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Research Methodology in the Field of Anti-Corruption: Research Design, Theories and Methods of Studying Corruption
Contact information:

Oleksandra Keudel
Berlin School of Transnational Studies at the Free University of Berlin
olkeudel@gmail.com
+49 157 3156 1000 (What’sApp)
https://www.linkedin.com/in/oleksandrakryshtapovych/

Nina Onopriychuk
The Free University of Amsterdam (Vrije Universiteit), Political Science and Public Administration
Onopriychuk.nina@gmail.com
https://www.linkedin.com/in/nina-onopriychuk-13567661/

Group mailing list: acicp_2018@googlegroups.com

Course description:

This interactive course is for master’s students, postgraduates and analysts researching corruption. Alongside the main thematic focus on theory and interdisciplinary methods of corruption research, students will engage with English-language scientific literature and academic writing.
AIM OF THE COURSE:

- Learning how to utilise theories and methods of corruption research confidently;
- Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of individual theoretical approaches and methods;
- Developing skills to criticize theories and methods constructively, and respond adequately to criticism;
- Grasping how to work effectively with scientific literature and improving academic writing skills;
- Designing and defending your own research.

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE COURSE:

1. 40% of the total mark – writing task – original research, conducted in a group of 2-3 people:
   - deadline: 1 April 2019
   - type of research: you can work on research which forms part of your daily activities, including journalism. You can also select a topic to contribute to a scientific conference or publication, concerning the concept of corruption, anti-corruption activities or communications between actors in the anti-corruption sphere.
   - scope of the work: 12-16 pages (7500-10000 words), font: Arial 14, line spacing: 1.5.
   - structure of the work:
     - Annotation
     - Introduction
     - Literature review
     - Analytical framework (for a scientific article - focus on theories)
     - Methodology
     - Analysis
     - Conclusion
     - Literature and annexes
   - all members of a group will be assigned the same mark

2. 20% of the total mark – writing a research design in a group of 2-3 people and 5% of mark – presentation of the research design in Block II to receive feedback and edit your work on time
   - Deadline: written work until 3 February 2019 (3-5 pages) and presentation until 7-9 February (1 slide, 5 min. + 5 min. of discussion)
   - Please, follow this structure:
     - Analytical problem or research puzzle, not only connected to the specific problem and with a justification of the relevance of the research, but also a contribution to the scientific literature (theoretical contribution).
     - For this you need to study the existing literature and write about the most up-to-date literature relating to your topic (what are the main arguments? Outline with arguments, not authors) and point out gaps in the literature.
3. 10% of the mark – review on one course book of your choice (individual work) (max. 800 words till 25 February 2019)
   - According to the results of critically reading of your selected book, write a short review with the following structure:
     - What analytical problem does the author formulate? How does he/she justify it? Do you think the problem is relevant or not? Why? Why not?
     - Was there a formulation of the author’s questions in one/two sentences? Do you think the question is justified and relevant? Why?
     - Analyze the author’s theoretical argumentation: are his/her definitions of basic terms convincing? Is the connection between arguments and different elements of the theory logical? Justify your opinion.
     - If there is a methodology in the book (research design) and methods of data collection and data analysis, how transparent and clear is the description? What do you think of the choice of methodology and were the methods appropriate? Why? Why not?
     - Note the author’s arguments: were they consistent? Did the text have theses without confirmed information? Did the author appeal to facts or emotions? Please, use tips from Suny Empire State College, “Interpreting Texts Critically: Asking Questions.”
     - “Reality check” your point of view: how much do you know about the topic of the book, does the author confirm or refute their arguments? Do you think conclusions were well-argued and credible? Why?

4. 15% of the mark – writing task “Critical literature review” (max. 800 words until 16 March 2019)
   - Task: write a review on 3-4 scientific research papers or political research papers which are relevant to your written work within the course and identify any gaps in your knowledge. The aim of this task is to outline clearly the “puzzle” that you will study, so this task is a base for a wider overview of the literature in your field of research.
     - Follow this structure:
       - What do we know about the topic of your research? Briefly present the main arguments, advantages and disadvantages of approaches and/or conclusions in selected works. It is better to group texts by arguments and conclusions, not by authors. Use tips from lectures on systematic work with literature: categorize arguments on a scale or by explanation, arguments in the form of “debates” by their authors etc.
       - What do we not know but must know? Introduce inaccuracies, differences of opinion in your topic from the analyzed references. What are the disadvantages of previous research? Perhaps the methodology or operationalization is questionable. Were theories analyzed? Did empirical studies explain the reality completely or partly? What is not enough for complete understanding of the topic (problem)?
       - In this part you have to clearly define the “puzzle”:
         - The analytical problem which you will study.
         - Choice of literature: Choose relevant sources: they should relate to the phenomena you want to study on the theoretical and/or empirical level. For this, use tips from lectures about strategies for developing an analytical problem: are you checking theories in practice? Do you want to explain an unknown phenomenon or an aspect of a phenomenon? Do you want to compare the applicability of theory to explaining empirical phenomena, etc.?

