

Cultural Specific Training In Corruption Reporting For Pacific Island Journalists

It is a truism that all countries experience corruption and equally true that journalists and media organisations will list the uncovering and reporting of corruption as one of their principal responsibilities. Despite this, very few journalists have formal training in corruption reporting. Staff from the University of Queensland's Centre for International Journalism (CIJ) conducted workshops in 2000 and 2001 for journalists from the Pacific Islands, where corruption is well entrenched in many business and political activities. As a result of the workshops, we hope to stimulate debate about how such programs might best be implemented, given the economic and cultural constraints that exist in some Pacific Island countries. The first part of the paper explains the role of the media as an anti-corruption mechanism and the difficulty journalists face in identifying and sometimes stamping out corruption. The second part of the paper looks at the programs adopted and explains the responses of journalists.

Stephen Tanner

University of Queensland, Australia

Nigel McCarthy

SBS Television, Sydney

To understand the role of the media as an anti-corruption mechanism, it is necessary to look at the problem itself. There is a sizeable and growing body of literature which suggests that corruption is a problem which affects all societies, developing and developed alike (Heidenheimer et al. 1989; Levi and Nelken 1996; deLeon 1993). However the evidence suggests that what may be corrupt in one country – or even at one time in history – may not be regarded as corrupt in another country or within the same country at a different time (Tanner 1999a). For example, there can be a considerable divide between western attitudes towards corruption and those in developing countries. Conduct that is labelled 'corrupt' according to western standards is often regarded as acceptable in developing countries and even considered to have a positive role to play in the development process (Johnston 1986; Dolan et al. 1988; Johnston 1983). Despite the different attitudes

that exist, however, it is clear that the very concept of corruption embodies a moral quality – one that journalists tend to seize on. As Peter Hay has observed: “corruption does not refer to a standardised set of activities, but is a term importing a quality of moral condemnation to certain practices” (Hay 1976).

Broadly speaking, definitions of political corruption fall into one of three schools: (1) formal legal (or public office), (2) public interest and (3) public opinion. However, as Philp (1994: 1) argues: “Each definition faces difficulties over the question of from where we should take the standards or norms of public office or public interest so as to be able to say when action has deviated from this standard.”

The formal legal (public office) definition regards as corrupt those actions which violate a known standard or rule of behaviour established or sanctioned by a political system (Peters and Welch 1978). This approach is often regarded as the most precise and reliable (Johnston 1986). Its appeal lies in the fact that it can be readily applied and has as its basis identifiable legal norms. Adopting this approach, Nye defines corruption as: “Behaviour which deviates from the normal duties of a public role because of private regarding (family, close private clique), pecuniary or status gains, and violates rules against the exercise of private regarding influence. This includes such behaviour as bribery (use of reward to pervert the judgment of a person in a position of trust), nepotism (bestowal of patronage by reason of ascriptive relationship rather than merit); and misappropriation (illegal appropriation of public resources for private-regarding uses)” (1967: 419).

Nye’s definition has come under considerable scrutiny. According to Johnston, the ‘normal duties’ include obligations and prohibitions placed on the holder of a public office by the law or other formal regulations (1982: 8). ‘Private regarding’ has also been broadly interpreted to include not just the office-holder using his or her position for personal or family gain, but to include one’s family or neighbourhood (Gardiner 1993: 112).

Despite the obvious attractions, this approach is vulnerable. The law still has to be interpreted, and this can produce definitions that are either too broad or too narrow (Gibbons 1989: 166). Significantly, the legal definition can be out of step with community attitudes. This approach can also lead to another problem, whereby everything that is not illegal is permitted (Jackson et al. 1994: 54).

A broader approach is to define corruption according to the public interest. Under this approach, conduct is said to be corrupt if the public good or trust is betrayed, irrespective of whether the action is illegal or not (Dolan et al.: 3-24). The public interest approach is premised on the belief that corruption is contrary to important social norms and may ultimately threaten the stability

of the political system (Rogow & Laswell 1963: 132-33). Despite the obvious flexibility this approach offers, it has also been widely criticised. 'Public interest' is an ambiguous term and therefore difficult to define. It is also often possible to identify multiple or competing public interests, rather than one universally accepted public interest. One of the most potent criticisms of this approach, however, is the argument that it provides politicians with an opportunity to justify almost any act by claiming it is in the public interest (Peters and Welch: 975).

