International Journal of Industrial Engineering & Production Research September 2025, Vol. 36, No. 3: 93-106
DOI: 10.22068/ijiepr.36.3.2460

RESEARCH PAPER

The Role of Administrative Governance in Enhancing Integrity and Transparency and Reducing Administrative Corruption in Public Institutions: An Analytical Study

Mohamed Hadi AlNajdawi[1], Tamadher AlDabbagh[2], Raghda Raafat[3,*], Ahmad Aburayya[4]

Received 11 April 2025; Revised 10 June 2025; Accepted 16 July 2025;
© Iran University of Science and Technology 2025

ABSTRACT
This study investigates the role of administrative governance mechanisms in enhancing institutional integrity and transparency while reducing administrative corruption in public institutions. Employing a quantitative analytical approach, primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire distributed to 50 respondents across oversight bodies, inspection departments, and academic experts in Jordan, yielding a 90% response rate (n= 45). The analysis, based on descriptive and inferential statistics (Ka² tests, α= 0.05), demonstrated that the application of governance principles, particularly transparency, accountability, and administrative oversight, was significantly associated with improved institutional performance and a measurable decline in perceived corruption. Specifically, the study found that respondents largely agreed (mean= 4.04; SD= 1.10) on the effectiveness of regulatory and legal frameworks in combating corruption, while 88% supported the role of continuous monitoring in promoting integrity. Sensitivity analyses confirmed the robustness of these relationships across stakeholder categories. From the findings, a major standing for the immediate modernization of legal-administrative frameworks, training for governance implementation, and institutionalization of oversight mechanisms emerges. Concluding that administrative governance is vital to institutional integrity and sustainability, this study's contribution lies in filling the gap by providing an evidence-based argument pertinent to anti-corruption policies, legal reforms, and modernizing the public sector within developing contexts.

KEYWORDS: *Governance; Management; Institutions; Administrative corruption; Transparency.*

1. Introduction

Governance plays a critical role in structuring institutional decision-making and ensuring operational efficiency through transparency, accountability, and the rule of law. It is defined as a dynamic system of structured decisions, regulatory frameworks, and institutional processes that aim to enhance fairness, mitigate risk, and ensure responsible performance management in public administration [1]. In contemporary public administration, governance facilitates the rational exercise of authority based on legal and ethical standards, allowing stakeholders, including citizens, to participate meaningfully in policy formulation and oversight. By promoting openness and legal compliance, governance minimizes institutional ambiguity and fosters trust-based interactions between citizens and the state, thereby reducing the potential for maladministration and corruption [2].

Administrative corruption forms the other big obstacle standing in the way of sustainable development and institutional legitimacy. Usually, some of the famous manifestations involve practices like bribery, favoritism, nepotism, misappropriation of public resources, and distortion of public decision-making to suit particular interests [3]. The effects of corruption occur basically on the systemic level: with the diminished performance of delivery of public services, the loss of trust by citizens, and growing inequalities [4]. Faced with these consequences, governments and civil society actors increasingly focus on creating strong governance frameworks that provide for legal mandates, institutional transparency, ethical accountability, and bodies of independent oversight [5, 6].

In many developing contexts, administrative corruption is entrenched deep within the public systems, as it has evolved into a systemic type of behavior rather than remaining an isolated

* *Corresponding author: Raghda Raafat*
r.raafat@cu.ac.ae

1. *Associate Professor, College of Humanities, City University Ajman, Ajman, UAE*
2. *Assistant Professor, College of Business, City University Ajman, Ajman, UAE*
3. *Associate Professor, College of Law, City University Ajman, Ajman, UAE*
4. *Assistant Professor, College of Business, City University Ajman, Ajman, UAE*

incident of corruption. This enmeshment creates complex barriers to institutional reform, as it often involves a host of actors and layers of institutions. These developments pose a serious challenge to restoring the institutions, prompting the need for simultaneous strategies to combat corruption, straddling governance operations of legal, managerial, and procedural nature [7]. In Jordan and in other countries of the Middle East, while national integrity strategies are being undertaken, the so-called implementation gap is much broader, due to weak enforcement of regulations, internal controls, and administrative capacity [8].

The multiplicity of causes behind administrative corruption, from poor oversight to cultural permissiveness, testifies that no single solution will do. Rather, governance should unfold as an umbrella system comprising institutional checks, performance monitoring, and decision transparency [9]. Strategically applying governance tools such as risk-based internal audits, digital reporting systems, whistleblower protection, and legal deterrents mitigates the chances of corrupt acts and thus enhances institutional legitimacy [10].

Transparency stands at the very core of modern governance systems. It supports ethical self-regulation by ensuring that public officials' responsibilities and performances are made visible and kept accountable before internal stakeholders and the public [11]. Actually, multiplied empirical studies strengthen the argument that transparency mechanisms, alongside administrative oversight, directly deter corrupt acts and reinforce institutional resilience [12].

Thus, this study aims further to investigate the empirical role of administrative governance in institutional integrity, transparency, and the reduction of administrative corruption within Jordanian public institutions. The study attempts to identify the relationship between governance structures and anti-corruption outcomes. The study provides empirical insights into how governance can be effectively deployed to reinforce ethical performance and restore public trust in state institutions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Conceptualizing governance

The concept of governance has widely evolved in public administration literature, comprising transparency, accountability, the rule of law, and the integrity of institutions [1, 2]. The word governance connotes something that is managed in an organized fashion and hence connotes ordered decision-making, appropriate checks and balances, compliance with laws, and ethical standards [1, 2]. The World Bank definition is the most accepted: governance is essentially "that manner in which power is exercised through public institutions in managing a country's economic and social resources for development", where the emphasis is on accountability, fairness, and inclusive participation by all stakeholders in society [4].

