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Abstract

Corruption is an increasingly important factor in development. Despite a range of initiatives to address the issue, few anti-corruption initiatives to date have had a positive impact. Popular definitions of corruption are reductive, normative, and economics-based, and common ways of addressing corruption are also deficient. In addition, local contextual factors are often not taken into consideration in anti-corruption initiatives. The present study focuses on the most influential non-governmental organization in the anti-corruption industry, Transparency International (TI). The study is based on a social constructivist approach to knowledge and employs a combination of Norman Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis and Philipp Mayring’s qualitative content analysis to a single TI initiative to answer the question Do Transparency International’s youth anti-corruption initiatives neglect local contextual factors? The study’s findings are inconclusive: Social actors’ agency is encouraged, but cultural norms are neglected.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Research Aim

Corruption can lower efficiency, damage investment climates and growth levels, increase inequality, jeopardize the legitimacy of public institutions, and subvert support for democratic reform and civic participation (Brown & Cloke, 2004, pp. 273-274). Further, a number of empirical studies report that corruption significantly increases income inequality (e.g., Li et al, 2000; Gupta et al, 2002). Effects of corruption in relation to development include “distorted development priorities, increased exploitation, … and heightened uncertainty” (Haller & Shore, 2006, p. 7). Corruption is thus an important factor in development discourse, and it is increasingly treated as such. Today, the anti-corruption movement plays a key role in development discourse, but it has also received criticism:

‘Corruption’, but more particularly the anti-corruption lobby that has expanded so dramatically in recent years, needs closer examination. Riding on a wave of righteous virtue, anti-corruption talk comes from diverse quarters and, for many, is unquestionable. Indeed, to do so is slightly heretical; corruption is so obviously harmful that querying this is equivalent to excusing immorality. (Harrison, 2007, p. 263)

This study will contribute to the academic literature on corruption and development, which, according to Walton (2013, p. 73), has yet to address concerns including the connections between anti-corruption organizations and neo-liberalism and the interests being served by dominant discourses of corruption. Specifically, this research will analyze an initiative of the most important non-governmental anti-corruption organization, Transparency International (TI), to determine how the organization frames its anti-corruption education for school children. Using Norman Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis as the primary method and qualitative content analysis as the secondary method to analyze Students Against Corruption – Handbook for Anti-Corruption Education in High Schools, my aim is to critique TI’s anti-corruption education to gain insights into how it is dispersed into society at large.
1.2 Motivation for This Research

My interest in the study of corruption derives from my experience in the anti-corruption industry: I work for a company that specializes in anti-corruption knowledge and training. As part of my job, I create e-learning courses for companies to ensure compliance with laws (such as the US Foreign Corrupt Practices 1977 and the UK Bribery Act 2010) that have extraterritorial reach (i.e., persons and/or companies can be prosecuted under these laws for corruption offences committed abroad).

In early 2014, I was part of a visit to Transparency International’s local chapter in Hungary (TI Hungary), where I first learned of anti-corruption initiatives aimed at children and youth. It was during this visit I received a copy of the *Students Against Corruption* handbook, which is the primary object of analysis in this research. My initial intention was to create a degree project as a combined academic and creative work that mapped a “best practices” of teaching children about corruption. The creative aspect was intended to be an interactive, scenario-based e-learning course for school-aged children in Hungary, with corruption-related real-world scenarios being supported by definitions of different forms of corruption and by explanations of the harm caused by corrupt acts.

However, I soon found a number of problems concerning my intended research. First, no “best practices” for teaching children about corruption exist. Transparency International (TI) did produce a *Teaching Integrity to Youth*\(^1\) booklet in 2004, but the booklet merely summarizes youth-based projects, and the only common thread between the projects was that their impact was difficult to measure (Meier, 2004, p. 4). And second, I was forced to question TI’s approach to corruption. The same booklet proclaims, “all contributions illustrate novel ways of changing attitudes and mindsets, when accompanied by necessary public sector reforms” (emphasis added) (Meier, 2004, p. 4). The focus on the public sector came as a surprise to me as I knew from my professional capacity that TI defined corruption as “the abuse of entrusted power for private gain.” The intention to reform the public sector is more the focus of international financial institutions (IFI) such as the World Bank, which defines corruption as “the abuse of public office for private gain.”

---

\(^1\) This booklet itself did not provide sufficient information on the initiatives for it to be used as empirical material in this study.
produce an e-learning course based on TI’s approach to teaching youth about corruption, I first needed to be clear on TI’s approach to corruption. It is from this perspective that the research for the present study began.

1.3 Research Question

Taking the above into consideration—but mostly driven from the findings of my literature review—I arrived at the following research question:

**Do Transparency International’s youth anti-corruption initiatives neglect local contextual factors?**

Guiding questions are to what extent does TI promote financial-based, institution-based, and local contextual solutions to corruption in its anti-corruption initiatives for youth. What is the balance between these factors? As will be shown, a tendency towards financial-based or institution-based solutions lessens the possibility for local contextual factors to be taken into account. Due to time and word-limit constraints, I have limited this study to just one TI youth anti-corruption initiative: TI Hungary’s *Students Against Corruption – Handbook for Anti-Corruption Education in High Schools*.

1.4 Relevance to the Field of Communication for Development and Social Change

In his influential work *Development Theory*, Nederveen Pieterse (2010) states, “corruption has been a familiar theme in development work but at each turn of the wheel it takes on a different meaning” (p. 16). There now exists a consensus that corruption is damaging to society, impacting the poor in particular (Brown, 2007, p. ix). Through the examination of an initiative by one of anti-corruption’s most significant actors, TI, this research seeks to critically study the theme of anti-corruption in today’s development “wheel” and to add to the literature that critically examines development’s corruption problem (Sampson, 2010, p. 273). Accordingly, this study is relevant to the field of Communication for Development and Social Change (ComDev) for a number of reasons, including the following.
First, by examining the initiatives of TI, the world’s largest anti-corruption non-governmental organization, this research will provide insights into the roles of actors and, more generally, into the undertaking of initiatives in contemporary development processes. TI’s role holds particular importance as the organization’s initiatives contribute significantly both to practical approaches to counter corruption and to research on the phenomenon (Andersson & Haywood, 2008, p. 760).

Second, academic assessments of corruption contend, “Some of the most interesting directions for thinking about corruption relate to … charting how discourses of corruption change over time and space” (Brown & Cloke, 2004, p. 285). Accordingly, ComDev is an ideal field to analyze the anti-corruption discourse, particularly because development assistance and FDI are factors influenced by TI’s perception measurements of corruption (Bracking & Ivanov, 2007, p. 298).

Third, donor agencies’ assessments of anti-corruption efforts also indicate a more thorough examination of anti-corruption is needed to provide better results. For instance, Norad’s (2009) research suggests increasing knowledge of the negative impact of corruption is only one aspect to be considered in anti-corruption interventions:

Typically the most difficult challenge [anti-corruption] development interventions have is transforming knowledge (‘this is what corruption is and does’) into new attitudes (‘corruption is bad’) and from there to new behaviour or practices (‘I will no longer engage in corrupt practices’). (p. 55)

It thus follows that this research may provide knowledge on a relatively new form of anti-corruption intervention: Those that target youth. Children are increasingly seen as important actors in development (Ansell, 2005, p. 51), so insights into children as actors in development processes will be of use for future research in the ComDev field.

Finally, there are many other scholarly assertions that link this study to the field of ComDev, including arguments that there exists a paternalistic slant in how corruption in the global South is characterized (Brown & Cloke, 2004, p. 280); that anti-corruption actors exercise power either in a culturally relative or in a universal manner, depending on their needs (Bracking, 2007, p. 15); that corruption’s “specific neoliberal conception has fulfilled significant ideological and political functions within the post-Washington consensus (Bedirhanoglu, 2007, p. 1240); and that some
NGO initiatives that have sought to debunk myths concerning corruption in development have instead validated such myths (Dogra, 2012, p.75).

