

Formation of Anti-corruption Integrity Standards (on example of the Russian Federation)¹

Evstratchik Svetlana,

*PhD, assistant professor, the faculty of economics SPbU
S. Petersburg, Russian Federation*

Menshikova Galina

*PhD, assistant professor, the faculty of sociology SPbU
S. Petersburg, Russian Federation*

Prujijel Nikolay,

*prof, Head of Department, the faculty of sociology SPbU
S. Petersburg, Russian Federation*

Savin Sergey, PhD,

*assistant professor, Head of Department, the faculty of sociology SPbU
S. Petersburg, Russian Federation*

Abstract. The article deals with the problems of creating anti-corruption policy in the Russian Federation, revealing the core of control over the effectiveness of actions which is anti-corruption evaluation standards. It is concluded that while the country is only guided by world standards, the policy of the government is dominated by the initial stage of understanding the available opportunities. Civil society, due to the lack of development of the institution of accountability, also did not realize the need and the possibility of monitoring the activities of the government in this direction. Accordingly, in relation to the Russian Federation it is more correct to talk about anti-corruption measures, not standards.

The authors of the publication have four goals. The first is to describe and to compare the four technologies of public administration: regimes, standards, monitoring and measures as ways to assess the quality of Government work (by areas). The second is to determine the structure of standards and then to identify the relative successes and failures of the Russian Federation in comparison with common evaluation system. The third is to describe the measures taken by the government, showing the slow nature of reforms, but still the presence of positive changes in them. Fourth aim is to show and to analyze the perception of corruption (and perception of anti-corruption measures) depending on gender, age, income and education of respondents on the basis of sociological research (surveys for 2017 and 2018).

Points for Practitioners

Russia, as is known, has a very low rating, but what is much more important is that it does not change over the years. It means respectively that the government is practically doing too little to overcome corruption in the country. The institutions of control are not developed in the country. People do not require reports from either the national government or the regional ones.

Scientists should replicate the ideas of social control in their works. Lecturers should restructure courses on public administration from descriptive forms to active ones, forming active residents and qualified civil experts from students. The phenomenon of evaluation comparisons, information about ratings compiled by independent expert communities should be discussed in the media, studied in colleges and universities. The country needs an anti-corruption rating of regions and public institutions (especially corporations), moreover, perhaps the country should adopt a law that made them (ratings) a mandatory basis for personnel carrier changes.

There are also positive results that we should note: all government agencies related to offences (Courts, Prosecutor's Office, bodies of the Ministry of Internal Affairs) have created their own websites where they provide information about their activities. The scientific community (and specialized units are organized within the framework of some universities and research institutes) should analyze them in order to appeal their results into the practice of people's behaviour, especially during electing campaigns. The anti-corruption national plan (for 2018) includes the task which is to form a single domestic portal, uniting all interested participants, and this task should be implemented.

There is a practice of regulating the structure of websites of authorities and management in Russia. The option of "anti-corruption activities" is obligatory position in them. It is necessary to activate it, making work with it mandatory and measurable. It is advisable to check the compliance of the governors with the scope of their activities provided by the anti-corruption plans of the government.

Key words: anti-corruption assessment standards, technology of smart governance, low public awareness, a survey of St Petersburg and Leningrad region residents.

¹ The article is based on the results of two grant applications between St. Petersburg state University and the creative research team of lecturers (sociology and political science) in 2017- 2018, code NIR-AAA-A18-118032090092-7

Introduction. Undoubtedly, corruption is one of the most serious diseases of Russian society. It is no accident that Transparency International estimates that the country is in the lowest (worst) rating cluster of the world ranking, steadily occupying about 130 positions. Resistance low position primarily reflects the low level of democracy in the country, restriction of freedom of media, the proliferation of the practice of anti-corruption measures as above, in relation to the bodies of power and administration (the principle of mandatory public accountability is not introduced here up to now), and depth – in relationships within the enterprises. At the same time there are positive point that we should speak about. The relevant law exists in the country. There exists the practice of open government realized in the framework of the sites, where the binding portals assume information about cases of corruption. Anti-corruption commissions have been set up in all regions (subjects of the Federation). They were organized not only to identify and punish corrupt officials, but also to promote norms of anti-corruption behavior. The government's plans for anti-corruption measures (ACM) are becoming more concrete and meaningful.

Outside the Russian Federation, anti-corruption actions are considered to be the most important direction of civil activity while corruption is the main enemy of social progress and growth of national well-being. This judgment is being replicated, the idea of anticorruption struggle became the core of the union of everybody.. Different kinds of unification practices are being created: web portals, authoritative international organizations, supervising over the activities of all stakeholders. The portal "Global contact" brought together 13,500 organizations, including NGOs, firms and government agencies from around the world. They implement ethical requirements in their enterprises and publish their results in annual reports. It includes 56 enterprises from Russia (or 0.3%), which is extremely too small. It's a shame that the pace of joining to Portal slowed down, so for the whole 2018 only 9 enterprises did it. Another portal with same goals is NISA (National Integrity System Assessment). It is designed to unite the forces of scientists on the area of corruption researches and includes more than 15 million scientists who have published 118 million publications and organized 700 projects. Russians (both firms or individual persons) take part in its work, but their share does not exceed 1%.

The development of Integrity Standards is a part of the anti-corruption technologies. They are the scorecards (national, regional, by enterprises) for public comparison of the progress in improving governing actions in a given direction. These systems embody three technologies: the introduction of new forms of interaction and a public report on them (Integrity Standards), evaluative comparisons according to the approved scheme (modes or regimes), ratings or ranking by the level of achieved indicators. These technologies are especially effective when they are woven into a general management mechanism and participate in the mandatory accountability of managers, predetermining objective criteria for their rotation.

Since the beginning of the century in Russia there were applied different kinds of evaluation standards (for example, ratings of regions for anti-corruption measures, standards of enterprises openness), but information about them is little known. Accordingly, these measures do not fulfill their main function: to make the fight against corruption a social task of the government, they did not become a social problem discussed in the media and through them among the population. Again, the success of the campaign leaders did not become a criterion filtering the heads of territories or enterprises. The people of the country are unaware of the severity of the problem (its real size and economic losses from it), the emergence of new anti-corruption methods, including the introduction of standards in enterprises. Russians perceive corruption as an inevitable evil that can not be defeated. Therefore when the media do not identify new figures of bribe-takers or corrupt officials, the problem is not discussed.

The authors of the publication set three goals. The first is to show the role of evaluation standards (regimes, ratings) as tools that determine the assessment of the quality of government work. The second is to determine the structure of the standards, to identify the relative successes and failures of Russia in terms of parameters. The third – based on sociological research (surveys for 2017 and 2018), to analyze the corruption perception index (CPI), comparing residents of the city and region, as well as the impact on the responses of gender, age, income and education of respondents.