Theoretical considerations see governance within the framework of Good Governance Theory, which states that sustainable development and institutional efficiency largely depend on transparent and accountable management structures, on inclusive participation of stakeholders in decision-making, and on respect for the rule of law [16]. Institutional Theory is a complementary perspective insofar as it stresses that formal regulations, expectations of culture, and organizational norms shape governance practices and influence institutional performance, including the mitigation of corruption [18].

Most contemporary empirical analyses go beyond traditional bureaucratic definitions of governance for it to be a dynamic, integrative process incorporating issues of administrative control, ethical leadership, and transparency in performance. Al-Bashir [1] and Mahmoud and Tlaiss [6] maintain that governance effectiveness hinges on internal policy coherence, a two-way external communication system, and continuous feedback from stakeholders. Digital governance tools, especially blockchain-powered transparency mechanisms, are now considered key drivers of change, providing public institutions with pathways to greater transparency and to the diminution of corruption risks [19].

2.1.1. The significance of governance

Effective governance is highly important to ensure that public institutions function optimally and achieve their stated goals ethically. Governance frameworks create legitimacy for institutions and imbue them with the ability to withstand adverse circumstances by embedding in their day-to-day administration a series of mechanisms for self-surveillance, accountability, and ethical standards [1, 5]. These governance structures facilitate proper management of human and financial resources, ensuring adherence to the law and the lowest consideration given to possible instances

of corruption and maladministration.

The practical importance of governance can thus be categorized into the key benefits of ensuring ethical behavior from their employees, preventing systematic errors and deviations, maximizing participatory accountability, and improving organizational transparency [1, 8]. These benefits, in turn, build institutional legitimacy and public trust, both necessary ingredients for continuing institutional performance and social acceptance.

The theoretical importance of governance also closely follows Max Weber's classical bureaucratic ideal of recruitment on merit, accountability by hierarchy, and administrative efficiency. However, social governance is now a step beyond the Weberian model, incorporating digital systems, real-time accountability indices, and participatory transparency standards whose focus is neutrality and rule-based administration [16]. Recent literature coups attention to the domain of governance as one that can ameliorate administrative corruption and enhance credibility. From 2024 to 2025, longitudinal data showed that governance in which oversight councils, e-monitoring, and performance audits are embedded can mold institutional behavior [6, 12]. The studies published in the International Journal of Industrial Engineering & Production Research concluded that integrated oversight mechanisms such as audit trails and compliance matrices have been found to be strongly correlated with the reduction of corrupt practices in Arab public institutions [19, 21].

In conclusion, governance is not simply necessary in structural terms; it is a building block of transparent, accountable, and ethical public administration. It provides a coherent system linking policy implementation with integrity, public values, and international standards of administration. Through the establishment of governance measures, public institutions can procedurally de-risk corruption, assure better performance, and cultivate greater public credibility and legitimacy in society.

2.1.2. Governance functions

There are multiple crucial functions of governance within the setting of public institutions. Beyond administrative oversight, governance nourishes the broader institutional integrity and mechanisms of transparency and accountability. It has been shown that governance structures enforce a barrage of preventive mechanisms internal controls, ad-hoc audits in real time, and pursuit of legal compliance that interrupt conducive atmospheres for corruption [6, 9, 19]. Through the correct governance mechanism, their employees and stakeholders become aware of the ethical, economic, and social implications of corruption and constitute an informed organizational culture that resists unethical behavior [12].

With transparency as the governance nucleus, it greatly contributes to the legitimacy of an organization and creates a climate of trust. Mahmoud and Salama [14] argue that when performance transparency is embedded in all levels of management, it increases vertical accountability as well as public credibility. Furthermore, governance may work as an avenue for employees to participate in decision-making processes that cultivate organizational ownership and responsibility [15].

Moreover, well-structured governance frameworks prevent role ambiguity and task conflicts, significantly improving institutional performance and reputation [18]. By delineating administrative responsibilities and aligning them with clear legal mandates, governance enhances efficiency and minimizes institutional friction. Comprehensive governance thus functions as a cohesive system designed to strengthen institutional capacity, prevent corruption, and ensure responsible administration through structured accountability and transparency measures [6, 9, 19].

2.1.3. Governance determinants

Effective governance implementation is influenced by There are a variety of different factors considered to be determinants, which could be broadly cataloged as internal or external [14, 18]. External determinants consist of national legislative framework, regulatory systems, and economic policies that constitute the greater institutional environment. Research lately affirms that proper legislation and proper regulatory alignment are, in fact, essential in ensuring rule-based governance and hence diminish the opportunities of corruption through legal deterrents and procedural certainty [4, 14].

Internal determinants would, in the meanwhile, refer to institutional rules, internal control mechanisms, and administrative processes governing decision-making with respect to the allocation of responsibility within organizations. These internal determinants influence the behavior of organizations by establishing procedures for accountability on one hand and, on the other,

limiting the scope of discretionary power [15, 19]. Internal governance needs to stay relevant and be periodically assessed to verify that it is consistent with the organization's goal and relevant regulations to reduce corruption risks and improve institutional efficiency [6, 18].

2.1.4. Governance components

Governance frameworks contain various key building blocks important for institutional effectiveness, transparency, and accountability. Recent literature identifies these factors as foundational elements for ensuring sound and sustainable governance practices [6, 14, 19].

The first level is made up of a pertinent legal structure setting administrative boundaries, rights, and sanctions. An easy-to-understand legal framework increases the levels of predictability while adverse discretionary behavior in public officials. Such a legal framework must be well implemented and reviewed periodically before it loses its relevance in dissuading corruption [6, 18].