Nederveen Pieterse (2010) wishes to define development not as improvement, as it had hitherto been considered in relation to, but as collective learning (p. 182). I contend that because studies reveal donor-supported anti-corruption initiatives have had little success (Norad, 2009, p. 9), it is time for us all to collectively learn more about corruption and anti-corruption processes, actors, and agendas in development. Further, Critical Discourse Analysis is an ideal method to study these factors, for it “does not understand itself as politically neutral, but as a critical approach politically committed to social change” (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2008, p. 64). Harrison (2007) argues “like all discourses, that of anti-corruption does not exist in an institutional vacuum: it is used and developed by particular actors and demonstrates particular sets of practices” (p. 261). It follows that ComDev is an ideal field to reveal and critique trends in anti-corruption discourse.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Defining Corruption

A complete history of the notion of corruption is beyond the scope of this paper. As will be inferred, such an overview is worthy of an entire research project. Suffice it to say corruption is a contested concept: It can be conceived differently depending on one’s perspective: Moral, political, social, and economic definitions of the term would each be different and would perhaps even conflict with other definitions. The purpose of this subsection is to outline some of these definitions—not to point to a ‘most correct’ definition but to demonstrate that different definitions of the term by different actors or in different fields have consequences. In this sense, this research adopts a post-positivist approach that is framed by social constructivism: What is corrupt is only what is believed to be corrupt at a certain place and time (de Graaf, Wagenaar & Hoenderboom, 2010, p. 99), as described in the Theory and Methodology section of this paper. This section will clearly show the term “corruption” is problematic, giving credence both to this study overall and to the use of critical discourse analysis as the method to be employed.

There is widespread agreement that there is “no adequate one-line definition of corruption and its multi-faceted nature mean that there probably never will be” (Brown & Cloke, 2004, p. 284); however, this does not stop most actors in the anti-corruption industry from utilizing a one-line definition. The most important actor in the anti-corruption movement, the World Bank, defines corruption as “the abuse of public office for private gain”; TI, the most influential anti-corruption NGO, defines the term as “the abuse of entrusted power for private gain,” and aid agencies adopt a similar approach. For instance, the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) in its literature review of anti-corruption approaches defines corruption as “the abuse of entrusted authority for illicit gain” (2009, p. 11). Thus, despite agreement that one-line definitions of the term should be avoided, all major anti-corruption actors adopt such an approach.

All definitions by actors in the anti-corruption movement share one common feature: The word “abuse.” Rothstein (2011) argues modern definitions of corruption all suffer from the same problem: “Abuse” infers that something is abused against a normative standard (p. 230). This normative standard is important to consider, for
corruption is not only a set of practices: it is a normative concept, too (Harrison, 2010, p. 262). Different cultural or political contexts may interpret the norm of corruption in different ways (Debiel & Gawrich, 2013, p. 2). Even though the norms defining what corruption is vary (de Graaf, von Maravic & Wagenaar, 2010, p. 13), “many of the generic definitions of political corruption which underpin the approach of international anti-corruption agencies are based upon an implicit understanding of ‘proper’ politics as being Western-style liberal democracies” (Andersson & Haywood, 2008, p. 750). Hence, the normative standard that permeates anti-corruption efforts is a distinctively Western standard. This is made clear through the widespread criticism of the most commonly used interpretation: The World Bank’s definition (i.e., the abuse of public office for private gain).

The World Bank’s definition was produced by economist Susan Rose-Ackerman, who sought not to deny the normative or cultural differences of corruption but to make clear “as an economist … when the legacy of the past no longer fits modern conditions” (Rose-Ackermann in Hindess, 2013, p. 2). There are criticisms from all academic and non-academic disciplines towards this definition, the most notable of which is summed up by Brown and Cloke (2004), who contend this definition inherently includes a neoliberal approach both that favors market-led economic reforms and that is critical of the state (p. 283). Bedirhanoglu (2007) goes even further, arguing this approach to the term is “a-historic, biased, contradictory and politicised, and has been induced by concerns over market competition rather than morality” (p. 1239).

While an extensive examination of the merits on the debate on corruption’s definition is beyond the scope of this paper, there are three aspects to be kept in mind as this paper progresses. First, the World Bank’s definition is the most widely used. This is problematic as, as Harrison (2010) states, “More complicated views or definitions [of corruption] become reduced to short phrases with strong rhetorical quality, which become accepted as truths and articles of faith” (p. 259). This acceptance of truth is important, particularly as critical discourse analysis is the method of analysis in this research. Moreover, short-phrase definitions of corruption limit understanding “of the complexities of even defining corruption in different political and cultural settings” (Brown & Cloke, 2004, p. 289). Second, almost all actors in the anti-corruption industry define corruption in economic terms (Gephart, 2014, p. 2): This will be important to keep in mind when examining TI’s role in the
movement. And finally, the definitions of corruption by TI and Norad—which substitute “public office” with “entrusted power” and “entrusted authority” respectively—considerably broaden the net of potential corrupt acts by allowing corruption to take place anywhere in society: “Corruption is now potentially possible in any organisation of entrusted power (private firms, government, NGOs, international organisations)” (Sampson, 2010, p. 267).

A final point to be conveyed here is that corruption is not a singular entity; it is a term “used as a basic descriptor for a myriad of behaviours loosely linked by some sense of the breaking of laws, illicit personal enrichment or the abuse of power/privilege” (Brown & Cloke, 2004, p. 280). These behaviors include bribery, embezzlement, patronage and nepotism, among others, but this paper is less interested in how these different forms of corruption are conceived than it is with how and by which actors the problem of corruption is addressed.

In sum, there is consensus that current definitions of corruption are reductive, encourage Western norms, and favor blanket, economics-based solutions. This last point will now be examined.

2.2 Addressing Corruption

There are two main theories that have guided attempts to explain corruption: The principal-agent approach and the collective action approach. The former, which is the most influential, envisages the problem as follows: “Corruption arises in the public sector due to transfer of responsibility and imperfect monitoring. … Hence the agent may abuse his position for personal gain” (Forgues-Puccio, 2013, p. 2). However, this approach assumes without question the existence of a benevolent principal, which may not be the case and should not be assumed (Rothstein, 2011, p. 230; Persson, Rothstein, & Teorell, 2013, p. 450). Further, “if corruption did work according to the ‘principal–agent’ model, it would be easy to erase just by changing the incentives.” (Rothstein, 2011, p. 231). The criticism of this approach makes clear its failure to adequately address corruption.

The collective action approach suggests all agents know they would gain from not being corrupt, yet none can trust that other agents will not be corrupt; as a result,

---

2 These approaches may be named differently, such as ‘rational-choice and legal-rational’ conceptualizations (e.g., Gephart, 2014, p. 6) or ‘interactional and structural’ approaches (e.g., Shore & Haller, 2005, p.3), but they boil down to the same overarching theories.
corruption must be erased through collective action, such as by establishing institutions with the effect of discouraging corruption (Rothstein, 2011, p. 231). The primary issue with this approach is that “establishing these institutions is in itself a collective action problem” (ibid.), meaning this approach can more often than not be successfully implemented. These two theories demand radically different solutions to corruption (Lamour & Wolanin, 2013, p. xiii; Persson, Rothstein, & Teorell, 2013, p. 450), but each has significant drawbacks.

These two approaches have largely been adhered to in academia, with economics and political science being the dominant fields studying corruption (Pearson, 2013, p. 30). Economic studies see corruption as “one way among several of allocating scarce resources, where the rational behaviour of market actors in respect to incentives and rents explains corruption outcomes” (Bracking, 2007, p. 10), thus aligning corruption with the principal-agent approach. Political science adheres more to the collective action approach: It “tends to define and explain corruption within the ambit of the abuse of public trust and power,” thus advocating institutional change (Bracking, 2007, p. 7). At a basic level, the object of analysis in this research appears to conform to the collective action approach in that it is produced for use in schools, but its content could be more focused towards the principal-agent approach. Both approaches largely neglect local contextual factors as both are generalized solutions to the issue of corruption. To better understand how corruption is addressed in practice, and to move closer to the object of study in this research, I will now turn to the anti-corruption industry.

2.3 The Emergence of the Anti-Corruption Industry

Mapping the dominant ideas associated with anti-corruption from post-World War II until the present is useful not only to make clear the term’s change in meaning and usage in relation to the development industry but also to introduce how corruption is addressed in practice.

Anti-corruption’s connection to development is complex. The different uses of the notion of corruption in development discourse throughout history reveal the meaning of the term has changed considerably, with different actors using their power to shape meaning over time. In the 1960s, it was widely thought that corruption could
contribute to development by encouraging investment (Williams, 1999, p. 487). The first significant event to change this view of corruption was the 1977 enactment of the US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, the first law to penalize corrupt behavior in foreign transactions; it targeted corruption by US companies in foreign countries (Sampson, 2013, p. 273). Following this, the US tried to get corruption onto the international agenda to level the playing field for US firms in an increasingly international marketplace, marking “the beginnings of an international movement to combat corruption” (Pearson, 2013, p. 42).

This movement then lay dormant for many years; the most accepted reason for this is because the West supported corrupt dictators to contain communism during the Cold War (Ivanov, 2007, p. 31). Indeed, the movement sprung into action after the Cold War ended, with international donors and the IFIs incorporating anti-corruption work into their operations (Bracking, 2007, p. 16). The US not only led negotiations on the first international convention on corruption, the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials (1998), it also used public pressure to encourage European governments to adopt anti-bribery rules (Ivanov, 2007, p. 30). Once the OECD Convention came into force, the major IFIs—the World Bank and the International Monetary Foundation (IMF)—soon prescribed deregulation as part of their conditions for loans under the guise of anti-corruption (ibid., p. 31).

