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Abstract

Corruption perception is a disputable subject. While corruption is hard to prove, corruption perception indexes are used in political measures such as denying adherence to international communities or international travel zones like Schengen. Post-communist countries are among the highest-ranking countries in Europe when it comes to corruption perspective. This thesis is meant to present the experiences of the citizens of two post-communist countries, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Romania, by conducting a qualitative survey with certain quantitative elements. The aim was to showcase and compare the countries’ similarities and differences concerning opinions on corruption as well as its connections to communism.
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1. Introduction

Corruption differs among and in various societies. The differences that have made an impact on developments in societies are because of the history and culture as well as the effects from the pre-existing and existing politics and economy. In spite of this, difficulties in assessing levels of corruption has made possible comparisons challenging (Jain, 2001).

Corruption is seen as one of the most compelling factors in hindering the process of democracy and that of good governance. Corruption acts prevent economic growth and weaken the trust the population has in its governance by providing access to bribing actors. Perceived corruption levels are higher in ex-communist countries that other countries in the same cultural and geographical regions which were not communist. (Sandholtz & Taagepera, 2005).

Although the level of corruption varies from one country to another, any political and economic system display some form of corruption (Zakaria, 2013). Countries in Eastern Europe transitioned from communism to democracy during the 1990s. It was the first time in modern history that so many countries made such a complete change in their political and economic institutions in such a short time (Okulicz-Kozaryn, 2014). While the state owned everything under communism from enterprises to production, the transition to privatization opened possibilities for enrichment from the market system and extensive assets (Karklins, 2002). 1989 was a year when many countries in Central and Eastern Europe made several transitions. Communism turned into pluralistic democracies and a state-controlled market turned into market economies (Bideleux & Jeffries, 1998).

According to Sandholtz & Taagepera (2005), former communist countries are more prone to corruption due to legacy from the communist era concerning decision-making and also due to the vulnerability to corruption privatization can bring. Bureaucracy and its hierarchical structure nests corruption (Rose-Ackerman, 1999). Democratic govenances are jeopardized. Corrupt practices detract from openness and accountability which is an important element of democracy. Politicians who are perceived as loyal to their own interests and benefits instead of the public interest contribute to a decline in government trust and, gradually, a distrust in democracy itself (Sandholtz & Taagepera, 2005).

In the latest Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (2015) Romania and Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH) ranked 69 and 80 respectively. These two East European countries present some similarities in the sense that they both rank high on the Corruption Perception Index. Also, Romania was under a communist regime for 42 years (1947–1989) while Bosnia-Herzegovina was communist for 47 years (1945–1992).
2. Purpose

The aim of this thesis is to examine the perceptions of corruption between post-communist societies. It also means to describe the experience of citizens in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Romania respectively when it comes to their perception of corruption in their everyday life. The choice of the two countries was based mainly on the background of the authors which made the pool of respondents more substantial. One additional reason was that these two countries had never been compared distinctly. The result will be compared with previous research and theories in order to see whether these explain our own research.

3. Questions

1. What are the respondents’ experiences regarding corruption in their respective countries?
2. What are the similarities and differences between Bosnia-Herzegovina and Romania when it comes to corruption according to the respondents’ answers?

4. Method

Surveys were conducted and used as a research method in this thesis. The surveys were created on a website intended for internet based questionnaires. Two different surveys were used. They both had the same questions but in different languages, Romanian and Bosnian, so that the questions would be better understood and the answers more thorough. They were handled separately, one of the authors found respondents in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the other author in Romania. A subjective selection was made were the respondents were mostly found through personal contacts, such as friends and family. In that sense the authors already had a sense of the people that are going to answer the questionnaires. This caused a snowball effect, where the selection grew quickly as most of the respondents found others to answer the survey. A snowball effect can be described as a process where people who have already participated find new relevant respondents that they know by contacting them, which in turn made the numbers of participants grow rather quickly. This method enabled a more diverse pool of people, such as different ages and education-levels, which made for a wider set of participants (Denscombe, 2010). One possible outcome of the snowball effect is that it may encourage a like-minded type of answers as a result of the fact most of the people who respond are acquaintances and may have similar opinions.

The participants from Bosnia-Herzegovina are between the ages 15–59 and from Romania, 19–67. There are about 130 respondents from both questionnaires that answered all of the questions and about 152 that answered some or most of the questions. Those from Bosnia-Herzegovina who answered were mostly women, at about 64%, while there was a majority of men that answered from Romania, at about 57%. Their education level varied from ongoing high school to having finished university. The employment range varied, as well, from high-school student to retired. For the result, certain aspects were considered such as prioritizing which information was chosen. Deciding what was relevant was an important
element which took time, some things were seen as needing more attention than others. Themes and categories which spoke to the findings had to be designated. The categories were chosen based on the most common comments made by the participants’ in the questionnaire. The data was illustrated by using quotations from the participants to establish trustworthiness. The participants’ age as well as their gender is referred to at the end of each quote.

It has been discussed by researchers if reliability and validity is as applicable to qualitative research as it is to quantitative. This is because qualitative research is not related with measurements while validity often is associated with them. External validity has to do with the extent that the research can be generalized to other social situations which can be difficult in qualitative research because of the limitations that is usually used. The internal validity has the researcher's result and the theoretical concepts that are developed and connected with each other. External reliability is the extent to which research can be repeated after it has been completed. It is more difficult to accomplish in qualitative research since neither social settings nor their conditions can stay the same. Nevertheless, the researcher can undergo a similar social role as the one before them to see if the result can be replicated. Internal reliability is that which the researchers, if there is a team, mutually decide how to interpret what they have seen and heard (Bryman, 2011).

Surveys were chosen because the authors did not have the opportunity to travel to the countries for interviews, which was the original plan. This limited the opportunity for more in-depth and personal information that could have been gathered. Other questions could have been asked which were not thought of at first. With surveys, however, we were able to obtain more broad and widespread answers from different parts of the country which would not have been possible with interviews. The questionnaires also made the process go faster as the answers came in during a short period of time. Surveys are time-efficient and increase productivity in comparison to other methods. Furthermore, they proved themselves to be more flexible in the sense that the respondents could pick the time that best suited them to complete the survey and the time needed to complete it is much shorter. Also, the participants can skip the questions that they do not consider relevant to them. This can be troublesome since the researchers do not know the reason why they chose not to answer (Denscombe, 2010).

Another advantage of using a survey is that it is possible to pre-screen participants choosing just the ones who match the desired target profile. Although this is also possible with interviews, surveys allow a larger scale of participants. It can be hard to examine if the answers are genuine in surveys, but they do allow complete anonymity which maximizes the comfort of the respondents. Despite this, in comparison with interviews, surveys do not provide a large amount of deep information and not as many details. Since there is not much room for follow-up questions or the participants do not feel as obligated to explain their thoughts thoroughly the results can be somewhat impersonal. Web-based questionnaires can find trouble when reaching certain groups that do not have connection to the internet or who do not know how to use it properly. This can be the case with
pensioners, who in correlation with other groups, have not taken a large part in the surveys. In addition to this, the response-rate can be difficult to keep track of, as it is usually quite low. It is easily ignored and the researcher can hardly know who has completed the survey and who has not (Denscombe, 2010).

The survey is small-scaled and is used to find out what the people who answered feel about corruption. The results are not a general depiction of the whole countries’ opinions in the matter, but rather what the people who chose to answer the questions feel about the issue. The results of the surveys will be analyzed qualitatively as we describe and interpret the thoughts and attitudes in the result. The more quantitative approach of the result is made up by the closed question of the survey that resulted in percent outcome. It is used to show more precise conclusions and more clear similarities or differences. Most of the questions in the questionnaire were open, so that people could write their opinions. Then, we examined and interpreted the responses that had been received. The answers’ themes as well as patterns were categorized in the results to show connections and to describe a more coherent picture.

The advantage with qualitative research is that intricate situations can be represented in more detail as well as give more nuances to the subject. It depicts the realities of people's lives and can also show contradicting results which can cause uncertainties instead of having a definite answer. There are several explanations that can be used for a circumstance since it is built on interpretations made by the researchers. The disadvantage with this method is that it can be difficult to know to what extent the result is representative, generalizations of larger groups are not often possible to make. It takes more time to analyze the information when using a qualitative method, as well. Quantitative data, also present in the thesis, is easier to comprehend and explain. Long and detailed answers that come from interviews or questionnaires can be interpreted in several ways based on its context and the researchers. What is chosen to be shown can also be seen as a negative, as it can be picked due to the fact that it fits with the rest of the results. Some parts can be left out because it makes the results to confusing or uncertain instead of showing a definite conclusion that can be made. Improvements that could be made in the thesis would have been having better structured respondent poll which could have made the result more concise and focused. The subject of the thesis made it difficult to find similar research but also direct theories (Denscombe, 2010). A theory consuming approach has been used in the research. The subject was chosen first while the theories used were found afterwards to try to explain the case (Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson, Towns & Wångerud, 2017).
5. Theories

5.1 Nomenklatura and cadre dynamics

In 1922, at the XI Congress, Lenin stated: “If the Central Committee is deprived to direct the allocation of personnel, it will be unable to direct policy”. This sheds light on the importance of the nomenklatura system had during the communism era, although the system began to strengthen more after the death of Lenin (Rigby, 1988). The system was used to control thousands of posts in every sphere of the state. It was a type of Soviet socio-political order, a sort of personnel management system in an attempt to control and centralize the periphery from appointment and promotion to transfer and removal of the cadre. Later on, following Lenin’s theory of nationalism influenced the local recruitment of cadre. The Soviet approach on cadre recruitment was based on loyalty, “nativization” and economic development. The “nativization” principle was meant to empower locally thus strengthening periphery control. If the local showed too many “localists” traits, cadre rotation was favored. This rotation was, although, limited in the sense that regional work could be affected by a large number of transfers (Siegel, 2017).