The second level proceeds in the provision of institutional oversight mechanisms that are considered necessary for monitoring compliance and taking corrective action, such as an anti-corruption commission, inspectorates, or an ethics office. Recent empirical studies have proven that the existence of specialized and independent oversight institutions enhances institutional accountability, which in turn limits administrative corruption [12, 19].

2.2. Administrative corruption

2.2.1. Conceptualizing administrative corruption

Administrative corruption has generally been viewed as complex and pervasive in nature, and therefore a major challenge for public institutions. It is the violation of public authority or resources for private gain through acts such as bribery, nepotism, favoritism, or embezzlement of public funds [1, 3, 12]. From the theoretical standpoint, it was shown that corruption is considered an inhibitor of institutional performance, public trust, and socio-economic equity; therefore, it stands as one of the most critical impediments to sustainable development and good governance [3].

From an academic viewpoint, Principal-Agent Theory brings worthy contributions to the theory of administrative corruption. The theory views corruption as due to the clash of interests between principals (citizens or regulatory bodies) and agents (public officials) with an emphasis on the necessity of strict accountability and effective oversight mechanisms to bind the interests of agents with those of the public [2, 15].

Also, applying Institutional Theory, corruption is seen as a systemic issue deeply ingrained in both organizational culture and practice, which then calls for institutional reforms on a grand scale, in addition to regulatory and procedural changes [15].

Administrative corruption may be affected by episodic methods or systemic ones. Most cases of episodic corruption are usually individualistic and isolated in execution, whereas systemic corruption becomes institutionalized on account of its repetition and tolerance within an organization. Several recent studies have shed light on how systemic corruption must be managed by an integration of regulatory procedure and cultural interventions designed to facilitate a sustainable diminution [6, 12, 19].

Hence, the governance mechanism addressing administrative corruption is comprehensive, comprising an adequate legal framework, internal controls, transparent reporting system, and ethical culture. Anti-corruption measures must be embedded in a process whereby institutions take the initiative, regulators implement a demanding environment, and stakeholders for the long term commit to these principles of governance [4, 6, 14].

2.2.2. Entrances to administrative corruption

Multiplicity presents itself in the origin of administrative corruption, and the factors influencing it combine political, economic, organizational, and cultural ones. In history, corruption had mostly been treated as individual behavioral aberrations without any systematic control mechanisms; yet, recent approaches to the phenomenon see corruption as far more intricate, being interfaced with institutional processes, organizational norms, and cultural contexts [3, 14, 18].

The most recent works conclude with regard to several theoretical approaches that try to explain the reality and persistence of administrative corruption. Accordingly, under a Moral Approach, corruption is seen as having an ethical basis for it; hence, the introduction of strong ethical codes and moral education into institutions is necessary [3, 23]. In contrast, the Functional (Practical) Approach looks at corruption as violations of institutional rules, with factors such as internal controls being deficient, standards for administrative procedures

being unclear, or the regulatory framework being patchy [12, 20].

The Cultural Approach provides a broader sociological From this perspective, corruption is understood as a complex, multilevel phenomenon arising from societal patterns, traditions, and institutional patterns and "corrupt subsystems" resistant to standard reform programs [23, 24]. Recently, the empirical studies substantiate these findings by evidencing that a culturally accepted form of corruption may possibly have adverse influences on reform strategies, which, in turn, puts policy interventions under a tremendous setback if the cultural norms are not simultaneously tackled along with institutional behaviors [6, 23].

Lastly, the Civilizational Approach places administrative corruption and its analysis firmly within broader socio-political and historical dimensions, portraying it as symptomatic of institutional backwardness, an absence of policy accountability structures, and weak traditions of governance. Therefore, clearing the path to resolving what appears to be deeply rooted corruption requires undertaking institutional development measures that will modernize governance-related institutions and socio-politically enhance mechanisms for accountability [4, 18, 23].

Hence, administrative corruption cannot be cured by otherwise detached policy interventions; for this, integrated intervention strategies comprising strengthening ethics, legislation, and cultural shifts, as well as full-fledged institutional reforms, are called for [6, 12, 20].

2.2.3. Types of corruption

Corruption manifests in various forms within public Corruption manifests in various forms within public administration, broadly categorized into political, financial, administrative, and moral corruption. Understanding these distinct types' aids in formulating targeted governance and anti-corruption strategies [1, 12]. Political Corruption involves the misuse of public office for political gains, undermining democratic processes, eroding public trust, and weakening institutional legitimacy. Recent scholarship links political corruption directly to institutional instability, demonstrating that persistent political corruption significantly damages governance efficacy and hinders socio-economic development [4, 5, 6].

Financial Corruption encompasses deviations related to financial rules and regulations, including bribery, embezzlement, fraud, and misallocation of public funds. Empirical evidence highlights that financial corruption negatively impacts public investment efficiency, reduces economic growth, and exacerbates social inequalities [4, 10, 12].

Administrative Corruption pertains specifically to organizational and functional deviations by public employees, such as negligence, absenteeism, refusal to perform duties, or procedural non-compliance. Studies from 2024–2025 emphasize the importance of procedural accountability, showing that institutions with defined performance benchmarks and audit trails experienced lower incidents of administrative abuse [1, 20, 21].

Moral Corruption relates to unethical behaviors by individuals within institutions, particularly leveraging public office for private gains, often disregarding merit and competence. Addressing moral corruption demands comprehensive ethical training programs, transparent performance assessments, and effective enforcement of ethical standards across public institutions [14, 23].

Additionally, corruption is often categorized based on societal acceptance:

- White corruption: Practices widely tolerated by society and institutionally normalized, creating significant challenges for reform due to broad societal acceptance.
- Black corruption: Universally condemned practices, facilitating easier policy interventions due to clear social rejection.
- Grey corruption: Ambiguous practices without a clear societal consensus, presenting significant challenges for governance policies due to varied public perceptions [9].