The third approach, and one which has attracted considerable support in recent years, is to define corruption by reference to public opinion. That is, conduct is corrupt when the weight of public opinion considers it to be so. According to this approach the seriousness of conduct may be mitigated by factors not necessarily recognised in law (Johnston 1986). While much broader than the public office and public interest approaches, the public opinion approach has been forcefully argued, as Jackson et al. suggest: "Since the public opinion, understood broadly, determines what becomes law and what dictates the public interest, it has a claim to be the final test for corruption" (1994: 55). However like the public interest approach, it is often difficult to identify a single 'public'.

It is easy to understand how corruption can mean different things to different people, particularly to people at different times or in different cultures. A primary reason for this has to do with our expectations regarding the relationship between public figures and the citizens they have been elected to represent. In many developing countries, including some Pacific Island nations, the relationship between a Member of Parliament and his or her constituents is often influenced by familial and clan ties. In developed countries, these expectations tend to be framed by our attitudes towards accountability – one of the fundamental tenets of western liberal democratic thinking. The notion of accountability is also an important one for journalists, who often regard it as one of the primary justifications for the existence of a free and unfettered media. This view was forcefully expressed by Bentham nearly 200 years ago: "Such is the nature of man when clothed with power ... that ... whatever mischief has not yet been actually done by him today, he is sure to be meditating today, and unless restrained by the fear of what the public may think and do, it may actually be done by him tomorrow" (1820-21: 15, cited in Keane, 1991)

Yet despite their pledges to act as watchdogs or to embrace Fourth Estate ideals, journalists and media organisations do not

Corruption Reporting

have a strong record when it comes to uncovering corruption. In part this can be attributed to the complex nature of corruption, and the fact that there can be considerable disagreement over whether the conduct in question is corrupt or not. But linked to this are other reasons.

The first has to do with training. Despite the increasing numbers of journalists entering the profession with university qualifications, most are generalists rather than specialists. Very few have law degrees, economics or business degrees, let alone the forensic skills needed to understand the complexities of a particular corruption inquiry (Tanner 1999b: 179). Some journalism schools are helping by offering courses in investigative journalism as compulsory units, and giving students the opportunity to undertake specialisms in political reporting or business reporting (see, for example, McIlwaine et al. 2001). All help, but still they do not necessarily prepare journalists for life as a corruption fighter. One reason for this is that they do not provide any real insights into the nature of corruption, the definitional difficulties highlighted above, or even the role of anti-corruption commissions.

Doig (1983: 76) argues that three broad constraints work against the media playing an effective investigative role in seeking to uncover corruption. They are (1) collecting the information; (2) publishing the information; and (3) integrating the benefits of that publication with the primary objectives of the organization concerned (that is, the media).

Despite appearing relatively innocuous, the first of Doig's constraints highlights serious problems confronting journalists. Uncovering the information required to verify hunches or allegations can often involve risk-taking on the part of the journalist. In an Australian context, this is confirmed by the respective experiences of Chris Masters and Phil Dickie when piecing together their stories that led to the 1987 Fitzgerald Inquiry into corruption in Queensland (see, for example, Dickie 1988 and Fitzgerald 1989). In both instances they were threatened with physical harm. The risk can also be to one's career. For example, both academics and journalists say there is a reluctance to undertake investigatory work that might alienate the source, particularly if he or she is an influential individual whom the journalist relies on regularly for information, such as a politician (e.g. Haxton 2000). If the story is published or put to air, but the allegations against them are disproved, there is a risk that the journalist will be denied access to the source, and this could threaten his or her career, particularly if they are assigned to a news round that requires such interaction.

Despite the proliferation of Freedom of Information legislation

(FOI) in many countries in recent decades, journalists still find it difficult to access information that helps them uncover or confirm corruption. Speaking from a British perspective, Murphy argues: "Because of government and business secrecy, investigation only takes place where either someone with information complains, or an inside informant 'blows the whistle' on the operation of government or business bureaucracy. This means that the tighter and more ruthless the control, or the more dedicated the members of the bureaucracy, the less likely it is to be investigated. In this sense it seems most likely that the most potentially corrupt and dangerous organisations are impregnable to investigation" (1983: 72).

