



## **Administrative-Legal Mechanisms of Anti-Corruption Policy in the Context of Public-Law Protection of Internal State Sovereignty**

**Sergey M. Zubarev, Alexander A. Sitnik, Maxim M. Polyakov**  
*Kutafin Moscow State Law University (MSAL), Moscow, Russian Federation*



Corresponding Author — Maxim M. Polyakov

© S.M. Zubarev, A.A. Sitnik, M.M. Polyakov, 2025

**Abstract:** The paper presents a comprehensive study of the role of the administrative-legal mechanism in countering corruption within the system of public-law protection of the internal state sovereignty of the Russian Federation. At present, the issues of combating corruption in public administration remain highly relevant and require further research from the perspectives of various legal disciplines. Today, different mechanisms for countering corruption are recognized in the contexts of constitutional law, criminal law, administrative law, civil law, international law, etc. However, the authors argue that in the face of new challenges and threats, the administrative-legal mechanism for countering corruption holds a central role in ensuring the internal state sovereignty of the Russian Federation. It not only predominates among legal mechanisms for preventing corrupt practices within state institutions, but also establishes the necessary conditions for public authorities to successfully carry out the tasks and functions assigned to them to strengthen Russian statehood. The study substantiates the conclusion that the administrative-legal anti-corruption mechanism is most clearly manifested in specialized anti-corruption management forms and methods employed by specially authorized public authorities and officials. The authors emphasize the need for further refinement of this mechanism through a qualitative transformation of anti-corruption forms and methods at both the federal and regional levels of the Russian

Federation. Special attention is given to the inherent connection between the administrative-legal anti-corruption mechanism and the public-law protection of Russia's internal state sovereignty. It is impossible to achieve an adequate level of legal protection of national sovereignty under public law without effective functioning of this mechanism.

**Keywords:** corruption; anti-corruption measures; administrative-legal mechanism for countering corruption; administrative-legal forms and methods; public law protection; sovereignty; internal state sovereignty; public authorities

**Acknowledgments:** The research was funded by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation (Project No. 24-18-00764).

**Cite as:** Zubarev, S.M., Sitnik, A.A. and Polyakov, M.M., (2025). Administrative-Legal Mechanisms of Anti-Corruption Policy in the Context of Public-Law Protection of Internal State Sovereignty. *Kutafin Law Review*, 12(4), pp. 975–995, doi: 10.17803/2713-0533.2025.4.34.975-995

## Contents

I. Introduction .....	976
II. The Administrative-Law Mechanism for Countering Corruption:	
Concept, Structure, and Content .....	977
III. Anti-Corruption Administrative and Legal Forms and Methods	
in Public Law Enforcement of Internal State Sovereignty .....	984
IV. Conclusion .....	990
References .....	991

## I. Introduction

Corruption in public administration ranks among the most complex and multifaceted challenges. This socio-legal phenomenon is a persistent feature of governance systems, significantly impeding the functioning of state institutions and ultimately having a profoundly negative impact on governmental and societal structures, particularly in times of crisis. Eradicating corruption entirely from the mechanisms of state and societal governance is impossible, as global experience

unfortunately demonstrates. However, developing effective measures to minimize this detrimental phenomenon remains an obligation for every public authority.

Countering the spread of corruption in public administration is a priority of the domestic policy of the Russian Federation. The threat of corruption lies in its capacity not only to erode the institutional foundations of social relations but also to undermine the organizational and legal framework of internal sovereignty of the Russian state. It disrupts the normal functioning of state institutions, erodes public trust, discredits governmental authorities, fosters unlawful activities, and demoralizes society.

These challenges are exacerbated in the context of the hybrid wars necessitating urgent improvements to existing legal anti-corruption mechanisms. The administrative-legal mechanism must play a central role here, as it holds the highest potential for preventing corruption-related offenses and safeguarding the stability of Russia's internal state sovereignty (Zubarev and Troshev, 2024).

## **II. The Administrative-Law Mechanism for Countering Corruption: Concept, Structure, and Content**

Many Russian scholars have long noted that “corruption in Russia has reached a scale that concerns the entire society” (Boskholov, 2010, p. 51). We support the view that “corrupt societies cannot be reliable, democratic, or equitable,” which in turn clearly “indicates the failure of governance systems’ legitimacy” (Deryabin, 2005, p. 72). The danger of corruption also lies in its high latency (over 95 %) and the significant difficulty in detecting its direct unlawful manifestations (Antonyan and Polyakov, 2022, pp. 673–674).

Corruption stems from numerous factors — not only legal and social, but also economic, political, and psychological. From a psychological perspective, an individual's corrupt behavior “may be driven by circumstances that reduce the moral costs of dishonest conduct and enable unethical actions, while allowing the individual to still perceive themselves as honest” (Mironova and Tatarko, 2021, p. 13). In other words, individuals may rationalize their corrupt conduct by referencing

perceived inequities directed at them or by invoking situational factors, such as prevailing power dynamics. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the presence of corrupt practices in the public sector reflects not only flaws in the existing organizational-legal governance system but also a “decline in public morality, distorted by corruption” (Bashankaev, 2015, p. 155).