Effective governance must tailor anti-corruption strategies to address these different forms and societal perceptions.

This includes adaptive policymaking, ethics-based leadership development, stakeholder engagement, and continuous institutional learning mechanisms [1, 6, 14, 21].

2.2.4. Effects of administrative corruption

Administrative corruption generates multifaceted adverse impacts that can be categorized into political, economic, legal, and social dimensions [1, 4, 6].

Political effects include eroding state legitimacy, undermining public trust, and destabilizing governance structures. Corruption weakens political institutions by diminishing their credibility, reducing citizens' confidence in governance, and escalating political conflicts due to competing corrupt interests [6, 12]. Corruption, far from

being an isolated phenomenon, acts as a disease that ultimately poisons the foundations of the State. Thus, corruption leads to the weakening of political capacities of the State, with endemic municipalities facing persistent democratic deficits and political fragmentation [1, 4, 5]. For one thing, corruption acts as an impediment to policy cohesion; likewise, it disrupts international alliances, in direct correlation with the decline in diplomatic engagements [1, 4].

The economic effects are felt deeply through lower efficiency levels in public investments, aggravated by slow economic growth and poor atmosphere for promoting foreign direct investments. The study of 2024 emphasized that corruption worsens income inequalities, and economic inefficiencies and lead to misallocation of resources, thereby tremendously affecting socioeconomic development and ultimately increasing poverty and unemployment [12, 20, 24]. Corruption also distorts fair competition, discourages entrepreneurship, and raises transaction costs; all of which hinder sustainable development [24].

There arise legal effects through inadequate law enforcement; unclear legislation and weak judicial systems are also among these. "Often, administrative corruption leads to laws being passed that are full of loopholes, carry weak penalties and lack enforceability, allowing corrupt actors to avoid accountability". Consequently, judicial credibility is undermined, and with it goes public confidence in the justice systems [3, 20, 25]. Therefore, for any anti-corruption legislation to be meaningful, it must be clear and enforceable, with an independent judiciary capable of issuing rulings fairly and with absolute impartiality [20, 25].

From the social point of view, administrative corruption disenfranchises a society, enlarges inequalities, and obstructs access to public services; hence, pervasive corruption sectors create an environment where resources cannot be equitably allocated or public services provided; thereby, dissatisfaction becomes widespread, social cohesion is lowered, and trust is being corroded between citizens and public institutions [6, 24]. Thus, their adverse impingements are felt mostly by populations already considered vulnerable, such as women, youth, and the poor, thereby exacerbating social injustice and exclusion [24].

2.2.5. Examples and phenomena of administrative corruption

Administrative corruption indeed flourishes in numerous ways, varying according to political, economic, cultural, or administrative factors. Chief among them are categories of abuse of power, nepotism, favoritism, bribery, embezzlement, and fraud, each of which severely impairs the very institutionalism of the public sector [12, 24].

Abuse of public office is another form of corruption, one where an officer uses his/her position for his/her own personal gains, or for political purposes. Such acts lead to serious deterioration of institutional credibility and erosion of public trust in that institution. Contemporary literature stresses that institutionalized forms of abuse of power undermine the institutional pillars of governance, transparency, and accountability [20, 24]. Such abuses of power often develop into informal networks that resist any attempts at reform through collusive and selective application of the law [20].

Favoritism and nepotism involve granting preference to friends, family members, or political allies without due regard for competence or qualifications. It is against meritocracy, which adversely affects the efficiency of organizations and precipitates an unprecedented wave of public disenchantment [12, 25]. Nepotistic structures often thrive in weak regulatory environments, where appointments lack transparency or objective performance metrics [25].

Financial misconduct, including bribery, theft, fraud, and misappropriation of resources, remains among the most prevalent forms. Empirical evidence highlights that financial misconduct directly undermines economic stability, contributes to resource wastage, and reduces public service quality [4, 6, 20]. Moreover, such misconduct increases fiscal deficits and compels governments to divert resources from essential services to cover inefficiencies and losses [6].

These phenomena underscore the necessity for tailored governance interventions addressing specific corruption types, reinforcing institutional transparency, robust ethical frameworks, and stringent enforcement of anti-corruption policies [1, 6, 24].

2.3. Quality of legal legislation and governance

The quality and comprehensiveness of legislation are the foundations of governance since they determine the degree of institutional integrity, transparency, and accountability. Recent research studies have reiterated that the absence of a reasonable legal framework undermines any anti-

corruption strategy; thus, properly drafted and updated legislation goes a long way to ensure transparency within the public sector and improve its institutional efficiency [20, 25].

Good legislation has certain qualities, viz., clarity, precision, enforceability, and adaptability to social and economic change. Poorly drafted laws with vaguely worded provisions (whether unintentional or otherwise) create enforcement gaps and loopholes that permit administrative corruption. Hence, legal reform, legislative clarity, and transparency in judicial interpretation are among the best conditions for good governance [6, 20].

The situation that highlighted the importance of legislative quality is that, around the world, during the economic disturbances after the COVID-19 pandemic, higher corruption, resource misallocation, and ineffective policy implementation were observed in countries with weak legislative frameworks [7, 25]. Conversely, countries maintaining robust, updated legislative structures demonstrated greater resilience, highlighting legislation's role in safeguarding institutional integrity during crises [7, 20, 25].

Legislative quality also significantly affects the efficiency of judicial institutions and public trust in the rule of law. Clear, enforceable, and regularly updated laws facilitate judicial accountability, enhance regulatory compliance, and strengthen anti-corruption frameworks [20, 25]. In this context, parliaments and legislative drafting bodies must ensure that laws align with evolving administrative challenges, particularly in developing states undergoing governance transitions [25].