Following this, corruption is today commonly understood in economic terms in relation to both its content and its effects (Hindess, 2013, p. 1). Accordingly, estimates of its costs are primarily measured in terms of money. Over 5% of global gross domestic product (GDP) believed to be lost due to corrupt acts, and more than USD 1 trillion is thought to be paid in bribes each year (Kimeu, 2014, p. 231). In addition, the World Bank now “contributes significantly to knowledge production in the corruption discourse and exerts enormous influence through its lending practices” (Gephart, 2014, p. 1). Lamour and Wolanin (2013) summarize the current understanding of corruption by the following five characteristics: “It is international, economic, less patient with cultural explanations, suspicious of state action, and as much concerned with education and prevention as with investigation and prosecution” (p. xi-xii). This economic focus has played a large part in corruption being framed as an institutional issue “increasingly divorced from its local context” (Ivanov, 2007, p. 34). More generally, corruption is today used as an important signifier both in political discourse and in development discourse (Bracking, 2007, p. 12).
While the above section described the emergence of anti-corruption in a general sense, the movement came to form an industry after two important events took place: Both are centered around the major institution of third world development, The World Bank. The first is the founding, in 1993 of the NGO TI by a former World Bank official, Peter Eigen, and several colleagues from international development, business and diplomacy. The second is the famous ‘cancer of corruption’ speech by World Bank President James Wolfensohn in 1996, in which the agenda of economic development was tied together with the effectiveness of government, leading to new conditions of loans. (Sampson, 2010, pp. 273-274)

These two events combined marked the beginning of the anti-corruption industry’s rise in the international development agenda, leading to “an industry of consultants, organisations, and technologies bounded in the discourse of combat and high moral velocity” (Bracking, 2007, p. 3).

The international finance institutions (IFIs)—the World Bank and the IMF—led the industry’s development, using corruption to explain poor market-reform results of previous IFI programs (Ivanov, 2007; Abraham, Chaudhuri, & Munshi, 2009). Today, the IFIs remain at the forefront of the anti-corruption industry, but academic criticism of their role is growing. Deregulation, privatization (and the reduction of the public sector), and the reduction of public spending are all inherent in the IFIs anti-corruption programs (Gephart, 2014; Bracking, 2007; Abraham, Chaudhuri, & Munshi, 2009; Sampson, 2010; Ivanov, 2007), so many scholars contend the anti-corruption industry promotes policy that is primarily interested in enforcing a neoliberal economic agenda into the architecture of aid (e.g., Harrison, 2007) and into governance more generally (e.g., Bedirhanoglu, 2007; Bracking, 2007; Gephart, 2014; Haller & Shore, 2006). The IFIs anti-corruption efforts still largely derive from the logic of the principal-agent approach (Persson, Rothstein, & Teorell, 2013).

Apart from the IFIs, the other most-important actor in the anti-corruption industry is TI, which spreads anti-corruption efforts by different means and to different countries (Jakobi, 2013, p. 248). TI is emblematic of the anti-corruption industry’s push for a larger role for civil society in countering corruption (Ivanov, 2007, p. 37). TI has increased awareness of corruption, perhaps contributing to what Sampson (2010, p. 262) argues is the ongoing expansion of the anti-corruption industry despite anti-corruption programs having little impact, which is well-documented (see, e.g., Ivanov, 2007; Norad, 2011; Persson, Rothstein, & Teorell, 2013). Arguably, as Harrison (2007) asserts, the most significant “success” of these efforts has been an increase in anti-corruption rhetoric, which may in fact increase the
perceived problem of corruption (p. 260). This success has led to what Jakobi (2013) refers to as a “global norm” of fighting corruption (p. 243). Similarly, Sampson (2010) calls for the need to “critically examine the consequences of the global institutionalisation of anti-corruptionist discourse and anti-corruption practice” (p. 261). This research will, in part, address this need. First, though, it is necessary to outline the debate on Transparency International’s role in the anti-corruption industry.

2.4 Transparency International’s Role in the Anti-Corruption Industry

TI is the most important actor outside of the international financial institutions in the anti-corruption industry (Gephart, 2014; Ivanov, 2007) and has arguably led the internationalization of controlling corruption (Lamour & Wolanin, 2013; Pearson, 2013). Founded in 1993, TI is an NGO launched by “former World Bank officers, aid experts, diplomats and businessmen” and has led the way in terms of making corruption visible and transforming it into a risk in the business world; it “cooperates closely with and receives funding from international business through its national chapters” (Krause Hansen, 2010, p. 259). It also receives support from Western government donors and continuously cooperates with these donors in fundraising and advising activities (Harrison, 2007; Sampson, 2010, p. 275); its annual budget is estimated to be between USD 8-10 million (Sampson, 2010). Today, TI has national chapters in over 100 countries; a charter regulates the relations between the individual country chapters and the secretariat (Kimeu, 2014, p. 232). The secretariat reviews each national chapter every three years, losing the right to use TI’s logo and name if they fall short of TI standards (ibid., p. 236).

TI has a number of well-known anti-corruption initiatives. Among them, the most famous are the Global Corruption Barometer, which measures citizen perceptions of corruption in number of sectors in a given country; National Integrity Studies, which assess corruption in different sectors; the Bribe Payers’ Index, which asks citizens which sectors they pay bribes in; international anti-corruption conferences; anti-corruption legal aid centers to support whistle-blowers; and Corruption Fighters’ Toolkits to help individuals or organizations “fight” corruption (Harrison, 2007; Sampson, 2010). Without question, however, the most influential of TI’s anti-corruption initiatives is the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI), published annually.
The CPI has been criticized for a number of reasons. Donors use of the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) to justify their own anti-corruption initiatives has drawn criticism because the CPI measures only perceptions, not practices, of corruption (Harrison, 2007, p. 259). Jakobi (2013) argues this is problematic because “people subjectively tend to feel more insecure than they objectively are” (p. 255). The most important aspect of the CPI in relation to this study is that it is based not on TI’s own definition of corruption but on the World Bank’s: accordingly, it focuses only on the public sector (Andersson & Haywood, 2008, p. 749). There is much criticism of the CPI; for instance, Ivanov (2007) contends the CPI, despite its problematic methodology based on perceptions, allows economists to “produce econometric studies in support of the largely neoliberal economic agenda” (p. 28). Without adopting as strong language, Andersson and Haywood (2008) agree, stating the economist-driven study of corruption favors quantitative approaches (p. 755). Debiel and Gawrich (2013) warn that empirical findings in research on corruption must be treated with caution as almost all are based primarily on perception-based indices like the CPI (p. 10). Further, Ivanov (2007) asserts framing corruption as an economic and institutional issue results in it being divorced from its local context (p. 34). Another important factor is that the CPI is used to measure government performance by a number of actors, such as journalists and academics (Sampson, 2010, p. 274). In addition, and despite TI’s public protestations, the CPI has since 2004 been part of the criteria for determining whether countries receive development funding from the US government (Ivanov, 2007, p. 35). Bracking (2007) asserts, when we consider development as a discourse, both that the meaning of corruption can be strategically fixed and that statistical data like that produced by the CPI results in abstracted and ahistorical information which supports the dominant view of reality (p. 14). Given all of the above information, I agree with Bracking’s assertion. In short, TI’s flagship anti-corruption initiative, the CPI, is based on perceptions of—not instances of—corruption, it uses a definition of corruption that not only conflicts with TI’s stated definition but also has strong links to a neoliberal economic agenda, and its results are appropriated and used by a range of actors in unintended ways.

