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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research study to find association or links between poor forest governance and Bribery. The research area comprised of three union councils, Pir khail, Agra and Totai of Tehsil Batkhela, District Malakand, Khyber Puktunkhwa-Pakistan. A sample size of 357 respondents was proportionally allocated to the mentioned three union councils of the study area and selected by simple random sampling technique. Perception of respondents on bribery (independent variable) and forest governance (dependent variable) were measured on three level likert scale. Chi-square test was applied to test the association between the study variables. The result shows that forest governance had highly significant association with people pay bribe to forest staff for cutting trees from forest (P=0.000), people pay bribe to forest staff for collecting firewood from forest (P=0.000), people pay bribe to forest staff for grazing their animal in forest (P=0.000), people can’t meet their basic need until they pay bribe to forest staff (P=0.000) and those who pay bribe to forest staff can get their forest needs in excess (P=0.000). In addition, a highly significant association found between forest governance and loggers pay bribe to cut in excess of the legal permit (P=0.000), through bribe one can get a false timber permit (P=0.000) and through bribe one can impose false changes of forest offences on opponents (P=0.000) and between forest governance and those who pay bribe are most powerful (P=0.000). Implementation of forest policies and laws in true spirit, empowerment and equipping forest staff, community empowerment and involvement in forest governance, strong system of monitoring and apprehension and punishment of illegitimate practices were some of the recommendations in light of the study.

KEYWORDS: Bribery, Timber and Poor Forest Governance

INTRODUCTION

Bribery is well-known form of corruption that involves offering money or valuable things to someone to gain personal favor or benefits. Thus bribery is like exchange of money or valuables for undue or unwarranted advantages. It involves at least two parties, the payer and payee. Both the demand and supply sides of bribery involve ethical and legal issues of serious nature and breach the trust on part of both parties. The payments are not limited to cash only, in bribes, but include gift giving offering employment or some futuristic promises for undue advantages (Eggert & Lokina; 2008).

Bribery in forest governance is a burning issue. For the development of economic and financial domain each and every country should bring to decrease in corruption, or to find out another way to minimize the level of corruption in forest governance. Accordingly, Transparency International statistically shows that in 2009, Hundred plus countries have lower index than 5, means to say that there is a high level of corruption. The giving results of CPI, 13 independent survey shows that corruption is alleged to be among public and politicians. Peoples have different views regarding bribery, being depended on person’s position shows that there is a relation existence involvement of bribery. Similarly, now a day’s bribery is a part of human mentality and it is difficult to vanish but the only way to minimize its level. Bribery is definite wrongdoing of providing valuable things, such as money, to get an unlawful benefit. Offering money is the furthermore prevalent custom of corruption which manipulates the position of trust in order to gain unlawful benefits. There is a clear association among corruption and development. If we look at each and every government there would be a corrupt politician within the government, due to these corrupt officials country goes down underdeveloped. Its affects decision which is make through government; minimize power, miserable foreign
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investment. Currently, businessman, political leaders, identified that bribery are internationally biggest extortion to economic development. Internationally the corrupt countries are drop out from the competition. High level of corruption as well as bribery reduces economic growth (Collister; 1999; Eggert & Lokina; 2008).

