EU Grant Agreement number: 290529

Project acronym: ANTICORRP

Project title: Anti-Corruption Policies Revisited

Work Package: WP7, Individual values and motivations to engage against corruption

Title of deliverable: part of D7.4 Policy brief

Due date of deliverable: November 30, 2016
Actual submission date: November 29, 2016
Authors: WP7

Organisation name of lead beneficiary for this deliverable: Transparency International

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	X
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
Co	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

INTRODUCTION

The main objective of ANTICORRP is to investigate and explain the factors that promote or hinder the development of effective anti-corruption policies and impartial government institutions. Work Package 7 puts the focus firmly on better understanding individual values, motivations and contextual drivers for citizen action against corruption. We use a mix of different research methods to examine the types of actions that citizens can and do take against corruption and explore what kinds of evidence-based pathways are on the horizon and look promising for future such engagements.

EVIDENCE AND ANALYSIS

- **Bribe-paying and corruption-reporting across Europe: significant service-level corruption in many countries, with large sub-regional differences**

  Thirteen per cent of households utilising public services across European and central Asian (ECA) countries report having paid undocumented payments in order to receive a service over a 12-month period. Of those who have experienced corruption, 21.5 per cent report it to appropriate authorities.

Corruption-reporting is lowest in Baltic countries such as Latvia and Lithuania, as well as in other post-Soviet countries such as Armenia, Azerbaijan and Belarus, where fewer than one-tenth of the people experiencing corruption report it to the relevant authorities.

- **Large variations in reporting across services**

  We have known for quite some time that exposure to bribes varies significantly across services, but so far there has not been much evidence as to whether the reporting rates of those exposed to corruption also vary. Our data suggests that this is actually the case and that the differences across services are very significant, ranging from a reporting rate of only 14 per cent in health and 22 per cent for the police and education to more than 39 per cent for the courts and unemployment benefits. The reporting of corruption in emergency situations (medical treatment) and for those areas where service quality is difficult to judge and may hinge on the degree of commitment (such sectors as education and health, in which bribes are more likely to be described as gifts that reward good service) or where the fear of retaliation is probably quite high (the police) are much lower than reporting where specific, quantifiable entitlements are at stake (unemployment benefits, social security benefits, obtaining documents) or where a particularly strong expectation of fairness and justice is in play (the courts).

- **Gender differences and non-differences**

  There are surprisingly few gender differences in the stated willingness to report corruption, when controlling for other contextual factors. Men outnumber women by a factor of two to one, however, as clients of the major NGO-run anti-corruption help centre network that we examined in our research.

- **Corruption is not viewed as normal, and corruption-reporting in most countries is *not* strongly ostracised.**

  It is often claimed that day-to-day bribery is simply accepted as normality, that corruption-reporting is strongly ostracised and that both trends effectively discourage greater citizen action against corruption. Our findings do not support these claims for most ECA countries, with some exceptions in the former Soviet Union. On average, only 3 per cent of respondents think that the main reason for not reporting corruption is that corruption is common or not a 'big deal'. At the same time, more than 40 per cent of respondents indicate that they would feel personally obliged to report corruption and 31 per cent that it is commonly acceptable in their countries to report, while more than 20 per cent have actually reported. In addition, more corruption exposure seems to stimulate rather than discourage action. The more households experience corruption the more likely are to also have reported it.

- **There are three major obstacles to more corruption reporting that are persistently referenced across Europe**

  Difficulties in reporting (lack of time, knowledge or resources), the fear of retaliation and a suspected lack of impact are viewed as the main obstacles for reporting corruption, as invoked by, on average, 70 per cent of the survey respondents and consistently referenced by focus group participants as major obstacles for engagement.

- **Reality looks better than perception and points to interesting levers for change**

  Only 3.9 per cent believe that most people do report incidents of corruption, as against the actual stated reporting numbers of 21 per cent, and a personal obligation to report expressed by 40 per cent of respondents. This interesting discrepancy between reality and perception may point towards important leverage points for positive behaviour change when actual willingness to report is made more salient.

- **Collective citizen action against corruption: a highly dynamic action field**

  There is a very dynamic and diverse action, research and learning community around efforts to involve citizens in various forms of direct anti-corruption work, from participating in budget decisions to monitoring public works projects (commonly referred to as social accountability).