2.5 Literature Review Summary

I have shown that current understandings of corruption are problematic in that they
are reductive, normative, and economics-based. I have also detailed the two most common forms of addressing corruption, which both generalize and omit considerations of local contextual factors. This was further evidenced through detailing the emergence of the anti-corruption movement, of which the IFIs and TI are the most influential actors. Finally, examining TI’s role in the anti-corruption industry reveals its initiatives warrant analysis, as shown by the (mis-)use of the CPI. All of these issues lend credence to the current study and to the use of CDA as the method of analysis. In analyzing the extent to which the empirical material in this research maintains or challenges these understandings, this research will provide new insights into TI’s role in the anti-corruption industry.
3. Theory and Methodology

3.1 Theoretical Framework

This research will take the form of a desktop study and is based upon a social constructivist approach to knowledge; it is formed on the assumption that social actors construct meaning and communicate this meaning to others (Hall, 2013, p. 11). This meaning changes over time and is never fixed (ibid, p. 17). Taking this approach demonstrates my awareness that language does not neutrally describe the external world, an important consideration in corruption research (de Graaf, Wagenaar & Hoenderboom, 2010, p. 103). Accordingly, this study adopts a post-positivist approach to research that is not after a single “truth” but that seeks to demonstrate what can be—and is—conceived as “true.” In relation to corruption, de Graaf, von Maravic and Wagenaar (2010) describe the post-positivist approach as follows:

Focusing on the perceptions of corruption reveals the social construction of reality. Empirical research therefore emphasizes the importance of narratives and arguments in understanding the subjective perspective of reality. (p. 19)

In this study, the empirical material forms what is in effect taken as Transparency International’s perspective of corruption, and the analysis serves to critique this reality in order to determine how young minds are being shaped through anti-corruption education. As mentioned, this education has the potential to form opinions on corruption as the empirical material’s target group is children, so it is worthwhile to detail how corruption—which is socially and historically constructed (de Graaf, Wagenaar & Hoenderboom, 2010, p. 101)—is detailed in the initiative.

Discourse is an important factor in this research and in social constructivism more generally. In short, discourse is about the production of knowledge through language (Hall, 2013) that shapes both how the world is understood and how things are done in the world (Rose, 2001). This shaping of knowledge is arguably the most significant part of discourse as I use it in this study: Discourse shapes knowledge both by determining what can and cannot be said about a certain topic—and in what ways:

Discourse ‘rules in’ certain ways of talking about a topic, defining an acceptable and intelligible way to talk, write, or conduct oneself, so also, by definition, it ‘rules out’, limits
and restricts other ways of talking, of conducting ourselves in relation to the topic or constructing knowledge about it. (Hall, 2013, p. 29)

The relevance of discourse to this study is manifold and will be further detailed throughout this chapter and, implicitly, throughout the whole paper.

3.2 Methods

Norman Fairclough (2003) states, “We cannot take the role of discourse in social practices for granted, it has to be established through analysis” (p. 205), and my chosen methods both question the role of discourse in social practices. As mentioned, this study takes a social constructivist approach; accordingly, it tends towards a qualitative approach of analysis. In this study, I use Norman Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis as the primary method of analysis, with support from Philipp Mayring’s qualitative content analysis.

First, I will briefly describe discourse analysis as a method, for it is a term that covers a vast range of methods of analysis (Gillen & Petersen, 2005, p. 146). Discourse analysis is a “qualitative type of analysis that explores the ways in which discourses give legitimacy and meaning to social practices and institutions,” allowing the text to be placed in relation to its context (Halperin & Heath, 2012, p. 309). As a method of inquiry, it promotes the understanding the wider context of a range of textual materials (Rose, 2001). Concerning corruption, a discourse analysis can “identify the rules and resources that set the boundaries of what can be said, thought, and done in a particular (organizational) context or situation” (de Graaf, Wagenaar & Hoenderboom, 2010, p. 103). Thus, it is a valid method to use not only to answer the research question but also to apply this knowledge to the wider context of the anti-corruption movement.

I chose qualitative content analysis because one part of the empirical material—the terms regarding corruption—would benefit from the systematic coding and categorizing process that qualitative content analysis affords. I chose another qualitative approach due to its appropriateness to the study of corruption, mentioned above. In addition, a quantitative content analysis does not allow for the consideration of some important aspects for this study: the context of text components, distinctive
individual cases and things omitted form the text (Ritsert in Kohlbaher, 2006, p. 11). Mayring’s approach to qualitative content analysis was chosen due to its comprehensiveness—it tries to “preserve the advantages of quantitative content analysis as developed within communication science and to transfer and further develop them to qualitative-interpretative steps of analysis” (Mayring, 2000, p. 1). Choosing this method also aligns with the theoretical framework of constructivism used in this study. For a study of this kind (i.e., a document analysis), qualitative content analysis suited as a method to arrive at statements on the subject matter (Mayring, 2014, p.50).

### 3.2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

Norman Fairclough’s (1992) Critical Discourse Analysis comprises a three-dimensional framework:

> Any discursive ‘event’ (i.e. any instance of discourse) is seen as being simultaneously a piece of text, an instance of discursive practice, and an instance of social practice. The ‘text’ dimension attends to language analysis of texts. The ‘discursive practice’ dimension … specifies the nature of the processes of text production and interpretation, for example which types of discourse (including ‘discourses’ in the more social-theoretical sense) are drawn upon and how they are combined. The 'social practice' dimension attends to issues of concern in social analysis such as the institutional and organizational circumstances of the discursive event and how that shapes the nature of the discursive practice, and the constitutive/constructive effects of discourse referred to above. (p. 4)

Using Fairclough’s terminology, the discursive event in this study is the booklet *Students Against Corruption – Handbook for anti-corruption education in high schools*. The “text” is the booklet’s contents; the “discursive practice” is TI Hungary’s production and dissemination of the booklet, as well as its reception by teachers and students; and the “social practice” is the broader anti-corruption movement.

Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was chosen because it is the most suitable form of discourse analysis for this research. As Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) state, it “represents, within the critical discourse analytical movement, the most developed theory and method for research in communication, culture and society” (p. 60). More generally, critical approaches—as opposed to regular

---

3 Ritsert’s original text is in German.
approaches—to discourse analysis allow for discursive practices to be foregrounded and to show “how discourse is shaped by relation of power and ideologies” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 12). Thus, this would potentially provide insights that non-critical discourse analyses would not. Fairclough draws from post-structuralist theorists such as Foucault, and Laclau and Mouffe, but he is somewhat critical of them for not offering a methodology for analysis of specific texts (Fairclough, 2002). Unlike the poststructuralists, CDA “engages in concrete, linguistic textual analysis of language use in social interaction” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, pp. 62-63). Again, given the empirical material being analyzed, CDA is appropriate as it is a body of text to be used in the social interactions of a school classroom. A final, yet just as important, difference concerns Fairclough’s use of the term discourse: Post-structuralist scholars generally treat all social practice as discourse, but in Fairclough’s CDA discourse is limited to semiotic systems such as language and images (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, p. 67).

A complete list of definitions of important terms in CDA is beyond the scope of this paper; nonetheless, I will provide information on the most relevant aspects to the present research. These are taken from Fairclough’s Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research. They are direct quotations, but some information and terms have been omitted to focus only on the elements relevant to this research. The original work should be referred to for complete understanding of the terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Preconstructed and taken-for-granted ways of dividing up parts of the world continuously generate particular ‘visions’ of the world, ways of seeing it, and acting upon it. Different discourses embody different classifications, so we can research the deployment as well as the challenging and contesting and mixing of classificatory schemes by analysing how discourses are drawn upon and articulated together in texts, and realized in representations, meanings and forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative and strategic action</td>
<td>Communicative action is action oriented to understanding and exchange of meanings, strategic action is action oriented to producing effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogicality</td>
<td>All texts (written as well as spoken) are dialogical, i.e., they set up in one way or other relations between different 'voices'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalence and difference</td>
<td>Social processes of classification can be seen as involving two simultaneous 'logics': a logic of difference which creates differences, and a logic of equivalence which subverts differences and creates new equivalences. This process can be seen as going on in texts: meaning-making involves putting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genres</td>
<td>A way of acting in its discourse aspect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genres</td>
<td>Different genres which are regularly linked together, involving systematic transformations from genre to genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre mixing</td>
<td>An aspect of the interdiscursivity of texts, and analysing allows us to locate texts within processes of social change and to identify the potentially creative and innovative work of social agents in texturing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical mood</td>
<td>The grammatical distinction between declarative sentences, interrogative sentences and imperative sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegemony</td>
<td>A particular way of conceptualizing power and the struggle for power in capitalist societies, which emphasizes how power depends on consent or acquiescence rather than just force, and the importance of ideology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>Ideologies are representations of aspects of the world which contribute to establishing and maintaining relations of power, domination and exploitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdiscursivity</td>
<td>Analysis of the interdiscursivity of a text is analysis of the particular mix of genres, of discourses, and of styles upon which it draws, and of how different genres, discourses or styles are articulated (or 'worked') together in the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertextuality</td>
<td>The intertextuality of a text is the presence within it of elements of other texts (and therefore potentially other voices than the author's own) which may be related to (dialogued with, assumed, rejected, etc.) in various ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimation</td>
<td>Any social order requires legitimation — a widespread acknowledgement of the legitimacy of explanations and justifications for how things are and how things are done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Much action and interaction in contemporary societies is 'mediated', which means that it makes use of copying technologies which disseminate communication and preclude real interaction between 'sender' and 'receiver'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>The modality of a clause or sentence is the relationship it sets up between author and representations — what authors commit themselves to in terms of truth or necessity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalization</td>
<td>A type of grammatical metaphor which represents processes as entities by transforming clauses (including verbs) into a type of noun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of discourse</td>
<td>A particular combination or configuration of genres, discourses and styles which constitutes the discoursal aspect of a network of social practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social actors</td>
<td>Participants in social processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events, practices and structures</td>
<td>Social structures define what is possible, social events constitute what is actual, and the relationship between potential and actual is mediated by social practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue of neutrality is important to visit, for CDA, as inferred by the word “critical,” is not a neutral method of analysis:
Critical discourse analysis does not, therefore, understand itself as politically neutral (as objectivist social science does), but as a critical approach which is politically committed to social change. In the name of emancipation, critical discourse analytical approaches take the side of oppressed social groups. Critique aims to uncover the role of discursive practice in the maintenance of unequal power relations. (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, p. 64)

