



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# GENDER EQUALITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION ANALYSIS: CORRUPTION IN ARMENIA

ARMENIA INTEGRITY PROJECT

June 2022

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). It was prepared by EnCompass LLC for the Armenia Integrity Project (Contract No. 72011121C0000). The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

# CONTENTS

- ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....III
- ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS..... IV
- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... V
- INTRODUCTION ..... I
  - Project Overview..... 2
  - Purpose of GESI Analysis..... 2
  - Gender Analysis Approach..... 2
  - Research Questions ..... 4
  - Background..... 4
- METHODOLOGY .....7
  - Research Methods ..... 7
  - Document Review ..... 8
  - Primary Data Collection ..... 8
  - Data Analysis..... 10
  - Limitations and Opportunities..... 10
- GESI ANALYSIS FINDINGS..... 12
  - Overview of Gender Equality and Social Inclusion in Armenia: USAID’s Five Domains of Gender Analysis ..... 12
  - Research Question 1 ..... 15
  - Research Question 2 ..... 19
  - Research Question 3 ..... 27
- CONCLUSIONS .....31
- RECOMMENDATIONS.....35
- REFERENCES.....37
- ANNEXES .....44
  - Annex A. Primary Data Collection Participants..... 44
  - Annex B. Data Collection Tools..... 46

## **The Armenia Integrity Project**

The Armenia Integrity Project (AIP) is a five-year project funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). AIP is implemented by prime contractor Dexis Consulting Group with subcontractors EnCompass, American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative (ABA ROLI), and the Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC). AIP is intended to reduce opportunities for corruption and reinforce public demand for improved governance and accountability in Armenia through: 1) strengthening corruption prevention institutions and integrity systems; 2) supporting the implementation of specific legal-regulatory measures for corruption prevention; and 3) facilitating a collective action approach to hold local entities engaged in corruption prevention mutually accountable.

**Suggested Citation:** Khurshudyan, S., K. Cheney, Z. Mesfin, L. Wanga. *Armenia Integrity Project Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Analysis*. Prepared for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Armenia Integrity Project. Rockville, MD: EnCompass LLC, 2022.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by Shushanik Khurshudyan, Katie Cheney, Zenebech Mesfin, and Lina Wang of EnCompass LLC for the USAID Armenia Integrity Project, with data collection support from the Caucasus Resource Research Center (CRRC). The authors would like to acknowledge contributions, technical guidance, and review from Gayatri Malhotra, Patricia Morris, Ihrar Muhammadi, and Jennifer Pendleton (EnCompass), as well as the ongoing support and leadership of the AIP Chief of Party, Lawrence Held (Dexis Consulting Group) and the USAID AIP Contracting Officer's Representative, USAID Armenia Democracy, Rights, and Governance Advisor, Anahit Khachatryan. The team is immensely grateful to the respondents and participants whose input made the assessment possible, including the National Assembly of Armenia, the Government of Armenia and the Corruption Prevention Committee, the General Prosecutor's Office, Anti-Corruption Committee, as well as civil society organizations.

# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AIP	Armenia Integrity Project
ARMSTAT	The Statistical Committee of the Republic of Armenia
CEDAW	United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
CPC	Corruption Prevention Commission
CPI	Corruption Perceptions Index
CRRC	Caucasus Research Resource Center
CSO	Civil society organization
FGD	Focus group discussion
GESI	Gender equality and social inclusion
GOAM	Government of Armenia
KII	Key informant interview
LGBTQI+	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, plus
MOJ	Ministry of Justice
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
RA	Republic of Armenia
SDC	Switzerland Development and Cooperation
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
TIAC	Transparency International Anti-Corruption Center
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Armenia has taken a gradual approach to anti-corruption reform, resulting in steady and positive improvements. Since the 2018 Velvet Revolution in Armenia, anti-corruption measures have become the most important reform of the new Government and parliamentary majority. However, institutionalizing anti-corruption policies, addressing corruption in public service delivery, and transforming social norms to reject corruption remain critical first steps in Armenia's anti-corruption efforts.

The Armenia Integrity Project (AIP) is a five-year USAID-funded project designed to reduce opportunities for corruption and reinforce public demand for improved governance and accountability in Armenia. AIP's primary objectives are to:

- Strengthen corruption prevention institutions and integrity systems
- Support the implementation of specific legal-regulatory measures for corruption prevention
- Facilitate a collective action approach to hold local entities engaged in corruption prevention mutually accountable

AIP's primary goal is to support the Government of Armenia's (GOAM) nascent anti-corruption infrastructure. The newly created Corruption Prevention Commission (CPC) is at the heart of the GOAM's efforts to reduce opportunities for corruption and implement corruption prevention measures. AIP will, with concurrent support to the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) as well as with other GOAM stakeholders, undertake activities and provide technical assistance to help strengthen the CPC's institutional capacity to fulfil its core anti-corruption mandates.

In addition to and integrated with these objectives, AIP aims to ensure that the GOAM's anti-corruption efforts are gender and inclusion-sensitive. Globally, evidence demonstrates that socially excluded populations, broadly including women, youth and the elderly, people living with disabilities, and LGBTQI+ people, experience unique and disproportionate impacts of corruption. To better understand the impacts of corruption on gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) in Armenia and to inform Activity design to support the GOAM and CPC, the AIP conducted this GESI analysis between November 2021 and May 2022.

## GESI ANALYSIS PURPOSE AND APPROACH

The purpose of the AIP GESI Analysis is to understand the GESI dynamics of Armenia that are relevant to anti-corruption, good governance, and accountability, specifically to inform the development of the CPC institutional strategy, policies and outreach, and impact. Results from the AIP GESI Analysis will also be used to ensure that key AIP activities are gender and inclusion sensitive. Specifically, this research set out to:

- Uncover gendered patterns of corruption in Armenia—who engages in corruption, what types of corruption are prevalent, how it differs across sectors, and what influences it
- Identify the differential impact corruption has on women, men, youth, the elderly, people living with disabilities, and other excluded groups in Armenia
- Spotlight differences in perceptions of corruption and anti-corruption among women, men, youth, the elderly, people living with disabilities, and other excluded groups in Armenia

- Highlight gender-based constraints and opportunities and identify knowledge gaps for the integration of a GESI lens in AIP programming
- Identify lessons and good practices (including integrity idols and anti-corruption champions) for incorporation in AIP programming and CPC capacity strengthening
- Develop recommendations for integrating a GESI lens in AIP project activities

The AIP GESI Analysis applied the USAID Five Domains of Gender Analysis, in compliance with USAID ADS Chapter 205<sup>1</sup>, to answer research questions and determine the GESI issues associated with corruption and good governance in Armenia. The AIP GESI Analysis employed a collaborative, participatory approach that engaged project staff, USAID, and Armenian stakeholders throughout various stages, with a focus on utilization of the gender analysis findings for relevant, meaningful, and effective gender integration for the duration of the project.

## METHODOLOGY

This GESI analysis draws upon secondary data, collected via a document review of relevant national, regional, and global literature on the topic of GESI and corruption, and primary data, collected via key informant interviews (KIIs) and focus group discussions (FGDs) with Armenian government, local self-government bodies, private sector, CSO, NGO, and other stakeholders. CSO and NGO stakeholders largely represented targeted communities. A collaborative, participatory design process engaged AIP Activity staff, USAID, the CPC, international NGOs, and Armenian CSOs, and upon publishing, this report will be shared with all stakeholders involved in the GESI Analysis.

## FINDINGS

To establish a context for the data that responds to the GESI Analysis research questions, this report provides a brief overview of gender equality and social inclusion in Armenia through the lens of USAID’s five domains of gender analysis. Of note, despite Armenia having legal provisions that promote and protect gender equality, social norms and gender roles often prevail in perpetuating gender inequalities, including a persistent gender pay gap, a disproportionate burden of unpaid care and domestic work, and less access for women to leadership positions both within public administration and throughout other work places. The findings from the data, presented below, are organized by the primary GESI analysis research questions.

### RESEARCH QUESTION I

*Are women, men and socially excluded groups (youth, the elderly, individuals with variation in sex characteristics, diverse sexual orientation and/or diverse gender identities, people living with disabilities and ethnic and religious minorities) victimized by corruption in different or similar ways?*

**The public does not view corruption as a gendered issue**, but rather a challenge to Armenia being a democratic state. While the perception of corruption has changed over time, it remains

---

<sup>1</sup> USAID’s “ADS Chapter 205: Integrating Gender Equality and Female Empowerment in USAID’s Program Cycle” may be accessed here: <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/205.pdf>

pervasive, and the understanding of what corruption is and isn't varies. This affects how corruption is seen to affect women and men, youth and the elderly, people living with disabilities, and other socially excluded groups: **respondents are either unaware of or do not observe gendered differences to being affected by corruption, and few saw a link between corruption and gender and social inclusion.** However, when probed, respondents shared examples of how corruption increases barriers to women's access to healthcare and other social services, and its negative effects on women in the workplace. At the same time, respondents were aware of and acknowledged the impact of harmful gender norms and roles. **Many respondents noted a link between women's increased participation in public administration and politics and an anticipated decline in corruption; however, there are underlying gender inequalities that may prevent women from fully engaging in high-level roles.** This point as an anti-corruption issue is discussed further under Research Question 3.

In exploring the impact of corruption on other socially excluded groups, **youth were found to be less accepting of corruption yet are at risk of participating in and vulnerable to the negative effects of corruption** within the education system and while seeking employment. As noted in findings responding to Research Question 2, corruption is pervasive in the education system, disproportionately impacting youth. **People living with disabilities were also perceived to be particularly vulnerable to corruption,** and there was indication that youth living with disabilities are particularly affected in the education system.

## RESEARCH QUESTION 2

*Is there a gendered pattern to who engages in corruption and who supports anti-corruption efforts?*

The analysis found that **men and women engage in corruption for different (gendered) reasons, and how they engage in corruption is influenced by gender norms and roles within the household** – namely, gender roles appear to dictate that men are more likely to engage in grand corruption, and women in petty corruption. Further, while men seem to engage further in corruption within business and related to earning income, women are more likely to engage in corruption as primary users of social services, such as healthcare and education. **Respondents do not see a difference between women and men in what may motivate them to engage in corruption;** rather, women are typically in lower-level positions within the workplace, and therefore have less exposure to or opportunity to engage in corruption. While respondents did not demonstrate a deep understanding of how corruption may affect different social groups, they noted that **elderly populations may be more likely to engage in corruption both as a customary practice and in order to access basic services.** The elderly are perceived to engage in customs that linger from the Soviet era, such as small-scale bribery perceived as gift giving. Further, **lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, plus (LGBTQI+)** populations may be compelled to engage in corruption to access healthcare services.

**Access to resources, including employment, income, and social networks, also affects whether and the degree to which women engage in corruption,** whether they are forced to do so to access services and other resources, or for personal gain. Challenges in seeking employment and persistent wage gaps may place women at a socio-economic disadvantage that inclines them to participate in corruption. **Engagement in corruption is documented to be most prevalent in the public sector, intersecting with the private sector.** Specifically, corruption is reported to be



common in public education—in which women are predominantly employed—indicating a gendered pattern in engagement in corruption. Women's engagement in corruption in the private sector reportedly varied – while secondary data indicated that corruption poses a barrier to women's entrepreneurship, respondents indicated that there are no barriers to women in establishing or managing a business.

## RESEARCH QUESTION 3

### *Are anti-corruption efforts gender-sensitive?*

While respondents agree that there has been progress in addressing corruption at higher levels of public administration, **they are unaware of anti-corruption policies and efforts and perceive that anti-corruption efforts are not gender-sensitive. Nor are those efforts seen as considering the vulnerabilities of socially excluded groups.** However, gender and inclusion factors may contribute to or inhibit how people engage in anti-corruption efforts. **Respondents often point to education levels and access to information in reducing vulnerability to corruption – and youth are perceived to have increase technological savviness and therefore access to information. New technologies in reporting corruption may improve transparency and efficiency in public administration and in providing public services to socially excluded populations,** and more research is needed to better understand how these technologies could be more accessible. Building off of findings under Research Question 1, while only a few targeted anti-corruption activities have been undertaken, **it is key to have activities that focus on various social groups, and initiatives that target women and youth are key to combatting corruption and making changes in corruption perception.** Lastly, **multiple respondents felt that an increase in women's participation in public administration could potentially contribute to a decline in corruption.** While the anti-corruption stance of the GOAM is perceived to encourage women's recent participation in public administration leadership positions, there remain a number of barriers to women's engagement in leadership (see Research Question 1).

## CONCLUSIONS

This GESI Analysis serves as one of the only studies conducted specifically on the effects of corruption on gender equality and social inclusion in the Armenian context. The Analysis found that the topic of GESI and corruption is largely unacknowledged and unfamiliar to representatives ranging from various levels of government to civil society to the private sector, and there are very few anti-corruption efforts that target socially excluded groups in Armenia. Supplementary research to support the findings in this GESI Analysis can better inform how and why corruption may disproportionately affect socially excluded groups in Armenia, and the best way to address it for these vulnerable populations. The following conclusions present the analysis team's synthesis and interpretation of the significance of the findings.

1. Overall, there is a lack of awareness of (or ability to articulate) the different gender influences and impact of the effects of corruption in Armenia, and little indication of gender differences in how people experience corruption. This may affect the ability to detect, identify, and address the effects of corruption for socially excluded populations (Research Question 1).
2. Corruption in public administration may disproportionately impact people living with disabilities, who are vulnerable to becoming “victim participants” in accessing social services. (Research Question 1 and Research Question 3)

3. Youth emerged as a key demographic that is vulnerable to both participating in and the negative effects of corruption, and are potentially the most important social group to target with anti-corruption efforts. (Research Question 1 and Research Question 3)
4. Older members of the population may draw from Soviet era experiences and reinforce social customs that perpetuate corruption, while also being one of the groups most vulnerable to experiencing the negative effects of corruption. (Research Question 1, Research Question 2, and Research Question 3)
5. Given that the GESI Analysis was unable to unearth substantial data on the experiences of LGBTQI+ populations' vulnerability to or engagement in corruption in Armenia, there is need for additional research in this area. (Research Question 2)
6. Social and gender norms were found to be particularly influential in how accepting women and men are of engaging in corruption. Respondents perceived that there is no difference between women and men in engaging in corruption in Armenia, which may indicate the need for additional data that can explore the gendered differences of corruption further. (Research Question 2)
7. Whether women engage in corruption to access services or other resources, or to leverage power for personal gain, their engagement in corruption is influenced by their degree of access to resources—including employment, income, and social networks—and is present predominantly in education and the private sector. (Research Question 2)
8. There is a lack of awareness of anti-corruption efforts, let alone gender and inclusion sensitive interventions; those that do exist are not perceived to be gender sensitive. (Research Question 3)
9. Gender and social inclusion sensitive anti-corruption efforts that address the specific needs of women, youth and the elderly, people living with disabilities, LGBTQI+ populations, and other social groups can be successful at combatting corruption within specific sectors or within key demographics of Armenian society. (Research Question 3)
10. Women's empowerment is a key tool to mitigate corruption. The nexus of gender and corruption is complex: women's disempowerment, shaped by socio-economic inequalities and cultural norms factors, makes women more disproportionately vulnerable to corruption. (Research question 2 and research question 3)

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Develop an index or similar measurement tool to identify and document incidences of corruption experienced by women, youth, and other vulnerable groups.** This measurement tool should maximally engage Armenian counterparts and ultimately be owned and maintain by a GOAM agency, such as the National Statistics Committee.
- **Target and engage youth in developing and implementing anti-corruption efforts.** Interventions may include training youth to become anti-corruption champions, or establishing a hub at Yerevan and regional universities to create a space for youth to learn about, discuss, and plan for anti-corruption initiatives.
- **Conduct more research and collect additional data on how corruption is affecting people living with disabilities in Armenia,** particularly regarding their access to social services including healthcare, pension, and other social benefits.

- **Assess corruption reporting and public service technologies to ensure they are accessible to all populations**, and in particular the elderly and people living with disabilities.
- **Conduct a gender audit or assessment of anti-corruption laws, and work to ensure that existing and new anti-corruption policies and activities are gender-sensitive.**
- **Advocate for public policies that support women’s representation in higher decision-making roles in sectors where women have low representation and in public administration, including in local government bodies.**
- **Conduct capacity building with personnel implementing anti-corruption efforts.** Develop capacity of CPC personnel and other key stakeholders (including other GOAM agencies, law enforcement, and CSOs) to better understand the specific experiences/issues concerning women, youth, people living with disabilities, LGBTQI+, and other populations affected by corruption.
- **Integrate GESI into ongoing and new anti-corruption programs, strategies, and action plans.** Stakeholders may also consider integrating anti-corruption components into programming that targets women.
- **Conduct communications and outreach activities to increase knowledge and awareness of the impacts of corruption on socially excluded groups.** AIP could support the CPC and Ministry of Justice in carrying out such awareness-raising campaigns, as well as to expand available information on anti-corruption policies implementing by the GOAM.

# INTRODUCTION

Armenia has taken a gradual approach to anti-corruption reform, resulting in steady and positive improvements. Since the 2018 Velvet Revolution in Armenia, anti-corruption measures have become the most important reform of the new Government and parliamentary majority. However, institutionalizing anti-corruption policies, addressing corruption in public service delivery, and transforming social norms to reject corruption remain critical first steps in Armenia's anti-corruption efforts.

While strides have been made toward anti-corruption reform in Armenia, these efforts have largely remained gender neutral. However, a gender-neutral approach to anti-corruption efforts means that these efforts ignore the ways in which men, women, and their intersecting identities experience corruption, which may inadvertently widen gender and social inequality in access to public services and in participation in public life. Some of the ways in which corruption manifests in Armenia will undoubtedly affect men, women, youth, the elderly, people living with disabilities, and other socially vulnerable groups in different ways across the healthcare sector, education, state revenue collection, and law enforcement, as articulated in the 2015-2018 Anti-Corruption Strategy (Harutyunyan 2018). Understanding the ways in which different groups experience, participate in, and are vulnerable to corruption is an important first step to addressing the underlying social norms that persist around corruption. As different social groups experience the effects of corruption disproportionately, a gender-neutral approach to anti-corruption efforts in these key areas is needed to address gender and social inequalities in Armenia.

