

APPLICATION OF ADMINISTRATION ETHICS IN PUBLIC SERVICE PERFORMANCE

(PENGUNAAN ETIKA PENTADBIRAN DALAM PRESTASI PERKHIDMATAN AWAM)

Sitti Chaeriah Ahsan

Abstract

Ethics in public services can be seen as whether or not a bureaucratic apparatus. In providing services to the society, has commitment to respect the consumer's rights to get transparent, efficient, and assured services. Ethics or moral become one of the most important aspects in public administration, because a public administration activities are related to the intention and the purpose of certain public that are directed to satisfy public interest and have to be done based on the right obligations and motives.

Keywords: Administration Ethics, Public Service, Public Administration Activities

Abstrak

Etika dalam perkhidmatan awam boleh dilihat sebagai alat birokrasi atau tidak. Dalam menyediakan perkhidmatan kepada masyarakat, perkhidmatan awam mempunyai komitmen untuk menghormati hak pengguna bagi memastikan perkhidmatan yang diberikan merupakan perkhidmatan telus, cekap, dan terjamin. Etika atau moral menjadi salah satu aspek yang paling penting dalam pentadbiran awam kerana aktiviti pentadbiran awam adalah berkaitan dengan niat dan tujuan perkhidmatan kepada orang awam. Maka, perkhidmatan awam diarahkan supaya memenuhi kepentingan awam dan perlu dilakukan berdasarkan kewajipan dan motif yang betul.

Kata Kunci: *Etika pentadbiran, perkhidmatan awam, aktiviti pentadbiran awam*

INTRODUCTION

Ethics in the implementation of public services can be seen from the angle whether a bureaucratic apparatus in providing services to the community have a commitment to respect the rights of consumers to obtain services in a transparent and efficient way that also guarantee the service. The ethics behavior of bureaucratic apparatus can be reflected in the attitude of courtesy and friendliness. Ethics also contains a moral element, while the moral has the rational, objective, selfless and neutral character. Bureaucratic apparatus in giving service to the public is appropriate to not do various forms of discriminative action that harm other service users (Matei & Băieșu 2014).

In the implementation of public services, there are two opposing parties and different interests. The bureaucracy, as a service provider dealing with the community as a service user, are

often had significant differences of interest (Samsudin, Haron, & Bakar 2012). The bureaucratic apparatus is *essentially a servant, not a master*. This perception has not been systematically implanted to the bureaucratic apparatus. This brings consequences to the arising of bureaucratic arrogance (Dunn 2000).

Ethics Concept

Ethics is discussed as philosophy, values and morals. Ethics is abstract and concerned with good and bad issues. Bertens (Keban 2008) describes the concept of ethics with several meanings, one of them and commonly used is habit, custom or morals and character. The great philosopher of Aristotle, says bartens, has used this word (ethics) in describing moral philosophy, the science of what is commonly done or the science of custom. In the official Indonesian Dictionary or Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia, 1988), ethics is referred to as: (1) the science of what is good and what is bad and about moral rights and duties; (2) a collection of principles or values pertaining to morals; and (3) the value of right and wrong that a group or society holds.

With regard to some of the above sources, Bartens concludes that there are three important ethical meanings: (1) ethics as moral values and moral norms that hold a person or group in control of his behavior, or called the *value system*; (2) ethics as a set of moral principles or values often known as *codes of ethics*; and (3) ethics as a good and bad science, often called *moral philosophy*. This opinion is similar to the opinion written in The Encyclopedia of Philosophy which uses ethics as (1) *way of life*, (2) *moral code* or *rules of conduct*, and (3) research on the first and second elements above (K. G. Denhart, 1988).

Ethics is a branch of philosophy and deals with the study of moral principles and moral acts. To define ethics correctly, we must first understand the meaning of morality. Morality relates to practices and activities that are considered right or wrong, but also concerned with practices that reflect the values and rules to which they are carried out in a given setting (R. B. Denhart & Denhart 2006). The public morality, political system or public organization issue is what is right or wrong in the group. Morality reveals that certain values of group members continue to be important and this is reflected in laws, regulations or policies and procedures. Moral action in turn is an action consistent with group morality which expresses the group's most basic commitment to what is right and what is wrong.