1.1 Methodology of the evaluation comparisons as technologies of Global and State control

Evaluation standards as a technology of public administration began to be used from the 90s of the twentieth century, which was preceded by numerous theoretical works that proved, first of all, the possibility of subordination of national (group) interest to global values and attitudes. Scientists justified this in different ways, recognizing the difficulties in the interaction of community and society, described by Ferdinand Tennis. These theories indirectly formed the background of the possibility of regime comparisons (See: Table 1).

Table 1. The theory justifying the validity of Global Governance

The name of the theory	Main ideas	Their retranslation into sphere of politics	Persons
1.modern economic theory (f.e the aspect of readiness for cooperation)	The classical approach was to justify individualism. Neoclassical – the willingness to work together, but after long cooperation	Recognizing cooperation as a reasonable motive of state actions, the authors distinguish two periods in its evolution: cooperation without sympathy (1) and conscious one, achieved by new values and education (2)	Mises [1], Hodgson [2], Zykuta & Cook [3] Axelrod [4]

2. agents theory	features of relations in the transfer of authority to manage the property to Managers	Two aspects (as minimum): - the permissibility of the national government to express the interests of its population; - the powers of officials in different models of governance in decision making process. .	Mitnick [5], Shapiro [6] Lindblom [7] and others,
3. Globalization	It is supported by many researchers, including those who supported the following arguments: - economic benefits of integrating the world economy and productive forces , - formation of the world civil society - the rapprochement of cultures as a result of new forms of communication . - the idea of a special role of knowledge as a dominant in the formation of a new type of social relations		- Levitt [8], Obstfeld [9], -Rosenau [10], Chatterji[11], -Robertson [12] and [13] [14] - Stern [15].
4. institutionalization of Global Governance	Complex debates about Global Governmental bodies, their spheres of authority and methods of control over them, because, as it turned out, being outside the spheres of traditional control, they became "lagoons" of corruption		Hurt I[16],
5. the theory of "Smart Power"	Prerequisite for the implementation of Analytics in the system of state governance	The development of methods of analysis of state' foreign policy in order to assess the quality of governance and identify it with models, regimes	Coleman [17], Ferguson [18], Boltansky & Chiapello [19] and others

The table shows both those theories that can be considered as initial and related, deepening the modern understanding of the role of evaluation comparisons. The first (includes: neoliberalism, explaining its laws from the standpoint of the category of "interest" (1), realism, considering the scope of international relations from the standpoint of the diversity of factors affecting them (2), cognitivism, coming in their arguments from the theory of knowledge, i.e. considering the actors of the political system as carriers of scientific or social knowledge (3) [20, p.3]. With the purpose of convergence of views of representatives of these theories, it is proposed to use the dichotomy of "open doors" and "dead ends" ("Dead ends") as "the two ultimate alternatives the consequences of non-compliance with the regime requirements [20].

The reason for the interstate comparisons was the recognition of the relative failures of the administrative reform. To date, there are three such technologies (regimes, standards and monitoring). They are aimed at tightening the regulation of the activities of Governments (subjects of management), public reporting to them on the work done, which directly forms a reasoned assessment of the quality of work as a prerequisite for objective personnel rotation. They are based on the use of reasonable and constantly improving systems of indicators, indices, expert judgments, as well as taking into account the views of stakeholders (common people, business representatives, scientists) characterizing the activities of the subject of management (governments). They represent technologies of smart governing, as it is built on objective and extensive, including sources of big data, database. In table.2 the differences between these technologies are given.

Table 2. Comparison of regimes, standards and monitoring as new technologies of global governance

Characteristic of comparison	Regimes (codes)	Standards	Monitoring (ratings)
The essence of technology	A set of principles, rules, norms and decision-making procedures governing the activities of the subject of management	Ideal models proposed for imitation those who have recognized themselves as supporters of this direction	Constantly and regularly conducted measurements of indicators that are publicly announced, forming ratings
Main subjects of impact	Governments (regions, territories)	Governments, regions, territories, local authorities, enterprises	Governments, regions, territories, local authorities, enterprises, processes
Forms of exposure	Public information on the results of the period, collected from statistics or other sources (opinions of the population or experts)	Information provided by the organizations that have expressed a voluntary desire to cooperate	any information gathered according to the methods
Examples of application	«Convention on International Trade in Endangered Spices of Wild Flora and Fauna» или «US-Canada Great Lakes water quality regime», «Well-	Sustainable development goals (SDG), educational standards, of performance management, ISO,	A lot of them, for example "Transparency International", of economical development, of Human Capital, etc

	fare Regime», «Human rights regime», «Ethic regime», etc		
Some of the publications in which they are described	“Regime Theory and International relations» [21]. “Studies in International relations” [22] and others	“Standards-based learning in Action: Moving from theory to practice” [23]; “International Relations Theory: New normative approaches” [24]	“Self-representational approaches to Consciousness”, [25]

A special Regime Theory has a great significance for the discussed question. Eric Brahm [26] identifies the period of its formation in the 70th years of the twentieth century, calling as its founder Ruggie John Gerard [27] and Krasner St. D [28]. Other proponents of this theory (Hasenclever A., Mayer P., Rittberger V. [20]) note, in addition to the level of its distribution, its utilitarian potential. The most popular and at the same time prepared field for its application was the sphere of International relations, where it set the "evaluation format" to overcome the natural conflict between national interests and universal advantages obtained from the regulation of actions and cooperation of efforts [29], [30], [31] and others. It should be noted, however, that doubts about the possibility of implementing ethical (anti-corruption) norms in practice continue to be expressed [32].

There is no single definition of the regime, as researchers, representing different areas of scientific knowledge and interest, distinguish different parameters of the "evaluation framework". The range of approaches and directions of development of the category analysis is quite wide – from negative sense [32] to positive content.

Thus, the following definition is typical one: the regime is a set of explicit and implicit principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in this area of problems Hasenclever A., Mayer P., Rittberger V[20] deepened the understanding of regimes, treating them as institutions that fix the duties of social actors to fulfill promises or comply with accepted rules of the game (behavior). These authors write: "Creating shared expectations on a appropriate behavior and providing the necessary level of openness in a specific area, regimes help States (other actors) to cooperate, i.e. to obtain additional benefits in the form of growth of well-being and security"[20, p.4].

Schmitter F. and Terry Lynn Carl associate regime with the control system. They write, "a regime or system of governance is a set behavior patterns that define the methods of access to the main public institutions of the state; the characteristics of the actors directly showing whether they meet them or not; and the rules that must be followed when making public decisions. To work properly, this set must be institutionalized, which means that the rules of conduct must be well known, practiced and accepted, if not by all, then by most actors. More and more, the preferred mechanism of institutionalization is fixed by law, including the text of the Constitution, although many of the political norms may have an informal basis, which is dictated by prudence or tradition [33,p.76]."