Clearly the difficulties are not limited to the UK. They apply to Australia. Nor are the problems restricted to the collection of evidence. Journalists and media organisations can also find that publication is problematic and may result in legal actions being brought against the journalist who wrote the story and/or the newspaper that published it. Consequently, responsible media organisations tend not to risk defamation actions brought on the basis of flimsy or unsubstantiated evidence that may come from a source who has a "particular axe to grind". This view is also taken by Murphy, who points in the British context to the deterrent value of threatened legal action (1983: 72-3).

The third criterion identified by Doig links back to the relationship between the media organisation's public service and commercial roles and, in particular, whether these differing roles enable the media to undertake such investigations. While renowned Australian investigative reporters such as Chris Masters argue that the media can combine these roles (1988: 4-9), the proprietors do not seem to share that enthusiasm. According to Schultz, the lack of institutional support can be attributed to a number of factors, including the clash between journalistic values on the one hand and commercial and political considerations on the other; the decline in the number of media outlets and a reduction in the amount of space, time and resources allocated to investigative reporting (Schultz 1992; Haxton 2001).

It is against this background that any attempt to train journalists in corruption reporting must be assessed. In undertaking training workshops in 2000 and 2001 on the subject of corruption reporting for Pacific Island journalists, UQ's Centre for International Journalism were aided by the fact that the participating journalists all had first hand experience in covering corruption stories. They were also aware of the constraints identified by Doig, Schultz, Murphy, Masters and others,

Training Constraints And Opportunities

particularly the reluctance of media organisations to devote time and other resources to corruption stories through their own first-hand experience.

The 11 journalists who attended the first workshop were from Papua New Guinea (four), Fiji (three), Solomon Islands (two), and Vanuatu (two). They represented print media (eight), and the broadcast media (three), although some participants had experienced media other than their current employment through previous work and education. Five of the participants were women. They were nominated for the course through either media managers or Australian diplomatic staff in their countries following an appeal for 'the best and the brightest' young journalists. There were 14 participants in the second workshop, with men and women equally represented. Participants came from PNG (three), Fiji (four), Solomon Islands (two), Vanuatu (two), Samoa (two) and East Timor (two).

Most who participated in the program were relatively inexperienced. In the first group, seven were aged between 20 and 24, with the others ranging from 25 to 34. Eight had been working as journalists for up to four years, with three having between five and nine years experience. Five had undergraduate degrees - four were in journalism or communications. Two had combined degrees (one a BA/BJ; the other a BJ/LLB). Only one had a degree in a non-journalism field - a Bachelor of Public Administration. Five had undertaken cadetships, with three completing other qualifications (a certificate, a diploma in media studies and a university extension course).

Six of the participants in the second workshop were aged between 20 to 24, four were in the 25 to 34 age group. The others did not indicate their age group. Of the 11 participants who completed the corruption survey, 10 indicated they had worked as journalist for up to four years. One had been a journalist for five to nine years. Two indicated they had no formal journalism training. Two had served cadetships, six had completed undergraduate qualifications, and two had a diploma in media studies.

All participants in the first workshop were full-time reporters, although three had other newsroom responsibilities, including news editor (two) and deputy editor (one). Seven worked for newspapers, two for television, two for radio and one for journals and magazines. Most worked for privately owned organisations (eight), one worked for an independently managed, but government-owned company, another for a government-owned and controlled organization and one for a non-commercial public organization.

Among the second group, one was a freelance reporter,

another part time. Several participants held other responsibilities in the newsroom, including sub-editor (two), producer (one), moderator (one), and newsroom manager (one). The organisations they worked for ranged from privately owned and operated (five), privately owned but not controlled (three), government owned and independently managed (two), and government owned and controlled (one).

Given the range of organisations they worked for, it was anticipated that responses to some of the issues discussed during the session could differ quite significantly.

The first workshop was somewhat experimental. The first author was asked to “come along and chat to the journalists about corruption, based on his research interests”. Armed with a lecture previously presented to political science students, and the findings from a worldwide survey of the attitudes of corruption fighters to journalists’ role and commitment to the fight against corruption, there was an element of uncertainty about how the session would develop.

However it quickly became evident the participants were interested in both the theoretical and practical elements of the lecture materials, as summarised in the first part of this paper. All were willing and able to talk about their own experiences and to relate these back to the lecture material. It became apparent that their first hand experiences mirrored the problems identified in a British context by Doig and Murphy, and highlighted in Australia by the writings of Simons (1991) and the personal experiences of Masters and Dickie. Much of the conversation and class time revolved round how they could convince their editors and chiefs of staff to make more resources available.