This aspect of CDA may be problematic in this research as I am not explicitly attempting to emancipate anybody. The critical approach I am undertaking is an attempt to critique TI’s discursive practice to determine if social change does need to occur. If TI does neglect local contextual factors, it may be merely maintaining the status quo while promoting its own agenda; this is problematic as the status quo in the anti-corruption industry has not positively impacted development or led to social change, as explained in the Literature Review section. Moreover, the effects of unequal power relations alluded to above are considered ideological effects (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, p. 63); these effects, if found present in this study, could provide useful insights into the unequal power relations in development processes, which the anti-corruption industry is a part of. This issue will be revisited in the discussion section.

### 3.2.2 Qualitative Content Analysis

As this method is used only to complement this study’s primary research method, I will not go into great detail into its specifics; however, a brief overview is nonetheless warranted. One must choose between inductive category development and deductive category development when using this method (Mayring, 2000, p. 3). I chose a deductive approach as at the stage of implementing the qualitative content analysis—based on the findings of the literature review—I already knew the categories I was looking for, as described below in the research methodology section.

I chose qualitative content analysis as it provides a way to systematically categorize corruption-related terminology, of which there is a large range. As explained, corruption itself is an umbrella term under which any number of terms can be used and explained. Accordingly, a qualitative content analysis allows the material to be divided into content analytical units (Mayring, 2000, p. 3). This is relevant to the empirical material as the material contains definitions and explanations—indeed, most publications of this nature would require this element, so qualitative content analysis provides a platform to compare and contrast uses of corruption-related...
3.3 Research Methodology

First and foremost, it is important to note that Fairclough discourages blueprints for conducting discourse analysis. Each project should be approached in a manner appropriate to the research being undertaken (Fairclough, 1992, p. 225; Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, p. 76). Accordingly, I tailored my approach to try not only to suit my needs for the present research but also to create a methodology that can be utilized in similar studies in the future.

For CDA, I divided the empirical material into four categories: Introductory elements, general information and advice on corruption, specific information on corruption in Hungary and Slovenia, and other information. The idea behind categorizing the empirical material in this manner was to make it easy to replicate this study in the future. The introductory elements include all information in the booklet up to Chapter 1: The cover page, the inside cover page, the table of contents, and the introductory message. General information and advice on corruption is parts of the main body of the text that is not country-specific, while specific information on corruption in Hungary and Slovenia is parts of the main body of the text that discusses only corruption in the context of those countries. There was a little, but not much, overlap between these two categories. Finally, other information concerns all that could not be placed into one of the other categories. In this study, it comprised, for example, student-specific information and information for teachers.

Using these four categories as guides, I then analyzed the empirical material using Fairclough’s CDA terminology listed above and other, more general, forms of linguistic analysis (such as metaphors, wording, and grammar). I conducted this analysis using CDA’s three-dimensional framework, with the focus being on textual analysis and discursive practice in the Analysis section. The broader social practice was mostly taken into consideration in the Discussion section; this is appropriate given that social practice concerns the wider significance of the communicative event (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, p. 68).

For qualitative content analysis, I followed the framework proposed by Mayring (2014) and used his structuring deductive category assignment approach (pp.
The categories were formed with both the research question and the findings of the literature review in mind. Five categories were created:

1. Has a direct relation to corruption; favors contextual factors.
2. Has a direct relation to corruption; favors non-contextual factors.
3. Has a direct relation to corruption; favors neither contextual nor non-contextual factors.
4. Does not have a direct relation to corruption.
5. Is communicated incorrectly.

The coding rules implemented (ibid, pp. 95-96) are as follows: “relation to corruption” refers to the title of the key terms listed in the empirical material. An example of a term that has a direct relation to corruption is “bribery.” An example of a term without a direct relation to corruption is “democracy.” “Favors contextual factors” means local factors are emphasized, such as a school-based example like under nepotism: “e.g., a principal hires his/her daughter as a teacher even though she doesn’t have the necessary qualifications for the position, or other candidates have better qualifications than her.” “Favors non-contextual factors” means institutional issues are emphasized or public corruption is highlighted when private sector corruption could also have been in the definition; for example, “abusing entrusted power” uses a public sector employee in its definition: “When an official tells…”. Finally, category 3 refers to incidences when both contextual and non-contextual factors are detailed, cancelling each other out. For instance, “gift” refers to a public official yet includes school-based contextual example. Category five was formulated after trying to conduct the analysis in the four first categories. I found that some information in the booklet is factually incorrect; for example, under “whistleblower” it is stated that an example of this is when “a teacher reports to the authorities that the principal hired his/her daughter as the new teacher [instead of a more qualified applicant] … and in retaliation the principal fires the teacher” (emphasis added, p. 31). The italicized text does not relate to whistleblowing or a whistleblower.

### 3.4 Limitations

As detailed above (and implicitly throughout this study), this study warranted a qualitative approach of analysis. As such, the study’s findings will not be
generalizable. In addition, TI has over 100 national chapters across the world, so this empirical material cannot be said to be representative of all of TI’s youth anti-corruption initiatives—more examples would have to be studied before any generalizations could be made.

3.5 Link to Critical Corruption Studies

Taking all the above into account, this research can provide valuable insight into research known as “critical corruption studies.” Authors de Graaf, Wagenaar and Hoenderboom (2010) outline the characteristics of critical corruption research, and the present study corresponds in a number of ways. In critical corruption studies, questions concerning the intentions of anti-corruption discourses and the consequences of anti-corruption measures are examined (ibid, pp. 110-111). This study will examine both of these issues. In addition, de Graaf, Wagenaar and Hoenderboom (ibid) state, “Most of the critical corruption studies are not against anti-corruption measures per se, but what is labeled ‘corrupt’, what is not, and the effects thereof are critical” (p. 111). As is already clear from the literature review, this study takes a similar approach.
4. Analysis

4.1 Introductory Elements

Before the main text of the publication begins, there are three signs of note: The booklet’s title and two types of visual imagery. The title, *Students Against Corruption–Handbook for anti-corruption education in high schools*, is of interest because there is no mention of the local context, inferring it could be used as a resource in any high-school. In addition, the use of “against”—the social actors (i.e., students) are already situated in opposition to corruption. This statement is perhaps a tautology, but it can also be seen as contributing to a logic of equivalence: What student would not want to be seen as being “against corruption”? The first type of image is on the cover page, where two silhouettes of birds are shown (Figures 1 and 2, below). In Figure 1, a bird is perched with its head turned backwards, indicating it is looking out for something behind it. In Figure 2, a bird is flying with its wings spread far open, indicating a sense of freedom. Both images also infer an idea of looking. Linking this to the context of the booklet can lead to an idea of legitimation: Corruption should be looked out for.

The second type of image is displayed on the inside cover, and it is the European flag, as shown, with supporting text, in Figure 3. The reader is drawn to the image as it is the only image on that page. More importantly, the supporting text reveals the booklet is part of a “Youth in Action Programme” and is “supported by the European Commission.” This introduces elements of interdiscursivity in two ways. First, by being part of the Youth in Action Programme, it links anti-corruption efforts to youth actions as social actors, thus creating a genre chain where the two activities are...
linked. And second, the reference to the European Commission gives the booklet a degree of legitimacy due to the Commission’s role as an important actor in addressing corruption; it is a very important institution of the European Union.

The Contents page also contains interesting information: Two of the chapters have headings that are revealing through CDA. Chapter 1 is entitled “What’s corruption?” The contraction “What’s” creates an informal, relatable style that can be classed under Fairclough’s notion of dialogicality; it promotes a feeling of familiarity between the reader and the writer of the booklet. This sense of familiarity is somewhat furthered in the title of Chapter 2: “What can we do against corruption?” Here, the first person pronoun “we” relates to a social event by inferring “we” can do something against corruption. Further, “we” also implicitly assumes it is possible to do something collectively, relating back to the Addressing Corruption section in this paper’s literature review and encouraging a collective action approach to corruption.

