

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](#)

Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences

journal homepage: <http://www.elsevier.com/locate/kjss>

Implementation of the code of professional ethics for Thai civil servants

Srisombat Chokprajakchat ^{a,*}, Nittaya Sumretphol ^b

^a Doctoral Program in Criminology, Justice Administration and Society, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Mahidol University, Nakhon Pathom 73170, Thailand

^b Faculty of Science and Technology, Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep, Bangkok 10120, Thailand

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 13 August 2015

Received in revised form 25 February 2016

Accepted 18 March 2016

Available online 5 May 2017

Keywords:

civil servants,
code of professional ethics,
ethics

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to examine the implementation of the 2009 Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants B.E. 2552 (the Code). Data were collected by conducting focus groups with executive and operational officials and a survey with a sample group of 5,795 civil servants in 117 agencies. The results showed that the majority of the civil servants recognized the provisions of the Code. Another finding was that the knowledge of the Code was disseminated among the civil servants, staff, and employees; the civil servants were encouraged to comply with the Code, namely, cultivating ethics in new civil servants and providing opportunities for civil servants to participate in activities. However, some problems in the implementation of the Code were found. Additionally, among the agencies there still remain breaches of the Code. In agencies not having assessment of the implementation of the Code, it was found that Code misconduct was higher. Whistle-blower measures should be enforced to enhance implementation of the Code.

© 2017 Kasetsart University. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Introduction

Regulations on Ethics of the Civil Servants of 1994 was promulgated on March 9, 1994. Subsequently, the Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants (the Code) came into force on February 3, 2010 (Office of the Civil Service Commission [OCSC], 2010). Under Article 17 of the Code, an ethical control section shall be established in each governmental agency which has to report to the head of the agency and performs the duties of controlling ethics in accordance with the 2009 Code (Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants, 2009). Additionally, the Transitory Provisions Article 23 prescribes that an ethical control

section shall be established in each governmental agency within 90 days after the date on which the Code comes into force (May 2, 2010).

Although several studies have been undertaken on ethical issues concerning civil servants (OCSC, 2006; Pratchayaparit, 1994, 2008; Wirachnipawan, 2006), only the study of the OCSC focused on civil servants' knowledge and perceptions of the current code of professional ethics for civil servants, as well as official conduct (Sarapimpa, 2011). There has not been a study on how the process should actually implemented, as well as on the problems and obstacles encountered by agencies in the actual implementation of the Code. Thus, the significance of the current study laid its foundations in the practical implementation of the 2009 Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants, and the problems and obstacles of the implementation of the policies. Moreover, the study investigated

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: srisombat.cho@mahidol.ac.th (S. Chokprajakchat).
Peer review under responsibility of Kasetsart University.

the implementation process of the controlling mechanisms for the civil servants' ethics, with respect to the promotion measures for observance of the civil servants' ethics at both the level of operatives and the level of management, as well as the efficiency of the punitive measures against violators of the prescribed ethics.

The objective of this research was to examine the implementation of the 2009 Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants by different agencies and to explore the obstacles to implementation of the Code. The scope of this research was restricted to the 2009 Code, by studying civil servants of governmental agencies under the various Ministries and the Prime Minister's Office, governmental agencies which were not under Ministries and the Prime Minister's Office, and other organizations under the Constitution, which implemented the 2009 Code. This research was approved by the Ethics Committee of Mahidol University and was conducted between August 2011 and January 2013.

Literature Review

The applications of ethical principles in Thailand were studied, both in government agencies such as the Office of the Civil Servant Commission, and by reviewing the literature mentioning civil servants' ethical principles (Bhanthumnavin, 1993; Chinwanno, 2003; OC SC, 2006). The civil servants' ethical principles have been followed by civil servants using Buddhist principles, such as 'Raja-Dhamma (ten Royal virtues) and 'Charkrawatdhiwatra 12', which are Dhamma for a king, whereas 'Rajasangkawatthu 4' is Dhamma for formulating policies on state administration and country development or state governance, and 'Rajawasdee-Dhamma 49' is Dhamma for the execution of public affairs (OCSC, 2006).