The nomenklatura system has changed to a small degree through periods of time but the most significant changes appeared after the transition from Vladimir Lenin to Josef Stalin to Nikita Khrushchev to Leonid Brezhnev. Changing the tactics of purging and violence Stalin use to deal with insubordination, Khrushchev made tenures and offices insecure by continuously rotating cadre, creating, combining and eliminating offices. This approach led to chaos and hindered development, especially locally. Considering local officials never got to do their jobs. Brezhnev came with a different policy, that of the “stability in cadre”. This led to stability and more development. It also led, however to officials taking advantage of their positions and authority, following their own interests and recruiting similar successors. This contributed to officials becoming established in all possible networks from all aspects of society. Their delegates followed the same path. A reform came in 1990 meant to turn over the Brezhnev era. This came, though, at a time when officials had gained much power and support from locals, making some of Mikhail Gorbachev attempts of changing the already established officials, futile (Siegel, 2017). The nomenklatura system was used in the Soviet Union and other Eastern Bloc countries and helped those in key administrative positions hold their functions even after reforms or the fall of the regime.

5.2 Culture and corruption

Culture, in the studied area, translates as “orientation to action”. This custom is learned by socialization. There is a tendency for cultural patterns to reproduce themselves, thus the expectation for continuity. Cultures change at a slow pace. When it comes to corruption as a practice, it too could well continue many years, even after the dramatic changes in the late 1980s, early 1990s. While there are not many studies concerning the cultural approach
of corruption, some chose to study this theory in connection with the World Values Survey map (Sandholtz & Taagepera, 2005).

Fig. 1. (Sandholtz & Taagepera, 2005, p. 113).

In this two-dimensional map concerning personal values, the two axis range from secularism to religious values while the other looks at economic security and personal self-expression. Analyzing countries by mapping them in this system shows that corruption may be correlated with this value-axis. It can be argued that demands for survival may require corrupt practices, even if those involved are not for corruption and its practices. At the opposing pole, self-expression presupposes a lack of focus on basic survival needs, thus resulting in a lower level of corruption. It can be also argued that a lower level of corruption may aid in developing self-expression (Sandholtz & Taagepera, 2005).

According to Sajo (2007) the theories that look at corruption from a cultural perspective are one-dimensional. These theories that link the bribe cultures from the time of the Ottoman or Czarist Empire with the development of communism and later on, the high level of corruption today. There is anecdotal evidence that back these theories as certain
behavioral patterns spread quickly and once installed, and normalized, they are hard to diminish or alter. There are nonetheless strong cultural variables that correspond to long-term corruption perception (Sajo, 2007).

5.3 Political Corruption

When referring to political corruption, the focus is on the structure within politics that facilitates and requires corrupt practices. This type of corruption models a certain standard of governance imposed by the needs of the existing political structures. In this type of corruption, the use of the corruption discourse is of great importance and it can become a tool against political adversaries, both domestically and internationally. With this type of discourse used in a populistic environment, repeated and supported by experiences of payoffs and extortions can give a better understanding of the moralistic angle of politics. Post-communist countries describe themselves as deeply influenced by corruption and this is continuously fortified by the West in order to control this countries. As the West’s corruption grows, the frustration over it grows as well and the Western politics needs to demonstrate it superior morality is directly proportioned to the latter (Sajo, 2007).

5.4 The transformation of corruption after transition

The privatization that followed the fall of communism and the development of the market economy, the corruption patterns transformed gradually. Political structures continued to learn how to legalize corruption by the laws they adopted and making corruption difficult to divulge and prosecute. Some political science theories claim that corruption is inherited from communism when personal connections dictated and clientelistic structured thrived. The customs of ignoring rules from the communist era led to hindrances in establishing a rule of law (Sajo, 2007).

6. Definitions

Post-communism

Post-communism as a system. Implies that post-communism includes a number of characteristics which jointly build a form of society, from political to economic and social structures and values. The post-communist system also implies a wide variety of modifications from country to country. Post-communism as a condition. Opposed to the previous view, this perspective does not see all the characteristics as integrated as a system but observes them as evident and that they are normally together. Post communism as a situation. This perception sees post-communism as simply the period of time after the fall of communism. This perception does not take into consideration the nature of the society and political system. This perception sees post-communism as a situation that will cease the moment the characteristics of that country apply to another more suiting system (Gill, 2003).
Communism
According to Dagger & Ball (n.d.), communism is “the political and economic doctrine that aims to replace private property and a profit-based economy with public ownership and communal control of at least the major means of production (e.g., mines, mills, and factories) and the natural resources of a society.”

Transition
A transition is a series of occurrences which are politically correlated with a dictatorial regime going through different stages towards a more liberal and pluralist structure, such as a democracy (Anastasakis, 2013).

7. Previous research

To detect on which level the monopolies are being held it can be helpful to find out how much power officials have in terms of making decisions, the arrangements for various public services as well as how discrete they are and how much responsibility they take over their respective tasks. “Stealing the state” and “state capture” are two terms that analysts have used to describe the abuse of public authorities. Other analysts have another term which is “a hidden political regime”. In accordance with the term, the analysts mention in their reviews on previous research that there is a hidden political agenda within corruption and how that affects those in power and their relation to each other is difficult to perceive (Karklins, 2002).

Clientelistic structures and corrupt practices in post-communist countries are associated with one another. Corruption is ingrained in clientelistic structures and that is the case in all transitioning countries, regardless of their history, location or economic development (Sajo, 2003).

7.1 Communism, Transitions, and Corruption

Post-communist countries are vulnerable to corrupt practices mainly because the system of decision-making under the communist era and because the privatization and its following corrupt practices. Bribes and payoffs were common practices used when allocating economic backing, thus influencing the decision-making. Furthermore, the level of accountability during communism was low making communist countries more susceptible to corruption. The fall of communism did not make the opportunities the system had disappear. The new bureaucracies were not completely new, a large amount of administrative solutions and many employees continued to work in the system. Moreover, a new form of corruption was born when privatization started. The transition former communist countries made was dual and it was towards democracy and market economy. This transition was made at such a fast pace that it was difficult to set in place laws that would handle corruption. Decades of communism made practices such as bribery become a cultural practice. Once the communism collapsed, values and attitudes still remained in place. Corruption became an informal culture whose practices extended after communism and took advantage of the opportunities capitalism brought with it. Another legacy of
communism is secularism. Communist regimes encouraged, to say the least, secularism. At the same time, by impeding development, it pushed for concerns involving survival in the population. Former communist countries score higher on the survival axis of the World Values Survey than countries that did not have a communist regime. Also, survival orientation is indicative of a higher corruption level (Sandholtz & Taagepera, 2005).

7.2 Structures of opportunity and corruption

According to political economists who focus on structure of opportunities and constraint as important factors for corruption, low levels of competition create an environment for corruption. At the same time, bureaucrats with substantial power are exposed to having the possibility to demand bribes. During communism, there was little if any competition while highly ranked bureaucrats had no supervision. Previous empirical studies have shown that as the democracy is more developed, the corruption levels will be lower. Market competitiveness and trade openness reduce the level of corruption by making it corrupt acts more expensive. One exception is the countries dependent on exports of such materials as fuel and metal as they tend to be more corrupt. Political rights and democracy improve the possibilities that a corrupt act is disclosed and punitive measures will be taken. Previous research has also revealed that, when it comes to political systems, federations and presidential governances are at a higher risk of corruption (Sandholtz & Taagepera, 2005).

7.3 Control of Bureaucratic Corruption

Halim (2008) looks at the three perspectives of the control of bureaucratic corruption: the informal, the formal and the cultural one. It has been shown that there is a significantly reduced corruption when bureaucrats are hired on their merits rather based on nepotism. These bureaucrats have more to gain by adhering to accepted norms and being included by their peers than they would gain by engaging in acts of corruption. This is a form of informal control. The formal control of bureaucratic corruption refers to political institutions. Empirical studies are divided in mostly three divisions: that democracies are less corrupt than autocracies, that parliamentary democracies control corruption better than representative parliaments and that an effective judicial system is an advantage in combating corruption. The cultural control of bureaucratic corruption includes the civic engagement. As a result of statistical analysis, it has been shown that there is a strong connection between the level of civic engagement in a society and the level of corruption. The more involved citizens are in public decisions, the lower the level of corruption will be.
8. Background

8.1 The Balkans

Communists had power in most of the Balkan states with popular-front governments after World War II. Complete control was not achieved until 1948 and occurred first in Yugoslavia and Albania and later in Romania and Bulgaria. The strongest country in the Balkans after the Second World War was Yugoslavia, they were second in Eastern Europe after the Soviet Union. This was due to their big army which consisted of 800,000 well trained and experienced fighters as well as a new and different government. The military control that the partisan achieved during the war was used to establish the communist domination in Yugoslavia. Communist rule took the longest to enact in Romania where control was gained by repressing other parties and taking power in important ministries (Jelavich, 1983). All of the Balkan states had their own type of communism where many things varied such as ideology and control. For example, Romania was more nationalistic and authoritarian while Yugoslavia was more liberal open to the West. Because of that the transitions for these countries was diverse where some were more peaceful than others (Anastasakis, 2013).

8.2 Yugoslavia

To be able to succeed in Yugoslavia the religious and ethnic divisions had to be handled. This was achieved by not letting one of the “groups” govern, which would have been difficult due to previous internal tensions and because there was not a definite majority. Instead there was more focus on giving local autonomy in hope that this would support a peaceful and constructive federation made of diverse nations. The communists accomplished to surpass the existing ethnic and religious detachments, which no other movement did, as well as gaining support from all of the current distinctive groups (Bideleux & Jeffries, 1998). The previous tension had occurred during the Second World War between Croats and Serbs, which were two of the bigger ethnic groups in Yugoslavia. Both parties had nationalistic groups in the war which made the West give support to someone who wanted the Yugoslav area to join together and that was Josip Broz Tito and his partisans. Despite this, the communists led by Tito gained power mostly on their own (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002).