Thevenot Laurent [34] distinguishes three types (levels): as a characteristic of everyday rationality (“regime of familiarity”), the rationality of collective action (“regime of regular planned action”) and legal regulation (regime of justice). It seems that this is one of the modern definitions that fix the depth of penetration of the regulatory objectives into the behavior of both the subject of management and the population in the territory under its control.

Standards are the most ancient and now the most common among these technologies. They found out a wide scope of application. All sorts of norms and standards in the sphere of regulation of international activities had spread in the 90s of the XX century. Their analysis is reflected (in addition to those in table 2) in the works of many scientists [35]. Standards are ideal models proposed for implementation. They are like norms of behavior accepted voluntarily, and therefore the measures are chosen independently (but within the proposed framework). The selection of areas is carried out in different ways: it can be based on the identification of either the most significant or the most relevant areas. Like the regime, the standards represent two principles of control: external and internal audit.

Monitoring is a systematically repeated observation that can be carried out in a variety of ways: through document analysis, statistical data collection, expert or population surveys and others [36],[37], [38]. As a process, it has at least five mandatory properties: systematic repeatability (1), integrated use of information from different sources (2), methodological support, involving a single, but constantly improving system of indicators and classifications, harmonized tools, based on a constant assessment of data quality (3), comprehensive comparative analysis and rating (4), the publicity of results (5).

So far, the relationship between the institutions that shape global governance technologies has not been sufficiently explored. The hierarchy and interaction between them requires the formation of a single database of the States, including legislative norms, the levels of law enforcement and dissemination of norms within States (levels of governance, enterprises or general rules of people’ conduct). Up to now, in relation to countries, we can talk about whether their system of public administration meets the requirements of the regime or the standard as a whole.

The discussion on the compliance of national practices with the requirements of global regulation may relate to the assessment of the quality of public administration in a particular area as a whole, and its individual components, primarily legislative support. Country could not have the overall monitoring of corruption or ACM, but forms the monitoring that compares the activity of the regions or the standards of openness in the enterprise.

In contrast to the technologies of global comparisons (regimes, standards and monitoring), the design of "measures" is based on its own, therefore self-constructed system of indicators and methods. It can be linked to the recommendations of world public organizations, but usually pursues national goals, identifying internal tasks.

1.2 Anti-corruption comparisons: methods and techniques

Anti-corruption comparisons began in the 80s, covering various forms and objects (countries). There are many centers of comparative evaluation of the level of corruption and the quality (effectiveness) of anti-corruption measures (ACM), as well as technologies for assessing both phenomena. So Transparency International assesses the level of transparency and openness of the actions of the Government and its institutions; Bertelsmann Foundation (Germany) - corruption in the judicial system; the rating "Doing business" – business; International country Risk Guide (compiled by experts analysts PRS-group USA) – analyses corruption as the kind of national risks, formulating an index of political risks; "Global Integrity" - compares the effectiveness of governments. The UN has developed and applied programs to combat corruption in certain areas, f.e. in drug control and crime prevention.

Factors that explain the level of corruption and the effectiveness of measures to counter it are of scientific interest. Zakaria, using published data for 150 countries, established a mathematical relationship between the development of anti-corruption institutions in the country and the level of ICP (indicator of corruption perception). His research confirmed the hypothesis that developed anti-corruption national institutions form more trust and, as a result, a willingness to comply with Integrity Standards. In another study [39], he assessed the impact of a set of national measures on the micro level, taking Croatia as a field of analysis.

Ledermann, Loayza, Soares, [40] revealed a direct connection between public control (media freedom, development of civic society institutions) and the level of CPI. La Porta et al, [41], Nontinilla and Jackman [42], Sandholtz and Gray [43] Treiseman [44], [45] studied factors contributing to the level of ACM: democratization of the country, economy (Kurtz and Schrunk [46]), ethic franktionalism (Alesina et al, [47]). Torgler, Valev [48] tried to find out the influence of gender, age, national or cultural characteristics on CPI.

After analyzing various monitoring from 1994 to 2018, Cole Wade [49] revealed the phenomenon of "information paradox". He discovered that the increasing of information gives the impression that those practice worsened but in fact underlining conditions may have stabilized or even improved. A similar effect was found in the analysis of domestic violence (Keck Sikkink [50]). Other researchers, estimating growth of scales and forms, for example Sandholtz and Gray [43], estimated anti-corruption movement as direct and positive.

Numerous comparative studies or describing the features of ACM in one country can be attributed to this problem as well. They revealed a certain paradox: the more active is the combat, the sharper is the perception of corruption, i.e. the lower is the level of corruption, the more active is the country in its studying (and vice versa).

1.3 Directions of anti-corruption measures in Russia: assessment of successes and failures

In the case of Russia, the type of anti-corruption regulation is most accurately reflected by the term "measures", which expresses the initial stage of the formation of the system. There are measures of social control, prescribed prohibitions, certain regulations, but the requirements of publicity and accountability in this sphere are practically not applied.

The Russian Federation as part of the world system is included in the orbit of evaluation procedures, however, their representation in the scientific field of the country can't be considered sufficient. Both the new governance technologies and corruption itself have not yet become significant areas of science. Works dedicated to them, are not so much. Among them it is necessary to allocate the Report of the Public Chamber [51], a monitoring High School of Economics (HSE), book by Nisnevich Y. N [52], not more than 5-10 journal publications [53], [54], [55], 3-5 textbooks [56], [57], which for such a huge country is obviously not enough.

The concept of ACM was included in the field of science in 2003, when the text of the Model law of the UN General Assembly "Fundamentals of legislation on anti-corruption policy" was published. At the XXII General Assembly, this UN proposal was extended to the CIS (Council of independent States) in the following wording: "ACM are a single for a separate sphere of legal regulation guarantees, restrictions or prohibitions to prevent or reduce the impact of corruption on the functioning of this sphere." The provision is considered as basic one, although the content, based on the limitation of its "separate spheres" without a clear designation of boundaries, is not quite adequate to modern requirements.

There is no consensus on the role and understanding of the ACM in Russia. A number of authors see them mainly as a manifestation of information transparency and openness (Talapina E. V. [53]), supporting the recognizing of their importance, rightly argues that it is illegal to reduce the ACM only to them. Unfortunately, the trend is to squeeze the contents of ACM in the Russian science is sustainable. Thus, a number of authors, based on the texts of laws, limit the ACM only to the requirements for civil servants and more to the requirements for compliance of them with ethical standards.