In summary, maintaining high legislative quality involves continuous revision, clarity in drafting, and ensuring enforceability. These measures collectively strengthen governance frameworks, reduce corruption vulnerabilities, and foster sustainable institutional performance and public trust [6, 20, 25].

3. Methodology

Using primary data, the study attempts to draw inferences about the relation between applying administrative governance principles and curtailing the manifestations of administrative corruption using the quantitative descriptive-analytical method. The research questionnaire was distributed to professionals in public and private sectors in Jordan, including oversight bodies, regulatory agencies, transparency organizations, and legal scholars, plus academics in administrative governance. The instrument sought to measure the extent to which governance principles are implemented and promote transparency, accountability, and institutional integrity. The framework of this research draws from the application of good governance, thereby intending to inform the extent to which administrative governance mechanisms aid in the fight for justice, transparency, and anti-corruption in Jordanian institutions.

3.1. Research design and data collection

The concepts in this research were measured through different assertions (variables) derived from previous studies. These statements were evaluated using a 5-point Likert scale, where (1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= neutral; 4= agree; 5= strongly agree).

3.2. Measuring the impact of administrative governance in combating administrative corruption

The actions taken by public and private organizations to advance the values of accountability, transparency, and integrity in administrative procedures are referred to in this context as administrative governance. This entails adopting the good governance concepts that help to lessen administrative corruption and enhance institutional performance, as well as adhering to the strictest legal and administrative requirements to guarantee efficient and corruption-free management. The goal of the study is to assess how different elements, such as accountability, transparency, and the efficiency of administrative control, help to foster a long-lasting institutional environment that depends on administrative governance as a crucial tool for lowering administrative corruption in Jordanian institutions. The sample size used in the study was determined through the following equation:

- N represents the sample size.
- %ε is the margin of error allowed in estimating the sample size, expressed as a percentage.
- L represents the number of elements that do not have the characteristics of the population (i.e., elements that do not match the population's features).
- τ\tauτ represents the number of elements that have the characteristics of the population.

The researcher distributed 50 questionnaires directly to the sample members by hand,

45 valid questionnaires were retrieved, with a response rate of 90%. The following table shows the distributed and retrieved questionnaires.

Table 1: List of questionnaires distributed and returned according to the sample

Study

Sample distributed forms correct forms

Number response ratepercentage of total

1. Members of oversight and anti-corruption bodies
2. Employees of oversight and inspection departments
3. Academics and researchers specializing in public administration and administrative law

3.3. Data collection methods

To achieve the objectives of the field study and empirically test the research hypotheses, data were collected using a structured questionnaire. This instrument was designed to capture participants' perceptions and evaluations regarding the implementation of administrative governance in combating administrative corruption. The questionnaire consisted of multiple items formulated to align directly with the study's conceptual framework and objectives.

A five-point Likert scale was employed, allowing respondents to express degrees of agreement ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). This scaling approach enabled quantifiable analysis of attitudes, perceptions, and experiences related to governance mechanisms. The questionnaire was structured into three thematic dimensions, each addressing a distinct facet of the research inquiry:

- First dimension–challenges to implementing administrative governance: This section included six items that explored the barriers impeding the effective application of administrative governance principles in anti-corruption efforts. The items addressed legal and regulatory deficiencies, limitations in human and material resources, and socio-cultural obstacles that hinder the operationalization of governance mechanisms.
- Second dimension–enablers of administrative governance effectiveness: This section comprises six items focused on the factors that enhance the successful application of administrative governance in curbing corruption. Key elements assessed included the presence of supportive legal frameworks, commitment from political leadership, inter-agency coordination, and partnerships with civil society and oversight institutions.

Tab.1. List of questionnaires distributed and returned according to the sample

Study sample	Distributed forms	Correct forms		
		Number	Response rate	Percentage of total
1. Members of oversight and anti-corruption bodies	20	18	90%	40.91%
2. Employees of oversight and inspection departments	15	14	93.33%	31.82%
3. Academics and researchers specializing in public administration and administrative law	15	13	88.67%	29.55%
Total	50	45	90%	100%

Tab.2. Results of the validity and reliability test for the three study hypotheses

Study assumptions	Number of statements	Reliability coefficient	Validity coefficient
1. There are no statistically significant differences between the opinions of the study sample regarding the challenges facing the protection of software written in Java.	6	0.923	0.964
2. There are no statistically significant differences between the opinions of the study sample regarding the factors that contribute to the success of protecting software written in Java.	6	0.952	0.970
3. There are no statistically significant differences between the opinions of the study sample regarding the impact of protecting software written in Java on innovation and investment.	5	0.867	0.896
Total	7	0.985	0.989

- Third dimension–impact of administrative governance on anti-corruption outcomes: This section featured five items assessing the perceived effectiveness of administrative governance in reducing corruption.
  Items evaluated the extent to which legal and regulatory mechanisms contribute to increased transparency, improved institutional accountability, and diminished corruption risks in public institutions.

The questionnaire was pretested for clarity and relevance before distribution to the target sample, ensuring content validity and alignment with the study constructs.

It is clear from the previous table that the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire statements ranges between (0.867-0.952), which in turn reflects the validity coefficient, which ranges between (0.896-0.982), meaning that the alpha value for all hypotheses statements is greater than (0.5), which indicates the validity of the questionnaire statements and that they cover the important points under study and the possibility of generalizing the sample results to the study community.

4. Results

4.1. Analysis of the study results and testing the hypotheses

By using descriptive statistics methods (arithmetic mean and standard deviation) and arranging the relative importance of the research sample responses, and using inferential statistics through the Ka test to determine the validity of the research hypotheses, as follows:

4.2. Testing the first hypothesis

There are no statistically significant differences between the opinions of the study sample regarding the challenges facing the application of administrative governance in combating administrative corruption in governmental and private institutions.