There was a split between Tito and Stalin in 1948 which made Yugoslavia distance themselves from the Soviet camp and create a version of communism that was less “restraining”, which was not used in any country in Central and Eastern Europe (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002). Yugoslavia was a different communist country in comparison to others in the sense that it was socialist but non-Soviet and had a good relationship with the capitalist West. The communist party had both liberals and conservatives and they often discussed about the issues of reform and democratization. At the same time, there were dissenting ideologies present and these came together with both national concerns and prioritizing concerning nationalities as well as different ethnic minorities within
Yugoslavia. Several attempts at decentralization were met by the insatisfaction of various national interests. The death of Tito in 1980 would bring a need for a more enhanced liberalization of economy and pluralism. Instead of achieving this, the increased differences within the federation led to austere economic decline (Anastasakis, 2013).

Until the death of Tito in 1980 it looked as his strategies had a hold of possible internal discriminations as well as ethnic nationalism. Different ethnic and religious groups had lived together in peace without difficulties, especially in Bosnia-Hercegovina, and it seemed that the previous contempt amongst these groups had lessened over time (Bideleux & Jeffries, 1998). Despite this, the dissolution of Yugoslavia in the 1990s is mostly explained to be due to deep-rooted nationalist tensions that had been growing (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002). Local politicians had increasingly reached people with nationalist concepts and three different religions were “reborn” which added to the devotion and ambitions to the ethnic group (Bideleux & Jeffries, 1998). It was at the end of the 1980s when the ruling elite started to gain popularity with these nationalist ideas, through this six republics as well as two autonomous provinces were established. With the nationalism growing, Yugoslavia was officially dismantled 1991 and with this armed conflict followed in the region (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002).

The Dayton Agreement, which was signed 1995, was the end of the conflict that occurred in Bosnia-Hercegovina after Yugoslavia separated. The agreement also serves as the country's fundamental law. With it came a political system which is complicated and particular with two entities that include the Federation (FBiH) and Republika Srpska (RS) as well as a separate territory, Brcko District, that has its own internationally controlled situation (Georgescu, 2015). As a result of the agreement the Federation has 10 cantons and all of them with their own parliament and ministries. The country also has a total of 142 municipalities. It is believed that there are approximately 50 000 public officials that work in senior and middle administrative management and there is a total of 14 police forces in the country (Divjak & Pugh, 2008).

8.3 Romania

In pre-1989 communist Romania the wages were low. The benefits were represented by the influence the work position brought with it. This influence was mostly used for personal advantage and as it was widely accepted by society, it would turn into a significant instrument for corruption. These work positions were rarely distributed by merit but rather by the strength of someone’s connections with and within the communist party (Văduva, 2016).

Romania was the last country in the Soviet block to renounce communism and did so with a violence unprecedented by the former members. Political scientists call the revolution in Romania “a revolution from above”. The new leadership was a part of the old regime which later gathered under the name of National Salvation Front (NSF), a political party which dominated Romanian politics until the mid-1990s. Their leader, Ion Iliescu, became the
The president of Romania and was supported by two other radical nationalist parties (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002). At the same time, Romania began its journey to a freer market and towards international integration. It did so with a tradition of corruption, technical deficiencies and poor infrastructure (Văduva, 2016).

The 1991 adopted Constitution was based on the French model with the exception that the president could not dissolve the Parliament. The new regime had considerable control over the media and transformed the Securitate (secret police) into the lessen form of Romanian Information Service. This regime did not follow the constitutional laws. In June 1990 Iliescu called miners to the capital to disband the demonstrators in Bucharest that were asking for liberalization and democracy. This turned into a violent event with Iliescu thanking the miners publicly for their help in silencing the demonstrators (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002).

During the following nine years, the miners came to Bucharest for a total of six time, thus enforcing their reputation of being highly politicized, a reputation that dated since the communism era. Iliescu found it unnecessary to institutionalize the opposition as a necessary segment of democracy. Nevertheless, some opposing political parties were able to operate but at a lesser freedom than the parties in other European countries. In 1992 NSF split into two parties, Iliescu belonging to the majority formed a new party named Party of Social Democracy in Romania (PSDR) while the minority, led by Petre Roman founded the Democratic Party that went into the opposition, having a more liberal approach. Romania is seen, along with Bulgaria and Yugoslavia as being on the wrong side of the delimitation in Central and Eastern Europe by the fact that its politics is dominated with former communists which deliver populism and authoritarianism (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002).

After the fall of communism, state assets needed to be privatized. This was done in Romania, like in other former communist countries in Europe with questionable methods and politically motivated. This, paired with the fact that the old administration did not disappear immediately made the reform inefficient and its policies, corrupt. Romania transitioned from a totalitarian communist regime to democracy and an open and free market. This would have broad ramifications to Romania’s reorganization and the country’s public administration (Văduva, 2016).

In 1996, the National Peasant Christian Democratic Party (NPCDP) won the elections in coalition with a party representing the Hungarian minority, the Hungarian Democratic Union in Romania (HDUR). The election result was accepted by the outgoing regime, and with a government including representatives for an ethnic minority, Romania seemed to be on the right path to a secure transition into democracy. While during the campaign, NPCDP sustained the need for a monarchy comeback. After the elections, they dampened their convictions and opted for a more British approach to monarchy. Later on, they renounced the idea claiming it would bring instability at a time when Romania prepared for negotiations to join the European Union (EU) (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002).
Romania joined NATO in 2004 and the EU in 2007. Since then, the main focus of the administration was mainly to become eligible for the Schengen zone, to absorb EU funds, reform the justice system and decentralize education, health and culture. The 2008 financial crisis brought in a multi-trillion-euros rescue for the banking sector by governmental intervention and with it, extensive criticism when it came to corruption, incompetence, unaccountability and legitimacy. In order to build a strong democracy, trust, credibility, transparency and legitimacy are key factors. The governments and public administration’s main focus should be on providing basic public services and promoting social development (Văduva, 2016).

9. Results

The qualitative findings will be presented in the first part of the result. The answers were made to open questions were the participants could write their own opinions as elaborately they wished. There were common topics that arose from the content as follows:

9.1 Communism heritage and corruption today

Corruption under the communism era was not a focus point of the surveys. Still, when referring to communism in relation to the levels of corruption in today’s society, the respondents referred to many communist practices that they believed had been passed on throughout the last decades. Some of the respondents could not find any common practices between the communist era and today's system. An overview of the answers shows significant differences between the two countries. While the respondents from Bosnia-Herzegovina see little, if any, traces of communism in their society, the respondents from Romania have another perspective, ranging from numerous aspects to none.

Bosnia-Herzegovina
When talking of communism in the current society many mention that there is nationalism instead of there being unity amongst all people. Bosnian respondents continue by saying that the society today is corrupt and that there are no traces left of communism, which to most is unfortunate.

“There is no communism that is my opinion. Because in communism they gave: jobs, treatments, all kinds of help, and today they just take.” (F/55)

The respondents from Bosnia-Herzegovina did mostly answer that there was nothing left of communism. Some who said that there were remains from communism in today's society, talked about the mentality that people have, that is, that the mentality is still communist.

People who answered the question if there is more corruption now than there was during communism usually responded by saying that there is more now. Some mentioned that
there was corruption during communism as well, but that there has never been as much as there is now. Corruption is generally acknowledged as having existed both then and now. However, it is said that it was better for the people before and that nowadays, it is the corrupt that take for themselves and do not concern themselves with other people. Others, while still mostly saying that there is more corruption now, think that the repression of media and freedom of speech in that time makes it difficult to know what level of corruption there was during communism.

“Due to the form of government, that is, a one-party system, and repression I think that there was corruption but not more than there is today. Or at the time because of the stifling freedom of speech and the media, we do not have the right image of the achieved level of corruption at that time compared to today.” (F/28)

Most of the participants say that the people who worked during communism had everything, and notes that it is no longer the case. Comments to explain this include that their pays are not enough, much harder to find employment and having to bribe for most things that they might need.

“I did not feel the corruption during communism because I had a good pay and was able to build the house with money that was earned honestly. And now I gave 600 KM (307 Euro) to get a donation to be able to renovate the house, since I am not able to do so with what I earn.” (F/50)

Connections between communism and corruption among the people who answered is also generally seen as non-existing. Many comment on how it was good during communism because people had equal rights in employment, free and quality education and free healthcare. This, according to a large number of the respondents, is no longer the case.

“Maybe there was corruption during communism but it was not this easily detected. Now as soon as you go somewhere you give a gift and they say “here you are” but when you do not give anything they say “what do you want?” I did not feel that during communism.” (F/50)

Some of the participants did see some similarities between corruption and communism. The answer by saying that the fall of communism brought forward opportunities for corruption to flourish and develop in the new society.

“Communist totalitarian structure (political system in which the government is under the control of one political organization) found their place in the depth of society. The absence of private property, one party system, oppression, and repressing freedom of speech - is all something that every communist regime has in common in any country. All of that enabled the existence of corruption, today all this corruption only spilled over into the new system as it dropped even lower.” (F/28)
Others who note that there are some parts of communism left in the current society talk about those who have high-ranking positions. It is mentioned that the same people, or their relations, still keep their positions as they were before the transition phase.

“Well, the same people or their relatives that are in government now were there during communism.” (M/52)

Furthermore, when asked if communism had affected the level of corruption in the current society, the answers were similar. Many were against the idea that communism had any connections with corruption and some hinted to democracy having something to do with it. An abundance of the answers comment on the fact that there has never been more corruption and that it has never been to this extent.