Corruption is found to be detrimental to the health and well-being of women and is a barrier for women to fully access their civic, economic, and social rights. Corruption at points of access to basic services, such as health, education, justice, etc., can severely compromise women's access to quality services, negatively affecting their social and economic empowerment. Further, corruption exacerbates poverty and gender gaps, especially in situations when basic services are of low quality and gender inequalities are high. Women experience pervasive corruption due to poverty, need for healthcare, and susceptibility to coercion (Boehm and Sierra 2015).

This report presents the methodology, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) analysis carried out November 2021 through May 2022 for the Armenia Integrity Project funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The analysis presented in this report presents findings on how men, women, and their intersecting identities interface with corruption in Armenia based on the perceptions of representative stakeholders for marginalized groups. This analysis offers recommendations on how to use these findings to integrate gender and social inclusion into the development of the Corruption Prevention Commission's (CPC) institutional strategy, policies, and outreach and impact, as well as to inform state and non-state bodies decision making and policy planning processes. The results from this analysis will also be used to ensure that key AIP activities are gender and social inclusion sensitive.

## PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Armenia Integrity Project (AIP) is a five-year USAID-funded project designed to reduce opportunities for corruption and reinforce public demand for improved governance and accountability in Armenia by:

- Strengthening corruption prevention institutions and integrity systems
- Supporting the implementation of specific legal-regulatory measures for corruption prevention
- Facilitating a collective action approach to hold local entities engaged in corruption prevention mutually accountable

AIP's primary goal is to support the Government of Armenia's (GOAM) nascent anti-corruption infrastructure. The newly created CPC is at the heart of the GOAM's efforts to reduce opportunities for corruption and implement corruption prevention measures. AIP will, with concurrent support to the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) as well as with other GOAM stakeholders, undertake activities and provide technical assistance to help strengthen the CPC's institutional capacity to fulfil its core anti-corruption mandates.

## PURPOSE OF GESI ANALYSIS

The purpose of the AIP Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Analysis is to understand the GESI dynamics of Armenia that are relevant to anti-corruption, good governance, and accountability, specifically to inform the development of the CPC's institutional strategy, policies and outreach and impact. Results from the AIP GESI Analysis will also be used to ensure that key AIP activities are gender and inclusion sensitive. Ultimately, this GESI Analysis intends to shape anti-corruption work in Armenia, and potentially contribute to a reduction in corruption that will benefit the Armenian population.

Specifically, this research set out to:

- Uncover gendered patterns of corruption in Armenia—who engages in corruption, what types of corruption are prevalent, how it differs across sectors, and what influences it
- Identify the differential impact corruption has on women, men, youth, the elderly, people living with disabilities, and other excluded groups in Armenia
- Spotlight differences in perceptions of corruption and anti-corruption among women, men, youth, the elderly, people living with disabilities, and other excluded groups in Armenia
- Highlight gender-based constraints and opportunities and identify knowledge gaps for the integration of a GESI lens in AIP programming
- Identify lessons and good practices (including integrity idols and anti-corruption champions) for incorporation in AIP programming and CPC capacity strengthening
- Develop recommendations for integrating a GESI lens in AIP project activities

## GENDER ANALYSIS APPROACH

The AIP GESI Analysis employed a collaborative, **participatory** approach that engaged project staff, USAID, and Armenian stakeholders throughout various stages, from design sessions to developing the

data collection sample to validating initial findings. This participatory process was undertaken to help ensure alignment with project priorities and **utilization** of the gender analysis findings for relevant, meaningful, and effective gender integration for the duration of the project. The analysis also utilized an **intersectionality lens** focusing on the gendered impacts of corruption on marginalized groups including youth, the elderly, people living with disabilities, LGBTQI+ persons, and ethnic and religious minorities. This was accomplished through targeting a diverse sample and reviewing documents (where possible) that represented these different groups as much as possible, and focusing our analysis to incorporate findings specific to these groups. Our **systems-based** approach ensured that all levels of stakeholders that may shed light on GESI and corruption in Armenia—government, international donors, civil society organizations (CSOs) representing marginalized groups, law enforcement, etc. —were represented.



The AIP GESI Analysis applied the USAID Five Domains of Gender Analysis, in compliance with USAID ADS Chapter 205<sup>2</sup>, to answer research questions and determine the GESI issues associated with corruption and good governance in Armenia (USAID 2021). Icons per domain are applied throughout this report where in-depth analysis specific to a domain is provided.

	<b>Laws, Policies, Regulations, and Institutional Practices</b>	<i>The extent to which laws, policies, regulations, and institutional practices contain explicit or implicit gender biases</i>
	<b>Gender Roles, Responsibilities, and Time Use</b>	<i>Cultural norms and beliefs on appropriate qualities, life goals, and aspirations for males and females and excluded groups</i>
	<b>Patterns of Power and Decision Making</b>	<i>Division of labor between productive economic activity and reproductive (non-market) activity, and what males and females do in these spheres, including roles, responsibilities, and time use during paid work, unpaid work, and community service</i>
	<b>Cultural Norms and Beliefs</b>	<i>Whether females and males own and/or have access to and the capacity to use productive resources and information necessary to be a fully active and productive participant in society</i>
	<b>Access To + Control over Assets and Resources</b> (including income, employment, and assets such as land)	<i>The ability of females, males, and socially excluded groups to decide, influence, and exercise control over material, human, intellectual, and financial resources, in the household, community, and country</i>

<sup>2</sup> USAID’s “ADS Chapter 205: Integrating Gender Equality and Female Empowerment in USAID’s Program Cycle” may be accessed here: <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/205.pdf>

# RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions guided this GESI Analysis:

- 1. Are women, men, and socially excluded groups (youth, the elderly, individuals with variation in sex characteristics, diverse sexual orientation and/or diverse gender identities, people living with disabilities and ethnic and religious minorities) victimized by corruption in different or similar ways?**
  - a. What are the issues pertaining to intersectionality that compound the multiple disadvantages experienced by women, men, and socially excluded groups?
  - b. What are the different types of corruption that women, men, and socially excluded groups experience?
  - c. What factors have shifted perceptions and attitudes toward corruption? How have legal measures like gender quotas for elected representatives at national and local levels affected different members of the public's perceptions of corruption and anti-corruption? What is the correlation between the gender of government leaders and changes in public perception toward corruption?
- 2. Is there a gendered pattern to who engages in corruption and who supports anti-corruption efforts?**
  - a. Do gender relations shape networks and opportunities for corruption?
  - b. Are women and other socially excluded groups less likely to engage in corruption than men?
  - c. Does social acceptance of corruption differ based on the gender of the person engaged in corruption?
  - d. Does public support exist for anti-corruption efforts, and how does that support differ for different socially excluded groups?
- 3. Are anti-corruption efforts gender-sensitive?**
  - a. Do women, men, and socially excluded groups have the same opportunities to highlight their specific experiences of and concerns about corruption?
  - b. Does anti-corruption support and assistance seeking differ by group?
  - c. Is there a gender-sensitive approach to the reporting, investigation, prosecution, and adjudication of corruption cases?
  - d. Is there understanding for anti-corruption measures in the context of the international legal and policy framework for women's rights, gender equality and social inclusion?
  - e. What are the gendered impacts of anti-corruption measures? How does/can anti-corruption measures promote or hinder gender equality? Do women, men, and socially excluded groups perceive and tolerate anti-corruption efforts differently?

## BACKGROUND

### CORRUPTION IN ARMENIA

Despite a demonstrated commitment to address corruption in Armenia, corruption remains pervasive with roots that reach back to the days of when Armenia was part of the USSR. Armenia has made strides to implement anti-corruption reform. Especially since the 2018 Velvet Revolution, anti-corruption has been one of the most important reforms of the new Government and parliamentary



majority. However, institutionalizing anti-corruption policies, addressing corruption in public service delivery, and transforming social norms to reject corruption remain critical first steps in Armenia's anti-corruption efforts. The latter were also impacted by the COVID-19 restrictions and the 2020 Nagorno-Karabakh war, which shifted GOAM priorities over the last two years (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 2022)<sup>3</sup>.

In 2020, Armenia's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) score was 49 out of a 100—a higher score meaning minimal prevalence of corruption and a lower score meaning highly corrupt—and ranked 60 out of 180 countries, placing Armenia below the half-way point. Since 2012, Armenia has increased its CPI by 15 points (Transparency International 2022). Interestingly, the 2019 annual report by the prosecutor's office recorded a 4.7% increase from 2018 in corruption-related cases. There were a total of 2,083 cases of corruption, of which 1,399 became criminal investigations—yet only 52 cases ended in a guilty verdict (Freedom House 2020).

Armenia's Criminal Code criminalizes several forms of corruption including active and passive bribery, extortion, and abuse of office. Additionally, gifts and facilitation payments are also considered illegal in Armenia, however these practices remain pervasive and culturally accepted (Gan Integrity, Risk, and Compliance Portal 2020). Following the Velvet Revolution, the government of Armenia introduced a new anti-corruption strategy with its 2019–2022 implementation action plan. The government's key objectives under the action plan are to fight against corruption, establish rule of law, make the government transparent and accountable, strengthen democratic institutions and civil society, and create equal competitive conditions for economic and political role-players (Murray and Inman 2019). Additionally, Armenia also established an E-Government Strategy in 2014 to limit bureaucrats' ability to bribe citizens (USAID 2019).

Armenia also adopted a comprehensive legal framework for civil service and for public service integrity, including regulations on ethics and conflict of interest. It criminalized trading in influence and illicit enrichment, introduced laws on whistleblower protection, established the CPC, and enhanced the legal provisions on asset declarations and public procurement (OECD 2019b). Further, the GOAM Program for 2021-2026 contains key messages on the GOAM's anti-corruption vision and priorities, acknowledging the continuing challenge of corruption in establishing a legal, safe, economically developed, democratic state. Most recently, the MOJ and CPC have made notable progress in establishing policies and regulations on managing conflicts of interest among public officials, amending incompatible regulations, developing a gifts registry, and approving a model code of conduct for public officials (USAID 2022).

However, these collective efforts have arguably had a limited impact so far and corruption remains a significant problem in critical areas of public administration, such as the judiciary, tax and customs, health, education, military, and law enforcement. Although the existing legal framework seeks to provide legal equality, lack of a practical mechanism to combat discrimination and inequality hinders the process of establishing gender equality in Armenia.

## **GENDER, SOCIAL INCLUSION, AND CORRUPTION**

On a global level, evidence demonstrates unique and, in some ways, disproportionate impacts of corruption on socially excluded populations, broadly including women, youth, and the elderly, people

---

<sup>3</sup> OECD (2022), Anti-Corruption Reforms in Armenia: Pilot 5th Round of Monitoring Under the Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/e56cfa9-en>.



living with disabilities, and LGBTQI+ populations. Women commonly experience corruption when interacting with vital public services such as health care, education, the police, and local government. Women can face both financial and sexual extortion when accessing public services for themselves and their families (Amin and Marin 2020). Women in many ways face the same forms of corruption as men, although often to a greater extent due to gendered power relations, discrimination, and vulnerability. Forms of corruption that are gender-specific include the use of sex as an informal currency in bribery, exploiting concepts of honor and shame in extortion of women and girls, and human trafficking. While men are also subjected to these types of corruption, women make up the majority of those exposed. These acts often go unpunished as they are associated with private and public shame and are, in most cases, not recognized as corruption (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) 2015).

Women constitute the majority of the global poor, and therefore may face disproportionately negative impacts as resources for publicly provided services are often compromised and depleted by corruption (Boehm and Sierra 2015). Women have relatively less access to and control over resources; therefore, in contexts where bribery is a prerequisite to accessing services, rights, and other resources, women are more frequently denied access to those services (ibid.). Women's lack of access to resources affects their interaction with corruption: the perception that women do not have the money to pay bribes may mean that they are not asked for payments (and are therefore left without access to basic services); and when women do participate in bribery, the payment may take the form of cash from their income or sexual favors (Hendry 2018; Boehm and Sierra 2015). There are several studies that point to women being less prone to engage in corrupt transactions (SIDA 2015).

Most research on gender and corruption focuses on access to public services and financial resources, application of laws in advancing rights and protecting women from abuse, and political participation and decision-making. Research indicates that a higher level of women's political and economic participation is likely to indicate that a country is more open in general, with more transparent governance and a more democratic approach, which in turn possibly discourages or minimizes opportunities for corruption. Data from transition countries show that corruption is less severe in situations where women have a larger share of parliamentary seats and senior positions in the government bureaucracy (SIDA 2015). Several studies indicate that increased political participation by women could help tackle corruption (Paweenawat 2018; Bauhr et al 2019; Merkle 2022). However, there is no clear evidence that women who take on leadership roles are any less likely than men to engage in corruption (SIDA 2015). Evidence points to other factors such as the political and institutional context, culture and gender inequalities for explaining the links between female representation and levels of corruption (Amin and Marin 2020).

While research on the effects of corruption on socially excluded groups predominantly focuses on women, an assumption of disproportionate negative effects of corruption may be extended to other groups that rely heavily on access to public services. Given their reliance on public goods and services, such as health and education, both young and elderly people are likely to suffer disproportionately from systemic corruption (McDonald et al. 2021). Globally, aged-based discrimination can render individuals belonging to certain age brackets vulnerable to corrupt practices. Such discrimination relies on and exacerbates the relatively low political and economic power, limited awareness of legal entitlements, and lack of voice that young people in particular often have (ibid.).

Widespread anti-LGBTQI+ sentiment and discrimination—including discriminatory violence, hate speech in political discourse, violations of the right to freedom of expression and assembly, and restrictions on the right to work and education—create an enabling environment where discriminatory corruption against LGBTQI+ persons frequently goes unchallenged (McDonald et al. 2021). At a global

level, corrupt agents have increasingly begun to employ digital tools as part of their corruption schemes, and many LGBTQI+ individuals have been exposed to extortive corruption via the internet and particularly dating apps (McDonald et al. 2021). In many national contexts, channels for LGBTQI+ individuals to seek and obtain redress for acts of discrimination and corruption are absent. The same contextual factors that expose LGBTQI+ persons to coercive corruption also prevent them from challenging it. Research indicates that LGBTQI+ persons have low levels of trust in duty-bearers, a perception that initiating proceedings will not result in redress for abuses committed against them, and a reluctance to initiate legal proceedings that may require LGBTQI+ individuals to reveal their identity and discuss their private life, all of which may prevent them from reporting corruption and other discrimination (McDonald et al. 2021)

## METHODOLOGY

The GESI Analysis utilized an appreciative, qualitative, and participatory methodology to answer the research questions, launched with an initial discussion on design with AIP staff, followed by a collaborative design session that included USAID, the CPC, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, other government counterparts, local CSOs, and international organizations. The scope, methodology, key areas of inquiry, and research questions were informed by these design sessions. The inception report for this GESI Analysis underwent EnCompass' Institutional Review Board's full review in December 2021.

## RESEARCH METHODS

The GESI Analysis applied a mixed methods approach framed by the analytical approaches and USAID's Five Domains of Gender Analysis as described above. During a document review, the team drew heavily upon secondary information from USAID and other donors to ensure that the research was cognizant of and able to build on cumulative knowledge, with a primary focus on literature available from the Armenian context. The team also collected primary data to understand and verify patterns identified in existing research and analysis and to identify new gender and social inclusion issues that should be explored. The target population for this analysis was residents of the ten marzes of Armenia and Yerevan, the capital city.

## DOCUMENT REVIEW

The Analysis Team conducted a document review on key themes related to the gendered dimensions and impacts of corruption and anti-corruption in Armenia, and in the Europe & Eurasia region and globally where data was found to be potentially relevant to the Armenian context. In total, the team reviewed 56 documents—ranging from reports to surveys to published research and articles to governmental and international policies and conventions—from sources including AIP research and reports, the GOAM, USAID, United Nations (UN) organizations, international organizations, and other stakeholders (see [Exhibit I](#) for full list).

Guided by a document review protocol developed at the start of the Analysis, the Analysis Team reviewed and summarized the documents using a review template that organized key information by USAID’s gender analysis domains and by each research question. There were also opportunities to capture information on gaps and challenges, potential anti-corruption interventions, and general background. All documents were organized using an Excel tracker and EndNote citation software.

### Exhibit I. Illustrative Document Review Sources

- The GOAM, including the Ministry of Health
- USAID
- United Nations organizations, including the UN Development Programme (UNDP), UN Women, and the UN Office of Drugs and Crime
- Transparency International
- Indices, including the Social Inclusion and Gender Index and the Corruption Perceptions Index
- Human Rights Watch
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
- Freedom House
- Asian Development Bank
- Council of Europe
- The Armenian Lawyers' Association and the CSO Anti-Corruption Coalition of Armenia

## PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION

KIIs and FGDs were conducted to deepen the analysis of policy and programming issues related to the impacts of corruption and anti-corruption on GESI in Armenia. KIIs and FGDs provided information on constraints and opportunities for transforming gender relations in Armenia, differences in access to information, resources, and opportunities, and the quality of men’s and women’s participation in improved governance and accountability in Armenia. Semi-structured protocols and tools for KIIs and FGDs ([Annex B](#)) were piloted and data collectors were oriented prior to commencing data collection to establish the highest possible level of comparability between key informants’ responses and to ensure that questions were posed with consistency. Across all KIIs and FGDs, 98 individuals were interviewed—66 women and 32 men.

**Key Informant Interviews.** The GESI Analysis Team Lead conducted KIIs between February-April 2022. Depending on location, accessibility, and local COVID-19 case rates, KIIs were conducted in-person or remotely via Zoom, and all interviews were conducted with participants located in Yerevan. The majority of interviews were conducted in Armenian, and in English where the participant preferred. The Team Lead conducted 21 KIIs with representatives from institutions including USAID; the Ministry of Justice, the CPC, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport, and other government agencies; law enforcement agencies (including the newly established Anti-Corruption Committee, general prosecution); anti-corruption, integrity and rule of law; women-focused, youth-focused, persons with disabilities-focused, regional and community development, LGBTQI+, and environmental CSOs, and international organizations. Sampling for the GESI Analysis prioritized representation of key organizations, agencies, and institutions working in anti-corruption. From these

institutions, 13 women and eight men were interviewed regarding their perception of their organizations' targeted participants' experiences. A detailed list of the institutions represented in key information interviews is included in [Annex A](#).