Significantly, most of the discussion centred around ‘public interest’ arguments and how these could be used to justify stories about corruption. Despite this, however, it was widely accepted that pushing the ‘investigative barrow’ was a difficult task, with media organisations reluctant to commit resources, including time and money to researching an issue that might not produce a story one week, one month or five months down the track.

This discussion led into the second part of the program. Participants were given a questionnaire drafted as part of a research program. The questionnaire of 55 questions asked participants about their role as corruption fighters, their experience, their commitment to anti-corruption work, the difficulties they experience, both individually and in a corporate sense. The questions, with some divided into sub-questions, proved an effective teaching tool, because it raised many of the

Experimental Workshops

issues they had been forced to confront while writing about corruption, including legal and ethical issues. After they had completed the survey, we had a second discussion that focussed on some of the issues raised.

Feedback from the students suggested that the corruption workshop could be developed to become an important teaching tool. For example, students wrote:

- “[the workshop] opened my eyes to the world of corruption and how a journalist should always abide by his or her code of ethics.”
- “... even though your media is suppressed by the government you could always report about corruption. Just report factually.”
- “... the workshop helped me [gain] a comprehensive knowledge of corruption.”
- “... [the workshop] made me appreciate and understand the issue of corruption reporting more.”
- “Realising that the issue of corruption is similar in other Pacific countries and how we can work together to fight it.”
- “The workshop gave me a fair idea of how to expose corruption, but at the same time being careful of not getting into trouble with the Government.”

Based on our experiences with the first workshop, we took a slightly different approach for the second. We kept the lecture for the first hour, but again gave students plenty of opportunities to relate the material to their own experiences. This is one of the benefits of working with practitioners, particularly journalists. They are not likely to be ‘shrinking violets’ and generally are willing to share their own knowledge or experiences with others.

However before launching into the lecture, the participants were asked to complete a number of quick tasks, specifically to prepare them for the session. They were asked to:

- Define corruption
- Give five or six examples of ‘corrupt’ conduct
- List the most recent corruption scandals (national or international), covered by the media in their country
- Indicate the major hurdles confronting journalists who want to play an anti-corruption role
- State how much support they receive in exposing/ writing about corruption

The lecture provoked considerable discussion, beginning with an analysis of corruption in their own countries, and whether it fitted any of the broad definitions provided. This was particularly interesting as it highlighted the difficulties in defining corruption as the participants also tended to weave their own cultural interpretations into the equation.

The discussion then turned to the difficulties they experienced as journalists in seeking to expose and report on corruption. They identified the key problem of kinship relationships that existed and the expectations under which MPs operated. This was linked directly to the problems identified above, in matching the western liberal democratic definitions of corruption with specific cultural expectations.

This provided an ideal lead-in to the second part of the workshop – the team project. Participants were allocated into teams of three or four to work on a hypothetical scenario in which their chief of staff had asked them to investigate on the following information:

- According to your source, your Prime Minister has been given 10,000 shares in a company (Genetic Research Pty Ltd) that will soon be floated on your local stock market. You know that the share issue has already been over-subscribed and that the shares were distributed amongst major investors, meaning that small investors will miss out. The shares are expected to be issued at \$5.50 (thereby valuing his share-holding at \$55,000).

This represents less than one percent of the value of the new company, but in your country, where the average annual income is \$21,000, it is considered a large amount. Furthermore, you have heard from other sources that the share price is likely to rise quickly once investors hear about the company's plans.

- The company is a subsidiary of a major pharmaceutical company. The parent company is one of the world leaders in genetic engineering. One of the reasons why it has established the subsidiary and plans to float it on your stock market is because of the public outcry against its work in its home country, the Netherlands. It has been widely rumoured, but not yet confirmed, that the company was involved in human experimentation in a number of other countries. It closed its laboratories in those countries when the rumours began to surface, moving its operations to other sites.

- Your source tells you that the PM was only given the shares because the company wanted to conduct similar research in your country and was planning to buy not only the PM's favour but that of other politicians as well. He tells you that the parent company had used similar tactics in the past to gain political support for and silence over its research.

You begin to dig around and, in the process, uncover the following information:

- The Leader of the Opposition, the Minister for State Development and Industry, and the Speaker of the Parliament have all been allocated shares in the new company.