“Communism did not affect the corruption level. There was corrupt people before but today it is wherever you go, in any institution, health, administration, school…” (F/40)

Nostalgia for communism differs amongst those who are doing better and those who are doing worse following the end of it. It is influenced by people's individual situations, the people who have it worse after communism are much more inclined to think that it was good in comparison to those who have it better (Okulicz-Kozaryn, 2014). Many answered that it was better during communism and that the ordinary citizens had good lives and that people were more equal, in comparison to the current situation.

“If there was corruption during communism it was for the people, but now they just take for themselves. I do not think that communism affected the level of corruption. I grew up during that time and I was satisfied with my life and today I am sad.” (F/55)

Most people in many Eastern European countries feel that there was a better quality of life during communism. This is mostly due to the fact that there was job security, among other things (Okulicz-Kozaryn, 2014). The answers are for the most part consistent on the fact that people had better lives before and that there was less suffering among the ordinary people. People who remember what it was like to work during communism note that it was not like it is now.

“I don't think so. In communism, they ruled one kind of people, people, but now it is a different kind. The communists were better for the people and these just want to take for themselves.” (F/40)

There were answers that also mentions the transition phase from one regime to another and how it has affected corruption in the country. Many post-communist countries had hardships in their transitions phases since they had not had capitalism. Without a group that could invest legally obtained funds in the new privatized society and new market, a form of affluent societal group could prosper, one that grew its illegal income (Holmes,
2015). This is noted from the participants who write about the opportunities that corrupt officials had during the transition period.

“The fall of communism brought forward mass privatization, and in translation that means, who grabs more has it better. That is what created a fertile ground for breeding corruption and thieves. The company that exported domestic production, began to slowly to deteriorate, lay off workers and sell for 1 KM.” (F/26)

Some participants saw corruption as a gate-regime which, by its nature of limiting the media and getting people accustomed to being controlled by a single leader, party or group of people, has opened the way for the abuse of power current politicians resort to. People comment on how its fall led to the emergence of massive corruption and that people took advantage of the situation that they were in.

“Communism helped start corruption. When the president of a country has all the power that makes it a bigger chance to have opened the way for bribery and corruption, because it all depends on only one person. And if you abolish freedom of the media you will get a real dictatorship.” (F/20)

An economic challenge is privatization. It gives room for corruption since people with power positions gives out bribes to improve their situation in comparison to others in the development from being state-owned to being owned by private individuals. It is seen as a big reason for high levels of corruption in transitioning post-communist countries (Holmes, 2015).

“The communist regime strengthened today's culture of corruption. Within the context of economic transition to a market economy, corruption and criminal behavior has enabled the growth and release even stronger roots in society. It is very difficult to pull up all the roots of corruption.” (F/28)

A study completed in the post-communist region outlines that corruption had a lot to do with the privatization. A common trait is that the officials were more focused on their private profits in the transition phase when public property was being privatized. While honest politicians did not do much to prohibit the corrupt acts which is big reason for the corruption in these areas (Karklins, 2002). When asked if communism affected the level of corruption today many did not agree, while some say that the transition in the 1990s made a big change in corruption levels.

“Of course not, corruption was formed as a result of the transition from one socio-political arrangement to another. A single corruption is not the result not of an old or new design, but the result of the aforementioned changes.” (F/20)
Romania

Regarding corruption and communism, many respondents gave definitions of corruption and what it means to them. One man ties corruption to communism, its traits and its consequences:

“Corruption is a ‘shortcut’ that certain individuals ‘treat themselves to’, to their own interest, which is possible in certain societies where individual taught with these practices and who continue to benefit from corruption; moreover, the period of time when shortage of everything from food to advanced technique was registered, permitted the people who were in the administration and had the resources to benefit from their position obtaining other resources or better positions for their family in the respective society.” (M/53)

Certain people saw no lingering elements of communism in the present society, said the corruption existed long before communism, that it continues to exist long after the communism’s fall, stating that the Romanian society is developing towards something different. Respondents also pointed out that the autocracy can be both communist and capitalist and that the relationship between the state and the citizen and the state and the civil society is an essential factor:

“I don’t think it has to do with the ideology or the political system. It has to do with how the state works. The relationship between the state and the citizens. Where there is rule of law, the level of corruption is lower. When the state is run by a self-interest oligarchy and the civil society is underdeveloped and the elite cannot be liable and the elite does not answer to the citizen for its actions, it doesn't matter if the oligarchy is communist or capitalist.” (F/39)

Others point out to positive aspects of communism, a time when there was correctness and, thus, lower corruption level. Some grew up during that time and see communism as an era when they grew up nicely and well-educated with common sense. One respondent sees communism as an ideology that was essentially a good idea, while arguing that what we see today is the aftermath of that poorly understood ideology.

Another percentage of people perceived corruption as blossoming after the fall of communism or that the fall of communism unbounded those politicians who now steal freely from the state and thus affect the country to the extent of influencing the current emigration rates.

Along the same line, some people saw the fall of communism as just a weak possible cause of the current communism, which permitted people who were still prominent to get rich through corruption. Still, these respondents blame corruption on pure greed:

“Only if you especially look for them. The only connection (that too, indirect) is the frustration which communism left for some still influential people which permitted themselves to be corrupted to make the fortune that the previous regime, by its restrictions,
Participants mentioned that corruption is present in every society and the level of corruption is determined by the level of poverty. Interestingly, some respondents saw resemblances between the Western states and their current policies and the communististic approaches, especially in the social sector:

“We do have it as well. Paradoxically, there are more ties with the communism in the West countries that were never communist. For instance, they expect the state to equalize through an assistential nature: to give you money, a pace to live, possibly even a job and that the state does not have any expectation from you.” (M/49)

Moreover, according to Jain (2001), democracies are not always prosperous in terms of dealing with corruption. They facilitate the access to the political stage for affluent people who look for their own interests.

Certain participants refer to communism not just as the ramp for corruption today but also as the source of all the setbacks in the Romanian society. One 45-year-old man looks also from the perspective of the people who were imprisoned under communism. These people were people who opposed the regime, upper-class people or intellectuals and were “crippled” or even “physically exterminated” by the system. Looking back at the history of communism in Romania, he also mentions that those in power cultivated a society where the people in power put their children, who had learned a similar moral from them, in high positions or in charge of their parents’ former assignments. Thus, by removing all opponents and assuring a lineage, the system could continue indefinitely by imposing poverty and ruling by terror.

Some respondents point out to corruption as being accentuated by the presence of people from the old nomenclature, that people from the communist system infiltrated the new Romanian administration or never left. Some of these respondents blame the late implementation of the lustration law, as well, on the presence of old communists in politics. They also state that nepotism is directly related to the same phenomenon and that it helped the people raised in the communist mentality take over the leadership after the transition. According to them, this political hierarchy based on family ties and interests also continues to influence the media, no longer by censuring it but by manipulating it:

“There are numerous people from the old nomenclature who perpetuate the mentalities from back then and for which the December 1989 did not bring a change of mentality” (F/43)

Various participants mention oligarchs and political groups formed around them, beginning from the time of communism, continuing to the present day. The only thing they
say has changed is not the hierarchy itself but that the leader has been removed while the rest of the communists occupied the seats in the Parliament.

Mentality was also an issue various people referred to and believed to have persisted until current times. While some denounce communism as cultivating corruption as a survival method, others say that the regime made people accustomed to others making decisions for them, distorting the idea of liberty even until present times. These distortions, according to some, has led to a non-participatory mentality:

“Yes, it annihilated the public opinion. There are very few NGOs not pertaining to political parties and they do not have access to public information. People do not want to volunteer for democracy or social problems or administration. The total lack of transparency of the authorities, exactly as in communism, which helps them hide their corruptness.” (M/47)

On the subject of the regime itself, certain respondents blame communism on destabilizing the country, enabling xenophobia and popularizing low levels of education. One man does, however, mention that the regime Romania had during that era was not a communist one, but a “ceausescian” one:

“The communism destroyed the stability, the correct relationship between citizens, promoted deception, disguised theft, “uneducation”, ethnic hatred, and yet, I have to say that we did not have communism, but a “Ceausescian” regime; there is a difference.” (M/67)

9.2 Impressions of current corruption

In this category, the authors included various aspects of the respondents’ experience with and about corruption, including different aspects of how corruption affects various aspects of their lives.

Bosnia-Herzegovina

When asked about the most common type of corruption in their society the answers varied somewhat. Many mentioned several parts of society such as politics, health and generally people with power positions.

“In my humble opinion, the adjective "mostly common" can be throw out. Because, in Bosnia and Herzegovina all, on the one hand, is an act of corruption. Of those petty ones which include bribing clerk to the big ones, which are of vital importance. First of all bribery for employment or possible promotion to a higher working position. In addition, as a student, I am aware that there is a corrupt staff at the University of Sarajevo, as well, and exams can be in this group of acts of corruption. And I cannot leave out the famous "envelope" that is presented to doctors’ before/during/after surgery. You pay the first for an appointment to have an operation, and pay for it to be a well-performed surgery, and
eventually pay because you or your closest are alive. All in all, I would go on and on with listing but I am going to stop here.” (F/21)

A few, when talking about corruption in BiH, mentioned politicians and various institutions as being the most corrupt in the country as the benefit the most for those acts.