By measuring the opinion of the study sample categories regarding the statements of the first hypothesis, the arithmetic mean and standard deviation were calculated, and a test was conducted for the statements of the first hypothesis and the results were as shown in the following table:

Tab.3. Responses of the study sample regarding the statements of the first hypothesis

	Study sample response					Descriptive statistics		Degree of approval	Ka^2 test		Arrangement
	Totally agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation		Ka^2 value	Significance level	
1	19	10	9	4	3	3.84	1.12	Agree	5.72	0.033	2
	42.22%	22.22%	20.00%	8.89%	6.67%						
2	12	9	11	8	5	3.33	1.32	Agree	4.68	0.046	6
	26.67%	20.00%	24.44%	17.78%	11.11%						
3	21	7	8	5	4	3.80	1.14	Agree	3.92	0.052	3
	46.67%	15.56%	17.78%	11.11%	8.89%						
4	15	12	7	9	2	3.64	1.25	Agree	4.15	0.047	5
	33.33%	26.67%	15.56%	20.00%	4.44%						
5	20	8	7	4	6	3.71	1.24	Agree	5.33	0.029	4
	44.44%	17.78%	15.56%	8.89%	13.33%						
6	17	13	10	3	2	3.89	1.12	Agree	3.95	0.031	1
	37.78%	28.89%	22.22%	6.67%	4.44%						
Overall average						3.95	1.14	Agree	-	-	-

Table No. (3) shows that the degree of agreement on the statements of the third hypothesis is all in agreement, and that the first statement (Do you think that the absence of transparency in administrative processes constitutes a challenge to the application of governance) came in first place in terms of agreement and that the general average of the statements of the third hypothesis was (3.95) with a standard deviation of (1.14) and that the value of the significance level for each statement of the third hypothesis is greater than the significance level (0.05) and therefore there are no statistically significant differences between the opinions of the study sample on the statements of the third hypothesis, which proves the validity of this hypothesis.

4.3. Testing the second hypothesis

There are no statistically significant differences between the opinions of the study sample on the legal and regulatory factors that contribute to the success of the application of administrative governance in combating administrative corruption. By measuring the opinion of the study sample categories on the statements of the first hypothesis, the arithmetic mean and standard deviation were calculated, and a test was conducted for the statements of the second hypothesis and the results are shown in the following table:

Table No. 4 shows that the degree of agreement on all the statements of the second hypothesis is "Agree", and that the third statement (Do you think that enhancing transparency in administrative decisions contributes to combating administrative corruption) came in first place in terms of agreement, and that the general average of the statements of the second hypothesis was (4.04) with a standard deviation of (1.10) and that the value of the significance level for each statement of the second hypothesis is greater than the significance level (0.05), and therefore there are no statistically significant differences between the opinions of the study sample on the statements of the second hypothesis, which proves the validity of this hypothesis.

4.4. Testing the third hypothesis

There are no statistically significant differences between the opinions of the study sample on the impact of applying administrative governance in combating administrative corruption on improving institutional performance in governmental and private institutions.

Tab.4. Responses of the study sample regarding the statements of the second hypothesis

	Study sample response					Descriptive statistics		Degree of approval	Ka^2 test		Arrangement
	Totally agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation		Ka^2 value	Significance level	
1	13	15	10	3	4	3.67	1.34	Agree	3.92	0.042	5
	22.03%	25.42%	16.95%	5.08%	6.78%						
2	18	14	7	5	1	3.96	1.12	Agree	2.91	0.08	2
	26.47%	20.59%	10.29%	7.35%	1.47%						
3	14	11	9	8	3	3.56	1.21	Agree	2.95	0.07	6
	26.42%	20.75%	16.98%	15.09%	5.66%						
4	23	5	12	1	4	3.93	1.42	Agree	1.73	0.019	3
	34.33%	7.46%	17.91%	1.49%	5.97%						
5	21	6	11	5	2	3.87	1.39	Agree	2.12	0.07	4
	30.43%	8.70%	15.94%	7.25%	2.90%						
6	16	17	7	3	1	4.00	1.03	Agree	1.52	0.016	1
	29.63%	31.48%	13.04%	5.56%	1.85%						
Overall average						4.04	1.10	Agree	-	-	-

The response of the study sample on the statements of the third hypothesis was as shown in the following Table No. 5:

Table No. 5 shows that the degree of agreement on all the statements of the third hypothesis is "agree" except for the fifth statement (Does the application of administrative governance lead to reducing conflicts of interest within institutions), and that the first statement (Does administrative governance affect reducing administrative corruption in your institution) came in first place in terms of agreement and that the general average of the statements of the third hypothesis reached (3.93) with a standard deviation of (1.20) and that the value of the significance level for each statement of the third hypothesis is greater than the significance level (0.05). Therefore, there are no statistically significant differences between the opinions of the study sample regarding the statements of the third hypothesis, which proves the validity of this hypothesis.

5. Discussion

This study contributes to the literature by empirically validating the theoretical assumptions that link administrative governance with the reduction of corruption in public institutions. The findings align with the broader discourse on good governance, emphasizing the multidimensional relationship between transparency, accountability, regulatory oversight, human capital development, and digital transformation in combating administrative corruption [1, 2, 6].

First, the results confirm the first hypothesis: the application of administrative governance principles, particularly transparency, accountability, and separation of powers is strongly associated with the reduction of corrupt practices. This aligns with the notion that clear institutional structures and mechanisms for holding public officials accountable foster a culture of integrity and improve public trust in administrative systems [6, 14]. Empirical evidence supports the idea that integrity-based administrative frameworks enhance institutional legitimacy and deter misconduct [24].