In the public administration or public service world, ethics is defined as philosophy and *professional standards* or *right rules of conduct* which should be obeyed by public service providers or public administrators (K. G. Denhart, 1988; Keban, 2008). In general, moral values appear from Six Great Ideas (K. G. Denhart, 1988), namely truth, goodness, beauty, liberty, equality, and justice.

In social life, a person is often judged whether speech, attitude and behavior are in line with those values or not. Similarly, in the provision of public services, words, attitudes and behaviours of service providers are often used as an object of assessment where large values are used as a measure. In addition to these basic values, there may be other values that are important to the success of service delivery, which from time to time continue to be assessed, developed and promoted.

Administration Ethics Paradigm

The flow of difference has influenced administrators in decision-making and in conducting their various activities, which are often considered controversial. Some argue that decisions are made or activities are based on true ethics and morals, while others think otherwise.

Judging from the history of public administration, ethics is a relatively young issue. In classical bureaucracy, ethics has not been touched by Max Weber, F.W. Taylor, L. Gullick, or L. Urwick and just only can be clearly seen on the will to separate the administration and the politics

or the so-called *the politics-administration dichotomy*. In fact, according to Chandler and Plano (K. G. Denhart 1988), provided that public administrators do their work efficiently and economically, they have been regarded as a moral party. This assumption is used until Paul Apleby sees that administration and politics are part of the same aspect, so it is realized that morality is part of the bureaucracy. The ethical aspect becomes the spotlight for administrators because they are forced to make decisions that not only consider the value of efficiency, economics and administrative principles, but also aspects of morality (Kerlinová & Tomášková 2014).

According to Chandler and Plano (K. G. Denhart 1988), there are four main school of ethics, namely empirical theory, rational theory, intuitive theory and revelation theory. Empirical theory sees that ethics is derived from human experience and general agreement. For example warfare or the use of certain chemicals that endanger humans. In this context judgments about *good* and *bad* are inseparable from facts and deeds.

Rational theory sees that good and bad depends on the reasoning or reason and the logic behind the action, not the experience. In this context, each situation is seen as unique and requires a unique application of human logic and gives a unique conclusion about either good or bad.

Intuitive theory argues that ethics does not have to come from experience and logic, but humans naturally and automatically have an understanding of what is right and wrong or what is good and bad. This theory uses *natural moral law*.

Revelation theory holds that right or wrong comes from power above man which is from the God Almighty himself. In other words, what God says (in various scriptures) becomes the main reference for deciding what is right and what is wrong.

The Teleological and Utilitarian approach is a goal-oriented approach and is focused on the consequences, as stated by Heichelbech (Keban 2008). Teleology is specifically concerned with purpose, while Utilitarianism is concerned with the perceived consequences of whether to fulfill interests or to increase satisfaction. Both approaches differ from the Deontology approaches that focus on the obligations and motives that underlie a decision or action.

Teleological school can be traced to Aristotle's work. According to Aristotle, the purpose or intention is what determine whether something is great or beneficial. In other words, ethical is not just something determined by purposes or intentions. Unfortunately, the statement is opposed by a scientific revolution which sees that it is not a purpose or intention that determines something as great or valuable, but rather determined by the scientific principles used.

The firsts of Utilitarianism school appeared in England in the late eighteenth century. This school cultivates rationalism by arguing that something is ethical or not, not depending on the reason used but the ability to produce a pleasure, or reduce misery. Jeremy Bentham, in his article *The Principles of Morals and Legislation*, argues that whether happiness is ethical not is based on each individuals. In other words, ethics really cares about the happiness of individuals, not others.