“Corruption in BiH is most often directly related to politics and the highest levels of government. The most corrupt individuals are getting the benefit from the position and status in which they are located. State, public as well as private institutions, have a connection with corrupt procedures. The authorities and the opposition is seemingly but unsuccessfully struggling with the problem of corruption in BiH, which is increasingly taking hold.” (M/48)

Something that post-communist countries have in common is that the perception of corruption is higher than in countries that do not have a communist past and live in the same regions (Sandholtz & Taagepera, 2005). Many participants from BiH said that corruption can be found in various segments of life and in various daily functions. Many point out its presence in health, higher education, police, various government institutions and most structures of society.

“There are many, one of them is when the doctor takes money from patients, and then treats them a lot better, the other is for example when police officers take money from drivers so that they will not be punished, when professors and teachers takes payments so that children will not have poor marks, and so on.” (M/21)

Officials with high-positions are mentioned as taking advantage of their positions for private gain, which was a usual response from the participants. There was a general low level of trust of high-level officials in the answers that came from BiH, where many questioned them and their commitment to the citizens.

“Abuse of position/authority - people holding public office often use their position for personal gain, they “set up” competitions, grant, employ "their" people and etc. And they take money or other form of benefit for these things very often.” (M/24)

People who say they have themselves, or heard of others who have, witnessed corruption mention many different scenarios which include doctors, police officers and college professors. Most, if not all, of the answers connected to this mentioned bribe of some kind to receive certain services.

“I witnessed it countless times, when a police officer takes a bribe for speeding, in the hospital where everyone from the doorman to the directors take bribes in order to do what they are required to do.” (M/37)
One of the answers talked of their experience in college, where they witnessed people passing exams even if they were not exceptional students.

“Unfortunately, it is not a rare occurrence. In college, I personally followed the work of certain students who in miraculous ways with pre-exam 0 points pass the exams. Chocolate boxes and the like are being delivered to the doctors and staff at the counters of the public sector, the police who knowingly allow criminal actions in restaurants for the local elite …” (M/21)

Romania
A great part of the participants had a vast overview of Romanian corruption. Most of them referred to politicians, public officials or the companies these are involved with or have an interest in as a source of corruption. They also invoked theft from the public funds as a serious issue in the Romanian society:

“The political system in Romania is the best and biggest corruption example. It brings to power individuals whose purpose is almost without exception to drain public money through the companies of the political parties that gained power, simultaneously breaking the justice’s teeth in order to be able to steal in peace. Concerning the word ‘theft’, it is the first word the majority of Romanians learn, before the word ‘mother’. ‘Be careful so they don’t steal your…’ is the first sentence I learned and which the parents and kindergarten educators utter the most to children. To live in Romania means hearing the word ‘theft’ the most often.” (M/45)

9.2.1 Bribe and connections

When asked what the most common form of corruption is in their respective countries, people predominantly answered bribe and the use of connections.

Bosnia-Herzegovina
In concerns to informal payments, people refer to the fact that it is a common practice if you need something and it is does not come as a surprise for any party, the one who gives or the one who receives the bribe. When asked if grand corruption has an effect on them or their family one response was;

“Of course it has, if you want a job, to get treatment or something else you need to be prepared that they will require service for it. They do not look for anything but they do make it clear.” (F/55)

A survey that had its attention on corruption encounters in Bosnia-Herzegovina show that 8 out 10 citizens deal with corruption during a year. The most common place for experiencing corruption is at a local level, it is due to the fact that the communication mostly happens between those at that level and the public (Belloni & Strazzari, 2014).
Bribes, or some type of gift, is mentioned as being very valuable if you want to achieve something, according to the respondents and is seen as a common practice.

“Supplements or gifts are indispensable if you want the people in high positions to do a service or to allow us to be equal with other students (vacancies for work, enrollment to college, accelerated departure of the line at a doctor's appointment or to the operation and the like.). This is achieved thanks to some acquaintances (bonds) or with the help of bribing with gifts or money which is not in accordance with the law and regulations.” (F/28)

Bribery, including extortion, is likely the most frequently used type of corruption (Johnston, 2005). Surveys that were conducted in a couple of post-communist countries demonstrate that giving payments to police officers and for health assistance take up about half of all bribery costs. Another type of bribe which is continual is connected to education, more specifically high-level education (Karklins, 2002). This is noted in many comments as bribes is often written about when asking of corruption.

“All of the citizens of BiH have to give some kind of gift to get a job or better treatment. Whatever you want you have to give a gift or money.” (F/50)

Bribes are seen as a necessary act in the attempt to make life easier. While Bosnians condemn corruption, they do engage in corrupt practices on a daily basis in their interactions with schools, associations and other institutions (Belloni & Strazzari, 2014). It is usually seen as a necessity, in some areas, if you want to achieve something. When asked about how they can tell if a bribe, or gift, is expected of them the respondents talked of the fact that you can see it by their general behavior as well as the fact that you have to know how to read between the lines. It is also talked about how it is known that certain people are corrupt and that you should bring an envelope.

“From general experience and you can tell by the people it is just that they do not tell you directly but if you do not give them something you will not be well treated or you will be punished for some offense and so forth.” (M/52)

When responding to how they knew that a bribe, or gift, was expected of them, some pointed out that it was obvious while other referenced their behavior and body language. It is also generally talked about how those who expect it conduct themselves with someone they want something from.

“A combination of tone, choice of words, some sort of facial expression, maybe some hand gesture. When it happens, it becomes clear to you “Aha, money is expected of me”.” (M/21)

There is corruption in the education system in BiH as well, most notably at the higher level. Professors take bribes so that the student can pass an exam, it is a known fact at universities (Farjani, 2016). People also give bribes so that their children get accepted into the school,
even if their grades are optimal. When asked if and where they have noticed corruption the answered varied but there were some that responded with comments about the higher education system.

“I personally have not but I have overheard a conversation from people I know. A woman who gave 15 000 KM (7669 Euro) to enroll her son into college. Her son had finished medical high school with great success, but how to enroll him into college. They told her to go to ‘...’, she did not want to say the name, give her 15,000 KM and no problem. But her son was not accepted to the medical school, and now she is under heavy debt.” (F/55)

Romania
Concerning bribe, people mention the bribe has become so common in society to the point people forget that it, in fact, is a form of corruption. Certain people use them as accelerators for public services. Others say that bribe is necessary in all events related to the state: birth, education or building a house, from health and education to justice, public administration and the International Defense Minister to work-related instances:

“Work, school, hospital. At work, certain clients try to give us chocolate or coffee. Some clients call my boss ‘to put in a good word’ so that they can obtain a document quicker. You cannot even show up for surgery at the majority of hospitals without “paying contribution” to the doctor and if you don’t give the nurses money, your sheets won’t be changed as often, they ‘won’t hear’ the buzzer when they are called, they forget to bring you your medicine in time.” (F/47)

These situations call for bribes before a certain advantage or, in some cases, simple rights, are provided. In some instances, however, people give gifts as a sign of gratitude after the act or service.

There was, nonetheless, a respondent who had not encountered situation where bribe was asked or insinuated. Still, she reflects if her profession might have influenced this lack of familiarity with the subject:

“I do not give and even when I wanted to give chocolate or coffee to thank for the service, my gesture was categorically refused. But I am a journalist…” (F/43)

Aside from impeding a good development in politics and economy, corruption is paid directly by the citizens. The money that go into corrupt practices are also taken from funds meant for public goods, from safety and social services to infrastructures and education (Karklins, 2002). When asked how and who corruption affected the most, one respondent mentioned all the fields of people’s lives corruption affected, not only the high-level corruption but also the corruption the average citizens engage in:

“My whole family, because those money were intended for education, clothes, better food, a weekend at the mountain side, an extra book, some extra medical tests.” (M/47)
On woman was concerned more about the corruption’s effects on the new generation saying that the most affected were:

“The children who see these practices and start to see them as normal.” (F/35)

One respondent had a more detailed perspective. She talks about all the implications corruption has on those who participate in corrupt acts - those giving bribes and those receiving bribes. Also, she sees corruption as a current that keeps augmenting, making it difficult for the next generations to oppose corruption:

“I believe those affected are: - the ones receiving... They expect more and more and believe it’s normal to receive. The interest is focused just on receiving “presents” without caring that people will suffer because their actions. (Hiring an incapable person in certain positions). 
- the ones giving...believe they are not required to work anymore, they have their back covered. 
- the ones who come after us… will not be able to withstand the current, the habits.” (F/59)

Surveys of corruption have shown that the actual price of corruption is directly proportional to the level of power (Divjak & Pugh, 2008). It is the conclusion of one of the male participants who talks about the monetary value of corruption related to the people or groups involved in the corruption acts:

“The whole population is affected. Still, judging by the number of corruption acts, I think they are more reduced for the ones with medium/small incomes (here corruption has reduced money value), and the “high” level (the political class)...I believe corruption is generalized and has high financial values (especially when it comes to the state’s contracts with private firms).” (M/38)

9.2.2 Employment

The two above-mentioned practices are used in many aspects of the participants’ lives. Including employment. It is mainly Bosnians who referred to practices involving employment. Many of the questionnaire-participants from BiH said that employment is favored in the case of those who have the right contacts or are willing to pay.

Bosnia-Herzegovina

There is corruption in employment as well in BiH. When hiring someone, there is more focus on informal transactions and connection rather than who is mostly qualified for the position. The most esteemed work placement can be found in institutions and businesses which are owned by the government. These jobs are, according to many, secure and the wages are consistent. These positions are difficult to get without contacts who are on a high level (Farjani, 2016).
“Whatever you try in Bosnia, looking for a job or anything else, you cannot succeed if you do not know someone in office or money, it all comes down to family relations.” (M/45)

When talking of how people receive employment, Bosnians were generally negative of the methods that are being used. It is mentioned that some give money in order to become employed and that employing someone who is not qualified because of family connections is commonplace. If you do not have a connection, which is mostly specified, there will be nothing of the job according to many.