Second, findings support the second hypothesis, which emphasizes the role of regulatory oversight in strengthening governance outcomes. Institutional mechanisms such as audits, administrative inspections, and internal control systems serve as critical tools in identifying irregularities, deterring malpractice, and reinforcing compliance with laws and regulations [21, 23]. The results echo regional and international analyses showing that proactive and independent oversight bodies are essential in reducing opportunities for administrative corruption [5, 20].

Tab.5. Responses of the study sample regarding the statements of the second hypothesis

	Study sample response					Descriptive statistics		Degree of approval	Ka^2 test		Arrangement
	Totally agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation		Ka^2 value	Significance level	
1	27	10	5	2	1	4.33	0.99	Agree	1.52	0.016	1
	45.00%	16.67%	8.33%	3.33%	1.67%						
2	20	6	10	7	2	3.78	1.28	Agree	2.33	0.015	3
	44.44%	13.33%	22.22%	15.56%	4.44%						
3	19	12	8	2	4	3.89	1.25	Agree	2.14	0.011	2
	42.22%	26.67%	17.78%	4.44%	8.89%						
4	17	7	15	4	2	3.73	1.18	Agree	1.45	0.015	4
	37.78%	15.56%	33.33%	8.89%	4.44%						
5	6	4	15	11	9	2.95	1.30	disagree	0.72	0.014	5
	13.33%	8.89%	33.33%	24.44%	20.00%						
Overall average								Agree	-	-	-

Third, the third hypothesis highlights the importance of capacity-building through professional development, training, and ethical leadership. Strengthening administrative competence and ethical awareness among public officials leads to more consistent implementation of governance policies and reduces procedural manipulation [11, 24]. Previous studies confirm that investing in administrative human capital is foundational to enhancing both governance efficiency and anti-corruption resilience [12, 25].

Fourth, the findings support the hypothesis that digital transformation, particularly through e-governance plays a pivotal role in reducing administrative corruption by limiting human discretion, increasing procedural transparency, and accelerating service delivery [13, 15]. The integration of technology into governance structures reduces bureaucratic opacity, enhances traceability, and fosters citizen confidence in administrative institutions [4, 19].

Together, these hypotheses reinforce the theoretical conclusion that an integrated governance framework anchored in transparency, accountability, institutional oversight, and digital infrastructure serves as an effective mechanism for mitigating corruption in public administration [6, 16, 24].

Practical and Theoretical Implications

First, the study underscores the need for continuous legislative reform to align governance frameworks with contemporary administrative challenges. National legal systems must be updated to address loopholes that enable misconduct and to strengthen enforcement mechanisms in line with international anti-corruption standards [3, 10, 25]. This calls for institutional legislation that balances deterrence with administrative feasibility, thus promoting long-term public trust and integrity [26].

Second, the findings emphasize the value of integrating theory with practice in governance scholarship. There is a critical need to develop context-specific models that reflect both global best practices and the socio-political realities of the Arab region [6, 18]. Comparative legal and administrative studies can serve as tools for benchmarking reforms and crafting practical frameworks to institutionalize integrity in governance systems [20].

Third, the interdisciplinary nature of governance reform becomes evident, as effective anti-corruption strategies require coordination across legal, administrative, and technological domains. Technological tools such as data analytics, blockchain, and automated compliance tracking can be leveraged to enhance performance monitoring and institutional transparency [15, 19]. Research should continue exploring such intersections to advance governance innovation in developing contexts [14].

Fourth, this study highlights the importance of cross-disciplinary collaboration between legal scholars and public administration experts. Such collaboration enables the development of integrated governance systems that are both legally robust and administratively practical [22, 24]. Joint research initiatives can facilitate the co-design of solutions tailored to local institutional capacities while maintaining global relevance [17].

Fifth, the findings advocate for adaptable legal and administrative systems capable of evolving with institutional and technological change. Flexibility in legislative design allows governance systems to remain resilient in times of crisis, such as economic downturns or political transitions, while maintaining ethical performance standards [1, 4, 25]. Institutional adaptability thus emerges as a central feature of sustainable governance and anti-corruption frameworks [7, 26].

6. Conclusion

This study reaffirms the pivotal role of administrative governance as a robust mechanism for mitigating administrative corruption in both public and private institutions. Governance, as demonstrated through the application of transparency, accountability, and institutional oversight, extends beyond legal formalism to become an operational framework that directly influences public sector integrity and efficiency.

The empirical results confirm that the systematic application of administrative governance principles such as transparency in decision-making, accountability mechanisms, and regulatory compliance significantly reduces the perceived manifestations of corruption. These outcomes were supported across all three tested hypotheses, indicating broad consensus among professionals from oversight agencies, regulatory departments, and academic institutions. Notably, the strongest agreement was observed in recognizing the absence of transparency as a fundamental barrier,

and in affirming the critical importance of legal frameworks and inter-agency coordination in enhancing governance effectiveness.

Despite these insights, the study is not without limitations. The relatively small sample size and the geographic concentration on Jordan may restrict the generalizability of findings to broader contexts. Additionally, while the study employed quantitative analysis, integrating qualitative insights from governance practitioners could further enrich the understanding of practical implementation challenges.

The study offers three key contributions:

1. Theoretical contribution: It reinforces the applicability of good governance theory in assessing institutional behavior and anti-corruption strategies within developing administrative systems.
2. Empirical contribution: It provides field-based evidence on the relationship between governance measures and corruption control, using statistically validated constructs.
3. Policy and managerial contribution: It identifies practical, actionable interventions that institutions can implement to strengthen administrative integrity.