In foreign literature, corruption is extensively analyzed across various disciplines. Some scholars emphasize economic determinants, framing corruption as “illegal appropriation of resources diverted from their intended use for collective benefit and converted into illicit private gain” (Marino, 2025). Public administration in many macro-regions is plagued by corruption. High corruption levels are documented in most African, Latin American, and Southeast Asian countries. For instance, public spending in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is “often distorted and disproportionately allocated to non-productive sectors, largely due to corruption” (Mondjeli and Ambassa, 2025).

However, positive trends in countering corruption can be observed in some major states promoting active anti-corruption policies. For example, since 2012, China has implemented one of the largest anti-corruption campaigns in public administration in recent decades (Nechevin, 2023, pp. 86–101) evidenced by “the high number of officials investigated for corruption and the series of reforms introduced to alter bureaucratic norms” (Ming Fang et al., 2025).

In modern Russia, corruption increased sharply in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, a pivotal, crisis-driven phase characterized by accumulated contradictions associated with the formation of the Russian Federation’s statehood (Basova, 2012, p. 6). Corruption was officially recognized as a nationwide problem requiring significant efforts from the state and society to minimize its causes, identify and suppress corrupt practices, and hold perpetrators accountable.

The adoption and rigorous, sustained implementation of a national anti-corruption policy – promoted at the highest echelons of government – was instrumental. The President of the Russian Federation has repeatedly emphasized that “combating corruption at all levels requires professionalism, seriousness, and responsibility; only by meeting these

conditions, he argued, can anti-corruption efforts produce results and win broad, informed public support.”<sup>1</sup> In scholarship, anti-corruption policy is defined as “a scientifically grounded, consistent, and systematic effort by state institutions and civil society to counter corruption” (Malko, 2010, p. 106). It aims to “establish and enforce anti-corruption legislation in combating crimes and offenses, addressing the systemic challenge of corruption” (Khamazova, 2008, p. 12).

The legal framework for countering corruption is based on the provisions of Federal Law No. 273-FZ dated 25 December 2008 “On Countering Corruption”<sup>2</sup> (hereinafter referred to as the Federal Anti-Corruption Law). This regulatory legal act cannot be considered as an ideal legal instrument capable of minimizing corrupt practices. The law may be regarded as significantly belated in terms of its adoption and entry into force. Certain provisions of the law continue to draw criticism from the academic community to this day. For instance, the legal definition of the category “corruption” essentially enumerates criminal offenses possessing characteristics of corruption failing to address the socio-legal nature of corruption — an approach that can nevertheless be observed in the legislation of some Member States of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS).<sup>3</sup> Moreover, many anti-corruption instruments — such as anti-corruption monitoring, anti-corruption propaganda, and anti-corruption education — are regulated in greater detail at the level of constituent entities of the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Address of the President of the Russian Federation to the Federal Assembly dated 1 December 2016. Available at: [https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_207978/](https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_207978/) [Accessed 13.06.2025]. (In Russ.).

<sup>2</sup> Federal Law No. 273-FZ dated 25 December 2008 “On Countering Corruption” (as amended). *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*, No. 266, 30 December 2008. (In Russ.).

<sup>3</sup> For example, Para. 6 Art. 1 of Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 410-V dated 18 November 2015 “On Countering Corruption” (as amended on 1 January 2025) defines corruption as “the unlawful use by persons holding responsible state positions, persons authorized to perform state functions, persons equated to those authorized to perform state functions, or officials of their official powers and related opportunities for the purpose of obtaining or extracting property (non-property) benefits and advantages for themselves or third parties, either personally or through intermediaries, as well as the bribery of such persons through the provision of benefits and advantages.”

Russian Federation through relevant regional laws.<sup>4</sup> It should be noted, however, that the Federal Anti-Corruption Law has generally established a sufficiently solid legal foundation for combating corruption, enabling the consolidation of efforts by civil society institutions and the state in this direction.

The legislative definition of corruption has led to the predominance of a criminal-law approach to countering corruption in Russian jurisprudence, which specifically focuses on combating corruption-related crimes (Kochoi, 2018; Ivanov, 2017; Prozumentov, 2016). It should also be noted that modern Russian legal scholarship encompasses research on various aspects of international law (Magomedov and Alieva, 2018), constitutional law (Tsirin et al., 2021), and civil law (Botnev, 2015) countermeasures against corruption.

In administrative law theory, the existence of an independent institution of administrative-legal counteraction to corruption has been substantiated (Polyakov, 2023), where special anti-corruption forms and methods play a central role (Polyakov, 2024). We note that this institution is already known to modern science of administrative law and has been researched by individual scholars, particularly in relation to combating corruption in the customs authorities of the Russian Federation (Kurakin and Zvyagin, 2010). The authors propose to define administrative-legal counteraction to corruption in public governance as a normatively regulated activity of authorized power subjects aimed at implementing a complex of special forms and methods that ensure prevention of corruption offenses and minimization of consequences of corrupt practices in public administration (Polyakov, 2023).