5. 10% of the mark – Presentation and discussion about approaches to studying corruption in a group (17 January 2019, during lesson 2) Detailed description of the task in Annex 2.

6. For missed deadlines 1 point will be deducted for every 2 days after the deadline.
Books which students can use to write a review

REQUIREMENTS TO DESIGNING WRITING TASKS:

Works must have:
- your name
- name of the course
- name of the task and title of work (for reviews - the name and author of the reviewed books)
- date of writing
- numbers of pages
- number and titles of tables, graphs and other infographics
- references in the text and complete list of references (you can choose the citation style at your discretion; however, stick to one)

Which citation style to choose?
- The most common citation styles are presented and explained on the University Libraries University of Washington website, http://guides.lib.uw.edu/research/citations/citationwhich.
- The most common citation style in the social sciences - American Psychological Association (APA), which you can choose from automatic program settings for literature management, for example, Mendeley. More about it: http://guides.lib.uw.edu/research/citations/apa-style.

More about Ukrainian citation styles
### Grade for the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECTS Grade</th>
<th>Scores (Points)</th>
<th>Signification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-59</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0-29</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation criteria for the research papers (max 40 p)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure and content of the research</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logical, sequential, completed</td>
<td>Meets the task of the research, has some logical inconsistencies</td>
<td>Unclear and inconsistent structure, obvious logical inconsistencies</td>
<td>Structure is absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research problem and research question</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly formulated, original, relevant to the current discussion in the professional literature</td>
<td>Partially clear, ordinary statement of the problem and the question</td>
<td>Partly unclearly formulated, corresponds to an outdated discussion in the literature</td>
<td>Research problem and research question are absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical framework</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work is based on a well-defined theoretical approach, conceptualization of basic concepts is carried out, mechanisms of interconnections of the analyzed phenomena are outlined</td>
<td>There are slight gaps in conceptualization, insufficiently defined mechanisms of interconnection, the theoretical approach is only partially covered</td>
<td>Two or more elements of the analytical framework (theoretical approach, conceptualization and/or interconnection mechanisms) are missing</td>
<td>The analytical framework is not defined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The choice of design and methodology is well-grounded and fully relevant to the research question; the methods are described specifically</td>
<td>The choice of design and methodology is partly unfounded and incompletely relevant to the research question; partially unspecified methods</td>
<td>The choice of design is unsubstantiated or the chosen methodology is not relevant to the research question, or unspecified methods</td>
<td>Justification of the choice of design is absent; methodology does not meet the analytical question; methods are not described</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing justification, clarity of thought, sequence of argumentation in accordance with the goal of the work</td>
<td>The argumentation is convincing and consistent, fully consistent with the purpose of the work</td>
<td>Argumentation is partly convincing and consistent, there are deviations from the purpose of the work</td>
<td>The argumentation is inconclusive and inconsistent</td>
<td>The argumentation is absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality/own thoughts</td>
<td>Extraordinary, creative and convincingly grounded thoughts and ideas</td>
<td>Partially original thoughts and ideas</td>
<td>Own thoughts and ideas are almost absent</td>
<td>Own thoughts and ideas are completely missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language, style, use of professional terminology</td>
<td>High-level orthography, no mistakes, appropriate use of professional terminology</td>
<td>There are almost no mistakes, professional terminology is available</td>
<td>A lot of mistakes, incorrect / inaccurate usage of terms</td>
<td>Significant mistakes, professional terminology is absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References and formal requirements</td>
<td>Complete list of literature, unmistakable and relevant citation; the work is fully compliant</td>
<td>Complete list of references, inaccuracies in citation; the work meets the requirements, there are minimal deviations</td>
<td>Key literature is missing, significant mistakes in citation; significant gaps in compliance with requirements</td>
<td>The links are almost nonexistent or do not fit the topic of the work, formal requirements are ignored</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLAN AND DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE

Research Methodology in the Field of Anti-Corruption: research design, theories and methods of studying corruption
**BLOCK I**

17 – 19 JANUARY 2019

**FUNDAMENTALS OF THE RESEARCH DESIGN**

**INTRODUCTION TO CORRUPTION RESEARCH METHODS**

**ETHICAL QUESTIONS IN SCIENTIFIC WORK**

---

**Thursday, 17 January**

Lesson1&2, room 4-100

---

**Agenda**

θ Fundamentals of the research design
θ Aim, quality criteria and context

---

**Lecturer:**

Oleksandra Keudel

---

**Materials**


---

**Input 1:** Introduction to the course. Opportunities and limitations of corruption scientific research. An interdisciplinary approach to the study of corruption and principles of scientific work.