Moreover, in *Public Affairs Principles from the Compositions of King Rama VI*, His Majesty mentioned desirable qualifications for civil servants as "Ten Principles of Public Affairs" in accordance with the ten moral and ethical principles for the profession of civil servants (Ethics Promotion and Information Center, 2005 as cited in OCSC, 2006).

Furthermore, the principles that the civil servants should follow based on morality were also in the first Civil Service Act and appeared in the preamble of the *Civil Service Regulations (1928)*, prescribing:

His Majesty The King of Thailand wishes to stipulate regulations of the civil servants, as an approach to select knowledgeable persons to be enrolled for the civil servant profession, *free of concern about seeking benefits in other manners*, whereas the public sector shall receive more benefits, resulting from abundance of civil servants who are capable and knowledgeable of art and science of public affairs, *as well as duties and disciplines for being constantly maintained (Civil Service Regulations, 1928)*.

Subsequently, the *Civil Service Act (1992)* prescribed the principles that civil servants must follow the rules of morality, in Section 91 A: "A regular civil servant must abide by and comply with disciplines and customs of the civil service and *ethics for civil servants* under regulations stipulated by the Civil Servant Commission." (*Civil Service Act, 1992*).

Additionally, the *Office of Civil Service Commission's Regulations Civil Services Commission's Ethics (1994)* prescribed ethics according to 15 issues, namely, three ethics for themselves; four ethics for their agencies; five ethics for their superiors; and three ethics for the people and society, as follows. The Civil Servant Commission (CSC) stipulates the Civil Service Commission Regulations on Ethics for Civil Servants of 1994, which entered into force on March 9, 1994, thereby integrating the matter of ethics in courses of development training for all levels of civil servants; it includes practical principles that all civil servants must abide by and comply with under the Regulations as a code of conduct, whereby the subject matter of ethical principles focuses on the superiors' behavior toward their subordinates, the subordinates' behavior toward their superiors and colleagues, and the people and society (*Office of Civil Service Commission's Regulations Civil Services Commission's Ethics, 1994*).

The CSC promulgated the Regulation on Ethics for Civil Service on March 9, 1994 (*Office of Civil Service Commission's Regulations Civil Services Commission's Ethics, 1994*). Subsequently, in 1999, the Office of Civil Service Commission established the Ethics Promotion and Information Center, to serve as a center for the coordination of activities relating to the promotion of ethical standards in public, as well as the coordination of networking with other organizations and entities with respect to ethics promotion and training. Nowadays, the Ethics Promotion and Information Center has the status of an agency under the Civil Service Training Institute of the Office of Civil Service Commission, with its missions related to shifting paradigms, cultures, and values in work, thereby studying, researching, developing, promoting, advising, and networking, as well as creating and disseminating media about the morals and ethics of civil servants, a transparent civil service, corruption and misconduct prevention, including lessons from following in the footsteps of His Majesty, and the fulfillment of the oaths (OCSC, 2010).

Later, the *Civil Service Act (2008)*, Chapter 5: Upholding the Ethics of Officials, Section 78, prescribes that a regular civil servant must uphold the ethics of officials as prescribed by the government agency with the objective of achieving good officials who exhibit honor and dignity as officials. The second paragraph prescribes that a government agency shall prescribe rules on the ethics of officials in accordance with the work descriptions in such government agency pursuant to technical principles and professional ethics. The third paragraph prescribes that when prescribing rules on the ethics of officials under paragraph two, a hearing shall be held for officials and the rules shall be published by public notice and in Section 79, it is prescribed that where a civil servant fails to comply with the ethics of officials which does not constitute a breach of discipline, the supervising official shall issue a warning, apply the matter to considerations for appointment, salary increase, or to order such official to undertake training (*Civil Service Act, 2008*).

It can be considered that presently, the Civil Service Act of 2008 mentions the principles that the civil servants must abide with regard to morality in Section 34, Section 52, Section 72, Section 74, Section 78 and Section 79 (*Civil Service Act, 2008*).

