THE EFFECTS OF CORRUPTION ON POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT IN SOMALIA

ABSTRACT

Since the collapse of the central government, Somalia has experienced civil war for decades. Although the country is now recovering from civil war and is in a fight against the Al Shabab terrorist group, corruption is a major barrier to getting strong institutions, which leads to political violence. Thus, this study aims to compare how corruption affects political development in a specific time period. The objective of the study is to know how corruption and political development move in a specific time period. During this study, we used a comparative research design by using secondary data obtained from two different sources; the corruption perceptions index (CPI) of Transparency International (TI) to measure corruption. While measuring political development, we used the World Bank database’s Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI). Finally, the WGI variables were five and four of them didn’t relate to corruption after comparison. But one of the sub variables relates directly to corruption, and it is government effectiveness. For all the years from 2012-2018, as you can see in the above tables, the two variables moved together. This means there is a significant relationship between corruption and government effectiveness.
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1. INTRODUCTION

As one of the longest periods of a country's disintegration in recent years comes to an end, Somalia aspects several common corruption problems that plague conflict torn states, with widespread corruption and a deep-rooted patronage system which weakening the legality of the regime (Omar & Kising’u, 2018).

"The misuse of entrusted power for personal gain" is how corruption is defined. Based on the quantity of money involved and the atmosphere in which it happens, corruption can be characterized as grand, petty, or political. Grand corruption is described as acts carried out at the highest echelons of government that distort rules or the normal operation of the monarch, allowing rulers to benefit at the expense of the rest of society. Petty corruption is the abuse of delegated power by low-to mid-level public servants in contact with ordinary individuals seeking essential goods or services in places like hospitals, colleges, police agencies, and other institutions. Political corruption is when political decision-makers use their position, popularity, and money to manipulate laws, structures, and policies regulating the allocation of resources and financing. ( Transparency International, 2018).

According to Nye, the term "political improvement" is first-class used to refer to the ordinary trouble of touching on governmental systems and methods to social alternates. It seems useful to apply one time period to refer to the sort of alternate which appears to be taking place in our age ("Modernization") and any other to consult the capability of political structures and strategies to deal with a social exchange, to the extent it exists, in any period. We commonly assume that this means structures and procedures which seem valid to applicable sectors of the population and powerful in generating outputs favored by relevant sectors of the population. I assume that legitimacy and effectiveness are connected in the "longer term." However, they can catch up on each other in the "quick run." What constitutes an applicable zone of the population will range with the duration and with social modifications inside the duration. Inside the modern-day length, we have a tendency to count on that, as a minimum, a veneer of extensive participation is important for setting up or maintaining legitimacy. In different phrases, in the modern period, political improvement and political modernization may additionally come near to the same matter (Nye, 1967).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Salad & Hassan investigated the effects of corruption on government institutions in Somalia. During their graduation thesis preparation, they used a descriptive research design. They selected a sample of 67 respondents from a target population of 80 participants by using "Slovene’s formula n = N/ (1 + N e2)". The researchers found that corruption is a chief hassle in authority establishments, and is now not only most effective in growing nations, but all around the world. It impedes financial growth, weakens the guidelines of the law and undermines the legitimacy of institutions. Although it has been studied on the national stage from exclusive perspectives, there may be a current growing frame of studies on neighborhood corruption. Also, there is a negative relationship between the variables, as they indicated in their study (Salad & Hassan, 2019).

The African Union's (au) anti-corruption operations in 2018 may benefit greatly from the corruption perceptions index (CPI). The au's topic this year is "surviving the fight against corruption: a sustainable path to Africa's development." Because the au is implementing its strategy, this is a critical time for Africa to assess its current situation. The CPI indicates a more positive future for Africa in a few ways. Improvements in Rwanda and Cabo Verde show that corruption is possible if a continuous effort is made. Anti-corruption initiatives made over a long period of time in countries like Cote d'Ivoire and Senegal also are paying off. In contrast, for nations at the bottom of the ranking, such as South Sudan and Somalia, combating corruption remains a monumental task (Banoba, 2018).

According to Hussein, 2019, In Somalia corruption affected nearly all establishments of government. It affected the office of the president, the prime minister, parliament, the mayor of the capital, safety corporations as well as an international useful resource. The practice of nepotism, extortion and the robbery of public resources are commonplace. Those officials misused their authentic positions to enrich themselves and neglected the public hobby. The scenario was outlined in a report released by the global governing organization. Somalia presents one of the most significant corruption issues that plague war-torn countries, with widespread corruption and a deeply ingrained patronage structure eroding the government effectiveness. Lack of functioning major powers, loss of resource management
and administrative competence, poor leadership structures, and a restricted ability to provide basic services to its public employees all aggravate corruption (Hussein, 2019).