18:00 – 19:20

**Input 2:** The problem of cause and generalization in scientific research. Criteria of research quality and ethical principles.

10 min. Break

19:30 – 20:50

Group work presentations: the role of theories in the study of corruption (corruption as an individual or collective problem, corruption as a system and (anti-) corruption discourse. Discussion.

---

**Task to block 1, lesson 2:** “Group presentation and discussion of approaches to the study of corruption”

**Aim of the task:** to capture knowledge received during the first semester of theoretical differences of approaches to understanding corruption and the consequences of different approaches to analyzing and fighting corruption.

For this, join one of the topic-groups on the Doodle link (max. 7 people in a group) and make a presentation (powerpoint or similar), which will consist of key arguments of the approach and your analysis of abilities and limitations of this approach to understanding corruption and fighting it.

**Follow this structure:**

1. Presentation of key theoretical arguments of your approach: definition of corruption (what type of corruption?), assumptions about mechanisms and the principles of corruption, reasons for corruption (why does it happen?), cause and effect relationships between different elements of the theory;
2. Critical analysis of the theoretical foundations of the approach: do different points of view exist within this approach? Does this approach explain adequately the reality of corruption (“reality check”)? Are there any contradictions?
3. Consequences of using a particular approach to corruption and anti-corruption policy: what are the recommendations for the state policies from the approach and what are the consequences of fighting corruption;
4. Conclusion: advantages and disadvantages of approaches to understanding corruption and/or fight corruption.
Presentation duration is 7 minutes, after it the audience has 5 minutes for questions or comments.

To complete the task successfully, we recommend all members of the group to read all the materials first (see below) to meet in groups (off-line or online), and to discuss and create a presentation.

The thematic groups and related literature are presented below; you are also free to use additional scientific references. For all groups, we also recommend considering relevant information from the following references:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Friday, 18 January

Lessons 3&4, Room 4-100

Agenda

- Basics of the research design
- What’s interesting about the research and how to justify it?

Lecturer:
Oleksandra Keudel

Materials


18:00 – 19:20
Input 1: Development of a scientific research problem. Strategies for defining the scientific “puzzle” of the research.

19:20 – 19:30
Input 2: The role of the scientific question in the research, examples of major questions in the study of corruption; development of an analytical research question.

10 min. Break

19:30 – 20:50
Development of the research design in the context of relevant scientific literature, independent and dependent variables.

Design solutions:
- inductive or deductive approach, the choice between a factor-centric and result-centric design, the number of cases and the “direction” of the research.
Saturday, 19 January

Lessons 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9, Room 4-100

Lecturers:
Nina Onopriychuk (lessons 5–9)
and Oleksandra Keudel (lesson 9)

Materials

Conceptualization of corruption:

Approaches to design (choice between quantitative, qualitative and mixed):

9:00 – 10:20

Conceptualization, categorization and operationalization in research (principles for self-developed definition)


10 min. Break
### Advantages and disadvantages of qualitative methods: case studies, process tracing and comparative analysis in the corruption research:


### Quantitative corruption research: opportunities and limitations. Basic principles of understanding and interpretation of the results of statistical analysis


### Feasibility of the use of mixed methods and triangulation: experimental designs (vignette study, survey experiment)

**Methods of Data Collection and Analysis**

**Work with Scientific Literature**

**The Place of Analysts in the Process of Policy Making**

**Thursday, 7 February**

*Lessons 10&11, Room: 4-100*

**Agenda**

- Sociological surveys
- Interviews and content analysis: features of application

**Lecturers:**

Tetiana Kostiuchenko (lesson 10)
and Oleksandra Keudel (lesson 11)

**Materials**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:00 – 19:20</td>
<td>Sociology surveys: opportunities and restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of research design: 2 groups (20 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min. Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:30 – 20:50</td>
<td>Input 1. Interview: features of work with people as data bases, the opportunities and limitations of the method, risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Input 2: Content analysis: quantitative and quality (conventional, directed and summative) features of analyzing documents and interviews, software systems for content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of research design: 2 groups (20 min)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Friday, 8 February

Lessons 12&13, Room: 4-100

Agenda
- Effective analysis vs scientific research
- Work with scientific literature

