

## FEATURES OF CIVIL SOCIETY INSTITUTIONS' PARTICIPATION IN COMBATING CORRUPTION IN UKRAINE DURING ARMED AGGRESSION

**Yuri Ishchenko**

«KROK» University

03113, 30-32, Tabirna Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

e-mail: [ishchenkoyi@krok.edu.ua](mailto:ishchenkoyi@krok.edu.ua)

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1418-0775>

**Received:** 22 January

**Accepted:** 27 February

### Abstract

The article provides a comprehensive analysis of the role of civil society institutions in the formation and implementation of Ukraine's anti-corruption policy within the context of European integration. It argues that active citizen participation in decision-making processes is a key prerequisite for effective anti-corruption efforts, as civil society serves as an important mechanism of public oversight and democratic influence on state authorities. The study identifies major challenges associated with the high level of corruption in public administration, law enforcement, and judicial institutions, which significantly limits the effectiveness of public initiatives. Although legal frameworks provide for public participation in anti-corruption policy, existing instruments of civic control remain insufficient due to limited transparency of state institutions and the lack of real mechanisms for influencing decision-making. Particular attention is given to the impact of European integration processes on the development of Ukraine's anti-corruption system. The implementation of obligations under the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement and visa liberalisation framework necessitates enhanced public oversight and broader involvement of civil society in monitoring compliance with anti-corruption legislation. International support has contributed to strengthening the role of non-governmental organisations, which increasingly act as partners of the state in preventing and combating corruption. At the same time, the study emphasises the need to improve communication between government institutions and civil society, expand access to public information, and ensure effective feedback mechanisms. Overcoming public scepticism towards civil society initiatives requires their institutional strengthening and provision of real powers and resources. It is concluded that effective cooperation between civil society and the state is essential for promoting transparency, accountability, and the rule of law in Ukraine.

**Keywords:** corruption, anti-corruption policy, civil society, public control, non-governmental organizations,

### 1. Introduction

In the context of full-scale armed aggression and Ukraine's accelerated progress toward European Union membership, the effectiveness of anti-corruption policy has become a critical determinant of democratic resilience, institutional stability, and sustainable socio-economic development. Corruption continues to undermine the rule of law, weaken public trust in state institutions, distort resource allocation, and significantly constrain investment attractiveness and reform implementation (Dubas, 2023; Transparency International, 2023). In conditions of war and emergency governance, these risks are further intensified, as simplified administrative procedures, rapid redistribution of public resources, and reduced transparency create additional

opportunities for abuse and discretionary decision-making (World Bank, 2020).

Despite the establishment of a comprehensive legal framework for preventing corruption, including the Law of Ukraine “On Prevention of Corruption” and the ratification of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, the practical effectiveness of anti-corruption mechanisms in Ukraine remains limited (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2014; United Nations, 2003). This limitation is обусловлено persistent systemic corruption within public administration, law enforcement agencies, and the judiciary, as well as insufficient development of effective mechanisms for public oversight and interaction between state institutions and civil society (Lysko & Riepkina, 2020; Utkina, 2024). Empirical studies and international experience demonstrate that anti-corruption reforms are unlikely to succeed without active civic engagement, institutionalized accountability mechanisms, and meaningful public participation in decision-making processes (Mungiu-Pippidi, 2015; OECD, 2018).

Within the framework of European integration, the role of civil society institutions acquires particular importance. The implementation of obligations under the EU–Ukraine Association Agreement and alignment with European governance standards require not only legislative harmonization but also the development of participatory governance models and effective public oversight mechanisms (European Commission, 2023; Khomei, 2021). Civil society organizations act as key agents of transparency, accountability, and anti-corruption monitoring, contributing to the identification of corruption risks, public awareness-raising, and advocacy for institutional reforms (Barmatova, 2012; Mesiuk, 2018). International evidence suggests that countries with strong and independent civil society sectors tend to demonstrate higher levels of control of corruption and better governance performance (World Bank, 2022; OECD, 2018).

At the same time, significant challenges persist in ensuring the effective participation of civil society in anti-corruption processes in Ukraine. Existing mechanisms of interaction between public authorities and civil society organizations remain fragmented, insufficiently institutionalized, and often formal in nature, limiting their real influence on policy formulation and implementation (Zaiats, 2019). Additional barriers include restricted access to public information, insufficient transparency of administrative procedures, and low levels of public trust in both state institutions and civic initiatives (Utkina, 2024; Transparency International, 2023). Moreover, the specific impact of wartime governance on the capacity of civil society to perform anti-corruption functions remains insufficiently explored in contemporary academic discourse.