For the purpose of assessing corruption, certain analogies have been offered. Although each of the comparisons is instructive in some ways, none of them perfectly captures the phenomenon. Corruption is sometimes compared to a tax or a charge, for example. Bribes, like taxes, push the absolute and privately plundered capital margins apart. However, bribes differ from taxes in a number of ways, especially in addition to the apparent fact that they do not provide money to the government coffers. Even though the phrases are sometimes interchanged, corruption, or more precisely, bribes, are not the same as lease-in search. Although bribes are functionally transfers, rent-seeking is the communally expensive chase of rent, which is generally caused by government intervention in the market. There is no one-size-fits-all definition of corruption. This article focuses on government corruption, although corruption may also adopt the form of corporate collusion or misuse of firm assets, leading to losses to shareholders and clients. Felony payouts entailing pressure groups, campaign funds, as well as gifts, for example, can appear very similar to kickbacks which constitute bribery, and prison offers of retiree job opportunities in personal geographic area enterprises to officials and politicians assigned to reconfigure those same companies could appear extremely closely related to unlawful kickbacks (Svensson, 2005).

Corruption is a byproduct of each democratic transition. Corruption of several types may emerge during the transformation and in the new democracy. Arguments that democratization reduces corruption are afflicted by the fallacy: democracy is right, corruption is awful, and therefore democracy must reduce corruption. Comparable arguments are often advanced with respect to monetary liberalization. But, “without denying that there might be other advantages to be derived from deregulation, ‘downsizing’ and Liberalization, it has but to be proved that reducing corruption is forever one in each of them.” we are able to argue similar to regards democratization. Indeed, advanced western democracies are clearly corrupt to varying stages, and the nation-states which have democratized have tested that new styles of corruption may stand up or old paperwork may be strengthened. These tactics were evident in a variety of democratic processes, including the shift from authoritarian government, the transition from communism, decolonization, and the formation of new nation-states (MORAN, 2001).

3. TYPES OF CORRUPTION

By definition, political corruption refers to "public officers," distinguishing it from other types of fraud that occur in society. However, because of the vast scale of the public sector, corruption may exist in every level of government. A simple method for distinguishing between different types of corruption is to look at the institutional level of the public authority concerned, such as the corruption within the government branches, the courts, legislature departments, or local governments, the law enforcement unit (police), custom dealers, construction overseers, and so on. "Upper-stage" and "lower-level" corruption are two broad kinds of corruption depending on the institutional position. The first group includes presidents, ministers, members of the parliaments, state governors, and other top-ranking officials, whereas civil workers fall into the second. The top-stage/lower-level distinction is mostly based on variations in public officials' outstanding political positions or capacities, as well as the norms that regulate their behavior. As a result, "political corruption" usually refers to corruption at the policy-making level, or even the "input" side of the political system in Estonian terms, but while "bureaucratic" or "administrative" corruption refers to the "output" side of the equation, or the implementation of policies by lower-level officers (Morris, 2011).

That is every other corruption typology forthcoming in the literature which describes corruption as embedded within the perpetrators’ corrupt behavior itself. The typology identifies practices that are deemed to depict the phenomenon. In accordance with this typology, corruption may be construed to include such practices and behaviors as bribery, electoral corruption, favoritism, nepotism, procurement scams, financial corruption, and misappropriation of public resources for personal advantage (Agbiboa, 2012; Ijewereme, 2015; Nye, 1967; Otusanya, 2011). As an example, Otusanya (2011) in his review of corruption literature, identified 15 different behaviors as well as practices that represent corruption. Intimidation, bribery, extortion, abuse in workplace, deception, misappropriation, partiality, market manipulation, hobby wars, illicit contributions, money laundering, theft of identity, white-collar crimes, and cronyism are just a few examples (Suleiman & Othman, 2017).

Another corruption typology that gains extensive coverage in the literature is to explain the type of corruption in terms of developing international locations due to the prevalence and possibly greater devastating outcome of the phenomenon. Developing international locations were defined within the
literature as corruption-ridden international locations where, to a large volume, political management epitomizes corruption in its entirety. Even though scholars have identified corruption as a global risk, as no country in the world can claim the monopoly on moralism, they consider that the much less developed countries are extra prominently concerned with behaviors that symbolize corruption. For example, Nye (1967) identifies such traits that make growing nations at risk of corruption as inherent in their underdevelopment. These circumstances include excessive wealth inequality, the use of political positions as a means of wealth introduction, competing moral standards, weaknesses in the social and governmental enforcement systems, and a lack of experience with national cohesiveness. Another precursor identified within the literature for corruption to thrive in growing international locations is the difficulty of the legitimacy of the organization of government due to the superiority of the cash nexus, in addition to divergent ethical values from the outcomes of colonialism (Suleiman & Othman, 2017).

