



DIPLOMA THESIS REVIEW

Type of the Review: Supervisor's Review

Author of the Thesis: bc. Diana Tadevosyan

Title:

**„THE NATURE OF CORRUPTION IN THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA, ITS
IMPACT ON HUMAN BEHAVIOUR AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT“**

Author of the Review: Doc. PhDr. Pavol Frič, PhD.

1) *Factual Contribution;*

The author of the rated text focuses its attention to the systemic corruption analysis and its consequences on the human development in Armenia. It is probably the first attempt to analyse that pathological phenomena in the Armenian society on the theoretical background of systemic corruption. The source of data used for the analysis is public opinion survey. Of course, it is a standard source for the corruption measurement, but the content of the survey is unique and appropriate for the evaluation of the systemic nature of corruption in Armenia. The secondary exploitation of the data founded on the theory of systemic corruption shed new light on the causes and consequences of corruption in the Armenian society. The author found out cultural roots and informal normative background of corruption and widespread inactivity of citizens in an anti-corruption movement. She tries to explain the crucial role of closed groups (networks) and the closed social capital in the corrupt processes. She convincingly shows that corruption of the ordinary citizens is a matter of necessity in the conditions of corrupt culture or in the corrupt system. For this purpose she also uses qualitative data from the ethnographic observations. Finally she analyzes the ways how corruption undermines human development. Her analysis in this case uses rather deduction (embedded in the documents of international organizations or academic texts) than empirical sociological data. Logically she concludes that „corruption has become a constraining factor for human development, for enlargement of human opportunities and freedoms and for equality and participation in government in Armenia.“

2) *Research Questions and Answers;*

The goal of the thesis are formulated a bit widely: *“The goal of the study is to analyse the connection between the nature of corruption, social perceptions and human development*



in Armenia.“ The central word in the goal formulation is „connection“, but this connection is not theoretically captured and defined. The following hypothesis seems a bit banal: „The hypothesis of the paper is: *The nature of corruption in Armenia is systemic, which affects all the sectors of social life, causing damage to human development.*“ In the literature, there is enough analytical texts which can prove the hypothesis. Among research questions miss the one about the causes of systemic corruption:

- What kind of corruption exist in Armenia?
- How does corruption affect social life?
- What attitude had the society towards corruption?
- Is human development affected from the corruption?

3) *Thesis Structure;*

The thesis has standard structure but its theoretical part is relatively small.

4) *Quality of Argumentation;*

Generally speaking the author’s argumentation is logical and sophisticated seen from the academic point of view. However I have some objections. The author, concentrate her analysis mostly on the level of petty corruption in the interaction of ordinary people with street level officials who are considered as the main cause of the petty corruption. Of course the author knows also high level systemic corruption which she described as the cause of petty corruption too. But the high level systemic corruption is not recognized as a special type of corruption and it is analysed per se (the chosen methodology of survey secondary analysis does not allowed it). For example the role of political parties in corrupt system is not analyzed – in the text there are only rare references about political elites and corrupt government. The bearers of high level systemic corruption are described as the „people controlling corruption levers“, but the reader does not know what is their social identity – we just know that these people are powerful. Sometime I was not able to recognize which kind of corruption the author is talking about. For example when the author is looking for the causes of corruption, she tries to explain petty corruption as an individual behaviour but not as a system (“analysis show that the main causes of corrupt behaviour and corruption acts emerge in governing system“). One can asks, whether petty corruption is really systemic one?

5) *Theoretical Background;*

Theory of systemic corruption is not reviewed enough. The author describes only one or two concepts.



6) *Methodology;*

In the text, there is no discussion of the data sources and the used method of secondary analysis is not described. This is may be the biggest deficiency of the thesis.

7) *Literature;*

The author used wide scale of relevant literature. But in the list of literature one can find only few texts on systemic corruption.

8) *Stylistics and Formal Design;*

The author has very sophisticated academic style of writing.

Questions for Discussion:

1. What is the identity of „people controlling corruption levers“?
2. What is the role of political parties in the corrupt system?

From the preview comments follows that the thesis meets all formal criteria required for master thesis at the Charles University. I suggest to rate it by the degree „C“.

Date: 19. 9. 2018

Signature: Pavol Frič