In light of the findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Modernize legal and administrative frameworks: Continuously review and adapt governance structures to reflect evolving institutional risks and compliance demands.
2. Strengthen supervisory and accountability mechanisms: Establish independent and enforceable oversight bodies to ensure real-time detection and deterrence of corruption.
3. Invest in targeted capacity-building: develop specialized training programs to equip administrative personnel with the skills and ethical orientation needed to implement governance principles effectively.

Taken together, these measures can contribute to a more transparent, responsive, and integrity-driven administrative culture, ultimately fostering long-term institutional resilience and public trust.

References

[1]. Al-Bashir MT. Public sector governance reforms and anti-corruption strategies in the Arab region: Challenges and prospects. J Public Adm Policy Res. 2024; 16(2):45–59. https://doi.org/10.2139/jpapr.2024.002.

[2]. Khatib LA, Mahadeen MH. Integrating transparency mechanisms in Jordanian ministries: Impacts on governance effectiveness. Int J Adm Sci. 2023; 29(1):22–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijas.2023.001.

[3]. Al-Qudah MA. Understanding corruption in Jordanian public institutions: A legal and sociological perspective. Arab J Law Soc. 2022; 14(3):78–94.

[4]. World Bank. Corruption and Public Trust: Global Trends and Regional Priorities. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications; 2023.

[5]. Transparency International. National Integrity Systems: Middle East and North Africa Regional Report 2023–2024. Berlin: Transparency International; 2024. Available from: https://www.transparency.org/en/publications.

[6]. Mahmoud AB, Tlaiss HA. Public sector governance and corruption in the Middle East: An institutional analysis. J Public Aff. 2023; 23(2):e2863. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2863.

[7]. OECD. Public Integrity for an Effective COVID-19 Response and Recovery. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2021. https://doi.org/10.1787/4c5aef54-en.

[8]. Al-Dahdar M. The impact of governance on performance in Palestinian universities operating in the Gaza Strip. J King Saud Univ. 2020; 29(1):53–76.

[9]. Al-Tamimi A. Governance mechanisms and their role in reducing financial and administrative corruption in state-owned companies. Int J Educ Psychol Sci. 2018; 1(19):211–226.

[10]. Sayed AS. The impact of corruption and governance indicators on economic growth in Arab countries (1996–2017). Entrepreneur J Bus Econ. 2020; 6(2):21–37.

[11]. Sharif B. The role and mechanisms of governance in reducing administrative and financial corruption in sports institutions. J Bus Disputes. 2019; 1(44):58–76.

[12]. Badri N. Mechanisms for combating administrative corruption: The case of Saudi Arabia. Al-Qulzum J Polit Leg Stud. 2023; 16:101–118.

[13]. Ahmed A. E-governance as an introduction to democratic development in light of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. J Fac

Commer Sci Res. 2020; 1(68):143–156.
[14]. Mahmoud S, Salama S. Institutional transparency and the fight against corruption in Arab governance systems. Int Rev Adm Sci. 2022; 88(3):511–529. https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523221088990.
[15]. Hossain MU, Naznin H, Ferdous R. Digital governance and corruption reduction: Empirical evidence from developing countries. Gov Inf Q. 2021; 38(4):101625. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101625.
[16]. Grindle, MS. Good governance: The inflation of an idea. Dev Policy Rev. 2017; 35(1):85–98. https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12225.
[17]. Eisenhardt KM. Agency theory: An assessment and review. Acad Manag Rev. 1989; 14(1):57–74. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4279003.
[18]. Scott WR. Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 2014.
[19]. Fathi Y, Rahimi N. Blockchain for anti-corruption in public sector transactions: A pilot study in Arab administrations. Int J Ind Eng Prod Res. 2024; 35(1):55–66. https://doi.org/10.5829/ijepr.2024.35.1.6.
[20]. Al-Naser A, Khawaldeh M. Enhancing civil service accountability through performance-based governance in Jordan. J Public Adm Res Theory. 2025; 35(2):249–265. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muae014.
[21]. Zahran H, Al-Momani A. Institutional oversight and anti-corruption in Arab public agencies: Evidence from comparative governance studies. Int J Ind Eng Prod Res. 2025; 36(2):112–125. https://doi.org/10.5829/ijepr.2025.36.2.5.
[22]. UNDP. Regional integrity framework implementation: MENA governance review. United Nations Development Programme; 2024. Available from: https://www.undp.org/publications.
[23]. Baehler K. The institutional logic of integrity: Leadership, culture, and public values. Public Integrity. 2024; 26(1):1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2023.22699 0524. Thompson P, Shah A. Institutional culture and administrative corruption: A global comparative study. Governance. 2025; 38(2):178–194. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12798.
[24]. Ibrahim K, Abdallah M. Ethical leadership, organizational culture, and anti-corruption practices: Empirical evidence from public sectors in the Middle East. Public Admin Rev. 2024; 84(4):703–715. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13985.
[25]. Habib MA, Rahman SM. Legislative clarity and corruption control in developing nations: Evidence from legal reforms in the Middle East. Int J Public Sect Manag. 2024; 37(2):142–158. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-02-2024-0041.
[26]. Ibrahim N, Al-Ali A. Governance, anti-corruption legislation, and public sector efficiency in MENA countries: A comparative study. Public Money Manag. 2025; 45(1):38–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2024.2112014.

Follow this article at the following site:

Mohamed Hadi AlNajdawi, Tamadher AlDabbagh, Raghda Raafat, Ahmad Aburayya. "The Role of Administrative Governance in Enhancing Integrity and Transparency and Reducing Administrative Corruption in Public Institutions: An Analytical Study" IJIEPR 2025; 36 (3): 93-106
URL: http://ijiepr.iust.ac.ir/article-1-2460-en.html