For the public sector of Thailand, the conditions and requirements under the [Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand \(1997\)](#) prescribe focusing the morals and ethics for the public sector operatives in Chapter 5: Directive Principles of Fundamental State Policies, Section 77, prescribing that the State shall prepare a political development plan, moral and ethical standards for the holders of political positions, Government officials, officials, and other employees of the State in order to prevent corruption and create efficiency in the performance of duties ([Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, 1997](#)).

Subsequently, the [Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand \(2007\)](#) included subject matter focusing on a solution to the problem of monopoly and unfair exercise of the State's powers, as well as political execution with a lack of transparency, morals and ethics, and failure of the check-and-balance system. In other words, to emphasize that the country should be governed with transparency, morals and ethics, this resulted in the prescription of Chapter 13: Ethics of Holders of Political Positions and State Officials ([Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, 1997](#)). In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand of 1997, Section 244, it was prescribed that the Ombudsman had powers and duties in connection with the ethics of holders of political positions and State officials. Next under Chapter 13, Sections 279 and 280 relate to the ethics of holders of political positions and State officials, with mechanisms and systems, which require the codification of ethics as an ethical standard for the holders of political positions, and each type of civil servant and State official.

Thus, Section 304 prescribes that the process of such codification of ethics should be finished within one year after the promulgation date of the Constitution in order that the ethical standards for the holders of political positions for each type of civil servant and State official should be efficiently enforced and punishments should be prescribed against violations or noncompliance with the ethical standards as disciplinary measures. Thus the Office of the Ombudsman set a standard that every agency of the public sector must formulate its own code of ethics with nine Core Values, along with the operational mechanisms and systems for efficient enforcement, including procedures for the imposition of punishments in accordance with the Constitution ([Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, 2007](#)). Therefore, the Office of the Civil Service Commission, as the leading agency in human resources management of the civil service, is required to comply with the provisions of the Constitution, and thereby introduced the Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Services to the Government promulgated in 2009. The Code provides 10 directives of conduct for civil servants. They are summarized as follows ([OCSC, 2010](#)):

- 1) A civil servant shall hold high moral principles and uphold righteous and moral conduct.
- 2) A civil servant must have a good conscience and responsibility for duties, devote him/herself to and perform duties with expedition, transparency and accountability.

- 3) A civil servant must separate personal affairs out of office, and uphold the country's public interest prior to personal gain.
- 4) A civil servant shall refrain from seeking personal gain in undue manners from using his/her office, and shall not commit any act in conflict between personal gain and public interest.
- 5) A civil servant must honestly abide by and comply with the Constitution and the law.
- 6) A civil servant shall honestly and fairly perform his/her duties, with political neutrality, and serve the people with a friendly disposition and without unfair discrimination.
- 7) A civil servant must strictly and expeditiously comply with the law on official information, and must not use information, which is obtained from performance of duties, for personal gain, but shall provide complete, accurate, up-to-date information for the people.
- 8) A civil servant must aim for the success of the mission, strictly maintaining quality and professional standards.
- 9) A civil servant must support the democratic form of government with the King as a head of state.
- 10) A civil servant must perform to preserve his or her reputation and to preserve the dignity of civil servants.

Therefore, in order to implement the provisions of Section 279 of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, in conjunction with the core values, which are recommended by the Ombudsman for being practiced by all agencies, the Civil Servant Commission, by resolution of the Council of Ministers, stipulated the ethical standards and compiled them into the Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Service.

Methods

The research used a mixed-methods methodology, consisting of quantitative and qualitative methods. For the qualitative method, data were collected by conducting five focus groups at the practitioner level, consisting of 12 people for each group, and two focus groups at the executive level (group director), consisting of 20 people for each group. All participants from Ethics Offices were selected by the head of agency and the letters of invitation were sent to agencies implementing the Code. For the quantitative method, data were collected using a survey of sample groups of civil servants. This research used stratified random sampling of 118 agencies from 20 ministries and other agencies only in the Bangkok Metropolitan Area that implemented the Code. By drawing 70 samples of civil servants from each agency of all working civil servants, in total, 5,795 participants were selected. The questionnaires were returned by 117 agencies with a response rate of approximately 99.15 percent. For the civil servants' questionnaire, the response rate was approximately 70 percent.