Although, Transparency International Indonesia reported that how bribery make someone push to do illegal acts in the forest sector of three regions in the country. Similarly, report applies a framework that uses workshops, containing stockholders from civil society, the public sector and government agencies, to generate first add data, secondary data takes from technical reports, from publication which is published by government, use media sources and documents from the private sector. International countries which donate and NGOs were used to appreciate these results. In Aceh, Papua, and Riau, bribery play a role to making someone to do illegality in different ways, some one of them makes logging operations amplify to protected areas, for such kind of illegal act it acquires authorization with politicians to make illegal acts look legal, it fabricate certification, it influences the data, it also make pressure on competitors do not take the right of concern one by bribe, if it affect environmental planning and pushups public officials become personal shares in logging companies (Zaman & Naz, 2016). The report of Human Right NGO 2009 believes that, more than half of the country timber in Indonesia 2003-2007 illegal acts and illegal logging on the peak and for that corruption was responsible for such condition of this outcome. Additionally, such report uses industry standard calculations that link consumption with legal wood supply to estimate illegal logging, complemented with interviews with key actors (government officers’ analysts, advocates, journalists, and donors) in 2008 to 2009. For tracing such figures they used technological procedure where loggers daily pay bribe to skipping obtaining the certain licenses to cut and move timber into the safe place where local officials face no consequences for letdown to submit require reports for chopped tress and revenues. Similarly, National Park in Southern Sumatra where there is invasion farmers encounter forest land. Around 2012 practice one year of fieldwork in which such ethnographic and archival research methods and interviews with spies like village heads, elected officials, and forest police, study consequences that local officials just think about their coming election nor for encroachments of forest land which is owing by farmers. On the basis of decentralization reorganization the local vote is most important on the decision to forest use protected continue. On the last not the least bribery have a major impact on forest governance, to decrease the density of such acts is fruitful for forest department and for natural environment. Bribery plays an unbelievable role between forest official and local contractors (Zaman & Naz, 2015). To provide illegal permit to local contractor government officials take bribe or provide valuable thing and make legalized in official documentation which promote a tradition and after certain century’s peoples makes belief that offering, receiving or soliciting a valuable thing is a part of our tradition. That’s why there is strong correlation among both, because of corrupt officials, just for few favorable benefits the entire forest department and forestry sector remains to put is at stake (Bettinger, 2015).

**Statement of the problem**

Forests are beliefs to be environmental pre request for the life on earth. Forests are belief to be the earth’s lungs. Their environmental benefit ranges from purification of air, erosion control, regulation of water cycle and bio diversity conservation. In addition, forests provide livelihood supports to local communities in term of meeting their timber firewood, grazing and other non-timber products related needs. Sale and export at commercial level has put some social groups, out of their greed, manipulate laws, exercise illegalities, promote corruption and encourage bribery to get maximum benefits out of these finite natural resources. The obvious effects of these illegal activities are the forest degradation and deforestation in one side and unmet legal needs of the local communities on other side. This research study is an effort to find out the perception of local communities regarding bribery related to forest governance in the area, and how is it linked with forest governance system.

**Research Objectives**

1. To understand the role and meaning of bribery in poor forest governance.
2. To explore the respondent’s perception regarding bribery.
3. To ascertain the perception of the respondents regarding poor forest governance.

**METHODOLOGY**

Study universe consist of union council Pir Khail, Agra, and Totae of Tehsil Batkhela District Malakand, Khyber Pukhtunkhwa, Pakistan. The area of the study consisted of three villages i.e. Pir Khail, Agra, Totae. Household heads of the selected villages were the impeding respondents for this research study. As per office record of Election Commission of Pakistan at Batkhela, the study area comprises of 5776 household. A sample of 357 respondents suffices for 5776 households (Sekaran, 2003). For the collection of data random sampling
technique was used. Sample was proportionally allocated to each union council by using proportional allocation formula (Cochran, 1977).

A conceptual framework was conceived as show in Table 1 questions was asked from the respondents accordingly conceived Likert scale. The dependent variable (forest governance) was indexed and cross tabulated with independent variable (Bribery). To measure the association between two variables chi-square test was used as a tool. Below statistical procedure was implemented to sort out the value of chi-square test (Tai, 1978) and bi-variate level was used through the formula as below.

\[
\chi^2 = \sum \sum \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}
\]

Table 1 Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bribery</td>
<td>Poor Forest governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Frequency and percentage distributions regarding bribery in poor forest governance

Bribery is paying to a public position holder for performing a legal or illegal taste. It is a common social evil in all developing nation. The menace of bribery has diffused to forestry sector where legitimate rights of people are abstracted for paying of bribe. To access the perception of people of bribery in forest governance, the perception of bribery as limited too few statements as given in table 4.3.3. The results show that a high proportion of 46.5% of the respondents agreed that People pay bribe to forest staff for cutting trees from forest. Similarly, 31.4% negated the statement and 22.1% were indecisive. Additionally, 30.8% of the respondents accepted that people pay bribe to forest staff for collecting firewood from forest followed by 50.4% of the respondents rejected the statements. Likewise, 18.8% of the respondents were unsure about the statement. The result further show that, most of the respondents (36.1%) were of the view that People pay bribe to forest staff for grazing their animals in forest and 51.0% of the respondents do not agreed with the statement while 12.9% of the respondents were hesitant about that People pay bribe to forest staff for grazing their animals in forest. Besides, high proportion of 45.2% of the respondents argue that people pay bribe to forest staff for collecting non timber forest products and 42.0% of the respondents were negated about the statement. Likewise, 12.9% of the respondents were indecisive about it. Forest dependent communities have their own needs for timber, firewood and grazing etc. to meet these needs the community use legal methods of permit or illegal way of theft. In some cases community members pay bribes to officials for getting things done. This statement was supported by HRNGO (2009) stated that loggers routinely pay bribe to avoid obtaining proper license and to cut and transport timber and where local officials face no failure of consequences.