- The new research facility is to be built on land owned by

a company (XYZ Corporation), whose registered owner is the PM's brother. The costs of the development are to be met by Genetic Research Pty Ltd. However ownership of the facility will remain with XYZ Corporation. In fact, Genetic Engineering Pty Ltd has agreed to pay XYZ Corporation \$25,000 a year in rent for the facility over 10 years, with annual increases linked to inflation.

- You dig deeper and find that the PM's son is a major but silent shareholder in the company managed by the PM's brother. Digging deeper still, you reveal that the company is in fact controlled by a family trust established by the PM's father, which names the PM as trustee.

- You are advised by contacts in other countries that Genetic Research Pty Ltd also pressured host governments to contribute most of the funding for Research and Development (R&D), without telling the government the real purpose of its work. Also, it was able to negotiate a range of concessions, including company and payroll tax relief, and rates and electricity rebates.

- The company still owed retrenched employees in other countries millions of dollars in severance entitlements.

- A number of employees of subsidiaries in other countries had 'mysteriously disappeared' when they decided to leave the company.

- Three key directors of the parent company had links with the mafia, and two of the people earmarked to head the local operation had served jail sentences – one for murder and drug dealing, the other for extortion and embezzlement.

- Five investigative journalists who had been investigating the link between the parent company and Genetic Research Pty Ltd had died horrific deaths.

- Your editor's son had been approached to play a middle management role in the company. This last piece of information was particularly interesting, because you knew that he had no real management experience and did not have a background in scientific or medical R&D. In fact you were aware that the editor despaired about his son and the likelihood of him getting a job after being unemployed for 10 years.

Armed with this background information, participants were asked to:

- Indicate whether they consider the conduct of the politicians and other people mentioned is corrupt or not. If it was corrupt, which of the models discussed in the lecture did it satisfy? Would this conduct be considered corrupt in their country, or is their approach a personal one? Even if it was not considered corrupt, would it be acceptable to people generally?

- Develop a story plan, indicating how they would

approach this story. List the people they would interview and the types of questions they would be asked.

- List the ethical or legal issues that might constrain the journalist.
- Indicate what cultural factors, if any, might influence their treatment of this story.
- Outline the possible risks to themselves, their family or their friends as a result of covering the story. Would they allow these to influence the way in which they approached the story?
- Do they approach the police with the information they have? Can the police be trusted to deal with the information in a proper manner, or is there a risk that they too may have been 'bought'?
- Finally, how do they deal with the editor? Do they believe that: (1) his son was offered the job simply to get the editor 'on side'? Or do they believe that the editor would see the story for what it was – one that was capable of bringing the current PM and other MPs, including the Opposition Leader, down on corruption charges?
- What happens if their newspaper refuses to publish the story? How do they ensure that it is published or broadcast?

This scenario was deliberately framed to cover many of the issues the workshop participants might encounter when dealing with a corruption story while working back home. It contained suggestions of nepotism, political kickbacks, misuse of office for personal gain etc. At the same time, the international dimension was added to encourage them to think about working as part of an international team, such as those encouraged by the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (see <http://www.icij.org>).

The scenario had the desired effect. Within the groups, most of which contained people from different countries, it provoked discussions of how it reminded the participant of a particular case at home. S/he would then relate to other members the facts and circumstances of the case and how it was resolved and covered by media organisations.

The hypothetical produced a consensus approach from participants. There was a general view that the conduct of the people identified was corrupt and that it would be considered inappropriate by members of the wider community, who would regard it as a typical case of politicians seeking to 'feather their own nests', that is, they would be misusing public office for personal gain. In the broader discussions, the question of nepotism and kinship expectations arose regularly, with a number of participants arguing that MPs were under pressure to provide for family and friends. It was clear that there were competing interests

at work, and that the journalists were conscious of these and that they would impact on community responses to the story.

The teams quickly settled down to work out how they would tackle the story. They set a plan of attack, which generally focussed on:

- obtaining the information necessary to verify the story;
- working out who to interview and when (so as not to jeopardise the story by warning people too early of their plans and the extent of their knowledge. There was another element to this as well. That was the need not to place themselves or their families at risk. Not surprisingly, this was a bigger issue for some individuals than others).
- How to present the information, taking into account legal and ethical issues.

It appeared that the most difficult issue for them was following the international trail, that is following links back to the Netherlands where the parent company was allegedly domiciled. In part, the concerns related to the difficulties involved in tracking down information. A number of the journalists were not confident in using the Internet to try to search for information. Nor did they appear keen to establish links with journalists from other countries who had covered the story previously. There was also some concern about the physical risks, both to self and family. This aspect tended to separate the 'investigative' journalist from those who would be intimidated by the prospect of tackling such a large and complex story.