Results

The sample group comprised of 5,795 civil servants in 117 government agencies in Bangkok. Two-thirds of the population were female (65.6%) with work experience not

exceeding 20 years. To answer the research question to what extent the civil servants recognize the implementation of the 2009 Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants, we used a four-point scale (1 = not sure, 2 = no extent, 3 = to a little extent, and 4 = to a great extent). The respondents were asked to rate to what extent they perceived each item for the implementation and the enforceability of the Code. It was found that the civil servants recognized with a high score the implementation of the 2009 Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants. The majority of the sample group civil servants (82.5%) recognized the Code, of which they were informed mostly by their own agencies and secondly by the media.

When considering cognition and understanding of the various issues of the Code, it was found that almost all of the civil servants (more than 90%) recognized and understood the provisions of the Code for all 10 items, except for the following two:

“A civil servant must comply with the law on official information in a strict and expeditious manner, without delay, and use information, which is obtained from the operation, for duty performance, and must keep the people informed in a complete, correct and timely manner, without any factual distortion.”

“A civil servant must observe the constitution and laws in a forthright manner.”

Regarding cognition and understanding the enforceability of the Code, it was found that over 70 percent of the civil servants acknowledged and understood the following items: “the Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants had come into force”; “all civil servants have roles and responsibilities to obey, whereby their agencies must implement measures for promoting compliance with the Code of Ethics”. Furthermore a violation or transgression of the Code of Ethics must be subject to a consequence, and approximately 60 percent of the civil servants acknowledged and understood the following items: “there must be a consequence against a violator of the Code of Ethics”; and “a violation of the Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants is a disciplinary offense”, whereas over 50 percent understood that religious conduct, such as making merit, saying prayers or giving candles to the monks, is a part of the Code.

In addition, the civil servants acknowledged the process of implementation of the 2009 Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants. More than half of the civil servants (56.8%) replied that there had been an ethical control section established in their agencies, but approximately 17 percent replied that any section of this kind had not been established, as well as 24.5 percent replied that they were not aware whether any section of this kind had been established or not. Nearly two-thirds (64.5%) replied that there had been ethics committees established, whereas approximately 34 percent did not know about it or thought that there had not been any ethics committee established in their agency. More than half (57.5%) replied that their agency's guidelines complied with the Code as stipulated, whereas 45.2 percent of the agencies had introduced guidelines as stipulated by OCSC and some agencies (13.9%)

had drafted their own guidelines. The majority of the sample group (72%) replied that their agencies had operated in the dissemination of knowledge of the Code among civil servants, staff, and employees in the agencies, whereby the methods of dissemination, according to their respective frequencies, comprised: 1) issuing circulars among all internal organs; 2) posting the Code on the websites of the agencies; 3) producing give-away documents; 4) integrating the Code into their training courses; 5) requiring supervisors to explain to/inform civil servants; and 6) authoring articles in journals.

Regarding the Prescription of Punitive Measures, in cases where civil servants do not comply with the Code, more than half of civil servants (approximately 55%) replied that there have not been or they do not know whether their agencies have prescribed punitive measures against violators, whereas 42 percent replied that their agencies have prescribed punitive measures.

To answer the research question of what the obstacles are for the implementation of the 2009 Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants, we asked the civil servants how they reacted to the misconducts and what types of obstacles they faced. The problem issues were examined and presented using the frequency of participants. The majority of civil servants responded that several problems occur. Around four-fifths (80%) of civil servants pointed out the problem of social patronage, with 73 percent saying there is a problem of authoritarian values. Around 67.8 percent of civil servants identified the problem of conservative values. Roughly 63.2 percent of civil servants pointed to organization culture. Almost 68.5 percent of civil servants pointed out the problem of a lack of clear guidelines on the penalties for misconduct. Around 73.3 percent of civil servants responded that civil servants themselves lacked interest in getting to know the Code. Approximately 60.2 percent of civil servants identified the problem of a lack of commitment at the executive level. Almost half of the civil servants identified the problem of executives violating the Code themselves.