However, the issue of content of administrative-legal counteraction to corruption requires a more comprehensive approach using the established doctrinal legal category of “legal mechanism,” which is applied across various branches of law (constitutional, administrative,

---

<sup>4</sup> This specifically concerns the provisions of the following laws: 1) Art. 10 “Anti-Corruption Monitoring” of the Law of Arkhangelsk Oblast No. 626-31-OZ dated 26 November 2008 “On Countering Corruption in Arkhangelsk Oblast” (as amended), 2) Art. 6 “Anti-Corruption Propaganda” of Law of Chelyabinsk Oblast No. 353-ZO dated 29 January 2009 “On Countering Corruption in Chelyabinsk Oblast” (as amended), 3) Art. 5.1 “Anti-Corruption Education” of Law of Vologda Oblast No. 2054-OZ dated 9 July 2009 “On Countering Corruption in Vologda Oblast” (as amended). (In Russ.).

financial, information, etc.). In particular, A.D. Selyukov defines a legal mechanism as “a normatively regulated complex of managerial relations concerning application of methods, instruments, and rules” (Selyukov, 2010, p. 2).

The legal mechanism is closely interconnected with another legal category, namely, the mechanism of legal regulation, fundamentally developed within the theory of the State and law. S.S. Alekseev understood the mechanism of legal regulation as “a unified system of all legal means, organized in a sequential manner, through which legal influence on social relations is ensured” (Alekseev, 1966, p. 30). It should be noted that in scholarly research, the categories of *legal mechanism* and *mechanism of legal regulation* are often equated (Kuznetsova, 2013). We agree with O.V. Pankova’s opinion that “the theory of state and law has not yet proposed a unified understanding of legal mechanism, and the overwhelming majority of legal mechanisms are considered as components or subsystems of the mechanism of legal regulation” (Pankova, 2020).

Both categories under consideration are used in the science of administrative law. The concept of “mechanism of administrative-legal regulation,” its structure and content have been thoroughly studied in works of leading Soviet and Russian administrative law scholars (I.I. Veremeenko, Yu.M. Kozlov, V.D. Sorokin, Yu.A. Tikhomirov, L.L. Popov, etc.). For instance, I.I. Veremeenko defined the mechanism of administrative-legal regulation as “a set of administrative-legal means through which influence is exerted on relations formed in the process of executive-administrative activity of the State” (Veremeenko, 1981).

The category of “administrative-legal mechanism” is recognized by most scholars as equivalent to the mechanism of administrative-legal regulation. For example, V.E. Stepenko considers the administrative-legal mechanism for ensuring the functioning regime of the state border of the Russian Federation as “a set of administrative-legal means of influencing social relations arising in connection with ensuring proper protection of the state border of the Russian Federation” (Stepenko, 2006, p. 14).

In our opinion, the foundation of administrative-legal counteraction to corruption lies precisely in the administrative-legal mechanism,

representing a set of administrative-legal means aimed at preventing, detecting and suppressing corruption offenses, as well as minimizing their negative consequences for society and the State.

The universality of this approach lies in the fact that the classical triad of the mechanism (norms, legal relations, and acts implementing rights and obligations) enables the formation of more complex, comprehensive legal instruments that reflect the specific features of legal influence in a particular area of managerial relations – in this case, countering corruption. For example, administrative law norms determine the status of subjects of administrative-legal counteraction to corruption and their competence. According to Art. 5 of the Law “On Countering Corruption,” these primarily include the President of the Russian Federation, the Government of the Russian Federation, federal state authorities, and state authorities of constituent entities of the Russian Federation.

The head of state defines the primary objectives and instruments of state policy for combating corruption and approves the measures for their implementation. For this purpose, since 2008 the President of the Russian Federation has been regularly approving the National Anti-Corruption Plan.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the head of state determines the competence of the federal executive authorities supervised by him with respect to combating corruption, and prescribes the modalities for compliance with applicable restrictions, prohibitions, and requirements, as well as for the fulfillment of obligations established to that end.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 460 dated 13 April 2010 (as amended on 13 March 2012) “On the National Anti-Corruption Strategy and the National Anti-Corruption Plan for 2010–2011.” *Sobraniye Zakonodatelstva Rossiyskoy Federatsii (SZ RF)* [Collection of Legislation]. 2010. No. 16. Art. 1875; Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 478 dated 16 August 2021 (as amended on 26 June 2023) “On the National Anti-Corruption Plan for 2021–2024.” *Sobraniye Zakonodatelstva Rossiyskoy Federatsii (SZ RF)* [Collection of Legislation]. 2021. No. 34. Art. 6170. (In Russ.).

<sup>6</sup> Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 613 dated 8 July 2013 (as amended on 26 October 2023) “On Anti-Corruption Measures” (including “The Procedure for Publishing Information on Income, Expenses, Property and Property-Related Liabilities of Certain Categories of Persons and Their Family Members on Official Websites of Federal State Bodies, Public Authorities of the Federal Territory ‘Sirius,’ the Audit Chamber of the Federal Territory ‘Sirius,’ the Territorial Election

The Government of the Russian Federation allocates anti-corruption functions among federal executive bodies under its supervision. The Government adopts anti-corruption legal acts, including Decree No. 96 dated 26 February 2010, which approved the rules for conducting anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts, the methodology for conducting anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts.<sup>7</sup> The Administration of the Government of the Russian Federation plays a direct role in implementing anti-corruption measures. In particular, the Personnel Department of the Government of the Russian Federation maintains and administers the register of persons dismissed due to loss of trust on the official website of the unified system.<sup>8</sup>

The Ministry of Labor and Social Protection of the Russian Federation, under the Regulation approved by Government Decree No. 610 of 19 June 2012, serves as the federal executive body responsible for formulating and implementing state policy; developing the regulatory and legal framework for the state civil service; designing, implementing, and providing methodological support for corruption-prevention measures in organizations and monitoring compliance with those measures; and performing the functions of the federal authority for civil service management, including forming state orders for professional development programs for federal civil servants and organizing anti-corruption awareness initiatives.