  Our empirical understanding of such social accountability initiatives has advanced significantly in recent years, leading to a number of key insights, which we have critically examined.

  o Information is not (sufficient) for power and accountability, yet it opens a large design space for targeted experimentation informed by insights from social psychology, social design and other fields.
  o There is some recent and valid disenchantment with technology-centric approaches, from open data that is of poor quality and difficult to work with, to crowd-reporting corruption that faces difficulties in attracting sustained use to social-media-centred activism that is less grass-roots-driven than many may have expected. But too much pessimism might be premature. Many important avenues have not been explored yet. Longer-term impacts remain to be seen. And expectations need to be adequately calibrated, given that tackling corruption is not simply a technocratic development intervention ready to scale but a perennial struggle, with significant push-back by and tactical responses from powerful forces.
  o The empirical proof of concept that social accountability can have significant positive impact is established, yet success is highly contextual.
  o Aiming for more sustained and significant impact through more integration both with institutional mechanisms and multi-level reform efforts has emerged as a key message from social accountability research. Even more could be done, however, to achieve broader coalitions beyond the governance community.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As most of these research streams have shown, citizen engagement against corruption can consist of individual acts or concerted action, yet, in its impact and efficacy, it is always a collective accomplishment driven by the contributions of many different stakeholders, all playing vital complementary roles.

- Anti-corruption activists should look to forging broader coalitions and linking their issues more firmly into other stakeholders' agendas, from business to other community groups and broader social movements.

- NGO-run citizen support centres cannot substitute for official reporting lines and law enforcement, yet they play a highly catalysing role. They may want to consider leveraging the interplay with official reporting mechanisms more strongly, strengthening their outreach efforts to women and assessing how good their traction is with other potentially marginalised client groups.

- Government-run and NGO-supported complaints mechanisms may both benefit from putting a specific focus on and developing targeted mobilising strategies for reaching clients of services in which reporting rates are disproportionately low, such as the police, health and education.

- Positive campaigns that give salience to the high willingness to report across society and the sizeable reporting numbers, in conjunction with easier and better-promoted access to reporting mechanisms that also advertise the rate of cases that have been successfully resolved, can go a long way to unlocking the potential of citizen feedback in helping prevent and punish corruption.

- Governments should genuinely recognise the hugely valuable and productive role that citizens can and will have to play in tackling corruption. They can also be enormously helpful in making social accountability work. Integration between bottom-up and top-down social accountability initiatives is the big rallying cry, backed up by plentiful evidence and learning.

  Establishing effective legal frameworks that make citizen voice, participation and engagement possible, respected, protected and promoted in the first place is essential, but it is still very incomplete, and increasingly urgent in times of shrinking civil society space. For example, despite some significant improvements, whistleblowing protection is woefully inadequate in many European countries, and the deep economic integration across many borders is also in urgent need of more continent-wide protection.

  Funders who are keen to support social accountability should watch out for the savviest local activists and entrepreneurs, rather than rigidly log-framed business plans. They should invest both patiently in long-term institutional support and opportunistically in creative interventions.

- Future research on citizen engagement against corruption might benefit from paying closer attention to the ripple and peer effects around citizen reporting and social accountability, which may offer interesting cues for longer-term transformational opportunities. Researchers might want to complement the current focus on randomised controlled trials and national-level survey work with more ethnographic methods, a longer time horizon and a focus on positive outliers in order to broaden the horizon for more creative pathways to change. Social media analysis can provide some valuable, complementary insights, yet it is a

very fast-moving target. Most importantly, future research should devise and be built around adaptive learning mechanisms that feed evidence right back into project implementation and help to try out a much broader array of design variations, adjust on the go and leverage unexpected effects.

Citizens are already engaged in the struggle against corruption on many levels. The results of our surveys, interviews, experiments, in-depth case studies and social media analysis suggest that more than six million reports against corruption were made by citizens across Europe and central Asia during a recent 12-month period, while experimentation with citizen-focused collective action mechanisms against corruption is continuing apace.

It is not some fatalistic norms that hold back further engagement but, instead, very mundane practical obstacles and the fear of retaliation or having only limited impact. Much can be done by governments (both nationally and at European Union level), civil society, donors and researchers to help remove such barriers, in order to further unlock and help translate into impact the indispensable commitment, energy and creativity that citizens bring to the fight against corruption.

RESEARCH PARAMETERS

Work Package 7 has sought to address the following main research objectives:

- to gain a better understanding of how citizens experience and react to day-to-day corruption and how they can be further mobilised to resist bribe-paying and take action against corruption
- to review and synthesise the multidisciplinary state of knowledge as to how individual attitudes and motivations vis-à-vis corruption, civic and political engagement are formed and under what circumstances they are translated into action
- to develop an empirically representative evidence base on EU citizens' attitudes and perceptions towards different forms of corruption, with a particular focus on people's motivations, strategies and perceived constraints in either taking action against it or refraining from doing so
- to explore the socio-economic profiles, motivations and focus of concerns of citizens who have reported corruption concerns to helplines across Europe
- to gain a detailed understanding of successful individual strategies deployed by citizens to resist corruption
- to gain a better understanding of how innovative social accountability tools based on collective citizen action (such as budget-monitoring and social audits) can support the fight against corruption and how their potential can be fully utilised
- to review the empirical evidence base on the scope, use and impact of key social accountability mechanisms around the world
- to examine in more detail how and with what degree of success these tools are actually being used across Europe

- to further examine the efficacy and potential of related innovative interventions through field experiments

In order to do justice to this enormous breadth and depth of research objectives, a mixed-method approach was pursued that contained the following elements.