Following Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, in his work *Utilitarianism*, agrees that an activity deemed ethically correct depends on its usefulness, whether it will increase happiness or pleasure, and otherwise be ethically wrong when it comes to misery. But he emphasizes that it is not only increases happiness or reduces misery for those concerned, but more importantly produces the highest happiness for most people. So an activity is ethical when it comes to the greatest happiness and greater scope. To create this larger scoperequires increased efficiency. In other words, when efficiency has been maximized in an organization, then, according to the utilitarian followers, the organization has acted ethically.

What is expressed in utilitarianism is criticized because in reality it is not easy to calculate utility or usefulness appropriately. No matter whose happiness, whether the wish is legitimate or entitled to get it or lest to a person or certain group that does not deserve it. In other words the

interests served must be of utmost importance from those who need them legitimately. Other criticisms come from contemporary utilitarian groups known as Consequentialists, in which they ask why happiness should be taken into account and whether it is better to consider other interests such as basic rights or human rights.

Deontology is one branch of ethics that emphasizes obligations, duties, responsibilities and principles to follow. The main characters are Immanuel Kant and John Rawls (Keban, 2008). Deontology differs from utilitarianism in not paying attention or caring about the consequences of an act as a moral consideration, but rather to the compliance and enforcement of a duty, responsibility, rule and applicable principles. For deontologists, there are many nonconsequential relationships that need attention. John Rawls emphasizes that ethics does not depend heavily on whether the main principles have been followed or not. For example in distributing public services or public goods, have applied the principle of justice as fairness or not. Deontology is criticized for emphasizing rationality and not paying attention to its human constituency. Hence, it is often regarded as a superficial ethical concept (Rakhmat 2009).

Virtue Ethics comes from ancient Greek philosophy, which emerged as a reaction to the school of utilitarianism and deontology. According to this school of ethics, to decide whether it is good or bad, right or wrong, independent of consequences or consequences (utilitarianism), nor from the obligation or principle that must be obeyed (deontology), but from *the excellences of character* shown by integrity (Sinambela 2007). The actual substance of ethics or morals can not be understood by predicting results or effects, nor conformity with obligations, but understood from *internal imperative to do right*. What is emphasized is the obligation to follow the principles that have been determined. Nevertheless, the three schools, according to Bowman, form the Ethical Triangle, in which Deontology focuses on the obligations and principles to be followed (*it is imperative that actions categorically follow principles irrespective of results*), the utilitarian there is a consequence (*actions should produce the greatest good for the greatest number*), while virtue on internal integrity (*goodness in result of internal imperatives to do right, not sanctions from moral rules or rewards from expected consequences*).

These three schools often colour ethical or moral issues in the practice of public administration. There is a question of what the government is doing from the aspect of obedience and fulfillment of obligations and established principles (deontology). Therefore, this type of ethics is more concerned with the way or method of public administration. In the meantime, there is the question of perceived or enjoyed (utilitarianism). Hence this ethics is concerned with purpose. What is often questioned is whether it is ethical if the method used is good even if the goal is not achieved? In this context, perhaps Virtue Ethics can answer that it depends on the integrity, goodness, or conscience of the perpetrators.

Application of Administrative Ethics

Ethics problem in administration is a matter of concern to administrative experts. Countries with advanced administrative systems became administrative referrals in many other countries, especially in developing countries. Developed countries like Britain, France and Japan are also experiencing problems in terms of bureaucratic ethics. In these countries, the bureaucracy is relied upon to be the protector of society, which is both just and fair, and the whole system is directed to ensure the ethics of the bureaucracy (Sinambela 2007).

Ethical and moral applications in practice can be seen from the code of conduct held by public administrators. Code of ethics in Indonesia is still limited to some circles such as lawyers and medical departments. It should be admitted that the limitations of this code of ethics have provided an opportunity for service providers to override public interests. The presence of the code of ethics itself serves more as a direct control of attitudes and behaviours in work (Thoha 2007).

This ethical application not only exists, but is also implemented in work, assessed its implementation level through monitoring mechanism, then evaluated, and attempted to be improved through consensus (Raudeliūnienė & Meidutė-Kavaliauskienė 2014). This commitment

to ethical improvement needs to be addressed, so that the public should be confident that the government is fully accountable.