---

Commission of the Federal Territory “Sirius,” State Authorities of Constituent Entities of the Russian Federation and Organizations, and for Providing This Information to Nationwide Mass Media for Publication”). *Sobraniye Zakonodatelstva Rossiyskoy Federatsii (SZ RF)* [Collection of Legislation]. 2013. No. 28. Art. 3813. (In Russ.).

<sup>7</sup> Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 96 dated 26 February 2010 (as amended on 20 April 2024) “On Anti-Corruption Expert Examination of Normative Legal Acts and Draft Normative Legal Acts.” *Sobraniye Zakonodatelstva Rossiyskoy Federatsii (SZ RF)* [Collection of Legislation]. 2010. No. 10. Art. 1084. (In Russ.).

<sup>8</sup> Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 228 dated 5 March 2018 (as amended on 12 July 2023) “On the Register of Persons Dismissed Due to Loss of Trust” (including “Regulations on the Register of Persons Dismissed Due to Loss of Trust”). *Sobraniye Zakonodatelstva Rossiyskoy Federatsii (SZ RF)* [Collection of Legislation]. 2018. No. 12. Art. 1678. (In Russ.).

A distinctive feature of legal relations as an element of the administrative-legal mechanism for combating corruption is that they encompass not only all spheres of state administrative activity (administrative-political, economic, socio-cultural), but also activities related to the exercise of executive and administrative powers by local self-government bodies. It should be noted that the exercise of powers by certain officials of public authorities is particularly susceptible to corruption risks and therefore requires additional regulation, which has been codified at the federal level.<sup>9</sup>

### **III. Anti-Corruption Administrative and Legal Forms and Methods in Public Law Enforcement of Internal State Sovereignty**

Administrative-legal forms and methods that contain all the basic elements of the relevant administrative-legal mechanism should be identified as comprehensive legal means of combating corruption. In the theory of administrative law, the forms and methods of public administration play an essential role, since they reflect the specific features and signs of the functioning of executive authorities. In legal scholarship, the term “anti-corruption technologies” has recently been used to denote a system of methods and tools for implementing anti-corruption regulations during the formulation of legal norms and their enforcement” (Khabrieva, 2016, p. 194). However, this concept requires further scholarly clarification, since the term “technology” has only recently been incorporated into legal scholarship.

Understanding the place and role of administrative and legal forms and methods in the mechanism for combating corruption is facilitated by examining their etymology. Form (Latin *forma*, “appearance”) denotes the mode of existence of content — inseparable from and expressive

---

<sup>9</sup> Section III. “Other positions of the federal civil service, the replacement of which is associated with corruption risks” of Decree of the President of the Russian Federation dated 18 May 2009 No. 557 (as amended on 26 February 2024) “On approval of the list of positions of the federal civil service, in which federal civil servants are required to provide information on their income, property and property obligations, as well as information on income, property, and property-related obligations of one’s spouse and minor children.” SPS “Consultant-Plus.” (In Russ.).

of it – while method (Greek *methodos*, “way of inquiry”) denotes a manner of theoretical investigation or practical implementation (Ozhegov and Shvedova, 1994). In management scholarship, the form of management is traditionally considered as an external expression of public administration, and the method is a special technique (method, means) that is used by the subject of public administration to influence the object of management. In the theory of administrative law, back in the Soviet period, the legal content of most forms of public administration was substantiated. Yu.M. Kozlov emphasized that “forms of managerial activity represent its external manifestation, a way of expressing the content of managerial activity in specific conditions. All forms have a certain legal aspect, which is seen as their direct connection with the legal forms of state activity, law enforcement and protection of law” (Kozlov, 1977, pp. 26–27).

The modern science of administrative law has fully accepted this approach despite the variety of terms used to denote legal forms of public administration, including such as “administrative and legal form.”<sup>10</sup> According to A.B. Zelentsov, the administrative-legal form means “the legal expression of specific actions and decisions, the order (procedure) of the activities of public authorities and other subjects of administrative law in the process of public administration” (Zelentsov, 2003, p. 6). Yu.N. Starilov regards the legal form of management as “an externally expressed and legally formalized action of a public authority (or official), carried out within its competence and causing certain legal consequences” (Starilov, 2016, p. 529). Thus, countering corruption as a managerial activity is conducted through specific, legally defined forms that constitute elements of the corresponding administrative-legal mechanism.