One major issue, as far as the participants were concerned, involved the editor and his son. Several participants were concerned that by pursuing the story they would be jeopardising their jobs. Asked how or if they would tackle the editor over the allegations, they varied significantly in their responses. Those who feared for their jobs would not approach the editor. Others said they would raise it with him at the last moment, when all the other pieces of the jigsaw had been gathered. A number said that they would not be deterred by his son's involvement. They argued that if the editor sought to quash the story they would simply give it to a colleague working for another news organisation. Once it had been published or broadcast, their newspaper would be forced to follow-up, they argued.

These views emerged during the brainstorming session that wrapped up this part of the workshop. During this session each of the groups explained how they would tackle the project, and why they planned such an approach. They then responded to each other's proposals.

Having completed the hypothetical exercise, they were asked

to complete the survey. As was the case with participants in the first workshop, the journalists were encouraged to think about their own situation, the resources they could call on, and the difficulties they experienced in covering corruption. Finally, we held an open session in which they were encouraged to talk about corruption reporting in their own country.

Based on our experiences during these two workshops, we propose the development of modules for future workshops. Clearly the number and type of modules would obviously depend on the number of participants, their English language skills, and the time allocated for the workshop. In relation to the issue of language skills, our experience conducting courses in East Timor, Papua New Guinea and Australia shows that a lack of language skills (either on the part of participants, or lecturing staff) can have a large impact on the amount of information provided, particularly if provision has to be made for a translator to interpret material.

Nonetheless, a possible program could include some or all of the following modules, depending on the focus required:

- 1 Introductory lecture on corruption
 - understanding corruption
 - social, political and economic costs of corruption
 - the definitional approaches
- 2 Journalists and corruption
 - the media as the Fourth Estate
 - impediments to investigative journalism
 - organisational issues (staff, time, equipment)
 - physical, legal, ethical issues
- 3 Investigative techniques
 - traditional approaches
 - using new technology
- 4 Hypothetical and case studies
 - to develop team-working skills
 - to enable students to apply new skills they have developed during the course
 - to give them an opportunity to consider other issues discussed during the workshop (ethical and legal)
- 5 Wrap up and discussion

Clearly such a program is not exhaustive. If more time were available, it would be possible to expand some of the sessions. For example, there could be stand-alone sessions on ethics and legal issues. Likewise, the session on new technologies could be divided into a number of sessions that would enable participants

Proposed Program

to develop Computer Assisted Reporting (CAR) skills. However we have focussed on a small core because such workshops tend to be fairly short in duration.

Conclusion

These workshops show that there is strong potential for extension courses involving young journalists. While our programs to date have focussed on journalists from Pacific Island countries, the nature of corruption is such that similar courses could be offered to suit virtually any country.

The key to understanding corruption, and therefore being able to help journalists develop the skills required to expose it, is to have a solid understanding of the socio-cultural issues that prevail in different countries. We were conscious of the fact that we should not seek to impose western attitudes on countries where some conduct defined as corruption according to western standards is regarded as acceptable or even beneficial. It was interesting, however, that this did not appear to be a problem in the workshops we conducted. While conscious of the intricate familial networks that influenced politics in their countries, the participants did not regard the scenarios we gave them as 'acceptable'. Not only that, but they were in general agreement as to what corruption involved. That said, however, rather than opt for one of the three formal definitions presented to them in the first part of the workshop, they appeared to draw from each in formulating a workable (and acceptable) definition.

Finally, the benefits of these programs flowed both ways. While the journalists clearly gained from talking to the academics and each other about different strategies and techniques for uncovering and reporting on corruption, the teaching staff also benefited. We gained from the first-hand experience the journalists brought to the workshops with them. Wherever possible, we used personal examples highlighted by journalists to illustrate points we were making. This is a further benefit in that the 'relevance factor' to journalists is enhanced.