“When you are looking for a job and you have a connection, you will get it.” (F/50)
And when asked if they have witnessed corruption some wrote in employment as well. The respondents mention how they, or someone they know, have been offered jobs but for a certain fee.

“I had to pay 5000 KM (2556 Euro) for a working position.” (F/50)

When asked if grand corruption has an impact on them as well as their families there was a general agreement that it does. A few said that they do not believe that it does or that they have not seen it. Still, most said that it has an effect on all of them and mention the difficulties in finding employment in the regular way as being a major reason for it. It is believed that someone that has more money and is willing to pay, will get the job before them.

“Of course, very much so. The mere fact that someone came to something in a way that is not allowed and is not qualified for, it tells us that someone who is qualified and who would in normal situations come to it with effort, work and dedication, cannot reach due to such people, just one example: in employment.” (M/20)

When asked if grand corruption affects them or their family, one person responded by talking about connections and employment possibilities. This, while also mentioning those who have a better life in general have it easier when their children are applying for college. People who participated in the questionnaire also mention unemployment as being a serious issue when talking about who is most affected by corruption. While some mention the fact that they themselves have difficulties in finding a secure job, others mention the procedure as a whole.

“In my opinion, it is the unemployed. There have been a couple of cases where they had to pay to receive a particular function in which they were educated for but they had no connections that could get them there.” (F/29)
9.2.3 Health

Another use for bribes and payoffs the participants described was in the health system. With no significant differences, both the Bosnians as the Romanians described experiences when the health-care system necessitated extra incentives from their part.

Bosnia-Herzegovina

According to research, daily tasks performed by ordinary citizens are made easier by informal transactions. These have a utilitarian role in Bosnian society and practices like paying state medical staff and other state authorities are seen as standard (Farjani, 2016). This is, with some other categories, seen as one of the most ordinary practices of corruption in the country by the participants.

“Most people connect corruption with healthcare. The doctors and other medical staff are given money, so that they can go past the waiting list or how to get medical treatment as soon as possible. Also, doctors who have private offices (while they work in public hospitals) often call patients to come to their office and takes payment, which is free in a public hospital.” (M/24)

When recalling corrupt acts that they have seen in hospitals most mention giving bribes to get some types of treatments. This includes doctors and nurses who take bribes and afterwards, according to the respondents, are more attentive and nicer to the patient from which the money came. This is seen by many as being an everyday routine at hospitals. Sometimes, even if you were to give a bribe, the doctor or nurse might still not do much for the patient. One person, when asked how they knew that a bribe was expected of them, referred to an incident at the hospital:

“Yes. In the hospital. The doctor's facial expressions patient signaled that he would be present during her operation. She paid him. After the operation, she found out that he was not assisting during the operation, nor had he attended.” (F/26)

Previous research has shown that a significant part of the population in most post-communist Eastern European countries think that corruption is extensive among doctors (Holmgren & Rothstein, 2011). This is shown in answers were mentions of giving bribes to doctors is frequently referenced to.

“My father went to the hospital and had an emergency situation. There was no bed. They gave the doctor 150 Euro, he immediately found them a bed. He let a patient, who did not have to be there, stay in the hospital.” (F/17)

When asked if they witnessed corruption, or knows someone who has, there are numerous mentions of the hospital. Those that have not witnessed comment on the fact that they are familiar with the fact that you will come in line sooner for surgery and receive better care
if you give a bribe, the often-mentioned envelope, than those who do not. When asked if they have given a bribe in the last 12 months one person responded by saying:

“In the last 12 months, I have not given a bribe to anyone, but I have had to give to various doctors and nurses while my mother was being treated for cancer.” (M/37)

Mentions of grand corruption affecting people in hospitals and when receiving treatment occurred as well. If someone bought their way in, or had connections, into a position at the hospital it is bad for the people who are the patients. They will be unable to treat someone, according to participants, because they are not qualified for their position.

“They have an effect on society and not just on individuals. For example, if I am a director of a hospital and refuse someone who is college-educated and hire someone who does not have all of the needed qualifications then that process affects all visitors of the hospital and not just me or the person who is rejected.” (F/20)

When asked how they knew that a bribe was expected of them some responded by saying that doctors call people into their office for a talk.

“When someone is in the hospital, the doctor calls you into their office for a conversation that is why. They are expecting money, some gift, and you give it because you hope that the person on treatment will get better care and recover sooner. I personally do not have that experience but every day I meet people who have these problems.” (F/55)

Romania

The participants’ statements about health-care vary, although most do admit that healthcare is the most common instance they meet a situation when bribe becomes almost a necessity. Two of the questions to which people responded most with examples from the healthcare sector were the ones that asked about witnessing acts of corruption or taking part in one. Subsequently, the questions about what led them to believe that they needed to give a bribe was also a source of accounts about the healthcare system. The stories vary between personal ones or witnessed incidents. One woman evokes:

“When I was admitted to the hospital, there was a woman with the same diagnosis as mine but with another doctor. It was knowing that she didn’t have money to give to her doctor. Anyway, after a week, when after the surgery I left the hospital, this patient hadn’t had surgery yet. I think this is a clear example of conditioning the medical procedures.” (F/51)

Certain participants said that the gifts they gave were by no means asked for and the money or objects they gave were just a sign appreciation with no intent to corrupt.

While bribery is the public healthcare system seems to be common, one account notices not just that the bribe may not influence the quality of the medical act, a good doctor being a good doctor no matter what the circumstances are. It also points out that there are
instances in the private medical sector when people are being extorted on their way to the surgery room. One respondent recalls such an experience:

“We gave the doctors and the medical staff before some surgeries. Nevertheless, the money did not influence the medical procedure: the good doctor did his duty exceptionally, while the bad doctor, even though he got the money, did not look at any of my mother’s blood tests before surgery although they were made with tons of money and it affected her medically. A bad-quality doctor remains the same even if you fill him with money. On the other hand, they stole from me in the private health sector but in another way.” (M/45)

Many people report to having to bribe medical staff in order to get the treatments or investigations they are entitled to, with no delay:

“About three years ago, having some suspicions about certain medical symptoms, I asked a doctor to give me a colonoscopy. He postponed it several times, for two weeks, having different pretexts, that he can’t today, that he is tired after his shift, that he was on delegation and he is tired, that the colonoscopy is broken. After I gave him an amount of money, two days later, he performed that colonoscopy without any postponement. The two-day wait was due to a treatment needed to empty and clean the colon.” (M/64)

Furthermore, in such situations, some patients may not even be aware of bribe as a requirement until others inform them. One woman recalls that her surgery had been postponed twice until other patients advised her to pay extra so she could get the intervention.

From the people who answered the questionnaire, there was a percentage that had not given bribe in the past 12 months. Even so, a few do admit that in case they would need medical care, they would need a large amount of money:

“In the last 12 months, I didn’t give anything to anyone. If, God forbid, someone should be admitted to the hospital, a lot of money would be needed for services and the necessary attention.” (F/41)

9.2.4 Administration & Politics

Administration was another sector about which many respondents complained. From payoffs to avoid delays in procedure to bribes meant for city hall authorizations, the participants from both countries had accounts of such experiences. Politics was also pointed out as an encompassing source of corruption.

Bosnia-Herzegovina

The respondents from Bosnia-Herzegovina, when talking of administrations, mention that persons who work in the state administration prioritizes their own needs over the countries which makes it difficult for the country to develop. The question concerning grand
corruption and if its effects people had some answers regarding high-ranking officials who do not let themselves be influenced by the people's needs.

“Of course, it has, they take for themselves and we get low wages, pensions that barely last make us last a month. They have high wages, sit in meetings do not say anything, separate life, essentially all have a chauffeur and we are in misery.” (F/50)

There are a number of favorable and competent corruption laws in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Despite this, there have been conflicting and shaky implementation methods of these laws as well as few good outcomes which has increased the public's distrust in state institutions and officials (Divjak & Pugh, 2008). The distrust in public institutions, among other things, is not tough to see in the participants answers were most have negative opinions about them.

“Surely it (corruption) has an effect on society, including myself and my family. Corruption leads to the misuse of funds intended for public consumption or helping the ones in need, as well as to significant losses of revenue from taxation. Most generally, corruption leads to inefficient implementation of public policies and inefficient allocation of talents and resources that are available in the economy. Corruption manifests itself in various ways in society, it has a negative impact on foreign investments, which we really need because of the high unemployment rate.” (F/28)

Other mention lobbying as being an issue when it comes to corruption in the country. Since it can give bad products to the citizens, such as food, because it suits those who are making the decisions.

“Of course it does because of lobbying those who govern in political circles in markets are importing a lot of bad food, and investors due to the lobbying and bribing give up their investment in the economy.” (M/47)

When asked of high-ranking politicians committing corruption most had negative things to say. Frequent comments usually said that these politicians should resign or be replaced and that they are incompetent and immoral. While others comment on their needing to be bigger adjustments, such as a complete generation change for the problem to weaken. Most feel that the corruption is very deep in all institutions, and that they are not easy to eliminate.

“The law provides penalties for corruption and that would of course need to be respected. Unfortunately, Bosnia-Herzegovina is a kind of country in which that is close to impossible. In my opinion sanctions for politicians and people who perform tasks on a state level and in the state institutions need to be strictly punished and introduce precautions and quality investigations actions related to corruption.” (F/26)
There can be a feeling of “us” and “them” in a society due to corruption. Differences amongst the richest and the “ordinary” people is often quite big due to the public regarding corrupt officials to take for themselves and from the poorest in society (Holmes, 2015). It is evident, when looking through the answers, that it is an accurate depiction of how people in those situations feel about corrupt officials. It is said that those politicians should not be on the functions where they perform because they can only see personal benefit in it and not how it can harm the country's development.