**Focus Group Discussions.** Nine FGDs were conducted by AIP partner CRRC. All FGDs were conducted online via Zoom between February-April 2022. In total, 53 women and 24 men participated in focus group discussions. Each FGD was organized based on the type of organization, geographic focus, and the population represented. FGDs were organized as follows:

- **CSO FGDs:** one FGD was conducted with representatives from anti-corruption, gender, youth, persons with disabilities, LGBTQI+ journalistic, and environmental CSOs in Yerevan and three FGDs were conducted with anti-corruption, women-focused, youth-focused, persons with disabilities-focused, regional and community development, and environmental CSOs in the following regions (marzes) of Armenia. Individuals represented different age groups evenly, however the majority were between 30-45 years old; the majority of participants were also women (17 women and 7 men). See [Annex A](#) for a list of regional and Yerevan-based CSOs that participated in FGDs across all ten regions of Armenia.
  - Group 1: Syunik, Vayots Dzor, and Ararat regions, and Yerevan (nine participants)
  - Group 2: Gegharkunik, Kotayk, and Tavush regions, and Yerevan (eight participants)
  - Group 3: Shirak, Lori, Aragatsotn, and Armavir regions, and Yerevan (six participants)
  - Group 4 Yerevan Municipality (seven participants)
- **Private sector representative FGDs:** two FGDs were conducted with representatives of private sector organizations. In total, 22 private sector organizations participated in data collection, from sectors including construction, tourism (hotels), healthcare (hospitals), agriculture (produce, dairy), and manufacturing (textiles, canned food, infrastructure, paper goods). 12 men and ten women participated in discussions. To respect the confidentiality of representatives, a complete list of organizations interviewed is available upon request. FGDs were conducted with the following regional grouping:
  - Group 1: Syunik, Vayots Dzor, Ararat, Lori, and Aragatsotn regions and Yerevan (11 participants)
  - Group 2: Gegharkunik, Kotayk, Tavush, Shirak, and Armavir regions and Yerevan (11 participants)
- **Local self-government bodies and regional government authorities FGDs:** 3 FGDs were conducted with representatives of local self-government bodies and regional government authorities. Women were the majority of participants representing marzes (11 women and 5 men), and the Yerevan FGD was all women (9). Marzes FGDs included community social workers and senior specialists and heads of the Unit for Family, Women and Children's Rights Protection; the Yerevan FGD included specialists in the Unit of Social Security and Healthcare, Department of Child and Social Protections, and Social Work and Employment Department of the Regional Center of Unified Social Services. FGDs were conducted with the following regional representation:
  - Group 1: Aragatsotn, Talin, Vayots Dzor, Yeghegnadzor, Syunik, Kapan, Tatev, Ararat, Artashat regions (9 participants)
  - Group 2: Gegharkunik, Gavar, Charentsavan, Hrzadan, Armavir, Kotayk and Tavush regions (7 participants)
  - Group 3: Yerevan Municipality (9 participants, all women)

## DATA ANALYSIS

The Analysis team coded and analyzed all primary data in Dedoose Version 8.3.21, a web-based application for managing, analyzing, and presenting qualitative and mixed methods research data. The team developed a coding structure based on the gender analysis research questions and a review of a sample of KII and FGD transcripts. The team examined each code to generate emergent themes through an inductive process, which allowed respondents' voices and experiences to emerge as salient themes and avoided predetermined or expected hypotheses to define the findings.

The team then held a data analysis and interpretation session to collaboratively triangulate and analyze primary and secondary data, and to discuss the significance of and interrelationships among emerging themes. During the workshop, the team developed initial draft findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Following submission of the draft GESI analysis report in July 2022, AIP held a validation workshop in October 2022 with stakeholders from the GOAM, CSOs and NGOs, USAID, and others to review findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and validate the information presented in this report.

## LIMITATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The following factors posed limitations and offered opportunities throughout conducting the GESI Analysis:

- Based on a review of existing literature, this report appears to be one of the first documents that explicitly focuses on the effects of corruption on socially excluded populations in the Armenian context. While there is a wide range of resources available on the topic of GESI and corruption at a global level, there were very few published documents that discussed GESI and corruption specifically in Armenia. Further, publications that did address GESI and corruption in Armenia focused on women, and rarely addressed other socially excluded groups such as people living with disabilities and LGBTQI+ populations (groups for which there is limited data on overall). This GESI Analysis relies on primary data for insights into the effects of corruption on these groups, and acknowledges the need for further research in this area.
- Corruption is a sensitive topic in Armenia. Respondents largely did not speak to being affected by corruption, although interview questions attempted to glean this information. Official representatives of identified institutions, agencies, and organizations were invited to participate in KIIs or FGDs to share information and experiences of their institutions engaged in anti-corruption efforts via their professional role, and not individual experiences. This may have affected the team's ability to address research questions pertaining to socially excluded individuals' experiences of corruption, because individuals from these groups were not directly asked about their experiences in order to not put them at risk of disclosure of engaging in or being victimized by corruption. One exception to this was the case of private sector representatives, who voluntarily shared individual experiences as entrepreneurs or sole business owners, within the parameters of the KII or FGD protocols. This limitation points to the need for a measurement tool or index that can document incidences of corruption while, at the same time, exploring gendered experiences and differences among those incidences.
- While the Analysis intended to explore intersectionality in how socially excluded groups experience and engage in corruption, the team was unable to develop findings or conclusions in

this area due to lack of strong data. As described throughout the findings section, there was minimal preliminary awareness of how corruption affects socially excluded groups to begin with; therefore exploring intersectionality was less accessible to the research team, and did not present in the data.

- The GESI analysis relies on qualitative data gathered with a limited, purposeful sample of participants. The actual number of participants in KIIs and FGDs was less than the original targeted number of participants, due to participants' lack of availability or response during the time period in which the Analysis was conducted. Further, the sample was developed targeting specific stakeholder institutions rather than individuals, which limited the team's control over the gender distribution (and other factors) of the sample. While the information reported in this document aims to shed light on the GESI dynamics of corruption in Armenia, the findings included in this report should not be interpreted to apply to the whole population facing corruption issues, relevant government agency representatives as public service providers, and other categories of participants.
- Primary data was analyzed based on translated English notes or summaries of notes of the KIIs and FGDs. While care was taken to minimize biases and prepare as detailed notes or summaries as possible, it is possible that analysis of notes in lieu of transcripts may affect some aspects of the data collected.
- FGDs and some KIIs were held online via Zoom, with respect to local COVID-19 regulations. This allowed the team to collect data that represented all ten marzes of Armenia.



# GESI ANALYSIS FINDINGS

## OVERVIEW OF GENDER EQUALITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION IN ARMENIA: USAID'S FIVE DOMAINS OF GENDER ANALYSIS

Background research on the gendered experience of corruption in Armenia revealed the need for more gendered data on the corruption-related experiences of women and men. There was no research available on the impact of corruption on the LGBTQI+ community or people with disabilities in Armenia. However, the few sources that reported on corruption affecting women in Armenia revealed gendered data at the community, household, and institutional level.



### LAWS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES

The legal framework in Armenia provides equal rights for both women and men and in general does not contain discriminatory provisions. The Constitution of the Republic of Armenia (RA) prohibits discrimination (Article 29) and explicitly states the legal equality of women and men (Article 30). The RA Labor Code also prohibits discrimination (Article 3.1), and discrimination is criminalized in the RA Criminal Code as of July 1, 2022. Other laws, policies and strategies intended to promote gender equality in Armenia include the Gender Equality Strategy 2019-2023 and the Law on Provision of Equal Rights and Equal Opportunities for Women and Men. This Law provides legal protection against discrimination on the basis of gender in all sectors legal provisions that mandate women and men receive equal pay for equal or equivalent work, and prohibits discrimination in the job application process (Duban and Radačić 2017; Asian Development Bank (ADB) 2019). However, application of the Law on Provision of Equal Rights has been challenging without practical mechanisms in place to enforce it.

The Anti-Corruption Strategy and the corresponding Implementation Action Plan 2019-2022 identifies key areas and activities to combat and prevent corruption in Armenia, however neither integrate gender equality and social inclusion (GOAM 2019a). Similarly, the RA's 2019-2023 Strategy for Implementation of Gender Policy and Action Plan includes objectives to promote gender equality in public administration, but no precise actions (GOAM 2019b). The newly adopted RA government decree on the Public Administration Reform Strategy for 2022-2024 includes actions to institutionalize an ethics and integrity system (point 3.16) and to develop policy recommendations based on an analysis conducted to reveal gender equality issues within the public sector (point 3.14) (GOAM 2022). However, similar to other mentioned policies, the Reform Strategy takes a general approach without precise actions to ensure a participatory and holistic approach in addressing various gender equality and social inclusion issues.

Armenia has also signed on to international conventions that promote gender equality, and the national constitution guarantees equal rights to women and men (ADB 2019). While the laws in Armenia articulate a commitment to protect men and women equally, there is weak implementation of laws and regulations aimed at promoting GESI, lack of practical implementation mechanisms, further

discriminatory gender norms hinder women and other socially excluded groups representatives from fully exercising and benefitting from these rights (Gerasymenko 2018). The introduction of gender quotas for the Parliamentary and local self-government bodies elections has led to an increase in participation in politics and public positions by women, although participation still remains low, and women remain concentrated in mid-level positions.



## CULTURAL NORMS AND BELIEFS

Social and gender norms prioritize women’s role in society to household and childcare responsibilities, creating barriers to gender equality. A 2019 gender assessment of Armenia found that social and gender norms often prevail over laws established to promote gender equality (ADB 2019). Gender stereotypes influence the perception that women are primarily responsible for domestic and childcare tasks while men are perceived as the breadwinners and decision-makers both within the households as well as in public spheres. Even though women in Armenia are highly educated and active in the workforce, gender norms often dominate in limiting women’s role in the public sphere (ADB 2019).

While laws in Armenia protect against gender discrimination and mandates equal pay for equal work, gender norms remain a barrier to equity in employment and a gender pay gap in Armenia persists as men are given preference to women in higher paying jobs which are considered more culturally appropriate for men, such as politics (UN Women and The Statistical Committee of the Republic of Armenia (ARMSTAT) 2020; Aidis et al. 2019). Even though women in Armenia are highly educated, they experience discrimination in the workplace and may be dismissed as being less knowledgeable in the workplace and may be overlooked when it comes to promotions due to social and gender norms that assume men to be the breadwinners in their families (ADB 2019; Tovmasyan and Minasyan 2019).

*“...For example, they are very intolerant towards a woman engaged [in corruption]. Starting from the political, official [areas] ... They always say that: “you are a woman, you should be ashamed, etc.” Female, CSO representative*



## GENDER ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND TIME USE

There has been progress for women and girls in education, although inequalities persist once they enter the workforce. While women and girls are more likely to complete secondary and tertiary education, women tend to pursue courses that are considered more socially acceptable for women, such as in the social sciences, education, or health, which are typically lower-paying industries. Across industries, even though women generally have higher academic qualifications than men, most of the top positions are held by men. Underlying the persistence of a gender pay gap, in spite of a legal mandate for equal pay for equal work, is the reality that women are more likely to face time poverty due to their disproportionate burden of unpaid care and domestic work. Women’s disproportionate share of unpaid care and domestic work also contributes to women’s lower participation rate in the labor force. Women face greater time constraints when they enter the labor force, and their domestic and childcare responsibilities require the same level of time (ADB 2019).

As earlier noted, women and men engage in and encounter corruption in different (gendered) ways due to the roles they occupy in their households and society. As women are primarily responsible for managing the health and education needs of their families, this exposes them to vulnerability to corruption in those areas more so than men (Boehm and Sierra 2015). Women’s childbearing needs also



increase their interaction with health systems which disproportionately exposes them to any corruption practices at the point of service delivery (ibid.).



## ACCESS TO AND CONTROL OVER ASSETS AND RESOURCES

While the law provides equal access to opportunities and resources, in practice social and gender norms hinder women and girls access to and benefit from opportunities and resources such as home and land ownership and access to grants or loans that may enable them to start or expand a business. Women are less likely than men to own a home or land jointly or on their own (National Statistical Service [Armenia] et al. 2017). While there are also legal provisions that protect the inheritance rights of widows and daughters, customary and religious laws may be at odds with these laws (OECD 2019a). Women also face discrimination in accessing credit due to underlying discriminatory gender norms which give preference to men.

Respondents from CSOs and the private sector reported that people living in regional settlements, people living with disabilities, elderly people, and ethnic/religious groups did not have equal access to resources. Notably, respondents from local government bodies did not demonstrate awareness of how some socially vulnerable groups lack access to certain resources.



## PATTERNS OF POWER AND DECISION-MAKING

Women's participation in positions of power and decision-making in politics remains low. Armenia's electoral code has established a minimum quota of 30 percent<sup>4</sup> for representatives of each sex to increase women's representation in parliament (Republic of Armenia 2016). Although the quotas and a simple proportional system corresponded to an increase in women's representation in Parliament following the 2021 election—about 34 percent of the members of parliament are women (women's representation was 24 percent, as of 2019), only two out of 19 members, or 10 percent, of the National Assembly Council are women; only two of the 12 National Assembly standing committees are chaired by women; and the role of president of the National Assembly of 2021 has historically been exclusively filled by men—currently the speaker and his three deputies are men (though one of the vice-speakers has always been a woman since 2007) (WomenNet.am 2021a). Women also remain underrepresented in the subnational and local level, though the recent implementation of gender quotas into the Electoral Code has positively changed women's participation in the community councils. In 2021, local government elections resulted in 31 percent participation of women in the community councils, which is three times more than in previous years. As for the representation of women among community leaders, the situation remains critical; as a result of the elections, only two women were elected mayors, and these women were re-elected (WomenNet.am 2021b). At the national level, as of 2019 out of twelve ministerial positions, only one is filled by a woman. In the judicial system women are underrepresented in higher level positions, however in lower-level assistant positions women make up the majority at 66 percent (ADB 2019).

---

<sup>4</sup> Electoral Code of the Republic of Armenia Constitutional Law, Article 83, part 4. It should be noted that Article 100 part 3 states, "The waived/terminated mandate of a MP shall be given to the next candidate in sequence in the first part of the national electoral list of that political party, and where as a result of it, the number of representatives of any sex in the given faction falls below and results in less than 25 per cent, it shall be given to the next candidate of less represented sex in the first part of the national electoral list of that political party, if any."

Women’s political participation is hindered by the lack of funding support as well as access to networks that are more easily accessible to men. Women in politics experience higher levels of online violence in comparison to men, and this affects their willingness to participate in public roles (ADB 2019; European Union 2021). A wide array of respondents, including those from parliament, CSOs, international organizations, the private sector, and regional and local government agencies, state that discriminatory gender norms serve as barriers to equal participation in decision-making processes. These discriminatory gender norms mean that women face a higher level of criticism when they engage in decision-making processes compared to men; perceptions that women are less educated or informed, and therefore their lack of participation is normal; norms around women’s role in unpaid care and domestic work. People living with disabilities, people living in regional settlements, and national and religious minorities are also considered to be largely excluded from positions of power and decision-making processes, according to respondents.

*“We have a community where we have two women in the Community Council, but when we go to meetings, the women do not show up. It has turned out that one is the wife of the head of community’s brother, and the other one is the daughter-in-law of his uncle; they have just been placed on the list, but have no right to come, to be present, to answer to certain questions and raise issues.” – Female, CSO representative*

## RESEARCH QUESTION I

The findings in this section respond to Research Question I:

**Q1: Are women, men and socially excluded groups (youth, the elderly, individuals with variation in sex characteristics, diverse sexual orientation and/or diverse gender identities, people living with disabilities and ethnic and religious minorities) victimized by corruption in different or similar ways?**

*I.a: What are the issues pertaining to ‘intersectionality’ that compound the multiple disadvantages experienced by women, men, and socially excluded groups?*

*I.b: What are the different types of corruption that women, men, and socially excluded groups experience?*

*I.c: What factors have shifted perceptions and attitudes toward corruption? How have legal measures like gender quotas for elected representatives at national and local levels affected different members of the public’s perceptions of corruption and anti-corruption. What is the correlation between the gender of government leaders and changes in public perception toward corruption?*



**FINDING I:** The public does not view corruption as a gender issue, but rather a challenge to Armenia being a democratic state. While the perception of corruption has changed over time, it remains pervasive, and the understanding of what corruption is and isn’t varies.

Analysis of secondary and primary data showed that there is no significant difference between men’s and women’s perception of corruption in Armenia, and that men and women across Armenia view corruption as the number one challenge to Armenia being a democratic state (OECD 2019b). Respondents across several stakeholder groups mentioned that there has been a shift in perceptions and attitudes toward corruption, since the Soviet-era and again more recently since the 2018 Velvet

Revolution, though it is important to note that not all respondents believed that the Velvet Revolution resulted in positive change.

There is notable increased awareness of corruption, especially in recent years, and people are more likely now to speak up about it and are more cautious about engaging in corrupt activities. Respondents noted that, having grown up in a post-Soviet Armenia, young people especially are less accepting of and less likely to engage willingly in corruption compared to older generations, though they may still find themselves vulnerable to and party to corruption. While people are more cautious about engaging in corruption, corruption remains pervasive and is prevalent in access to government social services, education, healthcare, the private sector, banks, and public procurement. An international organization representative respondent pointed out that while there was a lot of improvement after 2018, trends in corruption have since regressed.

*“Now there is a little fear, drastic [corruption] risks are not taken. Whatever they do, they do it in secret... I think that as compared to several years ago, now the level of awareness has quite increased... It can't be compared with the situation of 15, 20 years ago and even before...” Female, CSO Representative*

While there is greater awareness of corruption, respondents' perception of what corruption is and isn't varied. For example, respondents across KIIs and FGDs did not recognize corruption as an abuse of power, and some respondents implied that those paying bribes to access services are doing so simply as an easy way to get what they want.