Lecturer:
Oleksandra Keudel

Materials

Input 1: Comparison of effective analysis and scientific research

18:00 – 19:20
Input 2: The place of analysts in the process of policy making
Presentation of research design: 2 groups (20 min)

10 min. Break

19:30 – 20:50
Systematic work with literature: literature review strategies and techniques, software systems for bibliographic automation links (Mendeley)
Presentation of research design: 2 groups (20 min)
Lesson 14, 15 & 16, Room: 4-100

Saturday, 9 February

Agenda

The basics of convincing analysis

Lecturer:
Nina Onopriychuk

Materials


Database with multiple sources on academic writing/ publishing / integrity. Available at: http://bibliosynergy.ula.org.ua/index.php/proekt1

9:00 – 10:20

Argumentation: how to distinguish convincing argument from false ones?

Ferrer, D. 15 Logical Fallacies You Should Know Before Getting Into a Debate Available at: https://thebestschools.org/magazine/15-logical-fallacies-know/


Presentation of research design: 2 groups (20 min)

Principles of academic writing

Guides: Organizing Your Social Sciences Research Paper: Academic Writing Style. USC University of Southern California. Available at: https://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/academicwriting

Bozhenko O., Korian Yu., & Fedorets, M. (2016). International Citation Styles and references in scientific papers.


Presentation of research design: 2 groups (20 min)

10:30 – 11:50

Principles of academic writing

Q&A about writing your own research (work structure, quality requirements, etc.)


Presentation of research design: 2 groups (20 min)

12:40 – 14:00

Presentation of research design: 2 groups (20 min)

50 min. Lunch break

The principles of writing structured analytical texts
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Oleksandra Keudel –
post-graduate student at the Berlin School of Transnational Studies at the Free University of Berlin, a researcher on civil society and its influence on political systems, a lecturer of the Certificate Program “Anti-Corruption Studios” at the Anti-Corruption Research and Education Centre (ACREC) and lecturer on the fundamentals of convincing analytics at the Kyiv School of Economics. Oleksandra has experience in implementing scientific and applied research on relations between civil society and the state, as well as implementing international and participative projects in the private and public sectors in Ukraine, Sweden and Germany. She received a master’s degree in International Administration and Global Management from the University of Göteborg (Sweden) and a master’s and bachelor’s Degrees from the Institute of International Relations of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.

Contact: olkeudel@gmail.com

Nina Onopriichuk –
Lecturer at The Free University of Amsterdam (Vrije Universiteit), Political Science and Public Administration Department. She is also a project researcher within an EU-STRAT EU Horizon 2020 grant from the Institute of Diplomacy and Global affairs at Leiden University, studying the strategic partnership of the European Union with the partnership of Eastern countries. Until August 2018 she was a lecturer at the Political Science department at Leiden University (Universiteit Leiden) as a lecturer of statistics and research skills such as argumentation and critical review of scientific articles. She was an intern at the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris and the International Criminal Court (ICC) in The Hague. She has a bachelor’s degree in International Relations from King Juan Carlos University (Universidad Rey Juan Carlos) in Spain and a master’s degree in Political Science Studies and Public Administration from Leiden University in the Netherlands.
Basic scientific interests - democratization of post-soviet countries, the development of anti-corruption initiatives and institutions in Ukraine, as well as the influence of the EU on the democratic development of the Eastern Partnership.

Contact: onopriychuk.nina@gmail.com

Tetiana Kostiuchenko –
Professor at the Sociology Department of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, one of the leading Ukrainian experts on the implementation of network analysis. She has numerous publications in relevant topics in national and international refereed journals. One of her latest publications on corruption is the chapter “Everyday Corruption Practices” for the monograph “State of the singularity: social structures, situations, everyday practices” of the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine and the Department of Sociology of NaUKMA. Her thesis topic is the networking structures of Ukrainian political elites. She has 9-years of experience in social research and took part in different international research projects with the support of the Swedish Research Council (SIDA), DAAD, CIDA and USAID and in projects for the UNDP, OSCE, Council of Europe Office, etc. In 2017 she participated in joint projects such as “Results of the First e-Declaration spate”, “Level of corruption and its perception in Ukraine” (as part of a research team of GfK Ukraine). As a guest researcher she worked at the Friedrich-Schiller University of Jena (2010 on a DAAD scholarship, 2013 on a scholarship from Erasmus Mundus), and at the University of Minnesota (2014. With a Carnegie Fellowship). Tetiana is a member of the International Corruption Research Network (ICR network), and an expert and trainer at ACREC.

Contact: t.kostiuchenko@ukma.edu.ua