At the same time, western studies already in the 1990s made up a set of areas that form the ACM. 10 items that make up the OECD recommendations, as well as an assessment of the degree of compliance of the ACM to them are presented in table. 3.

Table 3. Assessment of compliance of Russian ACM with the global regulatory standard (OECD recommendations)

The requirements of OECD standards	Russian practice
1. the presence of the Ombudsman (the Ombudsman system)	This institution is absent in the RF: there are no laws, bodies and individuals entrusted with the duties of the anti-corruption ombudsman, both in the country and in the regions, although in other areas it exists.
2. level of laws governing the application of ACM	The list of laws is given in table.4. It is evident that their basis is the decrees of the President (DP), there is one law. The problem of creating a Code of laws is not discussed.
3 legal institutions to improve honesty and accountability	There are ethical commissions in all government agencies according to the DP. Their activities are extremely important, although not public. It forces officials to identify situations with a conflict of interest, solving them legally
4 the Code of conduct for officials and managers	Codes of conduct are available in all state organizations. They became the subject of active studying on special lectures and other forms of acknowledging, although did not become the basis of career growth.
5. the existence of a special body organizing ACM	Two special bodies responsible for ACM exist under the office of the President, see table 5.
6. the existence of the state auditor system	This institution is absent in the RF. There are no laws, bodies, public independent organizations, individuals who are entrusted with the duties of an independent audit, both in the country and in the regions. The centre of social control is the Accounts Chamber, for which the fight against corruption is one of many other areas of activity.
7. the formation and development of the principles of open government	Laws have been adopted. All organizations have websites. In 2011 was adopted of a list with mandatory requirements for them/ Still the mechanism for monitoring the content of sites is not established, respectively, the requirements are met to a lesser extent.
8. the constant development of administrative reform	Dual assessment: the reform continues at the lower and middle levels, but is minimal at the top. Another problem is the lack of information about its current tasks, directions and results
9. transparency of information on budget policy	Budget policy information is declining (compared to 2011), and access to it is becoming more difficult.
10. transparency of information about public procurement	The relevant laws have been adopted, the competition system is observed, but often formally and with violations.

The general results are following. The introduction of the ACM is continuing, but more slowly than is possible. Top-level restructuring is required, but it is not interested in changes and often imitates activities.

Table.4 Status and list of basic acts regulating corruption and anti-corruption behavior in the RF

status and year of act adoption	The title of act
FL or 2001	About counteraction of legalization (laundering) of the money acquired in the criminal way and financing of terrorism,
FL, 2005	About anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and projects of regulatory legal acts,
FL, 2005	About order placement on deliveries of goods, performance of works, rendering services for the state and municipal needs,
FL,2008	On combating corruption,
FL, 2012	About accession of the Russian Federation to the Convention "On combating bribery of foreign public officials in international commercial transactions"
GD , 2018	About the register of the persons dismissed in connection with loss of trust
PD , 2008,	On measures to overcome corruption
PD, 2010	Federal program " Reform and development of the public service of the Russian Federation for 2009-2013»
PD, 2010	National strategy to combat corruption
PD, 2016	About the national anti-corruption plan for 2016-2018
PD, 2018	About the national anti-corruption plan for 2018-2020 .

Abbreviations in the table: FL - Federal law, GD - Government Decree, PD -Presidential Decree

The anti-corruption law (2008) was the first in the history of the RF that regulates the state's obligation to combat this evil. It formed the conceptual framework established the principles and organizational basis for the overcoming of corruption, although not identified the list of areas of corruption, as well as the standards of the depth of violations, etc. It applies demands only to employees, but not agencies that were prescribed in the UN recommendations, although in its modern edition it contains a list of prohibitions.

At the moment, the anticorruption regimes and standards follow from the norms prescribed in the documents of the UN and the Council of Europe¹. The first of the four mentioned in the footnote were ratified by the RF. The Convention on bribery is passing through the ratification procedure. The UN Convention on the criminalization of illicit enrichment (article 20 of the UN Convention against corruption, 2003) has not been adopted as contrary to national legislation.

In order to influence the improvement of national legislation on ratification of the norms recommended by the Council of Europe, the GRECO system (Group of States against corruption) was created, which is based on the inclusion of countries that have signed certain basic legislative acts. The organization is primarily aimed at European countries, where are adopted common values. In general the evaluation mechanism of the GRECO consists of several stages: a general analysis and identification of the basic national problems, development of recommendations on their elimination (1), the assessment of policy undertaken by governments (2), tracking of criminalization in areas including transparency of political parties (3) and corruption in the courts (4). Russia became a member of GRECO since 2008

The main claims of the international community to the legislative support of the ACM of the RF can be summarized as follows: deepening the norms of existing laws in order to turn them into unambiguous and clear provisions characterizing the full list of sanctions and prohibitions formulating the degree of punishment in proportion to the seriousness of offenses; inconsistency of the laws and enforcement practice, i.e. the lack of legally enshrined measures of mandatory effectiveness of laws; and the already mentioned 20 art. of the UN Convention on the criminalization of illicit enrichment.

In fact, the core of the ACM is the Council (headed by the its Presidium) and the department in the Presidential Office responsible for combating corruption. If the Council is a deliberative body under the President, the department of Office is the executive structure, officers of which are employed on a permanent basis. A comparative analysis of the bodies responsible for the implementation of the ACM is given in table. Five

Table. 5 Bodies responsible for ACM in Russia

The title of body	Dates of existence	Basic characteristics of membership	Functions and authorities
The Council for the fight against corruption,	2003-2007	6 top leaders of the state, including the Constitutional, Arbitration and Supreme courts	Advisory body under the President, i.e. its members heard reports and made recommendations
The Council for combating corruption	from 2008 up to now	First 19, then 25 people, including the heads of the state (20 persons), 3 scientists and 2 members of the Public Chamber under the President Since 2012 – 28 persons	Advisory body under the President, i.e. prepares proposals for the President, coordinates the activities of regions and departments, controls the activities of all bodies; the most active employees are included in the Presidium.
Anti-corruption Department under the President of the RF	was created in 2013	From 2013 its head was Oleg Plokhoy, from 2017 - A. Chobotov. The number has not been identified: there are employees on a permanent and contractual basis.	Works on an ongoing basics. Functions: preparation of reports, development of a training system, negotiations with foreign colleagues, control over the activities of the staff of the Presidential Administration, interaction with the media.