Several respondents across stakeholder groups described corruption in Armenia as systemic with root causes in social and cultural norms dating back to when Armenia was part of the USSR. CSO and private sector FGD respondents explained that some practices that are understood as corruption based on local perceptions may not be viewed as such due to norms around gift-giving, which is seen as the culturally appropriate way of thanking someone for services performed.

*“...we are a post-Soviet country and many customs from that time is well rooted in our daily life, which very difficult to get rid of...” Female, private sector organization representative*



## **FINDING 2: Respondents are either unaware of or do not observe gendered differences to being affected by corruption, and few saw a link between corruption and gender and social inclusion.**

Several respondents state that they were not aware of how corruption might affect men and women in different ways, though some did acknowledge that different social groups experience the effects of corruption in different ways. While few examples were offered, some respondents mentioned not being able to access corruption-free health care and other social services and scapegoating in the workplace.

*"Corruption and gender equality are two different things that have nothing to do with each other...gender equality and corruption have nothing to do with each other at all." Male, private sector organization representative*

Two FGD respondents and one KII representing CSOs gave examples of gendered differences in the workplace, in particular that women are more likely to be implicated in corruption-related investigations than men. They explained that often women are made to bear the punishment during corruption investigations because of their lower ranking positions, often in lower-level finance or accounting-related

positions which makes them an easy scapegoat. One male law enforcement agency respondent mentioned that the punishment for women may be less severe than for men: where men may face serious jail time, women may be offered bail.

*“The difference is that women are specifically targeted. For example, there is a big corruption scandal in a company, and you see that the accountant, who is a woman and a weaker link, bears the punishment.” Female, regional/local government representative*



**FINDING 3:** Many respondents noted a link between women's increased participation in public administration and politics and an anticipated decline in corruption (see Finding 15); however, there are underlying gender inequalities that may prevent women from fully engaging in high-level roles.

Some respondents, primarily representing CSOs and national and local government bodies, believe that women's greater involvement in positions of leadership and political positions will lead to a decline in corruption (Finding 15 discusses this further as an anti-corruption effort). Some believe this is due to women generally being more supportive of anti-corruption efforts and being less likely to engage in corruption activities themselves. While Armenia's constitution guarantees equal rights to women and men, and the Law on Equal Rights and Equal Opportunities for Men and Women in Armenia provides the foundation for policies and legislation to support gender equality (ADB 2019), in practice there are social and structural factors that may limit women's opportunities to participate in these roles.

“There are many stereotypes that limit women's engagement in political and public life. First, still the majority of society assumes that politics is not women's place and men should be more active there; also, women are not seen in active high positions [of public administration] because still men are considered to be the so called “bread winners”. Women also face issues in the recruitment and in taking [public] offices, and also during promotion in their career. Any opportunities of promotion are usually given to male workers because they are making income for the family.” Female, international organization representative Some respondents indicated that women cannot perform equally to men in politics and that participation in public life would conflict with their household and care giving responsibilities, with a few stating that women's increased participation in politics comes at a cost or detriment to men. Some male respondents held the view that women's increased political participation would lead men to ‘fall behind’ or have a harder time finding employment in civil service.

*“The legislative framework ensures [women's participation] and there are not any hinderances...there are more female servants than male. I am a head of a department and the majority of the department heads are female servants. This works against men.” Female, government representative*

Across government and private sector stakeholder groups, while respondents did not initially think that there were any hindrances to women's participation in civil service and public administration and generally did not believe that women face any discrimination or limitations in their professional lives, through probing it was revealed that social norms and factors—such as lack of employment equality, unpaid domestic and care work, the gender pay gap, and a limited network of support and encouragement for women's political participation—are perceived to limit women's participation. Another social factor is the beliefs and perceptions around women's leadership skills. Based on a public opinion survey on women's issues among residents of Armenia, 14 percent believed that women politicians are more likely to have leadership skills compared to 53 percent that believe men are more

likely to have leadership skills; only 31 percent believe that both women and men are inclined to have leadership skills. Similarly, 40 percent of respondents believe that men are more likely to have experience in public service, compared to only 11 percent believe that women are (IRI 2020).

Despite this acknowledgement, respondents believed that opportunities and resources are open to all regardless of gender and that it is up to the individual and their motivation to access these resources and opportunities. Respondents did not demonstrate an awareness of the social factors that may limit or hinder certain social groups from accessing and fully benefiting from opportunities.

*“There are no issues of discrimination any other limitations that women face in their professional life... Women who want to grow, to develop their capacity, do make a business or otherwise is engaged in public life, women who do not, do not engage and it is their choice.” Female, private sector organization representative*

*“We should take into account that a woman, in her calling, is different from a man. She is a mother, she brings up a person, she cannot be equally involved in all spheres, be equal to a man in politics”. Male, local government representative*



#### **FINDING 4: Youth are less accepting of corruption yet are at risk of participating in and vulnerable to the negative effects of corruption within the education system and while seeking employment.**

Youth that have grown up in a post-Soviet Armenia are less accepting of and less willing to engage in corruption than older generations. However, several respondents explained that youth often still find themselves forced to engage in corruption due to environmental factors in the education system and when they are seeking employment.

*“In general, young persons are more non-corrupted and non-willing to be engaged in corruption. If their parents offer to call someone as a help, they prefer and say not to call that person.” Male, international organization representative*

Although this will soon be criminalized in July 2022, teachers at secondary schools have been accused of not sufficiently teaching in class and then offering private lessons for a fee. Respondents reported these petty corruption issues at secondary schools, however, law enforcement agency representatives also stressed that this issue will be addressed in the newly adopted Criminal Code, which bans additional fees to conduct service, including in the education sector (Article 276).

In universities, students are often forced to give bribes. A male CSO respondent highlighted the widespread corruption in universities, where students are typically forced to give bribes. Local government respondents in a focus group said that young people are very vulnerable to the negative effects of and are at risk of participating in corruption and may unknowingly participate in corruption. In contradiction, a few local government respondents also mentioned that youth are not as vulnerable to being affected by corruption than the elderly as they have easier access to information.

*“That corruption scheme is rather a result of “Soviet” thinking. Young people are more aware that it is a negative phenomenon and this also affects the difference [in practices].” Female, CSO representative*

*“I think when youth has become a medium of payment (a source of income) [in universities], it is then corruption itself that became younger.” Male, CSO representative*

The literature review found that this trend of corruption follows young people when they are ready to enter the workforce, and that youth are concerned about nepotism and corruption in hiring processes (OECD 2019b). This was also supported by primary data. A key informant observed that once young people have attained their educational qualifications, they experience barriers to employment even when they are highly qualified or have completed the necessary recruitment exams (which is reportedly true for both public and private sector employment).

Some respondents suggested that youth living with disabilities are especially affected by corruption in the education system, though they did not cite specific examples. One youth CSO respondent noted that mothers of children with disabilities are very active in combatting the injustices related to corruption that their children face at school.



### **FINDING 5: Respondents perceive that the most vulnerable to corruption are people living with disabilities.**

Persons living with disabilities may find themselves forced to participate in corruption so that they can obtain the benefits or assistance that they are entitled to under the law. This includes things like obtaining disability status in the first place, receiving pensions or social allowances, and accessing health care. According to respondents representing CSOs, parliament, and local self-government bodies (and the majority of which are women), people living with disabilities (and other socially vulnerable people) find themselves as “victim-participants” of corruption as they feel forced into it so they can access the services they need.

*“Members of vulnerable groups have to engage in corruption to obtain disability statuses, receive a pension or social allowance. Otherwise, they will either be deprived of benefits/assistance provided for them by law or will face red tape.” CSO representative*

The same group of respondents also stated that some government institutions are dysfunctional and legislation on criteria for qualifying for social services is vague, which leaves the determination for access to essential services and benefits to be highly subjective. Because the determination for access is so subjective, this opens the door to abuses of power and people living with disabilities being vulnerable to corruption as the only way that they can ensure that they have the access to the benefits and services that they are entitled to.

## **RESEARCH QUESTION 2**

The findings in this section respond to Research Question 2:

### **Q2: Is there a gendered pattern to who engages in corruption and who supports anti-corruption efforts?**

*2.a: Do gender relations shape networks and opportunities for corruption?*

*2.b: Are women and other socially excluded groups less likely to engage in corruption than men?*

*2.c: Does social acceptance of corruption differ based on the gender of the person engaged in corruption?*

*2.d: Does public support exist for anti-corruption efforts, and how does that support differ for different socially excluded groups?*





## FINDING 6: Men and women engage in corruption for different (gendered) reasons, and how they engage in corruption is influenced by gender norms and roles within the household.

A 2019 gender analysis in Armenia found that social and gender norms influence the perception that women are primarily responsible for matters of the household and family, including domestic work and childcare, and that men are perceived as ‘breadwinners’ (Aidis et al. 2019). While these norms have shifted over time, they still influence the roles and positions that men and women occupy in their households and broader society, and also play out in the gender-differentiated reasons for and types of corruption that men and women engage in.

*"...I think, corruption is more typical for men. Why is that? Because of [socio-economic] issues. The more social problems, the greater the corruption risks. ...A man has to support his family, so he has to take a lot of money home, so the corruption risks increase." Private sector representative*

Respondents voiced that men are more prone to ‘grand’ corruption than women, explaining that according to Armenian social and gender norms, the socio-economic well-being of the family is considered to be the responsibility of men<sup>5</sup>. Additionally, respondents noted that grand corruption often occurs within bigger enterprises (more commonly owned or led by men) that are more engaged in corruption mechanisms, compared to medium or smaller enterprises (where women owners and leaders are more commonly represented).

Conversely, women’s roles as caretakers of the household makes them the primary users of services such as healthcare and education (ADB 2019). This was also supported by the primary data, where several respondents mentioned that women engage in petty corruption primarily related to health and education. Their engagement in corruption is often driven by need (Bauhr and Charron 2019). Global evidence indicates that women may face corruption when seeking reproductive healthcare, such as paying a bribe to get an appointments or having to pay for treatment that they should have received for free (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) 2020). Moreover, sex-selective abortions are prevalent in Armenia, a country with a skewed sex ratio at birth (United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) 2016). Although Armenia has seen a recent decrease in the bias of the sex ratio, sex-selective abortions remain widespread. As a sex-selective abortions preventive means, the Law on Human Reproductive Health and Reproductive Rights, in line with other means, defines counselling, as well as a three day period of reflection before the final decision for women who applied for abortion, and some women raised concern that that the waiting period might be used to discourage women from having abortions and result in increased corruption, unsafe abortions and other consequences (OECD 2019a).

Of note, multiple respondents across KIIs and FGDs considered engagement in corruption as dependent on “individual mindset” and completely disassociated from factors such as gender, ethnicity, age, or other indicators of vulnerability.

---

<sup>5</sup> In the context of this report, “petty corruption” takes place primarily between public institutions and individual citizens, typically through advantages following the payment of a bribe, and it includes other similar actions in which individuals are required to act unlawfully. “Grand corruption” refers to higher levels of the political system or economy and typically involves larger sums of money and far-reaching decisions (Stöber 2020).

*"Corruption is corruption, what does the human sex have to do with it? Do you mean which gender will or will not give more corruption or will take it? No, it seems to me that there is already gender equality in it, they both [male and female] take it equally." Male, entrepreneur*



**FINDING 7:** Respondents do not see a difference between women and men in what may motivate them to engage in corruption; rather, women are typically in lower-level positions within the workplace, and therefore have less exposure to or opportunity to engage in corruption.



A majority of the government, local self-government, and CSO representative respondents, both male and female, expressed that there is no gendered difference in engagement in corruption; rather, the unequal distribution of power and resources reduces women's opportunities to engage in corruption. A household survey conducted in 2010 also found that there was no significant difference between men and women in their willingness to engage in corrupt activities in Armenia (USAID 2010). Essentially, there is no indication that women have different motivations for engaging in corruption than men.

*"Another reason that men are much more bribe givers or bribe takers is that within different sectors, men are more widely represented compared to women." Male, law-enforcement representative*

*"Women are affected [by corruption] differently because mostly men take and have high positions at higher levels [of state offices] and as a result, mostly men are engaged in corruption." Female, CSO representative*

While a few respondents indicated that women may be more risk averse and therefore less prone to corruption, overall respondents agreed that because women are less visible in spaces where corruption occurs, they are perceived as less engaged in corruption (notably, without acknowledgement that women's role in society may force them to engage in corruption to access the services or resources they need). Many of the respondents noted that men generally are more visible in higher-level positions in public administration, where corruption is more prevalent, and women serve at mid-level positions of public administration where there is less opportunity to engage in corruption. Additionally, women are considered to be less active (or have less opportunity to participate) in public administration. Secondary data indicates that within the civil service, women are well represented in professional mid-level positions, whereas men are predominant in supervisory-level positions. This trend persists in the higher positions of public administration (ARMSTAT 2019), local self-government bodies (WomenNet.am 2022), regional bodies, government bodies of executive power (WomenNet.am 2021c), as well as in legislative and judicial bodies (Council of Europe 2021).

Conversely, a respondent shared the anecdote that nurses at health centers—the majority of which are women—were found to engage in petty corruption by selling false vaccination certifications required during the COVID-19 pandemic.





## FINDING 8: Access to resources, including employment, income, and social networks, affects whether and the degree to which women engage in corruption.



Several respondents raised the challenges women face in finding employment, which increases the likelihood that women will pay bribes for positions or otherwise engage in corruption through personal connections in order to be employed. A respondent from a regional FGD affirmed that women have unequal opportunities in finding employment because they have children, and others also noted that employers prefer hiring men that won't need to take maternity leave—placing unemployed women in positions that are vulnerable to corruption.

*“Women are educated but they cannot save their place at employment market. Women face problems to joint employment market. People use their relatives/friends to gain job, and this is usually done for men.” Female, National Assembly of the GOAM (Parliament) representative*

Discrimination against women in regional labor markets, wage gaps, and barriers to women's re-entrance into the labor market after maternity leave remain important unsolved issues across multiple regions of Armenia (Aidis et al. 2019). Despite education levels being relatively equal among men and women in Armenia (Osipov and Sargizova 2016), a vertical and horizontal segregation in the labor market based on sex continues to be common. Further, the average gender wage gap in public administration was 18 percent in 2021 (ARMSTAT 2021). A 2018 UN Women survey in Armenia shows that men are 11 percent more likely than women to work in sectors that pay above average, such as financial intermediation; government, public administration and defense; manufacturing; transport, storage, communication; and mining and quarrying. This may contribute to the evident wage gap, and combining these factors, may put women in a more vulnerable position to experience or engage in corruption (UN Women and Switzerland Development and Cooperation (SDC) 2018).

Networking has become an important aspect of modern life in recent years; networks are studied as new forms of social organization in business administration and in public policy (Pachmann and Dvorak 2008). Corruption is rarely an isolated phenomenon, and commonly different forms and manifestations of corruption are enabled and facilitated by a network of relationships (Granados and Nicolás-Carlock 2021). Women have also traditionally lacked access to predominantly male, informal socio-economic networks, which has limited their ability ultimately to advance their economic status and influence socio-political reforms (Aidis et al. 2019), which affects the level of engagement in corruption. Corruption networks—a form of corruption in which the interaction of multiple actors within a social network results in corruption—were also raised by respondents, where one respondent noted that they are formed based on the mindset that “alone one cannot solve problems”. A number of respondents from CSOs perceived that corruption networks are shaped by social groups and networks as well as certain sectors, including healthcare and education. Respondents most often attributed corruption networks to be formed and comprised of middle-aged men, due to men predominantly occupying high level positions in public administration.



## FINDING 9: Respondents perceive that elderly persons may be more likely to engage in corrupt activities themselves, both as a customary practice and as a mode to access services.

Respondents across several stakeholder groups (including CSOs, private sector, and local government) mentioned that corruption is systemic and that Soviet-era customs and practices are a primary root cause of corruption. Specifically, during a local government FGD, a local company representative mentioned that some cultural practices like gift-giving to receive better services are not viewed as

corruption, but as a common courtesy and a way of thanking someone for the services provided. Respondents representing CSOs similarly stated that the elderly are more likely to conduct transactions through a gift or bribe than young people because of practices from the Soviet era. One local government representative mentioned that there are several officers currently in service who also worked during Soviet times. Similarly, a few respondents indicated a perception that there may be traditions among national minorities that are manifestations of corruption, but are not perceived as such by minority representatives.

*“They will probably have their traditional things, related to a bribe or corruption...in other words, it may be considered corruption by us, but not by them.” Male, local government regional group*

*“...we are a post- Soviet country and many customs from that time [are] well rooted in our daily life, which [are] very difficult to get rid of...” Female, entrepreneur*

*“First of all, if young people are new to work, they think about their career development, they want everything to be clean, to be honest...Today we have officials, who... also worked in Soviet times... Corruption was flourishing in Soviet Armenia, that’s why those who held positions in those times are well aware of the nuances, how to take a bribe...” Male, local government regional group*

Respondents perceive that elderly persons are also more vulnerable to corruption because they are beneficiaries of social services. Similarly, some respondents stated that persons living with disabilities, frequently an intersecting identity of the elderly, often have to engage in corruption to obtain disability statuses, which gives them legality to access certain state social benefits or to receive a pension or social allowance. Otherwise, they may be deprived of benefits or assistance that is supposed to be provided for them by law, or will face obstacles or delays in accessing those services. Respondents also discussed that it is commonly accepted when people living with disabilities engage in corruption to access services, because that engagement is seen as a means of protecting their individual rights or entitlements (benefits that should be provided for free).

*“Elderly people are mostly left out of the decision-making process, as community issues and the activities of local self-government bodies are of less interest to them. They want their social issue to be solved and their pension to be a little higher; their social issues concern that a little bit.” Female, CSO representative*



**FINDING 10:** Though respondents did not demonstrate a deep understanding of how corruption may affect different social groups, they noted that LGBTQI+ populations may be vulnerable to engaging in corruption in order to access services.