The result further show that, Most of the 50.4% of the respondents were of the perception that bribe payment to forest staff is necessary for getting timber permit while 36.7% negate and 12.9% of the respondents were unsure about it. Additionally, high proportion of 33.1% of the respondents were accept that people cannot meet their basic need until they pay bribe to forest staff followed by 40.1% of the respondents deny about it. Likewise, 29.9% of the respondents were hesitant about it. Additionally, majority 48.2% of the respondents accepted that those who pay bribe to forest staff can get their forest needs in excess followed by 30.0% of the respondent disagreed with the statement that those who pay bribe to forest staff can get their forest needs in excess while some of the respondents (21.8%) were uncertain about it. Furthermore, 45.9% respondents viewed that loggers pay bribe to cut in excess of the legal permit, likewise, 24.9% of the respondents were negate about the statements also 29.9% were unclear that loggers pay bribe to cut in excess of the legal permit. Bribe payment in forest governance is common where bribe is paid for multiple purposes. Some of the community members pay bribe to have access to forest resources like timber, firewood and graeuses etc. illegally. Others pay bribe to get benefits in access to their due right like harvesting timber above the recommended quantities. The logger pay also bribes to cut trees in access to the prescription. Collister (1999) reported that besides grand corruption the petty corruption is common in forestry sector. The forest users pay bribe to the officials for their local needs. The cumbersome procedure for getting permits is the main cause to compel the community members to pay bribe. Eggert and Loking (2008) stated that amount of bribe increases with rank of official.

Similarly, 43.3% of the respondents agreed with the statements that through bribe one can get a false timber permit, 24.9% refused about it followed by 30.8 who were uncertain about the statement that through bribe one can get a false timber permit. In addition, 35.0% of the respondents accepted that through bribe one can impose false
changes of forest offenses on opponents, 33.6% negated the statement while 31.4% were indeterminate about the statement. In addition, high proportion of 54.9% respondents acknowledged that those who pay bribe are more powerful, 27.5% of the respondents deny about the statement that those who pay bribe are more powerful, and 17.6% of the respondents were unpredictable about it. Bribe payment is not only a source of getting access to the resources but it is also misused for getting power and damaging the opponents. The factices used for this purpose include getting permits on fake identity and damaging opponents by paying bribe to forest officers to chalk damage report against the opponents. Betinger’s (2015) finding support these results that people on higher range of social statuses pay bribe to the forest officer’s to damage the opponent. In this way they manage to overpower the opponents, destroy their political power and capture their resources.

It is evident from these results that the people belief that bribery is common in forest governance. For every petty forest use, legal or illegal, the people paid bribe. Moreover, to gain an over edge over opponents the paid bribe to forest officer’s and solicited their help to use forest resources over and above the legal prescription or to use others share of resource illegality.