The most relevant part in terms of CDA of the introductory elements of Students Against Corruption is the introductory address by Transparency International Hungary’s executive director, József Péter Martin. First and foremost, it begins with large, bold text that states “Dear Teachers,” as shown in Figure 4. Relating this to the social practice dimension in Fairclough’s three-dimensional framework shows that there is a clear hierarchy of information exchanging in relation to this booklet (i.e., the discursive event). TI-Hungary produced the booklet, and teachers are to read and interpret the booklet before introducing the information contained to children in the classroom environment.

Concerning Martin’s introductory message, the first instance that relates to CDA is when he states, “people ready to lie, cheat and steal can get along much better in Hungary today that those who are uncorrupted” (p. 5): The sentence creates a connection lying,
Cheating, and stealing with being corrupt. In Fairclough’s terms, this is a form of classification. In reality, corruption need not having anything to do with lying, cheating, or stealing, yet Martin logically links the actions with corruption, thereby situating these actions as possibilities of corrupt acts. Another notable excerpt from the introductory text is as follows: “Immediate actions need to be taken in order to shake up the young generation” (p. 5). This is an example of nominalization as there are no social agents mentioned to perform the actions. It is not unreasonable to assume Martin envisages TI taking whatever actions are needed: The statement was arrived at after mentioning survey results and a TI questionnaire’s findings, and, indeed, is situated in a booklet that is intended to inform youth of corruption risks.

Martin also uses pronouns throughout his message: “we,” “us,” and “your” feature on numerous occasions. This can be said to have the strategic action of producing the effect of developing the relationship between the reader and TI-Hungary, which Martin represents. It makes the presumption that the readers of the publication are teachers, furthering the effect of the title as discussed above.

The final point of note in the introductory elements is that feedback is encouraged. Martin communicates TI-Hungary’s role as imparting knowledge: The booklet is “designed to help you.” However, he also welcomes feedback to improve the training material (presumably he mean future initiatives of this kind):

We welcome and highly appreciate your comments and ideas, as they will surely enable us to further improve this tool. Also, please allow me to offer you the support of TI Hungary and TI Slovenia. Contact us, let us know how your classes went and share your thoughts on how to continue this program. (p. 6)

Other indicators from within the message further demonstrate this wanting to be reflexive is intentional. For example, Martin states the “activities included in the text will hopefully engage the students’ attention” (emphasis added, p. 6). “Hopefully” here is an example of modality: Martin avoids an assertion of truth in the statement.

4.2 General Information and Advice on Corruption

4.2.1 Text

The first point of note is that the booklet communicates corruption was not always seen as a problem; however, this is the case only from a historical perspective: “Ancient Greeks’ bribing of officials was seen not as wrongdoing” (p. 7). As the
timeline progresses in the booklet, in modern times “Certain political forms of corruption became common” (p. 8). No additional information is provided concerning cultural differentiations of the meaning of corruption, so the permitting of corrupt acts is limited to the Ancient Greeks.

The use of verbs as combative metaphors occurs frequently in the material. For instance, the timeline above concludes with a statement on “nowadays,” which in itself continues the informal style alluded to above. The metaphor states, “various organizations have been founded to tackle the problem of corruption and its consequences” (emphasis added, p. 8). On its own, the verb “tackle” does not necessarily infer a combative tone, but the reader is also reminded of “the fight against corruption” (p. 7). This is part of a wider discursive practice in the anti-corruption discourse; “People have been urged to ‘fight’ corruption, to ‘combat’ its causes and effects, to wage a ‘war’ against the degradation of the social fabric, and to rally around a moral standard of integrity and principal” (Bracking, 2007, p. 3).

Intertextuality features throughout the booklet. For instance, when providing examples that corruption can be found “in many areas of everyday life,” the booklet references TI’s Global Corruption Barometer. It mentions examples of local hospital corruption in Zimbabwe and the infamous Bangladesh garment factory collapse, which “has been linked to allegations of corruption” (p. 7). It is notable that the booklet references other TI initiatives, thereby giving them legitimacy as an authoritative source. In addition, the examples of Zimbabwe and Bangladesh add to the narrative of corruption being everywhere. TI references continue when the definition of whistleblowing is introduced; the cited definition was developed “in the framework” of a TI project (p. 14), inferring that TI created the most-used definition of the term. Another instance of intertextuality occurs when the “Integrity Pact,” a voluntary agreement of parties in relation to public procurement, is explained in detail. Here, it is not mentioned Integrity Pacts are promoted and driven by TI. All of these intertextual references to other TI publications can be seen as part of a legitimation process that reinforces TI’s role as a trusted anti-corruption authority. A final, non-TI related instance of intertextuality is a reference to Wikipedia that describes the etymology of the word corruption (p. 7); it may have been chosen due to students likely utilizing the source in their education, so it may have been mentioned

---

4 This is prior knowledge from my own anti-corruption experience.
to encourage a sense of familiarity with them. Interestingly, both the Wikipedia and the Global Corruption Barometer references are sourced with footnotes that link to webpages with further information—no other information in the empirical material is referenced.

The intertextual references and the citations are noteworthy also because much of the publication contains information from an unknown source. For instance, the statement that “Generally it is estimated that the European Union loses up to 40 per cent of the value allocated through public procurement procedure” (p. 15) is vague not only because of the unclear actor but also because of the adverb “generally.” This vagueness juxtaposes markedly with the advice for students to deal with corruption (p. 13):

- Always ask for a receipt!
- Don’t pay bribes!
- Don’t accept bribes!
- Report all incidents or potential incidents of corruption!

These imperatives are succinct and direct. It must also be noted that a “potential incident” of corruption is not explained.

A final point of analysis from the textual level is the importance of everybody needing to address corruption. The phenomenon is everywhere; “Corruption is an issue in every country. … Almost any actor in the public or private sector might commit corruption” (p. 8). Adverbs are also telling in this respect: “It is extremely import to understand that every person … has the right, the possibility and also the civic duty to act against corruption” (p. 13). The adverb “extremely” conveys a strong emphasis on the importance of everybody addressing corruption; in this instance, the combative metaphor verb is not used.

In sum, the text reveals that in the ancient past corruption was seen as acceptable. In addition, verbs related to combat are used to build support for addressing corruption. Other TI publications are referred to via a number of instances of intertextuality, while other information is supplied by unknown sources but presented as factual. Finally, corruption is constructed as being ubiquitous—it is everywhere, and all persons must not accept it.

4.2.2 Discursive Practice
Fairclough’s three-dimensional analysis encourages the separation of the categories, but there is some overlap. In this subsection, textual examples will support my assertions concerning discursive practice.

In the first few pages of the booklet, some claims are sourced with citations and URLs with further information (e.g., p. 7, p. 13), drawing on educational discourse in that it shows an awareness of needing to encourage learning on a topic. This is supported by the advice for students detailed above. Moreover, a school-based example of corruption is provided when discussing public procurement: “if your school needs to buy chalk for the entire school year it is essential to find the company which can provide the same quality chalk for the lowest price” (p. 16). This is a good example that the students can relate to—it considers the contextual factor of the school.

This form of educational discourse contributes to the reliability of the booklet: It is intended to teach children about corruption. This is somewhat problematic when a whole chapter is devoted to elections and democracy, which is introduced as follows: “Although these belong to our core topic only indirectly and most of these questions might have been answered during civic rights classes.” The admission of only an indirect relation to corruption is telling, almost apologetic. However, the inclusion of this chapter contributes to the anti-corruption discourse, making a claim that elections and democracy are important elements in anti-corruption efforts.

The other main discourse evidenced in this section is, arguably, a form of NGO-advertising discourse, for there are a number of mentions of other TI publications that act to reinforce the organization’s legitimation.

4.2.3 Social Practice

This section will also draw on textual examples to link to broader social practice. The booklet makes a claim concerning the definition of corruption: “the current understanding [of] corruption is the abuse of entrusted power for private gain” (p. 7). This is relevant for at least three reasons: First, It reduces the complex term to a short phrase, which, as detailed in the literature review, leads to these assertions being accepted as truths. Second, this “understanding” is TI’s understanding—not mentioning this perpetuates TI’s standing as an authoritative actor in the industry. Finally, and arguably most importantly, defining corruption in this manner limits the
possibility of political and cultural contextual factors being taken into account. The booklet does convey an awareness of how important TI is in the anti-corruption industry (p. 8), but not in a critical manner. Therefore, the publication largely reproduces the existing order of discourse.