Most of the respondents believe that corruption affects vulnerable social groups, including LGBTQI+ people, persons living with disabilities, elderly persons, women, and national minorities, more than other groups. However, when referring to forms of corruption, respondents did not identify substantive differences between the forms of corruption manifested in various social groups; they primarily refer to the perceived scale of engagement—greater or smaller engagement—of these groups in corruption. Several respondents also shared the perception that engagement in corruption is an individual motivation or a personal issue, separate from the particular vulnerabilities an individual faces that may

compel them to engage in corruption, such as nationality, sex, ethnicity, religion, or any other aspect of their identity.

In the same vein, respondents perceived no difference in how much or to what degree LGBTQI+ persons engage in corruption compared to other social groups, and one respondent noted that the LGBTQI+ population are often not considered in exploring the issue of corruption. However, the Analysis was unable to gather verified data on this point from LGBTQI+ respondents.

*“... The issue of lesbian, gay, trans persons are not even included. No value is even given to the existence of these issues, and we need to involve them in the decision-making that will overall contribute to the well-being.” Female, CSO representative*

A CSO representative mentioned that transgender persons may be more engaged in corruption in order to access healthcare and other social services, as they often do not have other options than offering bribes or giving other favors in order to receive necessary medical treatment that is not regulated by law.

*“Within the public service, there are LGBTQI+ persons but they are not identified as [such]. Trans people are left out of the system because there are very few trans people who studied at the university and also because of their gender identity. The reason why trans person stay out of the public service system is that initially they do not have support from their families, they do not have education, and they usually face problems of how to make their living... They usually have lack of money and [the] necessity [to earn] more and more because they also have huge expenses—the medical treatments [and] the surgeries they need are costly.” CSO representative*



## **FINDING 11: Engagement in corruption is documented to be most prevalent in the public sector, intersecting with the private sector.**



Based on a 2018 public opinion study that gathered data from men and women across ages and regions of Armenia, the army, police, courts, and education system are considered highly corrupt institutions (OECD 2019b); according to responses collected during this GESI Analysis, corruption is perceived to be similarly prevalent in access to government social services, including education and healthcare, the private sector, banks, and public procurement. As of 2010, this trend in Armenia aligned with global trends of corruption in the health and education sectors (Chêne et al. 2010). One respondent from local companies mentioned that one negative consequence of the increased caution around engaging in corruption among public servants is that, when they don't engage in corruption, things may move forward more slowly.



### ***Sub-Finding 11a. Women's engagement in corruption was reported to be common in public education.***

Some respondents representing civil society organizations, government and law enforcement agencies mentioned that women, as the majority work force of the education sector, are commonly engaged in petty corruption in public education, which may reinforce effects of corruption on vulnerable groups. Around 70 percent of students are female compared to around 30 percent of male students at higher education institutions. 58 percent of Armenia's women (compared to 42 percent of men) are employed in public administration, education, health, and social work (ARMSTAT 2021). Further, gender balance within teaching staff in educational system is as follows—99.8 percent of pre-schools, 89 percent of

general schools, 71.7 percent of preliminary vocational education, 75.4 percent of middle vocational education, and 54.6 percent of higher educational institutions staff are female (ARMSTAT 2021).

A number of public opinion surveys (USAID 2017, Mezhlumyan n.d.) suggest that corruption is pervasive in education in Armenia. 72 percent of students in secondary and tertiary education report that there is corruption in their institutions. Bribery appears to be the most common form, occurring most often during exams (including admission and graduation exams). An OSCE poll conducted on higher education found that 25 percent of 1,200 first- to third-year students pursuing their bachelor degrees at the universities in Yerevan and Gyumri had been personally involved in bribery transactions, while 37 percent had heard about such transactions (Milovanovitch 2015). Other common violations identified in sources on corruption in Armenian education refer to staff policies, bribing, favoritism and academic fraud. Although data on education expenditure is very scarce, the sector is commonly reported as underfunded, and the low salaries and compensation of teachers and faculty are believed to be among the main reasons for the readiness of staff to take bribes (Policy Forum Armenia, 2013; Milanovitch 2015). Further problems include illicit payments by parents in support of the schools of their children and forced donations to teachers, which often benefit principals and regional officials with responsibilities for education. The misuse of resources is facilitated by a weak system of control and school boards that fail to fulfil their oversight functions (Milovanovitch 2015).

Attempts to deal with corruption in secondary and tertiary education have produced mixed results. Problems with the implementation of requirements of the Bologna Process in Higher Education, which Armenia joined in 2005,<sup>6</sup> contribute their share to corruption challenges (Milovanovitch 2015). A recent 2020 study shows that women in leadership roles have been shown to be more motivated and invested in addressing aspects of corruption that are closer to their own reality, i.e., in areas such as public service delivery of health care and education (UNODC 2020). Globally, corruption in health and education can have disproportionate negative consequences for women and girls, seriously compromising their access to quality schools and clinics as well as their own social and economic empowerment. In these sectors, corruption can take “gendered” forms of sexual harassment, exploitation, and the use of sex as a form of ‘payment’ in return for public services (Boehm and Sierra 2015; Kirya 2019).



*Sub-finding 1 | b. Women's engagement in corruption in the private sector reportedly varied—while secondary data indicated that corruption poses a barrier to women's entrepreneurship, respondents indicated that there are no barriers to women in establishing or managing a business.*



Women's experiences of corruption in the business or private sector vary; while businesses managed by men are more likely to be required to pay bribes or make informal payments to public officials, women may be dissuaded from or limited in establishing or growing a business due to corruption, according to respondents. As a reflection of this, and generally women's engagement in corruption as discussed in Research Question I, an interviewee from a law enforcement agency mentioned that men are considered to be a more 'reliable' source to receive bribes from than women, and if bribes are taken for women's benefit, they usually are carried out through a male intermediary.

*“It is interesting to follow that female bribe givers are less [common] than male. Men are considered to be more reliable, more able to keep secrets, whereas women are seen as*

---

<sup>6</sup> Armenia signed the Bergen Communiqué of the Ministers of Education from the Bologna participating countries on May 19, 2005.

*chatty and not able to keep secrets...they might speak somewhere, hence generally, bribes are not taken from females". Male law-enforcement agency representative*

One of the gender specific barriers that Armenian women entrepreneurs face is exclusion from business networks (Aidis et al 2019). Due to this marginalization, they are less likely to be engaged in forms of corruption that flourish in collusive networks in comparison to men (Bauhr and Charron 2020). A 2010 USAID gender assessment identified that small businesses were more likely to be required to make informal payments to officials to facilitate business, an indicator of corruption—and women are much more likely to be running small businesses than men in the Armenian economy. This climate may dissuade women from opening or expanding businesses altogether (Duban 2010). Regulations are inconsistently applied to businesses, undermining fair competition and disadvantaging businesses which are less politically-connected. Small and medium-sized companies, as well as new market entrants, are particularly vulnerable to these issues (Gan Integrity 2020).

During an FGD, female entrepreneur respondents expressed that although there are no legal or practical obstacles for women entrepreneurs to receive bank loans to start or promote their businesses, women may be constrained in applying for property secured loans, as they are less likely to own properties to secure the loan. Interestingly, a respondent representing the private sector noted that female entrepreneurs are more proactive, more willing to form professional networks, and are eager to do in-depth study and research to facilitate their businesses, whereas male businessowners are more conservative and are less keen to take part in professional events. This indicates that men may seek other means to advance their businesses including corrupt activities.

One form of corruption experienced by women in the Armenian private sector occurs when male business owners take advantage of loans and credit earmarked for and in the name of female business owners (most commonly, their wives), which creates distorted data showing women receiving high levels of loans and credit, as noted in a 2019 USAID gender analysis in Armenia. The same analysis found that in some cases, property or assets were registered in a woman's name, but were ultimately controlled by her husband. The latter appears to be one of the challenges in determining the gendered impact of corruption within the private sector, because companies might be for all intents and purposes led by husbands, but de jure registered in the name of a female family representatives, such as a wife or mother (Aidis et al. 2019).

Different studies have found gender-related differences in how men and women dealt with corruption related to entrepreneurship, where businesses with male managers and businesses without any females participating in ownership were more often expected to pay bribes to conduct business. Women are more likely to obey the rules and pursue opportunities that are generally deemed to be less risky. They may choose business strategies that are less reliant on corruption or opt for ventures where corruption is less prevalent (Breen et al 2015). Women are perceived to be less tolerant towards corruption. This may indicate that firms led by female managers may be more likely to be small and in the retail sector, characteristics that make them less likely to be subject to frequent official inspections or that are viewed as less profitable through seeking informal payments (Duban 2010). Women are also less likely to accept bribes in situations where the repercussions are likely to be serious (Boehm 2015).

*"I think, it is mostly related to the social position of a person. And in the case of our society men above middle age perhaps have certain social positions. But if we change the situation regarding the social order, I think, the picture will change. It simply depends on opportunities, on the influence that a person has." Female, CSO representative*

Globally, women’s lack of inclusion in corruption networks related to business can reinforce their social and economic marginalization—corruption ultimately imposes restrictions on their ability to conduct business (Bauhr and Charron 2020)). Two studies focused on Armenia found that culturally, male government officials may find it more difficult to approach women business owners to request payments, and that women business owners were more likely to report an instance of corruption and seek assistance than men. Generally, men were considered unlikely to seek outside help and would have rather resolved the problem themselves (Hossain et al. 2010; Duban 2010). Specifically, a 2008 study on how women were being affected by corruption in the city of Kapan found that the Taxation Department did not ask women for bribes because tax officials assumed they were not making enough money to pay them, indicating how corruption in the business sector may exacerbate women’s economic marginality (Hossain et al. 2010).

## RESEARCH QUESTION 3

The findings in this section respond to Research Question 3:

### **Q3: Are anti-corruption efforts gender-sensitive?**

*3.a: Do women, men, and socially excluded groups have the same opportunities to highlight their specific experiences of and concerns about corruption?*

*3.b: Does anti-corruption support and assistance seeking differ by group?*

*3.c: Is there a gender-sensitive approach to the reporting, investigation, prosecution, and adjudication of corruption cases?*

*3.d: Is there understanding for anti-corruption measures in the context of the international legal and policy framework for women’s rights, gender equality and social inclusion?*

*3.e: What are the gendered impacts of anti-corruption measures? How does/can anti-corruption measures promote or hinder gender equality? Do women, men, and socially excluded groups perceive and tolerate anti-corruption efforts differently?*



**FINDING 12:** While respondents agree that there has been progress in addressing corruption at higher levels of public administration, they are unaware of anti-corruption policies and efforts and perceive that anti-corruption efforts are not gender-sensitive, nor do those efforts consider the vulnerabilities of socially excluded groups. However, gender and inclusion factors may contribute to or inhibit how people participate in anti-corruption efforts.



A common theme across respondents, including FGDs with private sector organizations, local and regional self-government bodies and authorities, and CSOs as well as the majority of KII respondents from CSOs, government, and international stakeholders, was that anti-corruption efforts are not gender or social inclusion sensitive, and that a unified or universal approach that is the responsibility of the government is needed. Further, many respondents did not demonstrate awareness of anti-corruption policies and efforts in general, and they had even less awareness of anti-corruption policies and efforts in relation to gender and vulnerable groups. One female respondent from parliament noted that international organizations primarily move anti-corruption general initiatives forward.

Armenians note that the GOAM has made progress in anti-corruption at higher levels of government, but more change is needed at the local and community levels. Based on a 2018 public opinion study that gathered data from men and women across ages and regions of Armenia, Armenians believe that the government has made progress in anti-corruption measures at the higher levels of government, yet they



are still looking for similar changes at the local and community levels of government (OECD 2019b). Armenians are eager to see more awareness-raising activities around the effects of corruption and increased transparency in handling corruption cases (OECD 2019b).

Interestingly, in the all-female Yerevan FGD with local government representatives, respondents did not see a link between gender equality and anti-corruption efforts, neither the possibility that reduced corruption may promote gender equality, nor the possibility that increased gender equality generally may reduce corruption. However, one respondent noted one example where an increase of women's representation in the Government could contribute to anti-corruption:

*"If there are female officials, there may be some progress. In other words, the level of corruption in that sector will decrease even more." Female, local self-government representative*

A few respondents from CSOs stated that women and young people are more supportive of anti-corruption efforts. They believe that the reason for that is their more negative attitude towards corruption.

*"I think that young people and perhaps also women are a bit more intolerant [towards corruption] and are more engaged in anti-corruption efforts in comparison. We have already mentioned that they are less involved in those practices, therefore it is also, let's say, beneficial to them that there is no corruption, and it will provide them greater opportunities." Female, CSO representative*

A USAID gender assessment conducted in 2010 noted that masculine identity is closely linked to public perceptions of status and power in Armenia (and this is still presumed to be the case), and that men are generally unwilling to appear weak or in need of assistance, presumably affecting their willingness to report corruption (as compared to women). Additionally, men in Armenia resolve corruption-related problems through informal networks, as opposed to formal corruption reporting structures (Duban 2010).



### **FINDING 13: Increased access to information, higher levels of education, and awareness of one's rights can reduce one's vulnerability to corruption.**

Respondents across several stakeholder groups (law enforcement, local companies, anti-corruption CSOs, local government and women and youth CSOs) all cited low education levels, lack of awareness of rights, and lack of access to information as contributors to vulnerability to corruption. Several respondents noted that those with limited access to information include the elderly, those who are socio-economically disadvantaged, people living with disabilities, people living in regional settlements, and some ethnic and religious groups.

A law enforcement respondent mentioned the perception that the majority of those who report incidences of corruption have lower levels of education. They hypothesized that those with higher education levels may be less vulnerable to corruption or that they are more aware of their rights and are not asked for bribes. Several respondents across stakeholder groups mentioned that youth have greater access to technology and information so they are more aware of their rights and can more readily access government e-tools, which make them less vulnerable to corruption.



**FINDING 14: New technologies in reporting corruption may improve transparency and efficiency in public administration and in providing public services to socially excluded populations.**

Six respondents, both men and women representing government, CSOs, and international organizations, indicated that new technologies in public administration, such as electronic medical health systems, may reduce risks of corruption and help to combat it by improving transparency and accountability. New technologies can help to monitor the efficiency and integrity of social services, make financial information more transparent, and facilitate reporting of corruption. Information and communication technology also may support campaigning efforts and mobilizing resources to combat corruption. The e-government initiatives and corruption reporting mechanisms have an impact on identifying and reducing corruption and supports anti-corruption efforts. Utilizing digital tools also reduces the human factor in the field of providing different services to citizens, which makes reveal of wrongdoings much easier. However, there may still be challenges with any anti-corruption intervention—a respondent representing a women’s rights CSO mentioned that while whistleblower hotlines exist, people are hesitant to use them as they do not want to get involved in such cases.

*Digitalization of the public service is yet another option to make services much more transparent...reducing the number of corruption [incidences]...wrong doings will be much easier to reveal. Digitalization will also reduce the human factor in the field of providing different services to citizens. – Male, representative of an international organization*

Of note, a law enforcement agency respondent mentioned that Armenians with a lower level of education were more likely to report on corruption than those that were more educated, based on the law enforcement agency’s statistics on corruption offenses. The respondent further clarified that personal issues and motivations drive people to report corruption, rather than the motivation of justice at a systems level. More data are needed to better understand why this may be the case and what the link is between education and reporting.



**FINDING 15: While a few targeted anti-corruption activities have been undertaken, it is key to have activities that focus on vulnerable social groups; initiatives that target women and youth are key to combat corruption and make changes in corruption perception.**

As noted in previous findings, respondents representing youth, international organizations, local companies, anti-corruption CSOs, and local government mentioned that corruption is systemic and some of the root causes of corruption are Soviet-era customs and practices; because of this, youth born in independent Armenia are more reluctant to engage in corruption compared to older generations, and are more proactive in combating corruption.

The document review surfaced some examples of anti-corruption efforts that targeted youth and women. Regarding youth, in 2018, Armenia’s Prosecutor General’s Office co-organized the International Youth Competition of Social Anti-Corruption Advertising named “Together Against Corruption”. Youth from ages 14 to 35 form groups from six countries (Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, and Tajikistan) to develop and present anti-corruption social advertising and video clips aimed at spreading and strengthening anti-corruption attitudes and efforts (OECD 2019b). More recently, the



Transparency International Anti-Corruption Center (TIAC) launched Armenia's fifth anti-corruption school in 2022 (TIAC 2022a). TIAC's Anticorruption Education team selected 28 candidates out of 163 applicants, ranging in age from 18-35. The aim of the schools are to enhance participants' knowledge of corruption, its causes and types, corruption risks in political, economic, social areas and their consequences, anti-corruption methods, and other topics. In addition to the field specific knowledge, the school contributes to the development of participants' leadership skills and critical and analytical thinking. In December 2022 TIAC marked International Anticorruption Day by organizing the "Politeia" intellectual tournament with the participation of young people (TIAC 2022b).

As found in USAID's 2010 gender assessment, the Ministry of Health identified women as vulnerable to corruption, and began issuing health vouchers for free pre- and post-natal care for all pregnant women to prevent medical professionals from extracting additional payments. Studies of this intervention showed that out-of-pocket payments for women's health services decreased considerably, especially among the poorest households (Duban 2010).



#### **FINDING 16: Respondents felt that an increase in women's participation in public administration could potentially contribute to a decline in corruption.**



As noted in Finding 3, some respondents, primarily representing CSOs and national and local government bodies, believe that women's greater involvement in positions of leadership and political positions will lead to a decline in corruption, as women are perceived to be more supportive of anti-corruption efforts and to be less engaged in corruption activities themselves, as mentioned previously. A study shows that more women—especially young women from civil society—are increasingly entering national politics, partially encouraged by the strong anti-corruption stance of the present government, which is seen as beneficial to women candidates (USAID 2019). Women in leadership tend to focus on improving service delivery particularly in sectors that address the needs of women and children, thus leading to greater transparency and accountability in these sectors and in effect reducing corruption (Merkle 2022). In the Europe and Eurasia region, 2008 research indicated that the existence of closely knit male dominated networks led to fewer council women on regional councils in 18 European countries (UNODC 2020). Therefore, women's increased participation may help disintegrate such male dominated networks that might be corrupt (Merkle 2022).