**Frequency and percentage distributions regarding bribery in forest governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People pay bribe to forest staff for cutting trees from forest</td>
<td>166(46.5)</td>
<td>112(31.4)</td>
<td>79(22.1)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People pay bribe to forest staff for collecting firewood from forest</td>
<td>110(30.8)</td>
<td>180(50.4)</td>
<td>67(18.8)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People pay bribe to forest staff for grazing their animals in forest</td>
<td>129(36.1)</td>
<td>182(51.0)</td>
<td>46(12.9)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People pay bribe to forest staff for collecting non timber forest products</td>
<td>161(45.2)</td>
<td>150(42.0)</td>
<td>46(12.9)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribe payment to forest staff is necessary for getting timber permit</td>
<td>180(50.4)</td>
<td>131(36.7)</td>
<td>46(12.9)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People cannot meet their basic need until they pay bribe to forest staff</td>
<td>118(33.1)</td>
<td>143(40.1)</td>
<td>96(26.9)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who pay bribe to forest staff can get their forest needs in excess</td>
<td>172(48.2)</td>
<td>107(30.0)</td>
<td>78(21.8)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loggers pay bribe to cut in excess of the legal permit</td>
<td>164(45.9)</td>
<td>89(24.9)</td>
<td>104(29.1)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through bribe one can get a false timber permit</td>
<td>158(44.3)</td>
<td>89(24.9)</td>
<td>110(30.8)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through bribe one can impose false changes of forest offenses on opponents</td>
<td>125(35.0)</td>
<td>120(33.6)</td>
<td>112(31.4)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who pay bribe are more powerful</td>
<td>196(54.9)</td>
<td>98(27.5)</td>
<td>63(17.6)</td>
<td>357(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number in table represent frequencies and number in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents.*

**Association between forest governance and bribery**

In corrupt system it is very hard to get our work done, legal or illegal, without payment of some amount to solicit favor of the concerns officers. Therefore grease money and sweetener are some additional names used to describe bribery. Payment of bribe is easy way to side sleeps the rules and gets the due or undue benefits with least discomfort. These, however, point to existing flaws in the governing system of any organization. Association of forest governance and bribery given in table 4.3.3 and explain below.

The result show that forest governance and paying bribes for cutting trees have highly significant (P=0.000) association. In addition, a highly significant association (P=0.000) association was found between forest governance and paying bribes for firewood collection from the forest. Similarly forest governance had a highly significant (P=0.000) association with paying bribes for grazing animals in forest. Forest dependent communities have multiple forest uses ranging from timber firewood grasses, and other associated resources obtained from the forest. Some of these resources are collected daily basis while other forest uses take long time for its occurrence. The livelihood of poor communities is highly dependent on use of these resources. The forest staffs on the other hand are the custodians of these forest resources and control its management. In lean situation the community members get excess to limited forest resources by paying bribes to forest officer’s which in intern hinder the forest governance process. HRNGO (2009) reported that payment of bribe is to the forest officers is common throughout developing work there is a reciprocal relationship between paying bribes and poor forest governance.

The association result further show that forest governance had highly significant (P=0.000) association with inability to meet forest related needs without paying bribes to forest officers. Likewise, getting in excess of forest need had highly significant (P=0.000) association with forest governance. Similarly, forest governance had highly significant (P=0.000) association with loggers pay bribe to cut in excess of the legal permit. Forest is the main source of subsistence for poor forest dependent communities the living of poor segment is almost entirely dependent on forest resource uses. The poor segment, however, have to pay bribe to get excess to their basic forest needs. Moreover, there is a simple thumb rule that the more you pay as bribe to the forest officer’s the more you can use the forest resources in excess to the legal allowable limit given in the permits. These results are validated by Collister, (1999) who reported...
that forest user pay bribe to the forest officers to meet their forest related needs some of the very legal requirements of the people like timber and firewood permits are not issued until the payment of the bribe. The forest officials used such tactics that forces the community to pay bribe.

The result further show that forest governance had highly significant (P=0.000) association with getting false timber permit through putting bribe. In addition, forest governance was found to have highly significant (P=0.000) association with imposing false forest offense charging on opponents by paying bribe. Likewise, forest governance was significantly (P=0.000) association with those who pay bribe are most powerful. Paying bribe seem like has been institutionalized into the local cultural people not only paying bribe to get due or undue forest benefits but bribery is also used to express own power or destroy the enemies by imposing false changes on them through use of government agencies like forest department. As a result the governance of forest is deteriorating day by day and the forest resources squeezing enormously. Eggert & Locana, (2000) also found that paying bribe has become a power ticktack that is used to get the undue help of government agencies in favor of personnel gain and eliminating or controlling enemies.

Contrary to above the association of forest governance was non-significant (P=0.093) with paying bribe for collecting non timber forest products and getting timber permits (P=0.558). Collection of non-timber forest products is still free and not brought under any forest regulation because of which there is no restriction of these products.