The Anti-Corruption Council under the President, as well as the Department with the same name, are the bodies that accumulate information and guide the activities of the Government in this direction. Being a structure of the Presidential Administration, however, they are not legitimate, because not spelled out in the Constitution. By decrees of the President, they are allowed, their functions and tasks are indicated, but the field of their competences, their rights in cooperation with executive bodies, state corporations, the degree of responsibility and reporting forms, primarily to the public, have not been identified. Comparing the competence of both it is evident that the powers of

¹ The UN Convention against corruption (2003); “Criminal law convention on corruption” (Council of Europe, 1999); “Convention on laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the proceeds from Crime” (Council of Europe, 1990); the UN Convention “Against transnational organized crime” (2000); “Civil Law Convention on corruption” (Council of Europe, 1999), “The inter-American Convention against corruption” adopted by the organization of American States (1996), “Convention on the fight against Corruption”. affecting officials of the European Communities or officials of EU member States, Council of Europe(1999) and others.

the second one are more serious. He participates in the formation of personnel policy and, although in general, their functions coincide, the Department is responsible for conducting ACM inside the Presidential Administration¹.

ACM are obligatory to all organs of power and administration: Federal Security Service (FSS), prosecutors, police, customs administration. So, in 2007 Control and prevention division of the traffic police, of Ministry of interior, of Police Department for both state and territorial levels were created and operate up to now. A special department on combating corruption has been established at the Accounts Chamber. It includes 30 people. As part of the anti-corruption strategy, all institutions of state power are obliged to conduct the ACM, i.e. within the framework of a particular structure (the Committee on economic security and anti-corruption or ethical Commission) are to train employees to anti-corruption behavior, in particular to create "road maps" to overcome the situation with a conflict of interest and to monitor the complaints of the population. Interesting annual reports (but only from 2011 to 2015) were presented by the Analytical center under the Government of the RF. It is important that most of the information received from these structures is available for use, but not data on the work of ethical commissions. Again, the powers of the latter are minimal and often they can only transfer information to higher authorities for the most malicious violation.

In addition to the state bodies involved in the ACM, there are public organizations. However, there is no complete and reliable register. The information we collect contains information about 24 organizations. Some of them have ceased to be actively engaged, although are still included in the official register. Among these organizations, the following groups can be distinguished: ceased to exist or formally present the final results: "Public anti-corruption committees" (there were two: interregional (2004-2013). and national (1996-2016)). "Freedom of information Fund" practically ceased to exist after its announcement by a foreign agent (2004-2015). Practically does not exist as a guide to ACM Fund "INDEM" (1990-2016). A number of organizations have regional coverage: interregional NGO "Center for combating corruption in public authorities" (established in 2006, the main task of collecting information through the site on cases of corruption). Several organizations deal with profile (branch) directions of ACM: "Association of lawyers for human rights" (created in 2007, reveals violations in courts), "Society of protection of the rights of consumers of educational services" (created in 2002, reveals violations in system of education), "National rating of transparency of procurement" (since 2006 – monitors transparency of information in the sphere procurement), "Business against corruption" (since 2011). As a special unit can be identified laboratories at Universities (f.e. High School of economics, Saratov Institute of law, where the forces of students and experts involved in the collection of information). Branches of well-known foreign organizations continue to play an active role: Transparency International-P (since 1997.), The Carnegie Moscow Center (since 1994).

It seems that the most active are the anticorruption fund of A. Navalny (created in 2011) and the Centre for anti-corruption research of Transparency International-P. The Fund of Navalny held a series of famous to everyone actions as "Rospil", "Rosyama", "Rosvybory", "Good machine of truth," "RosZhKH". Today the Fund has 63 thousand subscribers.

After studying the sites of these organizations, one can identify the following characteristics of their work. The first is that the emphasis is made on events, not processes, i.e. the phenomenon of corruption, new technologies of combating corruption have not been the subject of analysis and discussions. Second – the wave-like nature of the attractiveness of the subject. Thus, the President of Russia issued a decree in 2011 on the need for measures, various public organizations were created. The President keeps silence, the media and public attention to the problem is not great and the activity of the funds subsides. The third is the minimality of publications on the topic of ACM, lack of awareness of the population about the organizations and their leaders. The fourth is the change in discussion and methods of confrontation. The Internet has come to the fore. Networks became an important form of the information disclosure. Many organizations consider the activity in networks as the main one.

The core of the organized actions are national anti-corruption plans. There were two of them for 2016-2018 and 2018-2020. They are based on the designation of tasks and the list of necessary ACM for ministries and territorial subjects of administration. Comparing the two plans, it can be found that the new one is more concrete and consists of clearly defined activities. The Russian President is responsible for both. All reports, which must be prepared for each item of the plan, are transmitted personally to him. Some of the provisions in the plans are duplicated, which means that they have not been implemented. The concrete tasks of the plan for 2018-2020 makes it possible to check the degree of its implementation, especially since it is planned to create a special and publicly accessible platform.

The main tasks of the anti-corruption activities for 2018-2020 were recognized: improving the system of prohibitions and restrictions (1), ensuring uniformity in the legislation of the RF (2) and eliminating gaps in it (3), improving the system of public procurement (4), improving control over property, the origin of which is not confirmed by documents (5), improving the efficiency of educational work (6), protecting businesses from unreasonable extortion by officials (7), updating the efficiency of international cooperation (8).

In most countries according to the recommendations of international organizations, the rating of regions by ACM is carried out. In Russia it is not; there are regional (for example, in the Ural Federal district). However, the country has a rating of openness, which was created in 2015 by experts of the NIFI (Research Financial Institute) to encourage regional leaders to open data of their budget, to invite people to participate in the discussion at public

¹ <http://www.rline.tv/svobodnyj-korrespondent/upravlenie-prezidenta-po-voprosam-protivodejstviya-korrupcii/>

hearings. In addition to the list of regions-leaders, the relevant site contains an indication of the best practices, i.e. instructions for open documents (with their Internet addresses).

Thus, if in 2015 they included only data on budget plans, in 2018 – information on inter-budget transfers (Crimea), on the assessment of the effectiveness of tax benefits (Khanty-Mansiysk district), explanation of deviations of the actual budget from the planned (St. Petersburg), the volume of public services and their financial support (Moscow region), the mechanism for encouraging participants in public hearings (Sakhalin), their timely announcement (Yaroslavl region). There are few such examples – no more than 20 per year, which reflects the degree of readiness to open information, and thus eliminate the basis for corruption in government.

In the same series of positive changes that form a favorable background of the ACM is the publication of the register of corrupt officials. It began to be published in 2018 in accordance with the Decree of the Government of the RF. Now it consists of 394 people. The list is constantly updated, but there is no one person whose position would be higher than the head of the local Government (of a small settlement) or the Director of the Library. All organs of power and control must supply it with information. Its storage - 5 years, but in case of death it may be removed. The register contains the name, former position, place of work and violated articles¹.