4.3 Specific Information on Corruption in Hungary and Slovenia

4.3.1 Text

Analysis of the text relating to information on corruption in Hungary and Slovenia reveals three overarching themes: Vagueness exists when referring to some studies and when making some assertions, yet intertextual links are promoted concerning certain TI studies. In contrast, some other information—particularly TI’s own recommendations—is conveyed in a very authoritative manner.

Some assertions are made in the passive form; for instance, “corruption has been identified” (p. 9) and “there are concerns (p. 10). In effect, this conceals the agents making these claims. It is unclear why this is the case, particularly because earlier claims were referenced with links. However, aside from the examples mentioned above, few links are provided throughout the booklet. Similarly, references to some other information are vague; for example, “public opinion polls show” (p. 9) and “various studies have pointed at” (p. 9).

One can only assume these sources are not from TI, for intertextual links are frequently made to other TI publications: “Transparency International has assessed Hungarian state institutions’ transparency and accountability. … The study on National Integrity System (NIS) … gives an extensive overview of the functions and structure of the public and private sectors” (p. 10). This quotation infers TI is an authoritative source and gives reference to the private sector. NIS assessments are mentioned two more times in the publication (p. 10, p. 11); neither refer to private sector issues.

The publication makes a number of judgments on behalf of TI. “Huge loopholes” exist in enforcement systems in Hungary (p. 11), and “Slovenia is facing big challenges with conflicts of interest” and in local procurement (p. 9). These are just two examples, but there are many more in the booklet. The most representative of them is likely the statement “Transparency [International’s] position on the elections
and campaign financing,” which is followed by a paragraph of what is “necessary” and what “should” be changed in Hungary and Slovenia (p. 23). This is further evidence of TI’s relevance and authority on such matters. Adverbials are also used in this context for effect: “The judicial system would badly need systemic reforms” (emphasis added, p. 10).

Other textual features in this analysis included combative metaphors, such as “increased emphasis on fighting corruption” (emphasis added, p. 10) and statements of authority, such as the claim that a draft whistle-blower law “ignores the real needs of reporting persons (p. 14). The latter infers TI understands these needs. Whistle-blowers in both countries are encouraged to contact TI, again reinforcing the organization’s role; Slovenia’s Commission for the Prevention of Corruption is also listed as a possible contact for whistle-blowers but is, tellingly, mentioned after TI’s contact information (p. 13).

Finally, in this section the following quotation is revealing:

In a recent survey, 77% of respondents thought it was ‘typical’ for patients to give a gratitude payment (‘parasolvency’) or tip to hospital doctors for services to which the are entitled, and in most cases this practice is not viewed as unlawful by either the patients or the doctors themselves, let alone the authorities, who do not enforce anti-corruption legislation in this field. (p. 9)

First, the survey is again from an unknown origin. And second, it introduces the idea to the text that modern day corruption is not seen as such. This issue is not further discussed in the publication.

4.3.2 Social Practice

The information in the publication pertaining to corruption in Hungary and Slovenia arguably reproduces the current trend of social practices concerning corruption. The following quotation shows evidence of a growing awareness of corruption in the countries; further, it contributes to the idea of public-sector corruption being the most difficult issue to address: “Attitudes toward corruption in both countries are changing, the business community is trying to put more effort into anti-corruption activities and implement transparent measures” (pp. 10-11). According to the quote, the private sector is moving to address corruption;
the issue of corruption in the private sector remains largely unaddressed in the booklet.

4.4 Other Information

4.4.1 Text

Elements of interdiscursivity and intertextuality are evident in the game entitled “take a step forward.” The game “aims to discuss general human rights, discrimination, poverty and social exclusion, with a special focus on corruption” (p. 34). Accordingly, it associates the discourse of corruption with discourses on discrimination, poverty, and social exclusion. The intertextuality concerns the fact that the game is derived from a Council of Europe booklet, COMPASS – a Manual on Human Rights Education with young people.

The same game also uses directives as instructions for the teacher: “Introduce … Explain … Discourage questions … Ask … Read out… Ask …” (p. 35). Perhaps most notably, the publication encourages the teacher to adapt the game to local conditions: “The closer your role cards reflect the world in which your students live, the more they will learn from the activity” (p. 35).

Instructions for teachers occur at the beginning of each chapter. All individual chapters encourage teachers to “Please ask the questions as written in the headlines, … [and] please explain as written” (p. 15, p. 18, p. 21). This approach infers a top-down, hierarchical approach to the knowledge contained in the booklet; it encourages teachers to communicate TI’s definitions and explanations. However, this is somewhat countered by each chapter also containing the following statement: “Always try to bring an example! If you have any more vivid examples, please don’t hesitate to share them!” (p. 15, p. 18, p. 21). This gives agency to the teachers’ role in the process. Further, the final chapter has added information: “When speaking about money spent on different things, please try to compare this with something easily understandable be the students” (p. 21). Again, this encourages the teachers’ agency; it also conveys contextual awareness by promoting a relatable example for the students.
4.4.2 Discursive Practice

The little information available concerning children’s reception of the anti-corruption teachings by TI-Hungary and TI-Slovenia is available in the section, “Ideas of the winning groups.” It must be noted, however, that this does not concern the reception of this empirical material, so the statements below should not be considered comments on the discursive practice of this discursive event (the booklet) but of general anti-corruption teaching in high-schools. The section contains URLs to resources created by students following the teaching, but the links to the ideas that created videos (one was “an amateur campaign movie” and the other a “movie shooting on the bust streets of Budapest asking passers-by about their experiences related to corruption”) and where a webpage where “ideas and questions can be shared” are no longer functioning.

The only insight into the discursive practice concerns two pieces of information on the page. The first concerned “two bowls – one filled with dirty water and one with clean water. The task is to find the plastic money hidden in the dirty water and put it into the bowl with clean water” (p. 24). This task indicates the school children may have understood corruption in black-and-white terms: One is either corrupt (dirty water) or not corrupt (clean water). In the second example, “students from 2nd and 3rd grade are asked about their perception of corruption” (p. 24). This is somewhat curious as one would think 2nd and 3rd grade students are too young to be social actors in the context of corruption; however, that this was an idea of a winning group suggests TI saw no problem with this issue.

Finally, another discursive practice alluded to in the publication is youth as social agents in the anti-corruption movement. A “dance against corruption” is promoted: “Learn the choreography of TI Hungary’s dance! This roused festivalgoers with an out of the ordinary flashmob at Sziget’s World Music Main Stage to raise awareness to the importance of the fight against corruption” (p. 40). Once more, a combative metaphor is employed, but, more importantly, the sentences allude to music festival attendees being part of the movement to raise awareness of corruption.

---

5 Sziget is Hungary’s most famous music festival.
4.4.3 Learning the Terms Regarding Corruption

This content analysis is a systematic analysis of the game “Learning the terms regarding corruption” (pp. 28-33) in the empirical material. It is introduced with a series of directives for the teacher: “Introduce the activity by asking the students if they have ever heard about corruption. Ask for examples. Explain …” (p. 28). Before detailing the findings and beginning discussing this study in a broader context, here is a restatement of the five categories created after the coding process:

1. Has a direct relation to corruption; favors contextual factors.
2. Has a direct relation to corruption; favors non-contextual factors.
3. Has a direct relation to corruption; favors neither contextual nor non-contextual factors.
4. Does not have a direct relation to corruption.
5. Is communicated incorrectly.

Table 2. Deductive coding of “terms regarding corruption”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Reasons for code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indirect relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mentions public sector and a school-based example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusing entrusted power</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mentions public sector and a school-based example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misusing public funds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Term implies public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political patronage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Term implies public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepotism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gives a school-based example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing votes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Term implies public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gives a school-based example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistleblower</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Term incorrectly defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Procurement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Term incorrectly defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withholding public information</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indirect relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving door</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indirect relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gives a school-based example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic election</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indirect relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of powers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indirect relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indirect relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct democracy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indirect relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect democracy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public funds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral system</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Procurement Act</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign financing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election campaign</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elector (or voter)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Term incorrectly defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 indicates no terms in the empirical material had a direct relation to corruption and favored non-contextual factors. Three terms (10%) had a direct relation to corruption and favored non-contextual factors. Five terms (17%) had a direct relation to corruption and favored neither contextual nor non-contextual factors. It should be noted here, that three out of the five terms related only to the public sector. In addition, the two that did not relate only to the public sector mentioned the sector but were deemed neutral due to the school-based example given. Both of these terms—“gift” and “abusing entrusted power”—could have (but did not) mentioned the private sector. Eighteen terms (62%) had no direct relation to corruption. Three terms (10%) were communicated incorrectly—all were incorrectly defined.
5. Discussion

5.1 General Comments

This study’s findings are somewhat conflicting. The analysis revealed, on the one hand, the empirical material largely maintained the status quo in the discourse of anti-corruption: TI and its initiatives were promoted any number of times, while other sources of information were vaguely defined or were void of agents due to passive constructions. On the other hand, however, teachers and students’ own involvement and feedback were encouraged throughout.