“Who will do anything against them, they take what they need for themselves and do not care if the people are suffering. Inspection comes in a store where there are illegal workers there is no punishment or prison, because he has already been paid off. And for politicians and corruption, god help us.” (F/40)

Corruption is a big reason for why the public in Bosnia-Herzegovina feel disappointment, and in some cases contempt, towards politicians in the country. The general feeling and indications says that the people in the highest positions of power are not easily punishable by law (Donais, 2013).

“Politicians just work for themselves and their cousins. They do not concern themselves with how the regular people live. It is just important for them that they have enough.” (F/57)

Some respondents mention that corruption is talked of often in a negative fashion among the citizens and that it is known to most that it takes place in the Bosnian society.

“Public secret. That is talked about everywhere, everyone is allegedly critiquing, but giving bribes seems normal to them if they benefit from it. The top of Bosnia-Hercegovina is itself corrupt, and a strong hierarchy transmits that recognition of corruption to all levels of political life.” (M/21)

The complexity of the Dayton accords gave nationalist leaders momentum to take advantage of public office. The decentralized nature of the economic reforms gave the establishment and local communities the freedom to withstand external regulations. The economical pattern also limited the social contract between the state and the citizen. As a result, the loyalty persisted within the local, clientelistic economic activities which were highly spread and greatly prejudiced. This provided the structure that enabled the abuse of public office (Divjak & Pugh, 2008). People see the agreement as being bad for the most part as it presents a type of experiment which divides territories and people.

“It is not favorable because it presents a political experiment and it is cancerous in its own mentioning. The war started so that the territory could be divided and that genocide could be enacted, and later someone smart remembered that it could be done with an ordinary document. It sounds like a joke, but sadly it is not one.” (F/26)
Something that is noted by most participants is that the agreement created a political system which is like no other and is very complicated. This is due to the fact that three presidents from the three largest ethnic groups need to be represented as well as other components of the agreement which tear the ethnic groups. There is a general consensus on the fact that people are divided based on their religion or ethnicity and that those who govern do not see beyond that.

“They divide us all based on our faith, they do not look at us as an entity and there is always someone who is unsatisfied. Aside from our presidents, there is nothing wrong, there is not a single small country with three people that govern.” (F/50)

There are several comments made about how Dayton needs to develop and change since it does not help the country develop and move forward. The agreement was there to make peace among the three largest ethnic groups but the relationship have instead been broken-down (Farjani, 2016). There are divisions in many parts in the Bosnian society, according to the participants, and politics is seen as being where it is most noticeable. It can still affect the everyday person when seeking employment or other parts of their lives.

“There is no chance. For example, to point out the status of ethnic minorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. If I am not a bosniak, serb or a croat there is a big chance that that will hold me back in absurd situations in everyday life. On most public functions people rotate based on national belonging.” (M/21)

Dayton is in most cases not seen as being favorable, for a single people. As most participant’s mention there having to be members from several groups in the society which slows down the country's progress.

“The Dayton agreement is not favorable, because we need representatives on all constructive people in the government which draws big financial resources but we do not see any significant shift in practices.” (F/23)

When some commented on the agreement they said that it is favorable because it stopped the war, but that is seen as the only positive outcome from it. Some comment on the fact that it is important that there is peace but it is usually the negatives that are mentioned when talking of the Dayton agreement.

“The Dayton agreement is a legal act which officially ended the war in Bosnia-Hercegovina and decided how the country would be governed in the future as well as the constitution. I do not know if it is favorable, practice does not show favorable results, the exception is that it ended the war.” (F/28)

The Dayton agreement can be described as being a cease-fire more than anything else. The agreement is quite vague with important concerns like how to manage people who are coming back to the country after the end of the war. It did, in some ways, keep the conflict
amongst the ethnic groups going instead of helping them work together in the new state (Donais, 2013). This can then be taken advantage of by the politicians who, as mentioned before, use these types’ situations for personal gain.

“The Dayton agreement stopped the war, and everything that stopped the war, is favorable for the people. The problem is that in the head of corrupt politicians which makes people tense, because it is a safe card for their corrupt acts. While the people are busy fighting one another, politicians put money into their pockets, while passing by unnoticed.” (M/24)

**Romania**

Survey that were conducted in post-communist state demonstrated low levels of public trust, democratic authority and that the laws of the country are followed by the state and its institutions (Karklins, 2002). The state as a corrupted institution was something many invoked. The structures it created and the lack of law implementation is, as reported by those who answered, the reason why people see themselves forced to engage in bribing.

“In a country practicing form without substance as a tradition of 200 years it is difficult to make changes. Laws are just forms without content, as interpreted at will, and are not equally applied for everyone. Example: access to health care and free medication is guaranteed by the Constitution and laws for children. In reality, they are not applied. In communism, as today, for our children's health, we all are corrupt and willing to any act of corruption, to save the life of a child. By corruption, we actually receive those services that, by law, should be free and to which we have guaranteed access.” (F/39)

Insufficiency in the justice system and the administrative sector not following laws are also problems. One man brings up the minority rights not being respected, as well:

“Actually, in all the states institutions there is the connections and contacts phenomenon and if you have money everything is solved quickly with a bit of bribe! The state’s administrative organs do only what the State commands them, and they don’t follow the laws! The minority laws in Romania exist only on paper and no one respects them, neither the mayor nor the police!” (M/51)

From the top down, the Romanian participants believe that the current public servants see themselves as the masters of those who they should serve.

**9.3 Comparative observations**

The quantitative part of the survey was made by multiple-choice questions. In this instance, the possible differences between the two groups of participants was easier to assess and compare because of their exact and straightforward nature.

Concerning the perceived level of corruption in their country, 94% of Bosnians said that corruption was a common practice while just 67% of Romanians agreed with the statement.
The Romanian respondents had more varied answers, ranging from disagreeing with the statement to agreeing to it while Bosnians all agreed to at least some level. Bosnians were also unfavorable to the notion that their income is sufficient for living a decent life. Romanians had the same response, the percentage of those unsatisfied with their income being 70.3% in Bosnia-Herzegovina and 74.7% in Romania.

In regard to the effect the corruption may have on them on their family, the concerns of the two groups were quite contrasting. Romanian respondents were most concerned with the impact it had on public services (48.1%) while the Bosnian ones did not worry on the subject (6.3%). They were mostly concerned by the standard of living (25%) but roughly in the same percentage the Romanians were (23%). The number of Bosnians concerned about the consequences the corruption has on the lack of jobs and lack of schools was 20.3%, almost triple that of the Romanians (7.6%).

When asked if they expect to be fairly treated when contacting institutions responsible for education, health, the judiciary or police in that order, there were differences between the answers from Bosnia-Herzegovina and Romania from 1 (not fair) to 4 (fair). Romanians were generally more positive towards all of the institutions in comparison to the Bosnians who were overall negative as seen in the figures below:

The two groups’ response to their reaction when being asked for a bribe were quite similar. The majority of the two groups stated they would not pay or would report the incident. One difference was the percentage that affirmed they would pay if they had the money. While 13.9% of the Romanians answered they would do it, 23.4% of Bosnians said the same thing.
One more question the two groups had obvious distinct opinions was that of the influence communism has had over the current corruption. Most of the Bosnian participants (77.78%) believe that communism did not impact corruption, while 81.8% of the Romanian participants believe communism has affected today’s corruption.
10. Discussion

As stated in the introduction Bosnia and Herzegovina and Romania are two countries that are sometimes associated by the level of perceived corruption and the decades they have been under communism. Upon analyzing the answers, the authors observed that corruption was a phenomenon that all the respondents experienced in numerous aspects of their lives. When it came to the level of corruption, its origins, which people, groups or institutions are more corrupt or what the consequences or corruption are, the Bosnians had quite a different understanding than the Romanians had.

The approach to communism of the two countries was rather contrasting. Romanians make reference to numerous practices and traits of communism when addressing the current corruption levels. Participants’ answers comment the communist regime removing and imprisoning political opponents or potential threats, a practice found in Lenin’s forceful methods of removing bourgeois class and installing a proletariat. The proletariat is also something Romanians mention speak about as being one of the problems still persistent today by maintaining similar values of demerit. Contrasting to this approach, the answers the Bosnian group provided were hinting of a certain communism nostalgia.
The nomenklatura concept was present in the Romanian answers exclusively. Romanians blame it and nepotism for the network that was created then and that is still present now. Oligarch, nomenklatura, nepotism, hierarchy are word commonly used in Romania and often found in the respondents’ answers. Perpetuating their morals, people who had power then have maintained it through the years with help of the influence they had and the networks they created. Romanians see that these networks as one of the origins of the level of current corruption. Some political science theories claim that corruption is inherited from communism when personal connections dictated and clientelistic structured thrived. Bosnians, nonetheless, do not mention these networks as originating or outliving communism. They see these networks and connections, the practice of nepotism as current problem and an astringent one.

Corruption as a culture was not directly referred to. Communism was pointed out as a factor and gift giving was sometimes referred to as simply a custom. Some participants named that communism created corruption as a survival mode, this being directly linked to various theories of corruption. There was a low number of Romanian respondents who hypothesized that the bribe culture was learned from the time of the Ottoman occupation, but most of the respondents did not mention such aspects. There were, however numerous answers that attributed the fear of self-expression not to corruption but to the years the Romanian society had under communism.

A lingering communist mentality was something both groups complained about, although in different intensities interpretations. Bosnians cite the communist mentality as something mostly positive while Romanians invoke all the negative aspects of it, blaming it for numerous societal faults, from lack of participatory democracy to fear of standing up to their own principles. Some of the Bosnians agreed that after communism collapsed, the values and attitudes in people still remained.