In ensuring the internal state sovereignty of the Russian Federation, the issuance of anti-corruption legal acts by state authorities plays a predominant role; these acts take several distinct forms. First, measures aimed at preventing and combating corruption and minimizing its

---

<sup>10</sup> In the scientific and educational scholarship on administrative law, similar terms are used: “the legal form of the exercise of executive power,” “the legal form of managerial activity,” “the legal form of public administration,” etc.

negative consequences are enshrined in anti-corruption plans and programs approved by the President of the Russian Federation,<sup>11</sup> federal government agencies,<sup>12</sup> government agencies of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation,<sup>13</sup> and local governments.<sup>14</sup> It is important to note that at present, anti-corruption plans and programs are in effect not only in public authorities, but also in all commercial and non-profit organizations, regardless of their form of ownership. These documents have actually become the basis for the daily consistent implementation of anti-corruption policy at all levels of public authority and management.

Another type of anti-corruption managerial legal act is anti-corruption standards of conduct for state and municipal employees. These standards constitute regulatory rules — restrictions, prohibitions, and requirements — designed to cultivate intolerance of corruption among public servants. The procedure for approving anti-corruption standards in the form of an official legal act<sup>15</sup> should be considered optimal, which makes them mandatory. It is questionable whether it is advisable to

---

<sup>11</sup> Decree of the President of the Russian Federation dated 16 August 2021 No. 478 “On the National Anti-Corruption Plan for 2021–2024,” 16 August 2021, No. 0001202108160035 (as amended and supplemented). Official Internet Portal of Legal Information. Available at: [www.pravo.gov.ru](http://www.pravo.gov.ru). (In Russ.).

<sup>12</sup> Decree of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation dated 14 December 2021 No. 475-r “On approval of the program on anti-corruption education of the population for 2021–2024.” SPS “ConsultantPlus.” Available at: [https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_407618](https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_407618) (not published officially) [Accessed 13.05.2025]. (In Russ.).

<sup>13</sup> Decree of the Mayor of Moscow dated 15 February 2021 No. 75-RM “On approval of the Anti-Corruption Plan in Moscow for 2021–2024.” Official portal of the Mayor and the Government of Moscow. Available at: <https://www.mos.ru/eco/anticorruption/normativnye-pravovye-akty-i-inye-akty-v-sfere-protivodeistviya-korrupcii/regionalnoe-zakonodatelstvo/view/249542220> (not published officially) [Accessed 13.05.2025]. (In Russ.).

<sup>14</sup> Order of the Tula City Administration dated 13 December 2021 No. 1/4486-r “On the Anti-Corruption Plan in the Administration of the Tula Municipality for 2022–2024.” Official portal of the Tula City Administration. Available at: [https://tula-r71.gosweb.gosuslugi.ru/ofitsialno/dokumenty/dokumenty-all\\_90.html](https://tula-r71.gosweb.gosuslugi.ru/ofitsialno/dokumenty/dokumenty-all_90.html) (not published officially) [Accessed 13.06.2025]. (In Russ.).

<sup>15</sup> Decree of the Governor of the Orenburg Region dated 5 February 2014 No. 59-CC “On approval of the Standard of anti-corruption behavior of a State civil servant of the Executive Authority of the Orenburg Region” (as amended and supplemented). (In Russ.).

formalize such standards with a document of a recommendatory nature, for example, a memo or a specific guide.<sup>16</sup>

Administrative regulations for the performance of functions and provision of services should be attributed to a separate type of anti-corruption legal acts of management. By establishing the content, procedure, rules, and sequence of actions of public authorities in exercising their powers, these legal acts significantly reduce corruption risks in the process of public administration. Certain administrative regulations are directly related to the direct exercise of the powers of the State or municipal authorities to prevent corruption.<sup>17</sup>

Individual anti-corruption acts occupy a special place in the administrative and legal mechanism for combating corruption, as they are legal facts that cause the emergence, modification or termination of relevant administrative and legal relations. Individual anti-corruption acts are personalized and have a law enforcement character, as they are aimed at implementing the norms of anti-corruption regulations. With the help of such acts, specific situations related to the prevention of corrupt behavior, the identification of a corruption offense, and the prosecution of the perpetrator are resolved. For example, an order imposing disciplinary sanctions on a civil servant for committing a corruption offense constitutes such an act.

---

<sup>16</sup> Anti-corruption standards (recommendations for federal government civil servants of the Ministry of Finance of the Russian Federation). Official website of the Ministry of Finance of the Russian Federation. Available at: [https://minfin.gov.ru/ru/document?id\\_4=312277-antikorrupsionnye\\_standarty\\_pamyatka\\_dlya\\_federalnykh\\_gosudarstvennykh\\_grazhdanskikh\\_sluzhashchikh\\_minfina\\_Rossii](https://minfin.gov.ru/ru/document?id_4=312277-antikorrupsionnye_standarty_pamyatka_dlya_federalnykh_gosudarstvennykh_grazhdanskikh_sluzhashchikh_minfina_Rossii) (not officially published) [Accessed 13.06.2025]. (In Russ.).

<sup>17</sup> Order of the Committee on Social Policy of St. Petersburg dated 26 September 2012 No. 217-r "On Approval of the Administrative Regulations of the Committee on Social Policy of St. Petersburg for the performance of State functions" (Supplement entitled "Administrative Regulations of the Committee on Social Policy of St. Petersburg for the performance of the state function of ensuring the implementation of anti-corruption measures in the Committee on Social Policy of St. Petersburg, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Social Policy of St. Petersburg, state unitary enterprises of St. Petersburg and state institutions, including autonomous institutions under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Social Policy of St. Petersburg"). Official website of the Administration of St. Petersburg. Available at: <https://www.gov.spb.ru/gov/otrasl/trud/gosuslugi/reglaments> [Accessed 13.06.2025]. (In Russ.).

