed, this author strongly supports the integration of women into the public sector of SSA countries, as it provides unique opportunities for women to influence governance structures. Integrating women into all levels of public sector institutions renders development processes more complete and inclusive; which, in the long run, translates into more vibrant and dynamic societies.
Since women, particularly from the African sub region, have been under-represented in the male-dominated wage sector, affirmative action to incorporate women into the sector is a possible remedy to deconstruct the male-biased sector. However, if promoting women into the public realm is to be premised on women’s high ethical standards, then a lot more needs to be done to reform socio-cultural institutions.

It should also be cautioned that justifying women’s inclusion into the public sector on the basis of their higher ethical standards risks being counterproductive to achieving equality, especially if such a policy backfires. This is primarily due to the fact that if the justification for women’s inclusion is anchored on an imagery of higher integrity, what happens if women’s superior morality fails to measure up? This paper concludes that if the presence of women fails to reduce public sector corruption in collectivist cultures, as the findings in this paper suggest, this carries the danger of thwarting overall efforts at integrating women on the basis of equality. As such, integrating women into the public domain should be championed and institutionalised as a right, not as an anti-corruption and good governance imperative.
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