When we asked the civil servants what they did when encountering misconduct, as defined in the Code, within their agencies, it was found that approximately 52 percent of the civil servants said they notified their commanding officials, and approximately 40 percent replied that they would ignore the issue and not proceed for different reasons. First, they were afraid of further trouble and were not sure of being protected and perceived the incidents as normal occurrences. Second, they were concerned for the misconduct of the management and not confident that the commanding officials would take the incidents seriously as well as in some circumstances the lack of reaction of the management. Finally, they worried about the violators in the way that if notified, the violators might be in trouble and that the violators were under sections different from the participants, mostly being affiliates of the commanding officials.

This research used a t-test to compare agencies having assessment and not having assessment on the implementation of the 2009 Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants.

Table 1
A comparison of misconduct issues of the Code of Ethics observed by civil servants

Type of misconduct	Not having assessment n = 1,538		Having an assessment n = 1,521		t	p
	\bar{x}	S.D.	\bar{x}	S.D.		
	Violation of the official regulations	2.15	1.12	1.70		
Misuse of public time	2.64	1.29	1.92	1.02	17.132	.000
Use of public properties to seek profits for themselves of other	2.14	1.57	1.54	0.89	13.005	.000
Sexual misconduct	1.63	1.00	1.34	0.75	8.962	.000
Circumvention of law for advantaging their own duty performance	1.79	1.16	1.38	0.79	11.262	.000
Unfair discrimination against people coming into contact	1.58	0.96	1.35	0.78	7.197	.000
Not behaving politically neutral	1.87	1.16	1.47	0.87	10.778	.000
Priority of personal interest over public interest'	2.03	1.22	1.47	0.86	14.786	.000
Use of authority for personal/family gains	1.80	1.11	1.40	0.81	11.412	.000
Lack of awareness of the duties	2.00	1.21	1.45	0.87	4.449	.000
Duties are not transparent.	1.88	1.14	1.39	0.80	13.594	.000
Neglecting responsibilities	1.96	1.11	1.44	0.80	14.676	.000
Illegal exploitation by using position	1.62	0.98	1.30	0.70	0.256	.000
Distortion of facts and information presented to the people	1.39	0.79	1.24	0.64	5.819	.000
Failure to strictly maintain the quality and standards of the profession	1.64	1.00	1.30	0.70	10.123	.000
Not adhering to constitution	1.20	0.65	1.16	0.57	1.940	.052
Conduct resulting in degradation of reputation and image of the governmental agencies	1.51	0.87	1.24	0.62	9.802	.000
Unedifying (especially executive)	1.98	1.22	1.38	0.79	15.956	.000
Not aiming for achievement of work	1.83	1.07	1.37	0.77	13.688	.000
Failure to adhere to and do not stand up for what is right (No integrity)	1.86	1.12	1.36	0.78	14.041	.000
Non-devotion to duty/use of public time for personal business'	2.08	1.16	1.49	0.85	15.860	.000

This research found that the five issues of the Code that had been most frequently violated were: 'misuse of public time'; 'violation of the official regulations'; 'non-devotion to duty/use of public time for personal business'; 'use of public properties to seek profits for themselves or others'; and 'priority of personal interest over public interest', whereas, mostly, the misconducts were committed not exceeding four within a year.

The five issues of the Code, whose violation was the least frequently observed, were: 'not adhering to constitution'; 'distortion of fact and information presented to the people'; 'conduct resulting in degradation of reputation and image of the governmental agencies'; 'circumvention of law for advantaging their own duty performance'; and 'unfair discrimination against people coming into contact,' whereas, mostly, the misconducts were committed not exceeding four within a year as well.

We applied a rating scale using a value from 0 to 4 points (0 = Never, 1 = Rarely, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Always) to measure how often civil servants' misconducts were found. This research found that five issues of the Code, whose violation was most frequently observed were: 'misuse of public time'; "violation of the official regulations"; "non-devotion to duty/use of public time for personal business"; "use of public properties to seek profits for themselves or others"; "priority of personal interest over public interest", whereas, mostly, the misconducts were committed not exceeding four matters within a year.