Another administrative-legal form of countering corruption is the administrative-legal agreement, which typically governs “horizontal” managerial relations — that is, interactions between authorities or bodies operating at the same hierarchical level. In the administrative and legal mechanism for combating corruption, contracts are used to prevent corruption. The most effective here is an official contract that sets out in a consolidated form, among other conditions, the duties and responsibilities of a government civil servant also in the field of combating corruption.

Summing up the consideration of administrative and legal forms of combating corruption, some attention should be paid to such a form as anti-corruption actions of legal nature. Such anti-corruption actions are based on the provisions of the legal acts of the administration and entail the emergence, modification or termination of administrative and legal relations related to the exercise of their powers by authorized officials, state and municipal employees. An example of such actions is the notification by a government civil servant of an employer’s representative about a personal interest that may lead to a conflict of interest.

Consideration of the administrative and legal mechanism for combating corruption will be incomplete without studying the administrative and legal methods included in it. The categories of form and method within this mechanism should be regarded as inextricably linked. As noted earlier, a method is a set of methods, techniques, and operations for practical or theoretical mastering of reality. As part of the study of the administrative and legal mechanism for combating corruption, it is of both scientific and applied interest to identify the relationship between the categories “method” and “measure.” This is primarily necessary because the first category is practically not used in anti-corruption legislation. In turn, the category of appears in almost all significant legal acts against corruption.

So what is a measure? There are very different approaches to understanding this category: philosophical, sociological, political, legal, etc. Without going into details of analyzing all the scientific approaches that reveal the phenomenon of *a measure*, we will focus solely on the legal aspects. For example, I.D. Yagofarova believes that a regulatory

measure should be interpreted as a measure to restrict the external freedom of subjects of legal activity (legal conduct) (Yagofarova, 2009, p. 10).

According to E.A. Kulikova, a measure in law is “a qualitative and quantitative characteristic of legal reality that describes the state and dynamics of legal phenomena both from the inside – from the standpoint of the content and meaning of these phenomena, and from the outside – from the standpoint of the action and boundaries of phenomena in objective reality, while speaking in all its diversity of meanings” (Kulikov, 2013, p. 9). In other words, in the broadest sense, a legal measure can be determined as a specific legal means of influencing human behavior.

Some authors include a diverse array of institutions in the system of measures to prevent corruption in public service, such as administrative responsibility, anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts, personnel management, psychological interventions, and conflict of interest prevention (Melnikova and Krizhanovsky, 2015). According to the authors, the measures listed above are not correlated in nature. It is incorrect to put legal responsibility, anti-corruption expertise, personnel work, and psychological work on a par. All this suggests that many researchers do not put sufficient theoretical depth into the terminology used. The measure is, in fact, a specific way of countering corruption, applied within the framework of larger methods.

Considering the prevailing doctrinal approaches in Russian administrative law, the authors propose to include the following anti-corruption methods, along with specific accompanying measures:

a) Anti-corruption expertise of legal acts in public administration, aimed at identifying and eliminating corruption-causing factors;

b) Anti-corruption monitoring in public administration, focused on identifying and analyzing the causes and conditions that lead to corruption offenses, as well as ensuring the development, implementation, and enhancement of anti-corruption plans and programs;

c) Anti-corruption propaganda, education, and awareness, which involves conducting informational and explanatory work within society regarding anti-corruption issues and fostering legal awareness about anti-corruption among the population and individual citizens;

d) Digital methods of combating corruption, which leverage modern information technologies, including internet resources, state and municipal information systems, and artificial intelligence.

The role and importance of administrative and legal forms and methods of combating corruption in modern conditions is significantly increasing due to the fact that corruption normally disrupts the activities of public authorities; it can become a destabilizing factor not only in the functioning of the state apparatus, but also in ensuring internal sovereignty in general. The Russian Federation has already established a system of law-making and law enforcement aimed, among other things, at combating corruption and its various manifestations. The administrative and legal mechanism for combating corruption is an integral part of public law support for the internal state sovereignty of the Russian Federation, which is an optimal combination of law-making and law enforcement based on a sufficient level of legal culture, allowing stable and sustainable functioning of public authority and public administration in the country, ensuring a balance of public and private interests, the rights and freedoms of citizens in the context of new challenges and threats (Zubarev and Troshev, 2024). Public law enforcement of internal state sovereignty is a complex system consisting of separate, interrelated and interdependent elements grouped into subsystems (Sitnik and Polyakov, 2024). The administrative and legal mechanism for combating corruption is organically interconnected with the value-oriented subsystem, the subsystems of normative regulation and law enforcement, the institutional competence subsystem, the subsystem of legal education and enlightenment, as well as control and supervision (Vedyashkin and Zaitsev, 2024, p. 26).