4. THEORIES OF CORRUPTION

4.1. Economists’ Perspective

According to Granovetter, traditional theories of corruption are dominated by financial solutions that focus on identifying incentive structures that make corruption more likely and assessing the impact of misbehavior on monetary performance. A crucial concept in this mentality is the inducement hypothesis, often known as first-agent dating. There is a regulatory principle and an agent in this concept. The agent, who might be a minor civil servant, is supervised by the first in command, who could be a central authority auditor or a renowned public worker. If the agent has more access to essential administrative knowledge than that of the manager, and the agent seeks pay-offs by unlawfully passing critical information to persons outside of the structure or administration alone without the manager’s awareness, corruption might emerge. In this case, the link is mostly "determined through how incentives are organized, and also the performers are otherwise similar or representative individuals." The agent and, most importantly, the domain was chosen for the evaluation may be extraordinary. The government or voters, for example, maybe the major characters, whereas the agent could be a prominent figure or a senior government official (Warsame & Kimemia, 2018).

4.2. Moralists Versus Functionalists’ Perspectives

According to Gould (1991:468; cited in a paper prepared for TI Bangladesh by Mohammad Mohabbat Khan45), moralists regard corruption as an unethical and immoral trend characterized by a string of moral deviations from societal moral requirements, resulting in a lack of admiration and self-assurance for duly constituted authority. Moralists investigate whether corrupt behavior comes from social cultures which prioritize gift giving and devotion to a small circle of kin or extended family over the rule of law. However, the functionalists’ concept of corruption differs from that of moralists. They claim that corruption plays an important role in the operation of public institutions, as it can boost the actions of the existing order and so achieve the highest level of efficiency. Functionalists “factor in the plausible advantages of corruption, claiming that it may speed up laborious processes, acquire political access for the barred, and conceivably even develop de facto policies as powerful as those emerging from normal channels,” according to Johnston’s eBook. The functionalists use the most common political gadgets or the structure of the organization as the basis for their study of corruption. They watch the other side of the coin by observing the efficiency with which services are transported by general public-area agencies (Suleiman & Othman, 2017).

4.3. Patron-Client Relationship

Another common notion in the study of corruption is patron-client dating. This theory investigates the structure of the political system and the role of management in emerging economies in order to understand corruption. Economists and political scientists are the most common users of this term. According to this concept, the functioning of wider public establishments and critical parts of a given area is surpassed by the lively informal networks that have emerged as a result of customer-to-customer dating. According to Khan, M. H. (1998), opportunities such as jobs and assets are generated via the use of the customer (who might be a civil servant or a flesh presser) who expects cooperation or assistance (as an example, in the form of attendance at meetings or votes). This allows for the creation of transactions between buyers and their sub-customers, clients, and intermediaries (Hussein, 2019).
4.4. Social Aspects of Corruption

Many corrupt activities, such as bribery, are ethically laden words within socioeconomic and political situations, corruption may be comprehended in a specific social context by studying Lancaster and Montinola. Corruption, like every political or socioeconomic activity, is a product of stakes inside the system, social energy, families, interests, and customs performed by human organizations. When researching corrupt practices as a societal problem and corrupt people, contextual information about social roles, hobbies, and interests within the structure, and also the political, economic, and social settings in which they operate, must be considered (Omar & Kising’u, 2018).

5. METHODOLOGY

In this study, we have used a comparative research design by using secondary data obtained from two different sources; the corruption perceptions index (CPI) of Transparency International (TI) to measure corruption. While to measure political development, we used the World Bank database's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI), which include things like “corruption control percentile rank, government effectiveness percentile rank, rule of law percentile rank, political stability & absence of violence/terrorism percentile rank, and voice & accountability” percentile ranks. Both data sources have been used for the same series of years, from 2012-2018. By comparing this data, we looked at how they affect each other since we are using different secondary data sources, but fortunately, the two sources are reliable because of their integrity and the time series of data are the same in the same context.

6. FINDING AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1: Corruption Perception Index of Somalia from 2012-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Corruption Perception Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Transparency International (TI), 2012-2018

Diagram 1: Corruption Perception Index of Somalia from 2012-2018, Source: Transparency International, 2018

The CPI illustrates 13 surveys and professional evaluations to measure public zone corruption in one hundred eighty (180) countries and territories, giving each a score from 0 (highly corrupted) to 100 (very smooth).