Table 1 shows that there is a significant difference between agencies having an assessment of the implementation and agencies not having assessment of the implementation of Code in any type of misconduct of the Code except for "not adhering to constitution". In agencies not having assessment of the implementation of the Code,

it was found that the misconduct of the Code was higher. Thus, the research hypothesis was acceptable that there is a difference between the agencies having assessment and not having assessment of the 2009 Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants.

Discussion

From these findings, it can be seen that although the agencies have prescribed measures preventing the civil servants from violating the Code by promulgating that violations of the Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants were disciplinary offenses, there are some civil servants who have not acknowledged this issue. The findings from the survey are consistent with the information of focus groups in the way that the agencies provided punitive measures against ethical violators, in accordance with their respective severity, comprising "having the commanding official reprimand", "imposing disciplinary punishment"; "issuing probation in writing"; and "requiring improvement on the misconduct matters".

Importantly, this research found that civil servants observed some violations of the Code such as "misuse of public time"; "violation of the official regulations"; "non-devotion to duty/use of public time for personal business"; "use of public properties to seek profits for themselves of others"; "priority of personal interest over public interest". This means that some measures to control misconducts should be revised. These findings were consistent for all focus groups.

Interestingly, almost half of the civil servants did not report misconduct for several reasons. First they were concerned of the consequences against the informers and being afraid of further trouble and not sure of being

protected and not wanting to get involved in matters involving others. Another reason was concern for the lack of clarity of practices in dealing with violators of the Code and having no serious punishment imposed, not being sure whether the violators were being punished; contents of the Code being too abstract (unclear), difficult to determine right or wrong; not remembering the contents of the Code, no internal section to report to, or not knowing about procedures for reporting; and having no confidence in the fairness of the system.

Finally, they were concerned about the methods of notification despite it being through anonymous letters; verbal forms; sealed letters, notifying ethical control sections; directly notifying the director general; and notifying the direct commanding official. This finding was consistent with information from the focus groups at the practitioner level.

When we asked the civil servants about their concerns regarding the implementation of the Code, the research found that most of the participants perceived problems, as follows: lack of continuity of policy promotions; ethical control section, who were directly responsible for this issue, having other missions to complete; lack of financial support; lack of directly respondents resulting in a lack of follow-up; and absence of directly responsive sections. These findings were consistent with information from all focus groups.

In terms of the executive level, it was found that management was not prioritizing or supporting the policy and that the management/commanding officials were violating the Code themselves. Moreover organizational cultures are major obstacles resulting from the presence of the patronage system in Thai society and the attachment to authoritarian values. This finding may be consistent with the study of Wirachnipawan (2004) as specified values of Thai officials that impede development. Thai civil servants have conservative values and are value dealers meaning the values of popular government and praise the idea of traders that value profit in the line of duty rather than dignity or honor.

In terms of self awareness, the following were raised: a person, who distinctly complied with the Code of Professional Ethics for Civil Servants, should be glorified as a good example; self awareness should be enhanced through publication campaigns; informative activities should be organized for stimulating awareness, and monitoring should be conducted to assess compliance and practicability; violations of the Code should be exemplified in awareness campaigns and understanding the consequences for violators; orientation courses should educate new civil servants about the Code and evaluation examinations should be arranged annually for all civil servants; and training, seminars and discussion sessions about ethics should be compulsory and held at least once or twice annually.

For the problem of unclear guidelines regarding the penalties for misconduct, the Code should be strictly and constantly applied by each level of government. OCSC should publish manuals compiling relevant laws and regulations, for use in the admission process of new civil servants. The Code should also be enforced on organizations and agencies independent from the government. The consequences should be expressly prescribed against Code violators and there should be definite sections for auditing

compliance, in order to prevent violations. Next, agencies in the same ministry should be integrated in praising and recognizing ethically good civil servants. Finally, the administration of governmental agencies should be ethically and morally evaluated as good examples of their organizations. The government's policy should expressly promote this issue, by publicizing, specifying it as a priority of the national agenda, or organizing seminars or workshops on this issue in each agency. In addition, senior management must be independent and impartial of persons who hold political positions. The policy should be continuously implemented by all governmental agencies, with sections for directly following up compliance with the Code.