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Corruption in the modern world has increasingly been utilized as a tool of external influence by hostile countries to undermine national sovereignty. The image of Russia as an extremely corrupt state is being purposefully formed. Ensuring internal State sovereignty is directly related to the implementation of anti-corruption measures in the public administration system. Corruption in the new conditions destroys the

foundations of the functioning of public authorities, sharply reduces the authority and trust in government, and negates the economic results of various reforms implementation.

Currently, an administrative and legal mechanism for combating corruption has been formed, which is a set of administrative and legal means aimed at preventing, detecting and suppressing corruption offenses, minimizing their negative consequences for society and the state. This mechanism is directly implemented by authorized public authorities and their officials at the federal level, at the level of constituent entities of the Russian Federation, as well as at the level of municipalities.

The long-term positive effect of putting into practice the administrative and legal mechanism for combating corruption will be not only a general reduction in the number of corruption offenses in public administration, but also a significant strengthening of the internal state sovereignty of the Russian Federation.

## References

Alekseev, S.S., (1966). *Mekhanizm pravovogo regulirovaniya v sotsialisticheskom gosudarstve [The mechanism of legal regulation in a socialist state]*. Moscow: Juridicheskaja literature Publ. (In Russ.).

Antonyan, E.A. and Polyakov, M.M., (2022). Determinants of corruption crimes in Russia and measures of counteracting them. *Russian Journal of Criminology*, 16(6), pp. 669–676, doi: 10.17150/2500-4255.2022.16(6).669-676. (In Russ.).

Bashankaev, S.D., (2015). The Anti-Corruption Policy in the CIS Countries. *Oriental Studies*, 8(1), pp. 154–160. (In Russ.).

Basova, T.B., (2012). Anti-corruption in the focus of Russia's administrative reform. *Russian Journal of Criminology*, 4, pp. 6–12. (In Russ.).

Boskholov, S.S., (2010). The fight against corruption: myths and reality, hopes and prospects. *Russian Journal of Criminology*, 2(12), pp. 51–64. (In Russ.).

Botnev, V.K., (2015). Civil-law regulation of countering corruption in business. *Public Administration*, 4(96), pp. 19–23. (In Russ.).

Deryabin, Yu.S., (2005). *Mozhno li odolet korruptsiyu? (Opyt Finlyandii) [Is it possible to overcome corruption? (The Finnish experience)]*. *Sovremennaja Evropa*, 1, pp. 71–82. (In Russ.).

Ivanov, S.V., (2017). On Strengthening the Repressive Potential of Criminal-Law Counteraction of Corruption. *Russian Law: Education, Practice, Research*, 1, pp. 47–50. (In Russ.).

Khabrieva, T.Ya., (2016). *Combating Corruption: New Challenges*. Moscow: Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law under the Government of the Russian Federation; Infra-M Publ. (In Russ.).

Khamazova, O.I., (2008). *Legal means of combating corruption: problems of theory and practice theory*. Cand. Sci. (Law) Diss. Saratov.

Kochoi, S.M., (2018). Criminal-Law Counteraction against Corruption: Gaps in Legislation, Law Enforcement Problems. *Courier of Kutafin Moscow State Law University (MSAL)*, 12, pp. 88–94, doi: 10.17803/2311-5998.2018.52.12.088-094. (In Russ.).

Kozlov, Yu.M., (1977). *Sovetskoe administrativnoe pravo: metody i formy gosudarstvennogo upravleniya [Soviet administrative law. Methods and forms of public administration]*. Moscow: Juridicheskaja literatura Publ. (In Russ.).

Kulikov, E.A., (2013). *The category of measures in law: questions of theory*. Cand. Sci. (Law) Diss. Chelyabinsk. (In Russ.).

Kurakin, A.V. and Zvyagin, M.M., (2010). The Russian Federation Customs Administrative Means of Corruption Counteraction. *Vestnic of Russian Customs Academy*, 2, pp. 26–30. (In Russ.).

Kuznetsova, S.A., (2013). On the question of the definition of “legal mechanism.” *Vestnik of the Saint Petersburg University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia*, 1(57), pp. 9–12. (In Russ.).

Magomedov, S.B. and Alieva, M.N., (2018). International Legal Mechanism Counteraction to Corruption. *International Bulletin of the State University*, 26, 2, pp. 99–103, doi: 10.21779/2224-0241-2018-26-2-99-103. (In Russ.).

Malko, A.V., (2010). *Pravovaya politika: slovar i proekt kontseptsii [Legal policy: a dictionary and a draft concept]*. Saratov: Saratov State Law Academy. (In Russ.).

Marino, D., (2025). The dynamics of corruption: a theoretical explanatory model and empirical results. *Physics A: Statistical Mechanics and its applications*, 658, doi: 10.1016/j.physa.2024.130288.

Melnikova, N.A. and Krizhanovsky, S.V., (2015). Konflikt interesov v sisteme mer profilaktiki korrupsii na pravookhranitelnoy sluzhbe [Conflict of interests in the system of corruption prevention measures in the law enforcement service]. *The Russian Investigator*, 23, pp. 30–33. (In Russ.).

Ming Fang, Weizheng Lai and Cunling Xia, (2025). Fighting corruption and political trust: data from China. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 234, doi: 10.1016/j.jebo.2025.107015.