REFERENCES

- DeLeon**, Peter (1993). *Thinking About Political Corruption*, M.E. Sharpe, New York.
- Dickie**, Phil (1988). *The Road to Fitzgerald and Beyond*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia.
- Doig**, Alan (1983). "'You Publish at Your Peril': The Restraints on Investigatory Journalism", in M. Clarke (ed.), *Corruption: Causes, Consequences and Control*, St Martin's Press, New York, pp. 74-104.
- Dolan**, Kathleen, Bruce **McKeown** & James A. **Carlson** (1988). "Popular

- Conceptions of Political Corruption: Implications for the Empirical Study of Political Ethics", *Corruption and Reform*, vol. 3, no. 1: 3-24.
- Fitzgerald, G. E.** (1989) *Report of a Commission of Inquiry Into Possible Illegal Activities and Associated Police Misconduct*, Qld Government Printer, Brisbane.
- Gardiner, John A.** (1993). "Defining Corruption", in M. Punch, E. Koltoff, K. van der Vijver & B. van Vliet (eds), *Coping with Corruption in a Borderless World, Proceedings of the Fifth International Anti-Corruption Conference*, Kluwer, Deventer: 21-38.
- Gibbons, Kenneth M** (1989). "Toward an Attitudinal Definition of Corruption", in Arnold J. Heidenheimer, Michael Johnston & Victor T. LeVine (eds), *Political Corruption: A Handbook*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick: 165-72.
- Hay, Peter** (1976). *Problems in the Analysis of Political Corruption*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Tasmania.
- Haxton, Nance** (2001). *The Death of Investigative Journalism*, unpublished MA thesis, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane.
- Heidenheimer, Arnold, Michael Johnston & Victor T. LeVine** (1989). *Political Corruption: A Handbook*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick.
- Jackson, Michael, Elizabeth Kirby, Rodney Smith & Lynn Thompson** (1994). "Sovereign Eyes: Legislators' Perceptions of Corruption", *Journal of Comparative and Commonwealth Politics* XXXII, no. 1: 54-67.
- Johnston, Michael** (1986). "The Political Consequences of Corruption: A Reassessment", *Comparative Politics* 18, no. 4: 459-77.
- Johnston, Michael** (1983). "Corruption and Political Culture in America: An Empirical Perspective", *Publius*, vol.13, no. 1: 19-39.
- Johnston, Michael** (1982). *Political Corruption and Public Policy in America*, Brooks/Cole, Monterey, California.
- Keane, John** (1991). *The Media and Democracy*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Masters, Chris** (1988). "Taking pride in journalism", *Australian Journalism Review*, vol. 10: 4-9.
- McIlwaine, Stephen, Stephen Tanner & Kerry Green** (2001). "Journalism Specialisms: Producing Better Generalists", *Australian Journalism Review*, vol. 23, no. 1: 171-82.
- Murphy, D.** (1983) "Journalistic Investigation of Corruption", in M. Clarke (ed.), *Corruption: Causes, Consequences and Control*, St Martin's Press, New York: 58-73.
- Levi, M. & D. Nelken** (1996) (eds). *The Corruption of Politics and the Politics of Corruption*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Nye, Joseph S.** (1967). "Corruption and Political Development: A Cost-Benefit Analysis", *American Political Science Review* vol. LXI, no. 2: 417-27.
- Peters, John G. & Susan Welch** (1978). "Political Corruption in America: A Search for Definitions and a Theory, or if Political Corruption is in the Mainstream of American Politics Why is it Not in the Mainstream of American Politics Research", *American Political Science Review*, vol. 72, no. 3: 974-84.
- Philp, Mark** (1994). "On Politics and its Corruption", *Political Theory Newsletter*, no.6: 1-18.
- Rogow, Arnold A. & Harold Lasswell** (1963). *Power, Corruption and*

Rectitude, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Schultz, Julianne (1992). "Investigative Reporting Tests Journalistic Independence", *Australian Journalism Review*, vol. 14, no. 2:18-30.

Simons, Margaret (1991). "Inside the Press Gang", *Eureka Street*, vol. 1, no. 1: 6-9.

Tanner, Stephen (1999a). *Political Corruption, Accountability and the Media*, unpublished PhD, University of Tasmania.

Tanner, Stephen (1999b). "The media as an anti-corruption mechanism", in A. Deysine & D. Kesselman (eds), *Argent, Politique et Corruption*, University Paris X Press, Paris.

STEPHEN TANNER and NIGEL McCARTHY lecture in journalism at the School of Journalism and Communication, University of Queensland.

Email contacts: s.tanner@mailbox.uq.edu.au

NIGEL McCARTHY is a senior producer at SBS Television, Sydney.

Email: nigel.mccarthy@sbs.com.au