Conclusion

The structure of implementation of promotion for compliance with the Code, such as procedures, should be clearly specified. The configuration of committees responsible for the measures should also be taken into consideration. Overall, compliance with the Code should be expressly promoted. For example, every government agency may be required to use compliance with the Code as one of its key performance indicators, thereby being included as a key performance indicator of the OCSC. The structure of responsible organs with operating resources should be clearly specified. Ethical promotion work-groups should be established with budgets, personnel, and career advancement, and job descriptions should be provided. For example, a new work-group directly responsible for this issue should be added, thereby having one group leader and three to four operatives working on formulating a plan for promoting ethics and upholding peace in order to emphasize proactive operations to encourage civil servants.

For policy implications, several alternatives are recommended. The issue should be included in the strategies of the agencies and be specified as a key performance indicator of the organizations. The Code of Professional Ethics must be integrated into the organizational culture. The ethical standard of people holding political positions should be clearly provided in order to be good examples for the people. An agency should include ethical issues as part of the consideration for increasing salaries and promotion. Whistle-blower measures should be enforced to enhance the efficient implementation of the Code.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the Thailand Research Fund (TRF) for financial support.

References

- Bhanthumnavin, D. (1993). *Ethical development of the subordinate. Remote training kit, Management course for provincial chief officers*. Bangkok, Thailand: Civil Service Development Institute, Office of the Civil Service Commission. [in Thai]

- Chinwanno, W. (Ed.). (2003). *Professional ethics*. Bangkok, Thailand: Rongpim Chuanpim. [in Thai]
- Civil Service Act B. E. 2535. (1992). *Royal Thai Government Gazette*. Book 109, Chapter 31 (The 31th of March 1992). [in Thai]
- Civil Service Act B. E. 2551. (2008). *Royal Thai Government Gazette*. Book 125, Chapter 22 A (The 25th of January 2008). [in Thai]
- Civil Service Regulations B. E. 2471. (1928). Promulgation on 23 February, 2471, Effective on 1 April, 2472. [in Thai]
- Code of Professional Ethics of the Civil Servant 2009. (2009). *Royal Thai Government Gazette*. Book 126, Special Chapter 162 D (The 5th of November 2009). [in Thai]
- Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, B. E. 2540. (1997). *Royal Thai Government Gazette*. Book 114, Chapter 55 A (The 11th of October 1997). [in Thai]
- Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, B. E. 2540. (2007). *Royal Thai Government Gazette*. Book 124 Chapter 47 A (The 24th of August 2007). [in Thai]
- Office of Civil Service Commission's Regulations Civil Services Commission's Ethics B. E. 2537. (1994). *Royal Thai Government Gazette*. Book 111, Chapter 19 D (The 8th of March 1994). [in Thai]
- Office of the Civil Service Commission (OCSC). (2006). *Research report of the project on dissemination of values of honesty for drafting the civil servant and government official's handbook*. Bangkok, Thailand: Faculty of Public Health, Mahidol University. [in Thai]
- Office of the Civil Service Commission (OCSC). (2010). *Promoting transparency in governance*. Retrieved from http://www.ocsc.go.th/ocsccms/uploads/File/CSTI_EPC2009/KM/53TR/03.pdf2553. [in Thai]
- Prachayaparit, T. (1994). Professionalism and conducts of the bureaucracy and civil service in foreign countries, The fifth reign and present reign. *Civil Servant Journal*, 39(3), 9–12. [in Thai]
- Prachayaparit, T. (2008). Professionalism and conduct. *Ombudsman's Journal*, 1(4), 25–80. [in Thai]
- Sarapimpa, K. (2011). *Report on survey of ethical status of the civil servants*. Ethics promotion center, Civil Service Development Institute, OCSC. Retrieved from http://www.ocsc.go.th/ocsc/th/files/BRD_Research/thesis%20knowledge/18_Feb_2013/180213.pdf. [in Thai]
- Wirachnipawan, W. (2004). Values of Thai officials in bureaucratic reform. *Constitutional Tribunal Journal*, 6(4), 28–51. [in Thai]
- Wirachnipawan, W. (2006). Development of the civil servant's ethics. *Rattaphirak Thailand National Defense College Magazine*, 48(4), 37–55. [in Thai]