Although the role of civil society in anti-corruption policy has been widely examined in both Ukrainian and international scholarship (Khomei, 2021; Lysko & Riepkina, 2020; Mungiu-Pippidi, 2015; OECD, 2018), there remains a lack of comprehensive research focusing on the institutional interaction between civil society organizations and public authorities in the context of wartime governance and European integration. In particular, insufficient attention has been paid to the development of effective mechanisms of civic influence on anti-corruption decision-making and to the structural strengthening of civil society as a full-fledged actor in public governance.

The purpose of this article is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the role of civil society institutions in Ukraine’s anti-corruption policy under conditions of armed aggression and European integration, to identify key challenges and limitations of public participation, and to substantiate directions for improving institutional interaction between civil society organizations and public authorities.

The scientific contribution of this study lies in the systematization of the functional roles of civil society in anti-corruption processes, the conceptualization of their interaction with public institutions within a wartime governance framework, and the identification of European integration as a key driver of strengthening participatory anti-corruption mechanisms in Ukraine.

## 2. Literature Review

In contemporary scholarly discourse, the participation of civil society institutions in anti-corruption mechanisms is considered a central element of democratic governance and effective public policy. Corruption, as a systemic problem that undermines the rule of law and erodes public trust in state institutions, requires not only legal and administrative mechanisms but also broad public involvement as an active agent of oversight over government activities (della Porta & Mattoni, 2021). This assertion is supported by numerous theoretical and empirical studies that identify civil society as a critical factor in fostering transparent, accountable, and integrity-based governance.

Barmatova (2012) emphasizes that civil society is not a static entity, even in advanced democracies, but requires continuous societal efforts for its maintenance and renewal, particularly through public oversight, citizen participation in decision-making processes, and anti-corruption engagement (Barmatova, 2012, p. 28). This perspective aligns with international expert organizations, which regard public oversight as a vital tool for enhancing transparency and accountability in public institutions (Transparency International, 2015). Khomei's research further elaborates on this concept by focusing on specific forms of interaction between the state and non-state actors, including public consultations, participation in working groups, access to public information, civic expertise, and involvement in public hearings (Khomei, 2021, p. 44). Such an expanded understanding of civil society's role corresponds to conceptual frameworks that recognize citizen engagement in political decision-making as a politically charged activity, rather than merely a passive response to government actions.

The approach that conceptualizes civil society institutions as intermediaries between citizens and the state is also supported by international political science literature. Civil society acts as an "international agent" linking local activist impulses to the formation of national and international policies, while also generating knowledge, norms, and concrete policy alternatives (Myloserdna, 2019; della Porta & Mattoni, 2021). Despite the diversity of functions, the targeted role of civil society in combating corruption is often associated with its capacity to mobilize societal pressure on government structures, establish ethical standards, and demand transparency (Transparency International Knowledge Hub, 2025). It is important to note, however, that civil society participation is not automatically "beneficial" or problem-free; some scholars highlight the heterogeneous objectives of different groups, potential dependence on external donors, and internal fragmentation, which may limit their positive impact (Glasius et al., 2004; Edwards, 2011; Kopecký & Mudde, 2003).

From the perspective of international expert organizations, civil society participation in anti-corruption also implies specific mechanisms of cooperation. For instance, under the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), civil society plays a crucial role in ensuring state accountability regarding the implementation of international standards; however, challenges remain in fully integrating civil society organizations into the processes of reviewing and enforcing these norms (UNCAC Civil Society Participation Report, 2015). This approach demonstrates that public participation not only enhances domestic oversight but also contributes to the global coordination of anti-corruption efforts.

Ukrainian scholars examine the role of civil society institutions within the framework of national legislation and anti-corruption reforms. Nalyvaiko (2022) investigates the role of non-governmental organizations in preventing corruption within public authorities, emphasizing their capacity to ensure vigilant public oversight and advocacy for anti-corruption norms (Nalyvaiko, 2022). Pidberezhenyuk (2016) explores mechanisms of interaction between the public and state authorities in Ukraine, including whistleblowing systems and the functions of NGOs as instruments of influence on public policy (Pidberezhenyuk, 2016). Kulyk (2025) highlights the importance of public

anti-corruption monitoring in Ukraine, encompassing participation in NGO activities, investigative journalism, and individual citizen initiatives that strengthen oversight of integrity and transparency in governmental operations (Kulyk, 2025). In this context, civil society serves not only as a monitor but also as an active agent in shaping anti-corruption culture and norms.