It should be noted some new milestones in the ACM taken by civil society and public organizations. The analytical Committee under the President has created a register of public organizations of anticorruption orientation, which provides information on public and government organizations, including: “Stop Corruption” hotline of the Public Chamber (tel. 8-800-700-8-800). It exists only one year (2011-2012) and was used for preparing annual reports to the President of RF. Its effectiveness was high and many citizens sent to it information but now not exist. According to the plan of 2018-2020, a state portal will be created in Russia, and while there are several public ones, including “Gulagu.net”, “No-corruption” and “Corruption NET”. The last one exists since 2009, although judging by the content of its site now it loses its activity.

Thus, the ACM are developing and expanding due to the state and the activity of civil society. The measures for the implementation of plans are concretized, which makes it possible to analyze and evaluate them. It is impossible not to see the dependence of activity on the political will of the President of Russia, however, the Internet and the activity of young people predetermine the inclusion of non-state structures in them.

1.4 The perception of corruption by the population of modern Russia

An important, though relatively reliable, indicator characterizing the level of corruption and ACM are its perception by the population of the country. The study of methods by other researchers has shown both the “information paradox” and the inverse relationship between the volume of real measures and their assessment by the population. Nevertheless, CPI remains an important evidence of the level of satisfaction with the quality of public administration. The research grant from St. Petersburg State University allowed to identify it and a street survey of residents of the Leningrad region and St. Petersburg was conducted at the sociological faculty of the university. 600 and 700 respondents were surveyed, respectively. The results are shown in tables 6-9

Table 6. Distribution of answers of respondents from St. Petersburg and Leningrad region (LR)² (on questions regarding corruption)

Assess the importance of the fight against corruption in comparison with other tasks facing the country		Need	Not needed at all	There are more pressing issues	Difficult to answer
	SPb	81,4	1	15,2	2,4
	LR	80,5	0,9	14,5	4,1
Rate anti-corruption measures in your region		Intensify	Weaken	Difficult to answer	
	SPb	14,5	57,5	28	
	LR	13,5	56	30,5	
Rate the level of corruption in your region		High / Medium	Low	Missing	Difficult to answer
	SPb	77,4	2,9	0,5	19,2
	LR	75,5	2	0,6	21,9
Rate the situation with the spread of corruption over the past 3 years in your region		Became better or a little bit better	Became worse / noticeably worse	Has not changed	Difficult to answer
	SPb	18,6	15	41,6	24,8

¹ <https://gosszluzhba.gov.ru/reestr>

² Leningrad Region is the area round SPb. Its special role for the Russian Federation is recognized by vesting it with the status of a subject of the federation (one of 85)

	LR	13,4	14	49,3	23,4
--	----	------	----	------	------

In general, the table shows a high level of understanding of the negative role of corruption in the region (80% estimate it as one of the main social problems). More than half of respondents are convinced that the government's activity in this direction has weakened. It should be specially pointed at the positive difference in the assessment of changes in the extent of corruption in recent years between the residents of the city and the region. Indeed, at the grassroots level: in hospitals, traffic police, schools and universities - the practice of bribes has significantly decreased and it seems that the respondents-citizens confirmed this with their answers.

The table shows the similarity of the answers of citizens and villagers: both groups almost equally assess the level of corruption and the activity of the ACM of the government. At the same time, villagers estimate the measures taken by the government higher than the citizens, and vice versa - the level of corruption and the degree of its spread (over the last three years) are lower.

Table 7. Distribution of answers to the questions posed depending on the level of income (in comparison with the subsistence minimum) 1 - below the subsistence minimum, 2. - family incomes correspond to it, 3 - slightly higher, 4 - 2 times higher, 5 - 3 times higher, 6 - 10 times higher, 7 - failure to respond

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Anti-corruption measures in the region have been recognized as increasing recently (% of respondents)	43,1	51,9	51,3	51,2	45,8	58,3	46,2
The most effective way to fight corruption is through forceful means with the help of harsh criminal punishment.	63,9	68,3	54,8	60,8	64,1	75	56,9
As long as there is poverty and high social inequality in the country, corruption cannot be defeated.	56,9	46,2	49,6	42,2	39,9	33,3	43,1
Personally, I can't do anything about corruption, it does not depend on me	63,9	51,9	52,2	39,2	39,9	41,7	43,1

The data in the table show that the better off people are more likely to rate anti-corruption measures. Power methods of struggle as especially effective ones are recognized by more than half of the population, and the most well-off respondents rate their role especially highly. The poorer the respondents, the more they are inclined to explain corruption by poverty. The wealthy respondents are more willing to recognize their own role as a fighter against corruption.

At the same time, it is clear that according to one study (without dynamics) many dependencies are difficult to identify, as well as the fact that to explain the discrepancies between the answers by income level, special researches are needed, which probably showed the origin of income: whether it is labor source or not, who is its recipient: state clerk, farmer, pensioner or property owner (shop).

Tables 8. Distribution of answers to the question of who is more susceptible to corruption, depending on the type of respondent

Who is more susceptible to corruption and more often involved in corrupt transactions in the country		
According to the age :	Youth	5,1
	middle-aged people	24,6
	older people	14,7
	all equally	50,9
	hard to answer	4,7
On income:	Poor	2,9
	middle-income	14,3
	Rich	36,9
	all equally	41
	hard to answer	4,9
By typical professions :	officials and municipal employees	38,4

	security officials and judges	7,1
	Businessmen	3,2
	state employees (education, science, health)	2
	all equally	44,1
	hard to answer	5,1

Answers of respondents did not reveal the influence of age on the propensity to corrupt behavior. Almost 40% of respondents believe that rich people are more prone to corruption, although as many (and even a little more) are convinced that income does not affect. Among the answers about which group of corrupt officials belong to, the majority (38%) are convinced that they are civil servants, although the same number are not inclined to single out any particular group.

Table 9. Answers on the question “are you personal, despite the danger, ready to participate in anticorruption activities and to condemn publicly corruption and corrupt officials” (according to gender and age both from SPb and LR)

	Gender		age				
	Mail	femail	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
Are generally ready in SPb	42,0	25,1	37,6	33,1	35,8	29,1	26,6
Difficult to answer	13,7	12,9	13,5	11,8	14,6	15,7	11,2
Are generally ready in LR	46,5	24,2	38	36,8	35,4	34,2	27,6
Difficult to answer	13,9	11,7	12,7	15,2	16,8	16,2	4,7

The table showed relatively low willingness of residents to participate in the combat against corruption, but men are more willing than women (more than 40% against 25%). The younger are the respondents, the more active they are (both in St. Petersburg and LR).