In 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015, Somalia got a score of 8. That means it was the lowest country out of 180 countries. But in 2016, the country made an increase or recovery and got a score of 10. That looks better than the past four consecutive years. In 2017, the country decreased its score to 9. There was no forward, it turned back 1. In 2018, the country made a little forward movement and reached a score of 10. But we have to mention that the country was in the last position out of 180 countries all these seven years.
Table 2: Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worldwide Governance Indicators</th>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of Corruption: Percentile Rank</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4739336</td>
<td>0.4807692</td>
<td>1.442308</td>
<td>0.9615384</td>
<td>0.4807692</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Effectiveness: Percentile Rank</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4807692</td>
<td>0.4807692</td>
<td>0.9615384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law: Percentile Rank</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4807692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism: Percentile Rank</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.904762</td>
<td>1.904762</td>
<td>2.380952</td>
<td>3.809524</td>
<td>3.809524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice and Accountability: Percentile Rank</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1.408451</td>
<td>1.408451</td>
<td>0.9852217</td>
<td>1.477833</td>
<td>2.463054</td>
<td>3.940887</td>
<td>3.448276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Banka Database, 2012-2018

The percentile rank reflects a country’s position among all other nations included in the combination indicator, with 0 denoting the lowest rank and 100 denoting the highest.

“Control of Corruption, Government Effectiveness, Rule of Law, Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism, and Voice and Accountability” were some of the factors we utilized to quantify political progress (See in table2).

Control of corruption: In 2012, it meant there was no control of corruption because the country got 0 out of 100. In 2013, it ranked at 0.4739336. That was still very low. In 2014, the country made a very low forward move and got a rank of 0.4807692. That means there is still no good shift compared to the previous year. In 2015, in accordance with last year, it seemed good. In 2016, the country fell to a rank of 0.9615384. In 2017, the situation got worse and the country decreased from last year’s rank to 0.4807692. But everything went bad when 2018 ranked the country 0. That means, for the first year, there was no control of corruption. So, by comparing table 1 from Transparency International, the variable has no relationship with it.

Government Effectiveness: In 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015, the four subsequent years, the percentile rank of government effectiveness was 0. And in 2016 & 2017, the percentile rank was the same at 0.4807692. In 2018, the country made a little movement and got a percentile rank of 0.9615384. When
we compare this variable to the independent variable in table 1, we can see that there is a direct relationship between the movement of corruption and government effectiveness during 2012-2018.

**Rule of Law:** In 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 the country got a percentile rank of 0. That means there was no rule of law in the country. But in 2018, the country made a little progress and ranked 0.4807692. That still looks very bad according to other countries. So the rule of law of the country and corruption had a little relationship during the study period, but it’s not much like government effectiveness.

**Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism:** In the years, 2012 & 2013, the percentile rank of the country was 0. That means there was political instability and violence/terrorism. In 2014 & 2015, the percentile rank of the country was 1.904762. That makes a little sense when we look at the previous years. In 2016, the percentile rank of the country was 2.380952, which means it increased by a notable point that makes sense based on the last 4 years. In 2017 & 2018, the percentile rank of the country was 3.809524. It seemed like it was going better year after year and it got a 3.809524 rank. That looked like a great job considering how the country has been for the last 5 years. By comparing this variable to the table 1 independent variable (corruption), there is no relationship between the variables.

**Voice and Accountability:** In 2012 & 2013, the percentile rank of the country was 1.408451. That states the rate of accountability in two years. In 2014, the percentile rank of the country decreased and it became 0.9852217 poorer than in the last two years. In 2015, the percentile rank of the country was 1.477833. This time we saw a small increase. In 2016, the percentile rank of the country increased better than the previous year and ranked at 2.463054. That looks like a great sign. In 2017, the percentile rank of the country touched its highest rank in the previous years and ranked at 3.940887. In 2018, the percentile rank of the country fell a little to rank 3.448276 compared to last year. It is not a good sign because of the decrease. And finally, when we made a comparison between our independent variable, which is corruption, and political development, which was the dependent variable of our study, the result was that there was no significant relationship between the two variables.

7. **CONCLUSION**

In this study, we investigated the effects of corruption on political development in Somalia. The corruption perception index (CPI) of Transparency International has been used to measure our dependent variable (corruption), while to measure the dependent variable, we have used worldwide governance indicators (WGI) from World Banks’s database. WGI variables were five and four of them didn’t relate to corruption after comparison. But one of the sub variables relates directly to corruption, and it is government effectiveness. For all the years from 2012-2018, as you can see in the above tables, the two variables moved together. This means there is a significant relationship between corruption and government effectiveness.
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