# CONCLUSIONS

<p><b>Conclusion 1</b></p> <p>Overall, there is a lack of awareness of (or ability to articulate) the different gender influences and impact of the effects of corruption in Armenia, and little indication of gender differences in how people experience corruption. This may affect the ability to detect, identify, and address the effects of corruption for socially excluded populations. (Research Question 1)</p>	<p><b>Associated Findings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding 1</li> <li>• Finding 2</li> <li>• Finding 3</li> </ul>
--	---

While there is increased awareness of corruption since the Velvet Revolution in 2018, the GESI Analysis found that there is lack of awareness of how corruption may affect men and women differently, although there was acknowledgement that corruption may uniquely affect other socially excluded groups. In a few cases, gender differences in experiencing corruption were acknowledged in accessing social services and in the workplace. Further, there was a belief among respondents that women’s participation in politics and leadership in public administration could lead to a decline in corruption. While this theory has been disproven at a global level, it may indicate entrenched social and cultural beliefs of gender roles and norms in Armenian society (e.g., the belief that women are less inclined to engage in criminal behaviors).

<p><b>Conclusion 2</b></p> <p>Corruption in public administration may disproportionately impact people living with disabilities, who are vulnerable to becoming “victim participants” in accessing social services. (Research Question 1 and Research Question 3)</p>	<p><b>Associated Findings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding 5</li> <li>• Finding 9</li> <li>• Finding 13</li> </ul>
---	--

People living with disabilities are perceived to be the most vulnerable to corruption and may be forced to participate in corruption in order to access services such as pensions, social allowances, or healthcare. Further, the GESI Analysis found that people living with disabilities are considered to have less access to information, so they may therefore have less awareness of their rights in terms of protection from corruption.

<p><b>Conclusion 3</b></p> <p>Youth emerged as a key demographic that is vulnerable to both participating in and the negative effects of corruption, while also potentially the most important social group to target with anti-corruption efforts. (Research Question 1 and Research Question 3)</p>	<p><b>Associated Findings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding 4</li> <li>• Finding 13</li> </ul>
---	---

Youth broadly condemn corruption, and were perceived as a group vulnerable to corruption, especially in the education system and in seeking employment. Youth were also seen as having greater access to technology and information. Anti-corruption activities that target youth and build their knowledge and awareness of good governance practices may be beneficial to pursue (see Conclusion 9).

<p><b>Conclusion 4</b></p>	<p><b>Associated Findings</b></p>
----------------------------	-----------------------------------

<p>Older members of the population may draw from Soviet era experiences and reinforce social customs that perpetuate corruption, while also being one of the groups most vulnerable to experiencing the negative effects of corruption. (Research Question 1, Research Question 2, and Research Question 3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding 4</li> <li>• Finding 9</li> <li>• Finding 13</li> </ul>
---	--

The GESI Analysis found that the elderly are more inclined to accept corrupt activities that are seen as social customs from the Soviet-era. Compared to youth, the elderly are considered to be at a disadvantage in accessing technology and information, and may benefit from anti-corruption efforts that acknowledge this.

<p><b>Conclusion 5</b></p> <p>Given that the GESI Analysis was unable to unearth substantial data on the experiences of LGBTQI+ populations’ vulnerability to or engagement in corruption in Armenia, there is need for additional research in this area. (Research Question 2)</p>	<p><b>Associated Findings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding 10</li> </ul>
---	--

While LGBTQI+ people were generally noted as being vulnerable to corruption, the GESI Analysis did not find extensive data on this group. This lack of data may be influenced generally by LGBTQI+ discrimination in Armenia. Given that there is global evidence of unique and disproportionate effects of corruption on LGBTQI+ populations, more data is needed on this topic.

<p><b>Conclusion 6</b></p> <p>Social and gender norms were found to be particularly influential in how accepting women and men are of engaging in corruption. Respondents perceived that there is no difference between women and men in engaging in corruption in Armenia, which may indicate the need for additional data that can explore the gendered differences of corruption further. (Research Question 2)</p>	<p><b>Associated Findings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding 6</li> <li>• Finding 7</li> </ul>
--	--

Social and gender norms in Armenia influence the perception that women are primarily caregivers and responsible for matters of the household and family, whereas men are perceived as ‘breadwinners’—influencing men to be more likely to engage in grand corruption, and women to engage in petty corruption. Further, men are more likely to take on higher level leadership roles which makes them more likely to engage in corruption, as opposed to women who are more typically in mid-level positions where they are less exposed to corrupt activities. However, the GESI Analysis found that there is perceived to be no difference between men and women in their willingness to engage in corruption. Differences in how and why women may engage in corruption as compared to men should be considered when designing anti-corruption efforts targeted to different groups, including sectors where women are predominantly employed.

<p><b>Conclusion 7</b></p>	<p><b>Associated Findings</b></p>
----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Whether women engage in corruption to access services or other resources or to leverage power for personal gain, their engagement in corruption is influenced by their degree of access to resources, including employment, income, and social networks, and is present predominantly in education and the private sector. (Research Question 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding 8</li> <li>• Finding 11</li> </ul>
--	---

The GESI Analysis showed that women may be compelled to engage in corruption due to a lack of access to employment or wages. As the majority of the workforce in public education, women are evidently engaged in corruption in public education. Corruption was also shown to be prevalent in the private sector, and while there is evidence that it may hamper women’s engagement in business and entrepreneurship, there is also a perception that there are no limitations specific to women in engaging in the private sector. Understanding the nuances and dynamics of women’s vulnerability to and ultimate engagement in corruption may inform how corruption in these sectors could be addressed.

<p><b>Conclusion 8</b></p> <p>There is a lack of awareness of anti-corruption efforts, let alone gender and inclusion sensitive interventions; those that do exist are not perceived to be gender sensitive. (Research Question 3)</p>	<p><b>Associated Findings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding 12</li> </ul>
--	--

The GESI Analysis shows that there is little awareness of anti-corruption efforts that are tailored to or target socially excluded groups, and that gender norms and beliefs may inhibit engagement in anti-corruption. Respondents tended to believe that a “unified” approach to combatting corruption was needed. This trend follows previous findings throughout the Analysis and reflects a general lack of awareness or knowledge of differences in how socially excluded groups may be affected by corruption, and likewise how there may be an opportunity to target different groups with anti-corruption efforts.

<p><b>Conclusion 9</b></p> <p>Gender and social inclusion sensitive anti-corruption efforts that address the specific needs of women, youth and the elderly, people living with disabilities, LGBTQI+ populations, and other social groups can be successful at combatting corruption within specific sectors or within key demographics of Armenian society. (Research Question 3)</p>	<p><b>Associated Findings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding 14</li> <li>• Finding 15</li> <li>• Finding 16</li> </ul>
---	--

There is some evidence that designing interventions to be gender and inclusion sensitive, especially targeting youth, can improve the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts and strengthen governance and integrity. Anti-corruption efforts may also influence a culture that promotes more gender-equitable practices, including increased participation by women in leadership positions in public administration. The named few examples emphasize that specific group targeted activities are crucial in addressing the vulnerable social groups needs and specific issues thus making anti-corruption efforts more effective and inclusive.

<p><b>Conclusion 10</b></p> <p>Women’s empowerment is a key tool to mitigate corruption. The nexus of gender and corruption is complex: women’s disempowerment, shaped by</p>	<p><b>Associated Findings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding 6</li> </ul>
---	---

---

socio-economic inequalities and cultural norms factors, makes women more disproportionately vulnerable to corruption. (Research Questions 2 and 3)

- Finding 7
- Finding 16

---

The impacts of corruption vary among different social groups, but are ultimately influenced by power imbalances and traditional gender and other roles. These factors may in turn limit or restrict women's economic opportunities and access to resources, which is shown to affect how women engage in corruption. Improved women's empowerment through greater female representation in government, namely in decision-making positions, as well as increased participation in the labor market particularly in sectors which are male dominant, may indirectly combat corruption, and in turn, a reduction in corruption may promote women's empowerment.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

The follow recommendations resulting from the GESI Analysis are based on the findings and conclusions outlined in the preceding sections of this report. Each recommendation includes potential actors that may be involved in implementing recommendations, assuming close collaboration with all counterparts.

**Develop an index or similar measurement tool to identify and document incidences of corruption experienced by women, youth, and other vulnerable groups.** The ability to explore differences in experiences of corruption across different socially excluded groups can support programming that protects these groups from corruption and targets anti-corruption efforts to reduce incidences of corruption. This measurement tool should maximally engage GOAM counterparts and ultimately be owned and maintain by a GOAM agency, such as the National Statistics Committee. Ultimately, an index would promote the collection of sex-disaggregated data and establish an open data source on gender and corruption.

- Potential Actors**
- AIP
  - CPC
  - CSOs
  - State Statistics Committee

**Target and engage youth in developing and implementing anti-corruption efforts.** Working with youth-oriented CSOs and/or international youth organizations, youth may be engaged in the design process to foster buy-in and ownership of interventions, and ensure that they may be most effective in addressing corruption. Interventions may include training youth to become anti-corruption champions, or establishing a hub at Yerevan and regional universities to create a space for youth to learn about, discuss, and plan for anti-corruption initiatives.

- Potential Actors**
- AIP
  - CPC
  - CSOs

**Conduct more research and collect additional data on how corruption is affecting people living with disabilities in Armenia,** particularly regarding their access to social services including healthcare, pension, and other social benefits.

- Potential Actors**
- AIP
  - CPC
  - Ministry of Health
  - Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs
  - CSOs

**Assess corruption reporting and public service technologies to ensure they are accessible to all populations,** and in particular the elderly and people living with disabilities. The CPC may conduct an assessment to explore specific needs of socially excluded populations in using technology to access public services and to report corruption.

- Potential Actors**
- AIP
  - CPC
  - Ministry of Justice

**Conduct a gender audit or assessment of anti-corruption laws, and work to ensure that existing and new anti-corruption policies and activities are gender-sensitive.** An assessment can support the CPC to identify where anti-corruption laws, policies, and programs may be gender-blind or inadvertently exclude certain social groups. The assessment would provide specific recommendations to improve gender sensitivity.

**Potential Actors**

- AIP
- CPC
- Ministry of Justice

**Advocate for public policies that support women’s representation in higher decision-making roles in sectors where women have low representation and in public administration, including in local government bodies.** AIP with the CPC can support the Ministry of Justice to include gender and social inclusion sensitivity into the draft Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan of 2023-2026.

**Potential Actors**

- AIP
- CPC
- Ministry of Justice
- Civil Service Bureau
- CSOs

**Conduct capacity building with personnel implementing anti-corruption efforts.** Develop capacity of CPC personnel and other key stakeholders (including other GOAM agencies, law enforcement, and CSOs) to better understand the specific experiences/issues concerning women, youth, people living with disabilities, LGBTQI+, and other populations affected by corruption. Further, CPC personnel should have a strong understanding of how intersectionality may exacerbate risks of experiencing or engaging in corruption by these groups. Additionally, conduct trainings to build capacity of integrity officers and Ethics Committee members that are involved with investigating cases of breach of Code of Conduct, including discrimination-related offenses.

**Potential Actors**

- AIP
- CPC
- Ministry of Justice

**Integrate GESI into ongoing and new anti-corruption programs, strategies, and action plans.** Stakeholders may also consider integrating anti-corruption components into programming that targets women. Further, through legislative amendments and technical support (such as adopting electronic systems), institutions can strengthen accountability mechanisms by promoting greater diversity, such as gender-balanced staff within public service competition commissions, ethics commissions, and other decision-making bodies.

**Potential Actors**

- USAID
- CPC
- CSOs, international organizations

**Conduct communications and outreach activities to increase knowledge and awareness of the impacts of corruption on socially excluded groups.** AIP could support the CPC and Ministry of Justice in carrying out such awareness-raising campaigns, as well as to expand available information on anti-corruption policies implementing by the GOAM. The GOAM may also invest in a national communications campaign to raise awareness on individual rights related to corruption, the impact of corruption on GESI, and socially excluded groups’ rights to receive public services, ensuring that the campaign takes into consideration the various ways that different social groups access and consume information and includes elements of a human rights-based approach. An awareness campaign may also be implemented around normalizing women in leadership roles and taking on roles outside of the household to combat gender roles and norms that place women in positions that are vulnerable to corruption.

**Potential Actors**

- AIP
- CPC
- Ministry of Justice

# REFERENCES

- Asian Development Bank (ADB). “Armenia Country Gender Assessment 2019.” Manila, Philippines: Asian Development Bank, 2019. <https://www.adb.org/documents/armenia-country-gender-assessment-2019>
- Aidis, R., Balasanyan, S., and Shahnazaryan, G. “USAID/Armenia Gender Analysis Report.” Prepared by Banyan Global. Washington, D.C.: United States Agency for International Development, 2019. <https://banyanglobal.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/USAID-Armenia-Gender-Analysis-Report-I.pdf>
- Aleksanyan, H. “Cases of Corruption and its Prevention in Armenia’s Education System.” Yerevan: 2012.
- Amin, L. and Marin, J. “Recommendations for Women Against Corruption for OGP Action Plans.” Transparency International, 2020. [https://images.transparencycdn.org/images/2020\\_PolicyPaper\\_WomenAgainstCorruptionOGP\\_English.pdf](https://images.transparencycdn.org/images/2020_PolicyPaper_WomenAgainstCorruptionOGP_English.pdf)
- Amnesty International. “Amnesty International Report 2017/2018.” London: Amnesty International Ltd., 2018. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/POL1067002018ENGLISH.pdf>
- Arab, C. and M. Abrahamyan. “Armenia Country Gender Equality Brief.” Istanbul: UN Women, 2019. <https://eca.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/Field%20Office%20ECA/Attachments/Publications/2020/05/Armenia%20Country%20Gender%20Equality%20Brief.pdf>.
- ARMSTAT. “Women and Men in Armenia.” Yerevan: The Statistical Committee of the Republic of Armenia (ARMSTAT), 2019. <https://armstat.am/file/article/gender-2019.pdf>.
- ARMSTAT. “Women and Men in Armenia.” Yerevan: The Statistical Committee of the Republic of Armenia (ARMSTAT), 2021. [https://armstat.am/file/article/gender\\_2021.pdf](https://armstat.am/file/article/gender_2021.pdf)
- Bak, M. “Overview of Corruption and Anti-Corruption in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine.” Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) and Transparency International, 2020. [https://knowledgehub.transparency.org/assets/uploads/kproducts/Regional-profile-Eastern-Partnership-countries\\_2020\\_PR.pdf](https://knowledgehub.transparency.org/assets/uploads/kproducts/Regional-profile-Eastern-Partnership-countries_2020_PR.pdf)
- Bauhr, M. and N. Charron. “Do Men and Women Perceive Corruption Differently? Differences in Perception of Need and Greed Corruption”. *Fighting Corruption in the Developed World: Dimensions, Patterns, Remedies* Vol 8, no. 2 (2020). <https://www.cogitatiopress.com/politicsandgovernance/article/view/2701>
- Bauhr, M, N. Charron and L. Wängnerud. “Exclusion or interests? Why Females in Elected Office Reduce Petty and Grand Corruption.” *European Journal of Political Research* 58, no. 4 (2019): 1043-1065. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1475-6765.12300>
- Boehm, F. “Are Men and Women Equally Corrupt?” Colombia: U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, 2015. <https://www.u4.no/publications/are-men-and-women-equally-corrupt.pdf>
- Boehm, F. and E. Sierra. “The Gendered Impact of Corruption: Who Suffers More – Men or Women?” Colombia: U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, 2015. <https://open.cmi.no/cmi->



[xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2475280/The%20gendered%20impact%20of%20corruption%3a%20Who%20suffers%20more%3f%20men%20or%20women%3f?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2475280/The%20gendered%20impact%20of%20corruption%3a%20Who%20suffers%20more%3f%20men%20or%20women%3f?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)

Breen, M., R. Gillanders, G. McNulty, and A. Suzuki. "Gender and Corruption in Business." *The Journal of Development Studies* 53, no. 9 (2017): 1486-1501.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00220388.2016.1234036>

CEDAW. "Concluding Observations on the combined fifth and sixth periodic reports of Armenia." New York, NY: United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 2016. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N16/402/28/PDF/N1640228.pdf?OpenElement>

Chêne, M., B. Clench, and C. Fagan. "Corruption and Gender in Service Delivery: The Unequal Impacts." Berlin, Germany: Transparency International, 2010.

<https://www.transparency.org/en/publications/working-paper-02-2010-corruption-and-gender-in-service-delivery-the-unequal>

Council of Europe. "Gender Equality in the Judiciary of Armenia: Challenges and Opportunities." 2021.

<https://rm.coe.int/eng-prems-080521-gbr-2651-gender-equality-in-the-judiciary-of-armenia-/1680a3ef54>

CRRC and USAID. "2010 Armenia Corruption Survey of Households." Yerevan: Caucasus Research Resource Center-Armenia and the United States Agency for International Development, 2010.

[https://www.crcc.am/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/2010\\_Corruption\\_Household\\_Survey\\_One\\_Pager\\_English.pdf](https://www.crcc.am/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/2010_Corruption_Household_Survey_One_Pager_English.pdf)

Duban, E. "Gender Assessment USAID/Armenia." Prepared by DevTech Systems, Inc. Washington, D.C.: United States Agency for International Development, 2010.

[https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/Pdacr978.pdf](https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdacr978.pdf)

Duban, E. and I. Radačić. "Training Manual for Judges and Prosecutors on Ensuring Women's Access to Justice." European Union and Council of Europe, 2017. <https://rm.coe.int/training-manual-women-access-to-justice/16808d78c5>

European Union. "Country Gender Profile: Armenia." Prepared by NIRAS. Armenia: European Union, 2021. [https://euneighbourseast.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/eu4genderhelpdesk\\_armeniagenderprofile.pdf](https://euneighbourseast.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/eu4genderhelpdesk_armeniagenderprofile.pdf).

Freedom House. "Armenia Nations in Transit 2020 Country Report." 2020.

<https://freedomhouse.org/country/armenia/nations-transit/2020>

Gan Integrity, Risk, and Compliance Portal "Armenia Corruption Report." 2020.