In poor forest governance system bribes are paid to get excess to due and undue forest related rights. Some of the forest uses like timber, firewood collection and grazing etc. or permissible to the right holders and connectionist on legal permits other forest uses like control grass cutting and collection non-timber forest products is free. The custodies of the forest don’t allow such legal uses to compel the users to get bribe. In addition, those who pay bribe insist on illegal cutting of forest resources aver and above the prescribe limits. Paying of bribe, therefore, is symbolized as power and those who pay bribe are most powerful to the worst, bribe is paid to drag the opponent into the court of law by charging false reports against them with the convenience of forest staff. In these worse scenarios of bribery the forest governance gets extremely miserable state.

### Association between forest governance and bribery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Forest Governance</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi-Square(χ²)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People pay bribe to forest staff for cutting trees from forest</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17(4.8)</td>
<td>131(36.7)</td>
<td>18(5.0)1</td>
<td>166(46.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14(3.9)</td>
<td>84(23.5)</td>
<td>14(3.9)</td>
<td>112(31.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>4(1.1)</td>
<td>44(12.3)</td>
<td>31(8.7)</td>
<td>79(22.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People pay bribe to forest staff for collecting firewood from forest</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6(1.7)</td>
<td>93(26.1)</td>
<td>11(3.1)</td>
<td>110(30.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>29(8.1)</td>
<td>130(36.4)</td>
<td>21(5.9)</td>
<td>180(50.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>36(10.1)</td>
<td>31(8.7)</td>
<td>67(18.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People pay bribe to forest staff for grazing their animals in forest</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14(3.9)</td>
<td>131(31.7)</td>
<td>20(5.6)</td>
<td>129(36.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15(4.2)</td>
<td>127(35.6)</td>
<td>40(11.2)</td>
<td>182(51.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>6(1.7)</td>
<td>19(5.3)</td>
<td>21(5.9)</td>
<td>46(12.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People pay bribe to forest staff for collecting non timber forest products</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15(4.2)</td>
<td>127(35.6)</td>
<td>19(5.3)</td>
<td>161(45.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16(4.5)</td>
<td>99(27.6)</td>
<td>35(9.8)</td>
<td>150(42.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>4(1.1)</td>
<td>33(9.2)</td>
<td>9(2.5)</td>
<td>46(12.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribe payment to forest staff is necessary for getting timber permit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20(5.6)</td>
<td>134(37.5)</td>
<td>26(7.3)</td>
<td>180(50.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11(3.3)</td>
<td>92(25.8)</td>
<td>28(7.8)</td>
<td>131(36.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>4(1.1)</td>
<td>33(9.2)</td>
<td>9(2.5)</td>
<td>46(12.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Forest governance is facing immense threat from illegitimate practices that are underway in the forest sector. Payment of bribe at micro level for getting undue benefits from forests in term of timber, firewood; grazing and grass cutting besides getting favor in term of relaxation in law is common. To the dismay, it is now a strong cultural belief that no right can be accessed without paying bribe. Therefore, people pay bribe for getting access to basic admissible right to permits for local use. Payment of bribe provide strength to local elite to over use the forest and control the marginalized group through involving forest staff and chalking false damage reports on innocent poor people, hence, bringing forest governance to extremely miserable state. Strengthening the forest staff by providing them the facilities and power, besides, enhancing financial benefits in terms of salaries and rewards to forest staff so that the honest forest officers are in better position to overpower forceful forest offences and rejects bribes offered to them.

Revisiting the policies and laws for forest governance to plug the loopholes in the forest governance issues besides, implementation of the laws in its true spirit so that those officers/officials/offenders that are involved in forest destruction are easily noticed, apprehended and punished under the law without any discrimination. Involvement of local communities in forest management related decision making processes through use of integrated participatory approaches right from identification of problem, assessment of available resources, planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and benefits distribution stages of forest governance issues. So that these communities develop a sense of ownership in forest governance and protect the forest from destruction while controlling the illegitimate practices. Empowering the communities in making local level forest management and use decision like timber, firewood and grass cutting related uses while taking technical guideline from forest department staff under the transparent and auditable benefits distribution system.

*Values in the table present frequency while values in the parenthesis represent percentages proportion of the respondents
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