Mironova, A.A. and Tatarko, A.N., (2021). Psychological Causes of Corruption: The Role of Worries. *Economic sociology*. 22, 1, pp. 11–34, doi: 10.17323/1726-3247-2021-1-11-34. (In Russ.).

Mondjeli, Itchoko Motande Mwa Ndjokou and Ambassa, M., (2025). Does corruption really affect the structure of government spending? *Structural Changes and Economic Dynamics*, 73, doi: 10.1016/j.strueco.2024.12.019.

Nechevin, D.K., (2023). *Istoriya protivodeystviya korrupsii na gosudarstvennoy sluzhbe Rossii i zarubezhnykh stran v XX veke [The history of the corporation's establishment in the civil service of Russia and abroad in the 20th century]*. Moscow: Prospect Publ. (In Russ.).

Ozhegov, S.I. and Shvedova, N.Yu., (1994). *Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language*. Moscow. (In Russ.).

Pankova, O.V., (2020). The Main Directions of Research Mechanisms in Law in Modern Scientific Doctrine. *Proceedings of Voronezh State University. Series: Pravo*, 1(40), pp. 79–80, doi: 10.17308/vsu.proc.law.2020.1/2392. (In Russ.).

Polyakov, M.M., (2023). The Administrative and Legal Fight against Corruption in Public Administration: The Concept and Content. *Administrative Law*, 12, pp. 21–24, doi: 10.18572/2071-1166-2023-12-21-24. (In Russ.).

Polyakov, M.M., (2024). Anti-Corruption Administrative and Legal Forms in Public Administration of the Russian Federation. *Zakony Rossii: opyt, analiz, praktika*, 1, pp. 35–39. (In Russ.).

Prozumentov, L.M., (2016). Corruption Risks: Classification, Assessment and Measures for their Prevention. *Tomsk State University Journal*, 405, pp. 178–183, doi: 10.17223/15617793/445/32. (In Russ.).

Selyukov, A.D., (2010). Finansovo-pravovye mekhanizmy gosudarstvennogo upravleniya [Financial law mechanisms of public administration]. *Financial Law*, 7, pp. 2–5. (In Russ.).

Sitnik, A.A. and Polyakov, M.M., (2024). System and structure of public-legal support of internal state sovereignty. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Law*, 4, pp. 949–963, doi: 10.21638/spbu14.2024.402. (In Russ.).

Starilov, N.E., (2016). *General Administrative Law*. Voronezh: Publishing House of Voronezh State University. (In Russ.).

Stepenko, V.E., (2006). *The administrative and legal mechanism for ensuring the functioning of the state border of the Russian Federation*. Dr. Sci. (Law) Diss. Saint Petersburg.

Tsirin, A.M., Cherepanova, E.V. and Matveev, V.V., (2021). Constitutional Waymarks in Combating Corruption (Review of the Tenth Eurasian Anti-Corruption Forum). *Journal of Foreign Legislation and Comparative Law*, 17(5), pp. 125–143, doi: 10.12737/jflcl.2021.059. (In Russ.).

Vedyashkin, S.V. and Zaitsev, D.I., (2024). Administrative discretion in the system of ensuring state sovereignty: a functional analysis. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Pravo = Tomsk State University Journal of Law*, 53, pp. 22–34, doi: 10.17223/22253513/53/2. (In Russ.).

Veremeenko, I.I., (1981). Mekhanizm administrativno-pravovogo regulirovaniya v sfere okhrany obshchestvennogo poryadka: predmet i ponyatie [The mechanism of administrative and legal regulation in the field of public order protection. Subject and Concept]. Part 1. Moscow; VNII MVD SSSR Publ. (In Russ.).

Yagofarova, I.D., (2009). The category of “measure” in legal research. *Russian Juridical Journal*, 3, pp. 7–12. (In Russ.).

Zelentsov, A.B., (2003). Citizens’ appeals as an administrative and legal form. *RUDN Journal of Law*, 1, pp. 5–15. (In Russ.).

Zubarev, S.M. and Troshev, D.B., (2024). The concept and essence of public law enforcement of state sovereignty. *Kutafin Law Review*, 11(3), pp. 569–594, doi: 10.17803/2713-0533.2024.3.29.569-594.

---

### **Information about the Authors**

**Sergey M. Zubarev**, Dr. Sci. (Law), Professor, Head of the Department of Administrative Law and Procedure named after L.L. Popov, Kutafin Moscow State Law University (MSAL), Moscow, Russian Federation

smzubarev@msal.ru, 125993

ORCID: 0000-0003-4322-3602

Scopus ID: 58987751700

Researcher ID (Web of Science): B-2029-2019

**Alexander A. Sitnik**, Dr. Sci. (Law), Professor, Department of Financial Law, Kutafin Moscow State Law University (MSAL), Moscow, Russian Federation

aasitnik@msal.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-6474-1145

**Maxim M. Polyakov**, Cand. Sci. (Law) Associate Professor, Department of Administrative Law and Procedure named after L.L. Popov, Kutafin Moscow State Law University (MSAL), Moscow, Russian Federation

mmpolyakov@msal.ru (Corresponding Author)

ORCID: 0000-0002-9357-0963

Researcher ID (Web of Science): NCV-4515-2025

Received 04.03.2025

Revised 13.06.2025

Accepted 20.06.2025