<https://www.ganintegrity.com/portal/country-profiles/armenia/>

Gerasymenko, G. "Corruption in the Eyes of Women and Men". Ukraine: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2018. <https://rm.coe.int/gender-corruption-report-en-11-/168098f7e7>

GOAM. "THE RA ANTI-CORRUPTION STRATEGY AND THE PROGRAM OF EVENTS FOR ITS IMPLEMENTATION FOR 2019-2022." Yerevan: Government of the Republic of Armenia, 2019a.

<https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=168051>

GOAM. “2019-2023 GENDER POLICY IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY AND PROGRAM OF EVENTS.” Yerevan: Government of the Republic of Armenia, 2019b.

<https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=168051>

GOAM. “STRATEGY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REFORMS, THE ROAD MAP AND RESULTS FRAMEWORK FOR 2022-2024, THE LIST OF PERSONS ENSURING THE SUPERVISION AND COORDINATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGY.” Yerevan: Government of the Republic of Armenia, 2022. <http://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=162791>

Granados, O. and J.R. Nicolás-Carlock. Corruption Networks: Concepts and Applications. Switzerland: Springer Nature, 2021. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-81484-7\\_1](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-81484-7_1)

Harutyunyan, N. “United Nations Convention Against Corruption”. Armenia: United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC), 2018.

[https://www.moj.am/storage/files/legal\\_acts/legal\\_acts\\_8444076290911\\_00.UNCAC\\_IRM\\_2nd\\_circle.pdf](https://www.moj.am/storage/files/legal_acts/legal_acts_8444076290911_00.UNCAC_IRM_2nd_circle.pdf)

Hendry, N. “When the Bribe Isn’t Money: Gender, Corruption and Sextortion”. Lawrence University (45:19 minutes), 2018. [www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bx7JkQJjgk](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bx7JkQJjgk). Hossain, N., C. Musembi, and J. Hughes. “Corruption, Accountability and Gender: Understanding the Connections”. United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM, now UN Women) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2010.

<https://www.undp.org/content/dam/aplaws/publication/en/publications/womens-empowerment/corruption-accountability-and-gender-understanding-the-connection/Corruption-accountability-and-gender.pdf>

Human Rights Watch. “World Report 2021: Armenia | Human Rights Watch.” New York, NY: Human Rights Watch, 2021. [https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/media\\_2021/01/2021\\_hrw\\_world\\_report.pdf](https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/media_2021/01/2021_hrw_world_report.pdf)

IRI. “Public Opinion Survey on Women’s Issues: Residents of Armenia.” Center for Insights in Survey Research, a project of the International Republic Institute, 2020. [https://www.iri.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/womens\\_political\\_participation\\_breavis\\_iri\\_results\\_presentation\\_final\\_07.01.2021.pdf](https://www.iri.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/womens_political_participation_breavis_iri_results_presentation_final_07.01.2021.pdf)

Karapetyan, S., H. Manasyan, A. Mirzakhanyan, M. Norekian, and N. Harutyunyan. “Armenia: Social Protection and Social Inclusion Country Report.” Yerevan, Armenia: Caucasus Research Resource Centers, 2011. [https://www.crrc.am/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Armenia\\_Social\\_Protection\\_and\\_Social\\_Inclusion\\_Full\\_Country\\_Report\\_2011.pdf](https://www.crrc.am/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Armenia_Social_Protection_and_Social_Inclusion_Full_Country_Report_2011.pdf).

Kirya, M. “Education sector corruption: How to assess it and ways to address it.” Norway: U4 Anti-corruption Resource Centre, 2019. <https://www.u4.no/publications/education-sector-corruption-how-to-assess-it-and-ways-to-address-it>

Klugman, J., A. Gaye, M. Dahl, K. Dale, and E. Ortiz. “Women, Peace and Security Index 2019/20: Tracking sustainable peace through inclusion, justice, and security for women.” Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace, and Security (GIWPS) and the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), 2019. <https://www.prio.org/publications/12117>

McDonald, E., M. Jenkins, J. Fitzgerald. “Defying Exclusion: Stories and Insights on the Links between Discrimination and Corruption.” Transparency International and Equal Rights Trust, 2021.

<https://images.transparencycdn.org/images/2021-Defying-exclusion-Report-v2-EN.pdf>

- Merkle, O. "Anti-Corruption and Gender: The Role of Women's Political Participation". United Kingdom: Westminster Foundation for Democracy, 2022. <https://www.wfd.org/sites/default/files/2022-01/Anti-corruption%20and%20genderV2.pdf>
- Mezhlumyan, A. "Anti-Corruption Policy in RA Education Sector (2015-2018 Analysis of RA anti-corruption strategy and program of measures)." Armenia: Open Society Foundations – Armenia, n.d. <https://www.osf.am/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Anti-corruption-policy-in-the-Education-sector-of-RA-Avetik-Mejlumyan.pdf>
- Milovanovitch, M. "Strengthening integrity and fighting corruption in education: Armenia." Open Society Foundations, 2015. [http://www.osf.am/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Integrity-report\\_final\\_en\\_12.11.2015.pdf](http://www.osf.am/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Integrity-report_final_en_12.11.2015.pdf)
- Ministry of Health, Republic of Armenia. "Anti-Corruption Action Plan Annex to Government Decree on Anti-Corruption Strategy of the Republic of Armenia of 2019-2022". Republic of Armenia, 2019. [https://www.moj.am/storage/files/pages/pg\\_7105326429692\\_Anti-Corruption\\_Action\\_Plan\\_03.10.2019\\_ENG.pdf](https://www.moj.am/storage/files/pages/pg_7105326429692_Anti-Corruption_Action_Plan_03.10.2019_ENG.pdf).
- Murray, M. and M. Inman. "Anti-Corruption and Integrity Systems in Armenia: Targeted Literature Review and Field Research", prepared by New-Rule LLC. Washington, D.C.: United States Agency for International Development, 2019.
- National Statistical Service [Armenia], Ministry of Health [Armenia], and ICF. "Armenia Demographic and Health Survey 2015-16." Rockville, Maryland, USA: National Statistical Service, Ministry of Health, and ICF, 2017. <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR325/FR325.pdf>
- OECD. "Social Institutions and Gender Index: Armenia." Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Centre, 2019a. <https://www.genderindex.org/wp-content/uploads/files/datasheets/2019/AM.pdf>
- OECD. "Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan: Fourth Round of Monitoring, Armenia Progress Update Report". Paris, France: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia, 2019b. <https://transparency.am/en/publication/pdf/165/1251>
- OECD. "Anti-Corruption Reforms in Armenia: Pilot 5th Round of Monitoring Under the Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan". Paris: OECD Publishing, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1787/e56cfa9-en>
- OSCE. "Students' perception of corruption in the Armenian higher education system." Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, 2010. <https://www.osce.org/yerevan/74758>
- Osipov, V. and J. Sargizova. "Men and Gender Equality in Armenia: Report on Sociological Survey Findings." Yerevan: United Nations Population Fund, 2016. [https://menengage.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/MEN-AND-GENDER-EQUALITY\\_Final.pdf](https://menengage.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/MEN-AND-GENDER-EQUALITY_Final.pdf)
- Pachmann, A. and J. Dvorak. "Networking and Corruption." Encyclopedia of Networked and Virtual Organizations. IGI Global, 2008. <https://www.irma-international.org/viewtitle/17723/?isxn=9781599048857>
- Paweenawat, Sasiwimon W. "The Gender-Corruption Nexus in Asia." *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature* 32, no. 1 (2018): 18-28. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/apel.12214>

Republic of Armenia. “The Republic of Armenia Anti-Corruption Strategy and Its Implementation Action Plan for 2009-2012”. Yerevan: The Republic of Armenia, 2009. [http://www.translation-centre.am/pdf/Translat/HH\\_other/anticorr\\_strategy/ANTICORR\\_PROG\\_en.pdf](http://www.translation-centre.am/pdf/Translat/HH_other/anticorr_strategy/ANTICORR_PROG_en.pdf)

Republic of Armenia. “Electoral Code of the Republic of Armenia: Part One, Section I, General Provisions.” Yerevan: President of the Republic of Armenia, 2016. [http://www.translation-centre.am/pdf/Translat/HH\\_Codes/Electoral\\_Code\\_04052018\\_en.pdf](http://www.translation-centre.am/pdf/Translat/HH_Codes/Electoral_Code_04052018_en.pdf)

Rheinbay, J. and M. Chêne. “Gender and Corruption Topic Guide.” Transparency International, 2016. [https://www.transparency.org/files/content/corruptionqas/Topic\\_guide\\_gender\\_corruption\\_Final\\_2016.pdf](https://www.transparency.org/files/content/corruptionqas/Topic_guide_gender_corruption_Final_2016.pdf)

SDC. “Strengthening the Anti-Corruption Committee of Armenia” Switzerland Development and Cooperation, 2022. <https://www.eda.admin.ch/deza/en/home/countries/south-caucasus.html/content/dezaprojects/SDC/en/2020/7FI0503/phase1.html?oldPagePath=>

SIDA. “Brief: Gender and Corruption”. Sweden: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, 2015. <https://cdn.sida.se/publications/files/-gender-and-corruption.pdf>

Soghomyan, S., Zadoyan, K., and Zadoyan, M. “Civil Service Report on the Implementation of Chapter II (Prevention) & Chapter V (Asset Recovery) of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption in Armenia”. Yerevan: The Armenian Lawyers' Association and the CSO Anti-Corruption Coalition of Armenia, 2021. <https://uncaccoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/Final-Civil-Society-Report-Armenia-ALA-UNCAC-Coalition-15.3.2021.pdf>

Stöber, S. “Combatting and preventing corruption in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia How anti-corruption measures can promote democracy and the rule of law.” Germany: Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2020. <https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/en/publications/publication/did/combating-and-preventing-corruption-in-armenia-azerbaijan-and-georgia-en>

Tovmasyan, G. and D. Minasyan. “Gender Inequality Issues in the Workplace: Case Study of Armenia.” *Business Ethics and Leadership* 3, no. 2 (2019): 6-17. <http://armgpublishing.sumdu.edu.ua/journals/bel/volume-3-issue-2/article-1/>

Transparency International. “Corruption Perceptions Index: Armenia.” 2022. <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2020/index/arm>

TIAC. “TIAC’s 5<sup>th</sup> Anti-corruption School Launched.” Yerevan, Armenia: Transparency International Anti-corruption Center, 2022a. <https://www.transparency.am/en/media/news/article/4594>

TIAC. “Let’s Play Politeia!” Yerevan, Armenia: Transparency International Anti-corruption Center, 2022b. <https://www.transparency.am/en/media/news/article/4785>

UNODC. “The Time is Now: Addressing the Gender Dimensions of Corruption”. Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2020. [https://www.unodc.org/documents/corruption/Publications/2020/THE\\_TIME\\_IS\\_NOW\\_2020\\_12\\_08.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/corruption/Publications/2020/THE_TIME_IS_NOW_2020_12_08.pdf)

UN Women. “UN Women Data Hub: Armenia Country Fact Sheet”. 2021. <https://data.unwomen.org/country/armenia>

UN Women and ARMSTAT. “Analysis of the Gender Pay Gap and Gender Inequality in the Labour Market in Armenia.” UN Women and the Statistical Committee of the Republic of Armenia (ARMSTAT), 2020. [https://armstat.am/file/article/analysis\\_of\\_the\\_gender\\_pay\\_gap\\_armenia\\_en.pdf](https://armstat.am/file/article/analysis_of_the_gender_pay_gap_armenia_en.pdf)

UN Women and SDC. “Women’s Economic Inactivity and Engagement in the Informal Sector in Armenia: Causes and Consequences.” UN Women and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), 2018. <https://georgia.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/Field%20Office%20Georgia/Attachments/Publications/2018/Womens%20Economic%20Inactivity%20and%20Informal%20Employment%20in%20Armenia.pdf>

USAID. “Gender-Sensitive Indicators for Use in Europe and Eurasia”. Prepared by JBS International. Washington, D.C.: United States Agency for International Development, 2016. [https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/gender-sensitive\\_indicators\\_for\\_europe\\_and\\_eurasia.pdf](https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/gender-sensitive_indicators_for_europe_and_eurasia.pdf)

USAID. “Corruption risk assessment in the general education sector in Armenia.” Prepared by Transparency International Anticorruption Center and Institution of Public Policy within the framework of the “Engaged Citizenry for Responsible Governance” Project. Yerevan, Armenia: United States Agency for International Development, 2017. <https://transparency.am/en/publication/pdf/86/1136>

USAID. “Governance in Armenia: An Evidence Review for Learning, Evaluation and Research Activity II (LER II)”. Prepared by the Cloudburst Group. United States Agency for International Development, 2019. [https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/usaid\\_armenia\\_drg\\_governance\\_evidence\\_review\\_-\\_final\\_2019-02-22.pdf](https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/usaid_armenia_drg_governance_evidence_review_-_final_2019-02-22.pdf)

USAID. “ADS Chapter 205: Integrating Gender Equality and Female Empowerment in USAID’s Program Cycle.” Washington, DC: United States Agency for International Development, 2021. <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/205.pdf>.

USAID. “Armenia Integrity Project Annual Report, October 1, 2021-September 30, 2022.” Prepared by Dexis Consulting Group. Washington, D.C.: United States Agency for International Development, 2022.

WomenNet.am. “Only two women were included in the newly elected NA Council.” 2021a. <http://womennet.am/%d5%b6%d5%b8%d6%80%d5%a8%d5%b6%d5%bf%d5%ab%d6%80-%d5%a1%d5%aa-%d5%ad%d5%b8%d6%80%d5%b0%d6%80%d5%a4%d5%ab-%d5%af%d5%a1%d5%a6%d5%b4%d5%b8%d6%82%d5%b4-%d5%a8%d5%b6%d5%a4%d5%a1%d5%b4%d5%a5%d5%b6%d5%a8/>

WomenNet.am. “2021 Summary of local elections. Representation of women in councils has significantly increased.” 2021b. <http://womennet.am/2021-summary-of-local-elections-1/>

WomenNet.am. “Representation of women in the executive Addressing women’s issues in the government program.” 2021c. <http://womennet.am/women-in-government-2021/>

WomenNet.am. “Today, only three out of 79 communities in Armenia are headed by women.” 2022. <http://womennet.am/tim-2022-community-head/>

World Bank. “Armenia Country Gender Assessment, 2016: The State of Gender Equality in Armenia.” Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 2017. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/26267>.

World Economic Forum. “Global Gender Gap Report 2021.” Geneva: World Economic Forum, 2021.  
[https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_GGGR\\_2021.pdf](https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2021.pdf).

# ANNEXES

## ANNEX A. PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION PARTICIPANTS

The following is a list of the stakeholders represented in primary data collection conducted February–April, 2022 via key informant interviews and focus group discussions.

### Key Informant Interviews

- General Prosecutor's Office, Department of Supervision over Legality of Pre-trial Proceedings in the Republic of Armenia Anti-Corruption Committee
- National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia
- Corruption Prevention Commission
- Anti-Corruption Committee
- Civil Service Office
- Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Health
- Civil Service Bureau, Office of the Prime Minister of the RA
- Ministry of Education, Science, Culture, and Sport
- United States Embassy, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs
- USAID
- American Chamber of Commerce in Armenia
- Eurasia Partnership Foundation
- UNDP Armenia
- Transparency International
- Pink Armenia NGO
- Armenian Young Women Association
- Child Development Foundation

### Focus Group Discussions

- CSOs - Yerevan
  - Yerevan Press Club
  - Eurasia Partnership Foundation
  - Country Water Partnership
  - Foundation for the Preservation of Wildlife and Cultural Assets
  - Armenian Progressive Youth
  - PinkArmenia
  - The Helsinki Associations for Human Rights NGO
- Regional CSOs
  - Kapan Women's Resource Center NGO
  - Syunik-Development Community NGO
  - Kharikh NGO
  - Work and Motherland Regional Development NGO
  - Sose Women's Issues NGO



- Hope and Future NGO
- Clean Goris NGO
- Armash NGO
- Association of Women with University Education
- The Northern Branch of Eurasia Partnership Foundation
- Improve Our Village NGO
- Fund for Armenian Relief
- Lchashen Pasture User Association Consumer Cooperative
- Armenian's Fist NGO
- Bayazet Analytical Center
- Azhdahak Social and Environmental Center NGO
- Gegharkunik Regional Branch of A.D. Sakharov Armenian Human Rights Center

# ANNEX B. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

## Key Informant Interview Protocol USAID/Armenia Integrity Project (AIP) GESI Analysis

**Participant ID:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Interviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Note taker:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Start Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**End Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

Please record notes using the following best practices:

- Save as a separate document on SharePoint using the naming convention: KII.ParticipantID.Date.InterviewerInitials, e.g., KII.036.6Jan2020.KC
- Where possible, audio record interviews as a backup to note-taking, unless the respondent does not agree to recording equipment. Save audio recording in the same file location as the interview notes, with the file naming convention: KII.ParticipantID.Date.InterviewerInitials.audio, e.g., KII.036.6Jan2020.KC.audio
- Take notes as close to verbatim as possible and in first person, i.e., in the voice of the respondent; the respondent is “I”
- Take notes directly into the guide and the Interview Memo Template. If additional questions, other than probes are asked, they should be added to the transcript and indicated as such.

### Introduction:

*Good morning/afternoon. Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. My name is [insert name] and I am a [title] working with the USAID Armenia Integrity Project (AIP), which aims to reduce opportunities for corruption and reinforce public demand for improved governance and accountability in Armenia. The Armenia Integrity Project, or AIP, is conducting a gender equality and social inclusion analysis to examine how corruption affects women, men, youth, and other groups and their perspectives on corruption and anti-corruption efforts.*

*We are soliciting your input to assist in understanding the GESI dynamics in Armenia that are relevant to anti-corruption, good governance, and accountability. This Analysis will inform the development of the Corruption Prevention Commission’s (CPC) institutional strategy, policies, outreach, and impact. Results from the AIP GESI Analysis will also be used to ensure that key AIP activities are gender and inclusion sensitive. I will ask you a series of questions related to these topics; please know that there are no right or wrong answers to the questions. Your opinions and experience are appreciated and valued. At the close of the interview, you will have an opportunity to share anything you think is relevant to the topic that was not covered in the interview and to ask questions.*

*Please confirm that you have filled out the informed consent form.*

**Review and obtain consent prior to starting the interview. Once consent has been given, then ask for permission to record the interview.**

*We would like to audio-record our conversation so that we can listen to the recording after the interview to ensure we captured what you said accurately in our notes. Is it ok for me to record this interview?*

If you have received consent to record, you may start the recording.