For the most part, the anti-corruption discourse communicated throughout the booklet made assertions of truth either without any citations or by citing TI’s own resources. Given this communication, and TI’s dominant role in the anti-corruption industry, it arguably “classifies what is (not) true permitted, desirable, and so on. Truth and power are closely related” (de Graaf, Wagenaar & Hoenderboom, 2010, p. 109). The encouragement of school students as social actors to a degree perpetuates TI’s power in the field, supporting Sampson’s (2010) claim that “new actors can enter the field … appropriating the anti-corruptionist discourse” (p. 276). By only providing references to TI’s own publications, the booklet encouraged children to adopt the anti-corruption discourse promoted by TI.

Part of this anti-corruption discourse is the use of combative metaphors (Bracking, 2006), and these were evident throughout the empirical material. This type of language use potentially influences moral positions—as argued by de Graaf, Wagenaar, and Hoenderboom (2010)—by minimizing one’s opportunity to put into question the assertions.

Both CDA and the qualitative discourse analysis revealed the empirical material did not go into great length concerning the meaning(s) of corruption; in doing so, it can be said that it perpetuated a trend of ignoring the diversity of meanings of the term (Gephart, 2014, p. 15). Given TI’s influence in spreading awareness of anti-corruption and its role in developing policy to counter the phenomenon (Pearson, 2013, p. 38), such a reductive view may result in an even more dominant legal rational order at
the expense of the traditional sphere (Chadda, 2004, p. 122).

The general critique of the anti-corruption industry often focuses on the industry’s relationship with neo-liberalism—and, by proxy, an economics-based, principal-agent approach to dealing with corruption—and claims that neoliberal ideology dominates anti-corruption efforts (Sampson, 2010; de Graaf, Wagernaar & Hoenderboom, 2010; Bedirhanoglu, 2007). The findings of this study indicate very little inherent promotion of neoliberal values. A slight bias against the public sector was shown in the qualitative content analysis because public-sector examples were used as examples instead of private-sector examples. However, CDA revealed a general trend not for the promotion of neoliberal values but for the promotion of TI and its various initiatives—In this empirical material, promoting TI was of paramount.

A final general point of note is that the analysis revealed corruption was ubiquitous—not just in a geographic sense but in temporal and societal senses, too. This approach acts to reproduce and reaffirm the current anti-corruption discourse. Perhaps the most interesting of all the results was the finding that over 60 percent of the terms for students to learn about corruption had no direct relation to the term or its usage. Combining this with other discursive links in the material—such as to discrimination, to poverty and to social exclusion—evidences just how wide the contemporary anti-corruption net is cast.

5.2 Theoretical and Methodological Reflections

5.2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

A reoccurring question in my mind upon implementing CDA is, “Was I critical enough in the textual analysis?” I am uncertain. Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) state, “critical discourse analysis is intended to generate critical social research, that is research that contributes to the rectification of injustice and inequality in society” (p. 77). I feel as though my own role in the industry may have led me to be cautious about being overly critical of TI. Jørgensen and Phillips also assert that, for Fairclough, “Every communicative event functions as a form of social practice in reproducing or challenging the order of discourse” (ibid, p. 70). This research did,
indeed, reveal that the empirical material (i.e., the communicative event) reproduced the order of discourse.

Another issue I had with CDA is determining whether or not I was systematic enough. CDA offers a wide range of analytical tools, yet I chose only the ones most relevant. Further, I consciously avoided some terms. “Ideology,” for instance, would have been an interesting and worthwhile term to make use of, yet because of its potential implications with supposed neoliberal ideology in the anti-corruption industry, I avoided explicitly dealing with it; it was implicitly a part of the critique of the World Bank’s approach to corruption. In addition, Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) state, “It is difficult to distinguish between what is ideology and what is not” (p. 75). A lengthy and nuanced discussion of the term’s role in anti-corruption discourse could serve as the basis for further study.6

A weakness in terms of the implementation of CDA in this research is the analysis of the discursive practice level. Due to time limitations, no direct information was provided concerning the reception of the text. This is unfortunate, particularly as impact of anti-corruption programs is such an important issue (Sampson, 2010, p. 271). It is unknown “whether the resources used for anti-corruption actually affect the phenomenon it is intended to reduce” (ibid, 2010, p. 264). Any further study on this subject would need to better address the issue of consumption: “An analysis of the discursive practice focuses on how the text is produced and how it is consumed” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, p. 81). However, that being said, this problem is not uncommon in studies that utilize Fairclough’s CDA as a method: There is a “dearth of empirical research into the consumption of texts (not- withstanding their view that people are active in interpretation processes and that texts are polysemic). For the most part, their studies consist of textual analyses” (ibid, p. 90). In this respect, my study largely aligns with previous research.

Finally, in relation to Fairclough’s CDA, Jørgensen and Phillips state, “other approaches have a tendency to regard discourse as a reflection of an underlying structure and also to focus empirically on the role of discourse in social reproduction” (ibid, p.91). Adopting such an approach may have allowed my to avoid questions concerning how critical I was; however, it was only after the analysis that I

6 It would have necessitated a discussion on global governance
concluded the empirical material was largely reproducing and maintaining the current anti-corruption discourse.

5.2.2 Qualitative Content Analysis

I am pleased with the quantifiable outcome of the qualitative content analysis. Because of the method’s systematic nature, it provides a more solid (and, perhaps, clear) framework than Fairclough’s CDA to be used in other studies. As may be clear, I did not explore the full capabilities of this method; following Mayfair’s step-by-step approach was suitable for its use as a secondary method in this study. Most importantly, this method produces greater reliability than Fairclough’s CDA.

5.3 Research Outcomes

The research question was as follows: Do Transparency International’s youth anti-corruption initiatives neglect local contextual factors?

Based on the findings of this study, I cannot give a conclusive answer. Evidence from the empirical material studied favoring a “yes” answer is as follows:

- Corruption is communicated only as a problem, potentially neglecting local cultural norms; and
- The term “corruption” is defined simply, concisely, and unquestionably, favoring a blanket institutional approach to solving the issue.

On the other hand, evidence tending towards a “no” answer is as follows:

- The publication encourages feedback both from teachers and students, indicating a willingness to adapt future initiatives to these actors’ needs; and
- Addressing corruption requires a collective effort; accordingly, a diversity of actors and considerations must be taken into consideration.

Future academic research on TI’s youth initiatives must pay greater attention to the reception and the local embedding of such initiatives, as called for by Gephart (2014). More generally, current critiques of anti-corruption discourse have little impact on the industry and “do little to substantively alter the established knowledge regimes, techniques or policies” (Sampson, 2010, p. 271). This is essentially another call for greater study of the impact of anti-corruption initiatives; focusing on the impact—or
lack thereof—would provide a reason for actors in the anti-corruption discourse to take note of academic studies. Further, an approach focused in this manner would avoid merely pointing to the “negative side effect of the corruption fight” (de Graaf, von Maravic, & Wagenaar, p. 172)—It would promote action.

Nevertheless, post-positivist studies of corruption are worthwhile in that they promote a more contextualized view of the phenomenon; this type of view “could inform more successful policies” (Ivanov, 2007, p. 42). This is particularly important not only because conceptions of corruption are likely to change (Buckley, 2002) but also because—more importantly—there of the general failure of contemporary anti-corruption reforms to curb corruption (Persson, Rothstein, & Teorell, 2013, p. 454). As explained by de Graaf, Wagenaar and Hoenderboom (2010), “Applying a post-positivist perspective to corruption could most importantly sensitize us to the fact that people live in different social realities, and therefore have different perceptions of what constitutes corruption” (p. 112). From the findings of this study, this is at present being left out of the dominant anti-corruption discourse.

5.4 Implications for the Field of Communication for Development and Social Change and Concluding Remarks

The findings of this research showed TI created discursive links between anti-corruption and discrimination, poverty, and social exclusion—all are important issues to the field of ComDev. In addition, the link between corruption and development processes is growing (Andersson & Haywood, 2008). ComDev is an ideal field of study to analyze (anti-)corruption simply because its approaches to research are inherently critical.

In 2002, it was claimed a possible direction for the anti-corruption movement was to move toward including “whole-society approaches to education” (Buckley 2002, p. 194). TI’s anti-corruption education in schools is evidence that the movement did indeed move in that manner. However, this study has shown that more critical attention needs to be directed towards these initiatives.
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