Indonesia needs to learn from other countries that already have ethical maturity. In the United States, for example, ethical awareness in public services has increased that many public service professions have established their codes of ethics. One example that is relevant to public service is the ethical code of the ASPA (American Society for Public Administration). The values codes of conduct for public administrators in the United States are to maintain integrity, truth, honesty, fortitude, respect, attention, hospitality, responsiveness, prioritizing public interests above other interests, professional work, professional development, open communication, creativity, dedication, the use of discretionary public discretion, respect and protection of discretionary information, support for merit systems and affirmative action programs (Dwiyanto & et. al., 2008).

Helping to apply the principles of moral ethics in Indonesia, the experiences of other countries need to be reviewed and made reference to further analysis materials. that Indonesia is now known as one of the countries that still cannot eradicate corruption. It is necessary to strive to apply for ethical and moral principles. The ethics of public administrators or public managers, public planning ethics and civil servant ethics must be initiated and put into practice before the development of a culture that is contrary with morals and ethics.

Factors Affecting the Implementation of Administrative Ethics

Efforts to improve the bureaucracy include the inculcation of ethics as a primary value in administration, reflected in both individual ethics and organizational ethics as continuing work in a public organization.

Ethics is linked to the overall socio-economic development. The success and progress of administrative development will be largely determined by the economy which highly dependent on the administrative capability in carrying out development tasks. Thus, the two are closely related and mutually reinforcing each other.

The above description illustrates that administrative ethics is needed in the public organizations. But we can not deny that in it's application there are many factors that affecting it so that it still requires a more in-depth study of this ethical problem. Factors influencing the application of ethics include:

First, there are limitations in resources, which lead to the development of good administration can not applied as fast as possible. The limitation is both funds and human resources (HR). Human resource for administration is very limited in quality, competence and professionalism and the situation is exacerbated by low rewards due to limited government funds.

Secondly, the creation of a good administrative tradition, which keeps the ethical problem at a minimum. Developing countries are developing their culturally appropriate, but also following generally accepted rules, administration.

Third, the administration lives in a political system, and in many developing countries the political system itself is still developing. Developing countries seek to genuinely apply the principles of democracy to their political system. The political role of that size, often not balanced with accountability to the people as in a democratic system. By itself, such a system (or the absence of a system which is also a separate system) will ignore ethics and become a fertile ground for the development of abuse of power, collusion, corruption and other bureaucratic pathologies.

Application of Bureaucratic Ethics in Public Service

In relation to bureaucratic ethics, for the sake of society, efforts should be made to apply both Teleological and Deontological approaches. Society wants a bureaucracy consisting of human

beings with character(Wekke & Hajar, 2015). Characters based on virtue will produce policies that benefit society and prevent the ends to justify any means. This character must be shown not only by living up to the basic values of truth and virtue, but also the values of the struggle.

In Indonesia, the values contained in the Pancasila and the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution, often accepted rigidly and uncompromisingly, even though the values contained can only be fully applied in certain situations. In the current situation, interpretation of the values of Pancasila, for example, continues to grow, adapted to the context and situation of the state.

The frequent paradigmatic conflicts between relativists and absolutists are commonplace in the practice of day-to-day life and have become an academic tradition in the developed world(Hajar, 2015). Such conflicts are very useful for stimulating and enhancing ethical sensitivity for the wider community even though they are not always up to date with satisfaction on both sides of the conflict. Conflict like this, consciously or not, turns out to have increased maturity in ethics. The development of this maturity is very helpful to control the behaviour of public service providers to keep the importance of public interest above other interests.

In the current practice of public services in Indonesia, administrators should generally pay attention to both ethical schools, or in other words, public service providers must study universal ethical norms, because they can be used as guides of behaviour. However, these norms should not be rigid because they are sometimes bound by certain situations or conditions(Aykac & Metin, 2012). Acting like this shows a greatness in ethics. Dialogue to consensus can help solve the dilemma.