## **BEGIN RECORDING**

After you start recording, ask the following:

*I would like to confirm again that we have your consent to participate in this interview, and to record the interview.*

Once the participant confirms, you may start the recording. Ask the following:

*Before we begin, what questions do you have?*

*Note to interviewer:* When you've reached 45 minutes, inform the interviewee about how many questions remain and check that you can complete the questions in the 15 minutes remaining, or ask for additional time.

Once the interview has been completed, make sure to thank the participant:

*Thank you so much for your time and sharing your thoughts with us. We greatly appreciate it.*

*If you have any questions after this interview, feel free to contact me or the team.*

## **KII QUESTIONS BY ORGANIZATION TYPE**

The list of questions below will be used to conduct the KIIs with the various organization types in the sample above. The KII questions have been designed based on the organization types, which are government, law enforcement agency, international organization, local company/organizations, and CSOs. All KII interview questions will be translated from English to Armenian and a final version of the KII interview guide will be submitted to the IRB prior to data collection.

### **INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

1. What are the most critical constraints to GESI in Armenia? Are there similar laws across the country that are barriers to gender equality? Please explain. Are there common cultural norms and beliefs about women and men's rights, roles and participation in political and economic activities? Please explain.
2. How differently are women and men affected by corruption? Are there common patterns across the country/region in how men and women access resources and opportunities?
3. Do the national or regional programs you have worked on have a program objective related to GESI and anti-corruption? Why or why not? Do your regional programs have an implementation strategy or approach to achieve GESI outcomes related to corruption? Please explain.
4. Based on the experience you have gained from the national or regional programs you have worked on, are women, men, and socially excluded groups victimized by corruption in different or similar ways? What are the issues pertaining to 'intersectionality', if they exist?

5. Do the national or regional programs you have worked on have reveal gendered patterns to who engages in corruption and who supports anti-corruption efforts?
6. Are anti-corruption efforts within the national or regional programs you have worked on gender-sensitive?
7. What are the most promising opportunities for GESI as related to governance and accountability? Are there laws or policies that have made a difference in gender relations in the region? If yes, which ones and which way?
8. What successful practices are you aware of for national program interventions or national policy reform in support of gender equality and social inclusion and anti-corruption? What unintended negative outcomes are you aware of that have resulted from previous programming and existing policies?
9. What are the key areas where there is an information or data gap in GESI- related anti-corruption efforts in Armenia?
10. What recommendation(s) do you have for the USAID/Armenia AIP?
11. Can you suggest any other organizations or specific individuals that we should talk to about these issues?

## GOVERNMENT

The questionnaire will be further adjusted according to each government agency.

1. What are the most critical constraints to GESI in Armenia? Are there similar laws across the country that are barriers to gender equality? Please explain. Are there common cultural norms and beliefs about women and men's rights, roles and participation in political and economic activities? Please explain.
2. How differently are women and men affected by corruption? Are there common patterns across the country in how men and women access resources and opportunities?
3. Does the work of your institution have direct or indirect activities objectives related to GESI and anti-corruption? Why or why not? What efforts/activities does/have your institution implemented/implements to achieve GESI outcomes including related to corruption? Please explain.
4. Based on your experience are women, men, and socially excluded groups victimized by corruption in different or similar ways? What are the issues pertaining to multiple disadvantages (intersectionality) faced by different groups/persons of society, if exist?
5. Have you come across within your experience gendered pattern to who engages in corruption and who supports anti-corruption efforts? Are anti-corruption efforts within your institution activities gender-sensitive?
6. What are the mechanisms of reporting on corruption and inequality matters? Is there a gender-sensitive approach to the reporting and investigation adjudication of corruption cases?
7. What anti-corruption measures/activities your institution undertakes in the context of the international legal and policy framework for women's rights, gender equality and social inclusion?

8. What are the most promising opportunities for GESI as related to governance and accountability? Are there laws or policies that have made a difference in gender relations in the country? If yes, which ones and which way?
9. What successful practices are you aware of for national program interventions or national policy reform in support of gender equality and social inclusion and anti-corruption? What unintended negative outcomes are you aware of that have resulted from previous programming and existing policies?
10. What are the key areas where there is an information or data gap in GESI in Armenia?
11. What recommendation(s) do you have for the USAID/Armenia AIP?
12. Can you suggest any other organizations or specific individuals that we should talk to about these issues?

## LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

1. How differently are women and men affected by corruption? Based on your experience are women, men, and socially excluded groups victimized by corruption in different or similar ways? What are the issues of multiple disadvantages faced by different social groups, if exist?
2. Given your experience, have you come across gendered pattern to who engages in corruption and who supports anti-corruption efforts? Is there gender disaggregated statistics on criminal cases of corruption or other relevant criminal offences? What are the patterns? What do the statistics show?
3. What are the mechanisms of reporting on corruption and inequality matters? Have you noted gender or other patterns in reporting and investigation processes? Is there a gender-sensitive approach to the reporting and investigation adjudication of corruption cases? How is it manifested?
4. Do women, men, and socially excluded groups have the same opportunities to highlight their specific experiences of and concerns about corruption? What hinders women, men and other socially excluded groups to report on their experience of and concerns about corruption? Does anti-corruption support and assistance seeking differ by group?
5. What anti-corruption measures/activities your institution undertakes for gender equality and social inclusion? Does the work of you institution have direct or indirect activities objectives related to GESI and anti-corruption? Why or why not? What efforts/activities your institution have implemented/implements to achieve GESI outcomes including related to corruption? Please explain.
6. Is there understanding for anti-corruption measures in the context of the international legal and policy framework for women's rights, gender equality and social inclusion?
7. What are the most promising opportunities for GESI as related to governance and accountability within the country? Are there policies/activities that have made a difference in gender relations in the country? If yes, which ones and which way?
8. What successful practices are you aware of in support of gender equality and social inclusion and anti-corruption? What unintended negative outcomes are you aware of?
9. Given your experience, what are the gendered impacts of anti-corruption measures? How does anti-corruption measures promote or hinder gender equality? Have you noted any patterns on

how women, men, and socially excluded groups perceive and tolerate anti-corruption efforts, does it vary?

10. What recommendation(s) do you have for the USAID/Armenia AIP?
11. Can you suggest any other organizations or specific individuals that we should talk to about these issues?

## **CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS**

1. How differently are women, men and other socially excluded groups affected by corruption? Are they victimized by corruption in different or similar ways? What are the issues that pertain multiple disadvantages for women, men, and socially excluded groups?
2. Are the types of corruption people face differ based on gender, age, ethnicity, and other background person has? Do women, men, and socially excluded groups have the same opportunities to highlight their specific experiences of and concerns about corruption?
3. What factors have shifted perceptions and attitudes toward corruption for the recent years? Do you agree that women participation in decision making at government and politics (elected representatives at national and local levels) made changes and how? Please explain
4. Who engages in corruption mostly? Who shape opportunities or networks for corruption? Does it vary based on socially excluded groups? Are women and other socially excluded groups less likely to engage in corruption than men?
5. What are the mechanisms of reporting on corruption and inequality matters? Is there a gender-sensitive approach to the reporting and investigation adjudication of corruption cases?
6. Does social acceptance of corruption differ based on the gender of the person engaged in corruption?
7. Who supports anti-corruption efforts? Does that support differ for different socially excluded groups and how? Does anti-corruption support and assistance seeking differ by group? Do women, men, and socially excluded groups perceive and tolerate anti-corruption efforts differently?
8. Are women or men more likely to have corruption-free access to government services?
9. What are the most critical constraints to GESI in Armenia? Are there common cultural norms and beliefs about women and men's rights, roles and participation in political and economic activities? Please explain. How does/can anti-corruption measures promote or hinder gender equality?
10. Can you suggest any other organizations or specific individuals that we should talk to about these issues?

## **LOCAL COMPANIES/ORGANIZATIONS**

1. What are the gender and inclusion patterns of business in Armenia if there is? Please explain. What are the main areas of business one may face corruption or inequalities? Are the types of corruption people face differ based on gender, age, ethnicity, and other background person has?

2. How differently are women, men and other socially excluded groups affected by corruption? Are they victimized by corruption in different or similar ways? What are the issues that pertain multiple disadvantages for women, men, and socially excluded groups?
3. Do women, men, and socially excluded groups have the same opportunities to highlight their specific experiences of and concerns about corruption? What are the mechanisms of reporting on corruption and inequality matters? Have you had a negative experience for reporting, based on the social circumstances but not limited to? Is there a gender-sensitive approach to the reporting and investigation adjudication of corruption cases?
4. Do you agree that women participation in decision making at government and politics (elected representatives at national and local levels) made changes and how? Please explain What other factors have shifted perceptions and attitudes toward corruption for the recent years?
5. Who engages in corruption mostly? Who shape opportunities or networks for corruption? Does it vary based on social and other circumstances (socially excluded groups)? Are women and other socially excluded groups less likely to engage in corruption than men?
6. Does social acceptance of corruption differ based on the gender of the person engaged in corruption?
7. What anti-corruption efforts are you aware of? Based on your experience who mostly supports such efforts? Does anti-corruption support and assistance seeking differ for different socially excluded groups and how? Do women, men, and socially excluded groups perceive and tolerate anti-corruption efforts differently?
8. Are there common patterns across the country in how men and women access resources and opportunities?
9. What are the most critical constraints to GESI in Armenia? Are there common cultural norms and beliefs about women and men's rights, roles and participation in political and economic activities? Please explain. How does/can anti-corruption measures promote or hinder gender equality?
10. What tends to be the kind of corruption that is prevalent in your sector? Are men, women, and other excluded groups more likely to have to address that type of corruption?
11. Can you suggest any other organizations or specific individuals that we should talk to about these issues?



# Focus Group Discussion Protocol

## USAID/Armenia Integrity Project (AIP) GESI Analysis

**FGD ID Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of FGD:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Facilitator:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Note taker:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Start Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**End Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

Please record notes using the following best practices:

- Save as a separate document on Sharepoint using the naming convention: FGD.FGDIDNumber.Date.InterviewerInitials, e.g., FGD.07.6Jan2020.KC
- Where possible, audio record interviews as a backup to note-taking, unless the respondent does not agree to recording equipment. Save audio recording in the same file location as the FGD notes, with the file naming convention: FGD.FGDIDNumber.Date.InterviewerInitials.audio, e.g., FGD.07.6Jan2020.KC.audio
- Take notes as close to verbatim as possible and in first person, i.e., in the voice of the respondent; the respondent is “I”
- Take notes directly into the guide and the Interview Memo Template. If additional questions, other than probes are asked, they should be added to the transcript and indicated as such

### Introduction:

*Good morning/afternoon. Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. My name is [insert name], I am a [title], and my colleagues name is [insert name and title]. We are working with the USAID Armenia Integrity Project (AIP), which aims to reduce opportunities for corruption and reinforce public demand for improved governance and accountability in Armenia. The Armenia Integrity Project, or AIP, is conducting a gender equality and social inclusion analysis to examine how corruption affects women, men, youth, and other groups and their perspectives on corruption and anti-corruption efforts.*

*We are soliciting your input in this group discussion to assist in understanding the GESI dynamics in Armenia that are relevant to anti-corruption, good governance, and accountability. This Analysis will inform the development of the Corruption Prevention Commission’s (CPC) institutional strategy, policies and outreach and impact. Results from the AIP GESI Analysis will also be used to ensure that key AIP activities are gender and inclusion sensitive. I will ask you a series of questions related to these topics; please know that there are no right or wrong answers to the questions. Your opinions and experience are appreciated and valued.*

*Your participation in this group discussion is entirely voluntary, and you do not have to participate if you do not want to. We ask everyone in this group discussion to not to talk to people outside the group about what was said during the discussion. We will ask each of you to keep what was said in the group discussion confidential. However, we cannot stop or prevent participants who are in the group from sharing things that should be confidential.*

*Before we get started, please confirm that you have filled out the informed consent form.*

Review and obtain consent prior to starting the interview. Once consent has been given, then ask for permission to record the group discussion.

*We would like to audio-record our conversation so that we can listen to the recording after the discussion to ensure we captured what you said accurately in our notes. Is it ok for me to record this group discussion?*

If you have received consent to record, you may start the recording.

## **BEGIN RECORDING**

After you start recording, ask the following:

*I would like to confirm again that we have your consent to participate in this group discussion, and to record the interview.*

Once the participants confirm, you may start the recording. Ask the following:

*Before we begin, what questions do you have?*

*Note to interviewer:* When you've reached 75 minutes, inform the interviewee about how many questions remain and check that you can complete the questions in the 15 minutes remaining, or ask for additional time.

Once the group discussion has been completed, make sure to thank the participant:

*Thank you so much for your time and sharing your thoughts with us. We greatly appreciate it.*

*If you have any questions after this group discussion, feel free to contact me or the team.*

## **FGD QUESTIONS BY ORGANIZATION TYPE**

The list of questions below will be used to conduct the FGDs with the various organization types in the sample above. The FGD questions have been designed based on the organization types, which are CSOs (Yerevan), CSOs (Regional), Private sector agencies/ stakeholders (Yerevan and regional), and Local self-government bodies and regional government authorities (Yerevan and regional). All FGD interview questions will be translated from English to Armenian and a final version of the FGD interview guide will be submitted to the IRB prior to data collection.

### **CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS**

1. How differently are women, men and other socially excluded groups affected by corruption? Are they victimized by corruption in different or similar ways? What are the issues that pertain multiple disadvantages for women, men, and socially excluded groups?
2. Are the types of corruption people face differ based on gender, age, ethnicity, and other background person has? Do women, men, and socially excluded groups have the same opportunities to highlight their specific experiences of and concerns about corruption?

3. What factors have shifted perceptions and attitudes toward corruption for the recent years? Do you agree that women participation in decision making at government and politics (elected representatives at national and local levels) made changes and how? Please explain
4. Who engages in corruption mostly? Who shape opportunities or networks for corruption? Does it vary based on socially excluded groups?
5. Are women and other socially excluded groups less likely to engage in corruption than men?
6. Does social acceptance of corruption differ based on the gender of the person engaged in corruption?
7. Who supports anti-corruption efforts? Does that support differ for different socially excluded groups and how? Does anti-corruption support and assistance seeking differ by group? Do women, men, and socially excluded groups perceive and tolerate anti-corruption efforts differently?
8. Are there common patterns across the country in how men and women access resources and opportunities?
9. What are the most critical constraints to GESI in Armenia? Are there common cultural norms and beliefs about women and men's rights, roles and participation in political and economic activities? Please explain. How does/can anti-corruption measures promote or hinder gender equality?

#### **LOCAL AND REGIONAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES**

1. Are there common patterns across the community in how men and women access resources and opportunities?
2. How differently are women and men affected by corruption? Based on your experience are women, men, and socially excluded groups victimized by corruption in different or similar ways? What are the issues of multiple disadvantages faced by different social groups, if exist?
3. What anti-corruption measures/activities your institution undertakes for women's rights, gender equality and social inclusion? Does the work of you institution have direct or indirect activities objectives related to GESI and anti-corruption? Why or why not? What efforts/activities your institution have implemented/implements to achieve GESI outcomes including related to corruption? Please explain.
4. What are the most promising opportunities for GESI as related to governance and accountability within your community/region? Are there policies/activities that have made a difference in gender relations in the community/region? If yes, which ones and which way?
5. What successful practices are you aware of in support of gender equality and social inclusion and anti-corruption? What unintended negative outcomes are you aware of?
6. Given your experience, have you come across gendered pattern to who engages in corruption and who supports anti-corruption efforts? Are anti-corruption efforts within your institution activities gender-sensitive?
7. What are the mechanisms of reporting on corruption and inequality matters? Have you noted gender or other patterns in reporting and investigation processes? Is there a gender-sensitive approach to the reporting and investigation adjudication of corruption cases?
8. What are the most critical constraints to GESI in Armenia? Are there similar laws across the country that are barriers to gender equality? Please explain. Are there common cultural norms

and beliefs about women and men's rights, roles and participation in political and economic activities? Please explain.

9. What are the key areas where there is an information or data gap in GESI in Armenia?
10. What recommendation(s) do you have for the USAID/Armenia AIP?

## **PRIVATE SECTOR AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS**

1. What are the gender and inclusion patterns of business in Armenia if there is? Please explain. What are the main areas of business one may face corruption or inequalities? Are the types of corruption people face differ based on gender, age, ethnicity, and other background person has?
2. How differently are women, men and other socially excluded groups affected by corruption? Are they victimized by corruption in different or similar ways? What are the issues that pertain multiple disadvantages for women, men, and socially excluded groups?
3. Do women, men, and socially excluded groups have the same opportunities to highlight their specific experiences of and concerns about corruption? What are the mechanisms of reporting on corruption and inequality matters? Have you had a negative experience for reporting, based on the social circumstances but not limited to? Is there a gender-sensitive approach to the reporting and investigation adjudication of corruption cases?
4. Do you agree that women participation in decision making at government and politics (elected representatives at national and local levels) made changes and how? Please explain What other factors have shifted perceptions and attitudes toward corruption for the recent years?
5. Who engages in corruption mostly? Who shape opportunities or networks for corruption? Does it vary based on social and other circumstances (socially excluded groups)? Are women and other socially excluded groups less likely to engage in corruption than men?
6. Does social acceptance of corruption differ based on the gender of the person engaged in corruption?
7. What anti-corruption efforts are you aware of? Based on your experience who mostly supports such efforts? Does anti-corruption support and assistance seeking differ for different socially excluded groups and how? Do women, men, and socially excluded groups perceive and tolerate anti-corruption efforts differently?
8. Are there common patterns across the country in how men and women access resources and opportunities?
9. What are the most critical constraints to GESI in Armenia? Are there common cultural norms and beliefs about women and men's rights, roles and participation in political and economic activities? Please explain. How does/can anti-corruption measures promote or hinder gender equality?