- A large scale <u>citizen survey</u> to probe a representative sample of citizens across Europe and in select comparator countries on their experience, attitudes and engagement against corruption (Global Corruption Barometer, Transparency International Secretariat).
- A <u>stock-take</u> based on desk research on the evidence base for social accountability mechanisms and their efficacy in tackling corruption and strengthening accountability (Transparency International Secretariat).
- An <u>analysis of primary data</u> from an international network of anti-corruption helplines and from the social media sphere in two countries, the United Kingdom and Romania, in order to better understand who reports about what types of corruption issues and whether social media serves as a channel for citizen engagement on corruption issues.
- A <u>series of focus groups</u> in three countries (Macedonia, Romania and Bosnia Herzegovina), primarily with people who have stood up against and reported corruption, in order to better understand their motivations for doing so and the constraints that such reporting faces.
- <u>In-depth case studies</u> of a major public corruption-reporting mechanism in Portugal and an open data initiative in the United Kingdom, in order to examine how the concrete interfaces for corruption-reporting and the technical tools for engaging people around open government initiatives work in practice.
- Qualitative <u>in-country experiments</u>, to test how innovative feedback systems in the health sector could be a step towards more integrity (Lithuania) and how people respond to different mobilisation strategies (Montenegro).

PROJECT IDENTITY

PROJECT NAME

Anti-Corruption Policies Revisited: Global Trends and European Responses to the Challenge of Corruption (ANTICORRP)
Work Package 7: Individual values and motivations to engage against corruption

COORDINATOR

WP7: Main Coordinator: Dr Dieter Zinnbauer, Transparency International, International Secretariat, Berlin, Germany, dzinnbauer@transparency.org

CONSORTIUM

WP 7 Contributors:

Main contributor, coordinator and responsible author of policy brief: Transparency International (Secretariat, and Transparency International groups in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lithuania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Portugal, Romania and the United Kingdom)

Other contributors from ANTICORRP consortium:

Center for the Study of Democracy – CSD
    Sofia, Bulgaria
European University Institute
    Florence, Italy
Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy – ELIAMEP
    Athens, Greece
Hertie School of Governance – HERTIE
    Berlin, Germany

FUNDING SCHEME   FP7 Framework Programme for Research of the European Union – FP7-SSH.2011.5.1-1: Corruption and resistance to corruption in the private and public sphere (challenge)

DURATION   ANTICORRP: March 2012 – February 2017 (60 months)

This Work Package 7: October 2013 – January 2017

BUDGET   EU contribution ANTICORRP overall: €7,999,182

WEBSITE   http://anticorrp.eu

FOR MORE INFORMATION   WP7: Dr Dieter Zinnbauer: dzinnbauer@transparency.org
ANTICORRP overall: Niklas Kossov: Kossow@hertie-school.org

FURTHER READING   Pring, C. (forthcoming): *Global Corruption Barometer 2016: Europe*, Berlin: Transparency International

Zinnbauer, D., and S. Srinivasan (forthcoming): *Research Synthesis Report. Citizen Action against Corruption*; Berlin: Transparency International (submitted as deliverable D7.2)

Zinnbauer, D. (forthcoming): *Taking Stock and Looking Forward: Social Accountability Research and Practice*; Berlin: Transparency International (submitted as deliverable D7.4)

Zinnbauer, D. (2015): 'Crowdsourced Corruption Reporting: What Petrified Forests, Street Music, Bath Towels, and the Taxman Can Tell Us about the Prospects for Its Future', *Policy and Internet*, 7(1), 1–24

Project profile

ANTICORRP is a large-scale research project funded by the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme. The full name of the project is 'Anti-Corruption Policies Revisited: Global Trends and European Responses to the Challenge of Corruption'. The project started in March 2012 and will last for five years. The research is conducted by 20 research groups in 15 countries.

The fundamental purpose of ANTICORRP is to investigate and explain the factors that promote or hinder the development of effective anti-corruption policies and impartial government institutions. A central issue is how policy responses can be tailored to deal effectively with various forms of corruption. Through this approach ANTICORRP seeks to advance the knowledge on how corruption can be curbed in Europe and elsewhere. Special emphasis is laid on the agency of different state and non-state actors to contribute to building good governance.

Project acronym: ANTICORRP

Project full title: Anti-Corruption Policies Revisited: Global Trends and European Responses to the Challenge of Corruption

Project duration: March 2012 – February 2017

Theme: FP7-SSH.2011.5.1-1

Grant agreement number: 290529

Project website: http://anticorrp.eu