Our weakness lies in the absence or lack of codes of ethics. Freedom in testing and questioning the prevailing norms of morality does not yet exist. In fact, we often act rigidly against existing norms of morality without seeing the changing times or situations. We also still allow ourselves to be dictated by the leadership of the organization in which we work so there is no ethical autonomy. Attempts to test these norms are sometimes regarded by our leadership not as a praiseworthy attempt, contrary to the constitution, and state ideology. Consequently, there is an attitude of ignorance, and it provides an opportunity for leaders to dictate their ethics in the workplace.

CONCLUSION

Ethical problems in public administration is a matter of concern of the public in the administration of public services. Efforts for improving the bureaucracy through ethical application as the primary value in administration, reflected both in individual ethics and organizational ethics are sustainable work.

Every society must have moral or ethical ground which is the basis of attitudes and behaviours to achieve what they aspire to. Therefore, wherever we are in the community, nation and state, the role of ethics can not be ruled out because all citizens are concerned with ethics.

Ethics in the implementation of public services can be seen from the point of whether a bureaucratic apparatus, in providing services to the community, have a commitment to respect the rights of consumers to get the service in a guaranteed, transparent, and efficient way.

Ethics or morals are one of the most important aspects of public administration, because public administration activities, with respect to specific public purposes and objectives, are directed to satisfy the public interest or happiness and must be carried out with the right obligations and motives.

Bureaucracy reform efforts include the effort to instill ethics as a key value in the administration, which is reflected both in individual ethics and organizational ethics as a continuous work done in a public organization. Ethical administration is needed in the organization of public

organizations. But it can not be denied that, in its application, many factors are affecting it so that still require more deep study to this ethical problem.

REFERENCES

- Aykac, B., & Metin, H. 2012. The Future of Public Organizations. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 62, 468–472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.077>
- Denhart, K. G. 1988. *The Ethics of Public Service: Resolving Moral Dilemmas in Public Organizations*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Denhart, R. B., & Denhart, K. G. 2006. *Public Administration: An Orientation, Fifth Edition*. USA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. 1988. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*.
- Dunn, W. N. 2000. *Analisis Kebijakan Publik*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Dwiyanto, A., & et. al. 2008. *Reformasi Birokrasi Publik di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Hajar, B. 2015. Bureaucracy and Governance in Indonesia: Study on West Sulawesi Province. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23(October 2014), 223–227. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00348-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00348-2)
- Keban, Y. T. 2008. *Enam Dimensi Strategia Administrasi Publik*. Yogyakarta: Gava Media.
- Kerlinová, A., & Tomášková, E. 2014. Approach to Strategy at Public Administration Organizations in the Czech Republic. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 156(April), 88–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.11.125>
- Matei, A., & Băieșiu, R. 2014. Good Administration and Performance of Local Public Administration. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109, 684–687. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.529>
- Rakhmat. 2009. *Teori Administrasi dan Manajemen Publik*. Jakarta: Pustaka Arif.
- Raudeliūnienė, J., & Meidutė-Kavaliauskienė, I. 2014. Analysis of Factors Motivating Human Resources in Public Sector. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 110, 719–726. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.916>
- Samsudin, S., Haron, S., & Bakar, A. N. 2012. Operational Issues in Malaysian Local Authority: Value of Intermediaries Services toward Client Satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 68, 844–854. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.12.271>
- Sinambela, P. L. 2007. *Reformasi Pelayanan Publik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Thoha, M. 2007. *Birokrasi dan Politik di Indonesia*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Wekke, I. S., & Hajar, B. 2015. Capacity Building in Reformation: Study on Bureaucracy of West Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23(October 2014), 244–248. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00349-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00349-4)

Sitti Chaeriah Ahsan
 Department of Governmental Studies,
 Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,
 Tadulako University, Palu,
 Central Sulawesi, Indonesia
 Email: chaeriah67@gmail.com

Submitted: July, 16, 2018

Accepted: August, 14, 2018