The survival instincts felt by Bosnians often demands them to perform corrupt practices, which usually involves informal payments, even if they condemn these types of proceedings. This can be observed in their comments that most have carried out, seen or heard of such acts in their community and most have negative thoughts on the matter. Most Bosnians who answered the questionnaire, would describe themselves as deeply influenced by corruption. The perception of current corruption is high in comparison to corruption during communism. It is often seen as a need to, among the respondents, remove many high-ranking officials who commit corruption and replace them with someone else who is more appropriate for those positions.

While the corruption in Bosnia-Herzegovina was to become an informal practice, which became more widespread after communism, by taking advantage of the opportunities that the transition period had brought with it. The privatization that followed as well as the development of the market economy made the corruption gradually increase, according to a part of the participants from Bosnia-Herzegovina. Romanians did not mention transition
or privatization in their answers which is one of the aspects in the result that differ between
the two countries. If the mentions of privatization and the transition phase by the Bosnians
are not put into account, there are no comments that see communism as having anything
to do with the level of corruption in their current society.

While post-communistic countries are seen as corrupt and still deeply rooted in
communism, most Bosnians disagree while some Romanians observe firstly that all the
existing countries have corruption and that there are countries that were never communist
in the West and have more common traits with communism than Romania has.

Political corruption is something that both groups have mentioned. There is a notable
frustration over politicians and how corrupt they are believed to be. One Romanian
responded stated that the system the politicians created forces them into acts of corruption
and that in extreme cases the bribe can make the difference between life and death. The
Dayton agreement is, among most Bosnians, seen as being detrimental to the citizens as it
does not let the country develop and it divides the people based on their ethnicity. It is also
seen as a source of corruption since politicians take advantage of the complexity of Dayton
as well as the divisions it has created.

Bribe was the most prominent act of corruption for both countries and it extended in all
their lives’ instances. Connections were seen almost as an equivalent of bribe in the sense
that it was the most recurrent to option, besides bribe. Health and the healthcare system and
staff occupied the vastest slot in both the groups’ accounts. One notable difference was
that Bosnians mentioned employment where it is believed that corrupt acts take place.
Acquiring employment and the use of bribe and connections to do so was something very
specific to the respondents from Bosnia-Herzegovina.

In the strictly quantitative answers, differences and similarities could be observed. Both
groups believe corruption is a serious issue in their respective countries, but the percentage
of those who believe so is greater in Bosnia-Herzegovina. This is consistent with the
findings of Transparency International who ranked Bosnia-Herzegovina higher on the
index of corruption perception of 2015. Similarly, Bosnians and Romanians have the same
rate of satisfaction when it comes to their income.

When it comes to concerns related to institutions and aspects of their lives affected by
corruption, the two groups had different concerns. Most of the Romanians were concerned
with the quality of services the state provides, while Bosnians had more varied concerns,
from living standards to school and jobs. These concerns were also illustrated when asked
how they expected to be treated in different state institutions and Bosnians had a more
negative perception on how these institutions treat them. Their approach to being in a
situation where they are being asked for a bribe was very similar to that of the Romanians.

One of the most illustrative results was that for the question asking if communism had an
impact on the current corruption. The proportions of the answers are almost opposite with
almost 80% of the Bosnian respondents disagreeing while more than 80% of Romanians believe that the current corruption in their country was influenced by communism. It is an interesting aspect to consider when it comes to the perception of the possible reasons for corruption in post-communist countries.

While Bosnia-Herzegovina and Romania are two countries that are rarely associated, the results of the research have shown that while these two countries have various similarities they have differences when it comes to matters such as attitudes towards communism or which aspects of their life corruption affects most.

11. Conclusions

The results of this thesis show that corruption is a phenomenon that affects most aspects of the respondents’ lives, regardless of the country. The participants saw corruption as a severe national problem that reaches all institutions and sectors of their reality. The situations in which the respondents from both countries encountered corruption were resembling while the emphasis the participants put on the various situations differed. Although both countries are post-communistic countries, Bosnians did not really perceive themselves as such, believing the echoes of practices and principles of communism have disappeared in their society. They also show elements of regret for the regime. Romanians, on the other hand, in their majority, have still strong negative feelings about communism and what it did to their society. They believe that many of the country’s problems originate in communism. It is also notable that Bosnia-Herzegovina under Tito’s rule was seen as less restraining and more open than Ceausescu’s Romania and that Bosnia-Herzegovina is also a post-war country.

11.1 Future research

While there is extensive research on corruption as well as on communism, there is limited qualitative research on the subject. Additional future research would help illustrate the aspects of society post-communist countries see as most corrupt and give more dimension to the perceived corruption level. It would, furthermore, help portray former communist countries as individual countries, not just pertaining to a former communist bloc.
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13. Appendices

13.1 Thesis questions for Bosnia-Herzegovina

1. What do you think is the most common act of corruption in your country?

2. Corruption is a common practice in our country
   - Agree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Disagree

3. If you have witnessed corruption, where did it occur? (work, school, police, hospitals etc) Please, elaborate.

4. To whom and how many times did you have to give, directly or indirectly, a gift, any good or some extra-money in the last 12 months (with the exclusion of the correct amount of official fees)?

5. The last time that you had to make such extra payment or gift, how did you understand that an extra payment or gift was expected?

6. Who is mostly affected by corruption? Please, elaborate.

7. What are your thoughts concerning politicians or people of high-rank positions committing corruption?

8. Do you think that grand corruption has any impact on you and your family? Please, elaborate.

9. If there is a negative impact, can you be specific about what sort of impact it has on you and your family?
   - We cannot secure public services
   - Obstacles in business and private activities because of bureaucracy and inequality
   - It affects the standard of living
   - Price increases, cash deficits
   - It has an impact on environment and health
   - It has an impact on safe and healthy food and consumer products
   - Lack of jobs and lack of schools (good education)
   - Don’t Know/ No Answer

10. Do you think your income is enough for paying your bills and still maintain a decent standard of living?
11. What degree of fair treatment do you expect to receive when contacting the following institutions?
   • Education (not fair, rather not fair, rather fair, fair)
   • Health (not fair, rather not fair, rather fair, fair)
   • Judiciary (not fair, rather not fair, rather fair, fair)
   • Police (not fair, rather not fair, rather fair, fair)

12. If you face a situation in which you are directly asked for a bribe by a public or private official, what is your most likely action?
   • I will not pay
   • I will report
   • I shall pay if I have money
   • I will look for help
   • I will do nothing just wait
   • Don't know

13. If you do, where do you report incidents of corruption?
   • Management
   • AAC - Authority Against Corruption
   • Police
   • Media
   • Other (specify)

14. Are you aware of the telephone hotline for reporting corruption? Y/N

15. What should be done to prevent corruption?
   • Strong punitive measures
   • Perfecting legislation (new anti-corruption law, joining international)
   • Increasing public employees salaries
   • Transparency in administrative decision-making
   • Strengthening state control over public administration
   • Strengthening civil (non-government) control over public administration
   • Building public awareness
   • Other (specify)

16. Do you think that communism affected the level of corruption in today’s society?

17. Are there connections between communism and corruption? If there are any, which are they?

18. Are there aspects of communism present in today’s society and if so which are they?

19. Do you think that there was more corruption during communism than there is now?
20. Is the Dayton-agreement favorable for the society? Please elaborate on your answer.

13.2 Thesis questions for Romania

1. What do you think is the most common act of corruption in your country?

2. Corruption is a common practice in our country
   • Agree
   • Somewhat agree
   • Somewhat disagree
   • Disagree

3. If you have witnessed corruption, where did it occur? (work, school, police, hospitals etc) Please, elaborate.

4. To whom and how many times did you have to give, directly or indirectly, a gift, any good or some extra-money in the last 12 months (with the exclusion of the correct amount of official fees)?

5. The last time that you had to make such extra payment or gift, how did you understand that an extra payment or gift was expected?

6. Who is mostly affected by corruption? Please, elaborate.

7. What are your thoughts concerning politicians or people of high-rank positions committing corruption?

8. Do you think that grand corruption has any impact on you and your family? Please, elaborate.

9. If there is a negative impact, can you be specific about what sort of impact it has on you and your family?
   • We cannot secure public services
   • Obstacles in business and private activities because of bureaucracy and inequality
   • It affects the standard of living
   • Price increases, cash deficits
   • It has an impact on environment and health
   • It has an impact on safe and healthy food and consumer products
   • Lack of jobs and lack of schools (good education)
   • Don’t Know/ No Answer

10. Do you think your income is enough for paying your bills and still maintain a decent standard of living?
11. What degree of fair treatment do you expect to receive when contacting the following institutions?
   - Education (not fair, rather not fair, rather fair, fair)
   - Health (not fair, rather not fair, rather fair, fair)
   - Judiciary (not fair, rather not fair, rather fair, fair)
   - Police (not fair, rather not fair, rather fair, fair)

12. If you face a situation in which you are directly asked for a bribe by a public or private official, what is your most likely action?
   - I will not pay
   - I will report
   - I shall pay if I have money
   - I will look for help
   - I will do nothing just wait
   - Don't know

13. If you do, where do you report incidents of corruption?
   - Management
   - AAC - Authority Against Corruption
   - Police
   - Media
   - Other (specify)

14. Are you aware of the telephone hotline for reporting corruption? Y/N

15. What should be done to prevent corruption?
   - Strong punitive measures
   - Perfecting legislation (new anti-corruption law, joining international)
   - Increasing public employees salaries
   - Transparency in administrative decision-making
   - Strengthening state control over public administration
   - Strengthening civil (non-government) control over public administration
   - Building public awareness
   - Other (specify)

16. Do you think that communism affected the level of corruption in today’s society?

17. Are there connections between communism and corruption? If there are any, which are they?

18. Are there aspects of communism present in today’s society and if so which are they?

19. Do you think that there was more corruption during communism than there is now?