Table 10. Answers on the same question (according to the level of education from both SPb and LR) 1 – primary, lower secondary, 2. - secondary complete (secondary school), 3 - primary vocational (vocational school, lyceum), 4 -- vocational secondary (technical school, college), 5 - incomplete higher education (3 courses), 6 - higher education

	Level of education					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Are generally ready in SPb	20	24,4	28,8	30,3	30,7	37,5
Difficult to answer	20	11,1	7,7	12,3	17,3	14,4
Are generally ready in LR	11,1	27	36,6	29,5	40,7	43,8
Difficult to answer	18,5	21,6	9,8	11,1	18,8	8,8

The survey revealed a clear relationship between readiness for activity and level of education. More than a third of respondents with higher education (in the city) and more than 43 – in the region are ready for active action, while at low education they are 20 and 11%% respectively

Table 11. Answers on the same question (according to the level of income from both SPb and LR): 1 - below the subsistence minimum, 2. - family incomes correspond to it, 3 - slightly higher, 4 - 2 times higher, 5 - 3 times higher, 6 - 10 times higher, 7 - failure to respond

	Level of Income
--	-----------------

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Are generally ready in SPb	36,4	25	30,5	34,7	37,8	45,5	26,6
Difficult to answer	10,6	18	13,1	9,3	15	0	16,7
Are generally ready in LR	27,1	27,5	38	32,6	38	100	37,5
Difficult to answer	24,3	16,4	10	8,3	11,4	0	12,5

In terms of income, high-income groups of citizens (45.5) , and especially villagers (100%), are more willing than those with lower incomes. It is possible that 100 % of respondents of the region were called by the minimum number of them. . Identified 5 respondents and gave this percentage.

In general, the study confirmed the recognition of corruption as one of the country's main social problems and the outlined reduction in the authorities' activity to overcome it. Unlike the inhabitants of Russia, 55% of whom (according to "WCIOM" - Public Opinion Research Center)¹ positively assessed the growth of government ACM, according to our research, only 15% turned out to be such. This discrepancy is explained, first of all, by differences in the methods of conducting the survey, but I would like to hope that the standard of living and cultural background make the inhabitants of the region more critical and independent in their judgments.

Somewhat unexpected was the almost complete correspondence of the answers of the residents of the city and the village, given the fact that the quality of life in the region is much worse. This can be partly explained by the shortcomings of the study: respondents from the streets, as the most active part of the population, can't be fully representative of the villagers.

The study revealed the importance of factors affecting the perception of corruption. The level of education is particularly relevant for the Russia. The higher it is, the higher is the level of protest activity of the population and the more critical is the attitude to what is happening. It speaks for itself the fact that 40% of residents with higher education are ready for action, unlike 30% of those who have only vocational training, and even more so against 10 who have graduated from compulsory school. Obviously it becomes clear that this readiness does not characterize their psychological qualities, but their involvement in political issues. The lower is the level of education, the lower is the income and much more time people should spend on secondary employment or domestic work. To conclude, the lower is the level of education, the more people trust the media and to the Government, their capacity for independent judgments is less.

Conclusions.

1. The use of technologies of public comparisons (in forms of regimes, standards and monitoring) of the government' activity allows to create objective criteria for the estimation of state leaders, what is of most importance during election companies. This "evaluation framework" sets up officials on the state the permanent responsibility towards the people, promoting a natural way of upgrading honest, initiative and socially oriented ones.

Constantly improving methods allow to compare not only the quality of governance in different countries, but also to identify the directions of their successes or failures, indicating areas for further improvement.

To develop the skills of civil control, it is necessary to restrict the education system both in schools and universities, introducing new courses and adding new sections to the existing ones.

2. Numerous methods of comparison actualize the role of research at the micro level. They can identify not only the overall assessment of ACM, but also the factors contributing to them. It seems that despite the importance of global values, one cannot expect instant success where the standard of living and education is low, where civil institutions are just beginning to be created. Moreover, as studies have shown, the lower the level of corruption is and the more active the state is in combating it, the population, being able to receive full information, perceives the situation more keenly. Accordingly, the CPI, although is significant as the estimate, but a relative in his assessment of the situation.

3. Russia, despite its low Transparency International rating, is still fighting corruption with confidence. It has achieved some success in overcoming it at the domestic level. Transition to open technologies of interaction of the population with the power and public services made receiving bribes and commission of corruption behavior forms (for example, unfair distribution of quotas for treatment in hospitals, unskilled performance of duties by officials, etc.) became risky process when violators are easily revealed and punished. Nevertheless, in Russia there are lagoons for corruption behavior and the main of them is the system of public administration at the highest level, which is inaccessible to visual control. The introduction of mandatory reporting in the framework of performance management would allow to start conducting ACM in this area too

4. The applied research has once again confirmed a higher readiness of the population of St. Petersburg and its region to have a critical perception of the government's activities than the national average. It showed the role of education as a natural factor of civic independence. The study identified areas for further development of scientific problems that can be solved by in-depth interviews, as well as by comparing the results with similar data on the country. In Russia there is a need to expand the field of study of the causes of corruption behavior and ACM

¹ <https://wciom.ru/index.php?id=236&uid=9139>

technologies. While this does not happen – the number of studies is minimal, and the results of a few studies are not widely disseminated. Sometimes the studies are conducted, but their results are not published (for example, publication of the results of CPI evaluation by WCIOM - 2018) should be published,

References:

1. Mises, Ludwig von. 1966. *Human action, A Treatise on Economics*, 3-rd ed: Chicago, Henry Regnery.
2. Hodgson, Geoffrey. 1988. *Economics and Institutions, a Manifesto for a modern institutional Economics*, Cambridge; University of Cambridge press.
3. Zykuta, Michael E., and Michael L. Cook, 2002, *New Institutional economic approach to contracts and cooperatives, Contracting and cooperative research institute*, Columbia: University of Missouri press.
4. Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The evolution of Cooperation*, Basic Books,
5. Mitnick, Barry M. 2006. *Origin of the theory of Agency, An account of one of the theorists originators*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.
6. Shapiro, Susan P. Agency theory, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2005, N31: 263-284.
7. Braybrooke, David, and Charles E. Lindblom. 1963. *A Strategy of decision*, NY: The free press.
8. Levitt, Theodore. 1983. *The Globalization of Markets*. Harvard Business Review.
9. Obstfeld, Maurice and Taylor Alan M. 2003. *Global capture markets: Integration, crises and growth*, Cambridge; University of Cambridge press.
10. Rosenau, James. N. 2005. *Globalization, Security and the nation state: the Paradigm in Transition*. Albany: State University of New York.
11. Chatterjee, Deen, and Michael Crausz (eds). 2008. *Globalization, Democracy and Development: Philosophical Perspectives*, Lanahan MD; Rowman and Littlewood
12. Robertson, Robert. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, London: Sage.
13. Featherstone, Mike. (ed.). 1990. *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, London, Sage.
14. Waters, Malcolm. 1995. *Globalization*, L, NY: Routledge.
15. Stern, Nicholas. 2005. *Knowledge Societies*, L-n: Sage.
16. Hurt, Liz. 2012. *Aid, Donors and Corruption: Emerging Issues*, Stockholm: Chr. Michelsen Institute.
17. Coleman, James S. 1973. *The mathematics of collective actions*, Chicago: Aldine.
18. Ferguson, Barry. 2003. *Think again: Power*, Foreign Policy: march-april, pp.18-24
19. Boltansky, Luc and Eve Chiapello. 2005. *The new spirit of capitalism*, L-n, New York: verso.
20. Hasenclever, Andreas, Mayer Peter and Volker Rittberger. 2001. *Integrating Theories of International Regimes*, Review of International Studies, vol.26, №1 (jan.), p.3.
21. Rittberger Volker.(eds.) 1995. *Regime Theory and International relations*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
22. Hasenclever, Andreas, Mayer, Peter and Volker Rittberger. 1997. *Theories of International Regimes. Cambridge Studies in International relations*, Cambridge; University of Cambridge press
23. Schimmer, Tom and Hillman Garnet. (eds). 2018. *Standards-based learning in Action: Moving from theory to practice*, USA; Solution Tree Press.
24. Brown, Chris. 1992. *International Relations Theory: New normative approaches*, NY: CUP
25. Kriegel, Uriah and Kenneth W. Williford (eds). 2006. *Self-representational approaches to Consciousness*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
26. Brahm, Eric, 2005. *International Regimes, Beyond Intractability*, September, http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/international_regimes (accessed 10.03.2019)
27. Ruggie, John G. 1975. *International Responses to Technology – concepts and Trends*. International Organization, 29 (3), pp. 557-583.
28. Krasner, Stephen D (eds.). 1983. *International Regime*, Ithaka, NY: Cornell University Press.
29. Keohane, Robert. O.1984. *International Institutions and State Power. Essays in International relations theory*, Boulder, Westview Press.
30. Kratochwill, Friedrich. 2010. *The Puzzles of Politics: Inquiries into Genesis and Transformation of International Relations (New International Relations)*. L-n, New York: Routledge;
31. Young, Oran. 1998. *Creating Regimes, Arctic Accords and International Governance*, Ithaka, L-n: Cornell University Press.
32. Polowczyk, Pawel. L, 2018. *Organizational ethical Integrity. Good and bad Illusions*, Palgrave communication, 3 (1), pp.1-11 <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321635053> (accessed 10.03.2019)
33. Schmitter, Philippe. and Terry Lynn Carl. 1991. *What democracy is or not is not*, Journal of Democracy, volume 2 (summer), number 3, pp. 75-88
34. Thevenot Laurent. 2001. Pragmatic regimes governing the engagement with the world, in *The Practice turn in Contemporary theory*, edited by Karin Knorr-Cetina, Schatzki Theodore, Savigny Eike von. L-n: Routledge, p. 56-73
35. Campbell, David and Michael .J. Schapiro. 1999. *Moral Spaces: rethinking ethics and world Politics*, Minnesota: Minnesota University Press.

36. Hutchings, Kimberly. 1999. *International political Theory: rethinking Ethics in a Global Era*, L-n: Sage.
37. Keene, Edward, 2005. *International political Thought: a Historical Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
38. Zakaria Patty. 2018. *To tolerate or not tolerate bribery: Can a lack of Control over Corruption Determine Tolerance Levels?* <https://www.oecd.org/corruption/integrity-forum/academic-papers/Zakaria.pdf> (accessed 10.03.2019)
39. Zakaria, Patty. 2013. *Is Compliance an enemy for civil Society, The case of Central and Eastern Europe*, *International Political Science review*, 34(4), 351-371.
40. Lederman, Daniel, Loayza, Norman V. and Rodrigo R. Soares.2006. *Accountability and Compliance: Political Institutions matter*, *Economics and Politics* 17(1), pp. 1-35,
41. La Porta Raphael, Lopez-de-Silanes Florencio, Shleifer Andrei and Robert Vishny. 1999.*The quality of government*, *Journal of Law, Economic and Organization*, 15 (1), 222-279
42. Montinilla, Gabriella R and Robert W. Jackman. 2002, *Sources of Corruption, a cross-country study*, *British journal of political Science*, 32(1) , 147-170
43. Sandholtz, Wayne and Mark M. Gray. 2003. *International Integration and national corruption*, *International organization*, 57(4), 761-800
44. Treisman, Daniel. 2000, *The causes of corruption: a cross-national study*, *Journal of Public Economics*, 76, 399-457
45. Treisman, Daniel. 2007. *What have we learnt about the cases of corruption from ten years of cross-national empirical research*, *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 21-244
46. Kurtz, Markus J. and Andrew Schrunck. 2007. *Growth and Governance, models, measures and mechanisms*, *Journal .of politics*, 69(2), 538-554
47. Alesina, Alberto, Devleerschauer Arnaud, Easterly William, Kurlat Sergio and Romain Wacziarg. 2003. *Fructionalism*, *Journal of economic Growth*, 8 (2), 155-194
48. Torgler, Benno and Neven T. Valev. 2010. *Gender and Public Attitude toward Corruption and Tax Evasion*, *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 28(4), 554-568.
49. Cole, Wade. 2015. *Institutionalizing a Global anti-corruption Regime: perverse effects on country outcomes, 1984-2012*, *International Journal of comparative sociology*, 56 (1), 53-80
50. Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond borders, Transnational advocacy network in International Politics*, Ithaka, NY: Cornell University Press
51. Report on the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures in the R F and the participation of civil society institutions in the implementation of anti-corruption policy for 2013, M., Public Chamber of the R F, 2013
52. Nisnevich, Juliy N. 2017. *Politics and corruption: corruption as a factor in the global political process*, Moscow: Urait.
53. Rassadovskay, Anastasiia and Andrey V. Aistov. 2014. *Corruption Perceptions in Russia: economic or social issue*, Basic research program, Working Paper, Economics WP, BRP, 57/EC/2014;
54. Talapina, Elvira V. 2011. *Anti-corruption informational standard in public administration: approaches to understanding*, *State and Law*, No. 3, pp. 5-15;
55. Moiseev, Vladimir. V. 2014. *Fight against corruption in Russia*, M.: Direct-Media.
56. Rummyantseva, Elena. E.2019. *Anti-corruption*, M: Urait.
57. Okhotsky, Evgeniy. V. 2016. *Anti-corruption measures*, M: Nayka.