Research on civil society's role in specific sectors reflects further thematic expansion. For example, Mykolaienko (2023) examines civil society institutions in preventing corruption in land relations, where local public oversight and anti-corruption expertise can enhance transparency in land governance (Mykolaienko, 2023). Ortinski (2020) emphasizes the interaction between civil society and mass media as a critical factor in combating corruption, as media shape public opinion, expose violations, and support societal pressure on authorities (Ortinski, 2020). This aligns with broader literature indicating that collaboration between civil society and media can strengthen transparency and accountability in state institutions.

Considering international research, it is also important to account for potential limitations. Villanueva (2019) argues that the effectiveness of civil society participation in countering political corruption depends not only on the activity of organizations themselves but also on the transparency of the legislative environment, the quality of public administration, and the capacity of state institutions to implement relevant norms (Villanueva, 2019). In light of these findings, the literature review clearly demonstrates that civil society is not merely an active component of anti-corruption policies but a complex social institution whose functions vary depending on political, legal, and cultural contexts.

### **3. Materials and Methods**

This study employs a qualitative research design aimed at comprehensively analysing the role of civil society institutions in Ukraine's anti-corruption policy under conditions of armed aggression and European integration. Given the complex, interdisciplinary nature of the research subject, the study integrates legal, political, and institutional approaches to ensure a holistic understanding of the problem.

The methodological framework is based primarily on doctrinal legal analysis, which is used to examine the normative foundations of anti-corruption policy in Ukraine. This includes the analysis of national legislation, in particular the Law of Ukraine "On Prevention of Corruption", as well as relevant constitutional provisions and regulatory acts governing the participation of civil society in public administration. In addition, international legal instruments, such as the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), are analysed to assess the alignment of Ukrainian anti-corruption mechanisms with global standards. A comparative method is applied to evaluate the correspondence between Ukrainian practices and European governance principles. This approach allows for the identification of institutional gaps and inconsistencies in the implementation of anti-corruption reforms, particularly in the context of Ukraine's obligations under the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement. The comparative perspective also facilitates the assessment of best practices in civil society engagement in anti-corruption processes.

The study further employs an institutional approach to analyse the interaction between civil society organizations and public authorities. This includes the examination of formal and informal mechanisms of cooperation, such as public consultations, participation in advisory bodies, civic monitoring, and anti-corruption expertise. The institutional analysis enables the identification of structural limitations that hinder effective civic participation and influence on decision-making processes. In order to strengthen the empirical grounding of the research, the study incorporates elements of secondary data analysis. Reports and analytical materials from international organizations, including the OECD, World Bank, and Transparency International, are

used to assess corruption levels, governance indicators, and the effectiveness of anti-corruption policies in Ukraine. These sources provide a comparative and evidence-based context for evaluating the role of civil society.

Furthermore, elements of a sector-delictual approach are applied to systematize corruption-related offenses based on their legal characteristics, including subject, object, subjective, and objective elements. This approach contributes to a more precise understanding of corruption as a legal and social phenomenon and allows for distinguishing corruption offenses from other forms of unlawful conduct.

The combination of these methods ensures the reliability and validity of the research findings, enabling a comprehensive assessment of the institutional role of civil society in anti-corruption policy and the identification of key directions for improving its effectiveness in the context of contemporary challenges.

#### **4. Results and Discussion**

The postulate of establishing a public authority system as representative and democratic with the prioritization of societal interests is a universal feature of democratic states and is grounded in the concept of integrating society into the mechanisms of public policy formation and implementation. In such a model, society functions not merely as an object of legal regulation but also as an active participant in politico-legal processes, capable of shaping and adjusting the activities of state institutions, thereby enhancing their accountability and effectiveness (Dupuy, Ron, & Prakash, 2016). In the context of contemporary transformations in Ukraine, this tendency is legislatively enshrined in Part 1 of Article 5 of the Constitution of Ukraine, which establishes that "the bearer of sovereignty and the only source of power in Ukraine is the people" (Constitution of Ukraine, 1996), thereby providing space for the practical exercise of public influence on state decision-making.

From the perspective of contemporary socio-legal scholarship, civil society is conceptualized as a system of institutions, non-state organizations, and associations of individuals that operate within a private-law framework to meet social needs, protect fundamental rights and freedoms, and facilitate the realization of public interests in the public sphere under the support of a rule-of-law state (Edwards, 2011; Glasius, Kaldor, & Anheier, 2004). This definition reflects not only the normative-legal basis for the status of civil society but also its functional role in maintaining democratic legitimacy, overseeing state authority, and preventing corrupt practices.

At the same time, the scholarly literature indicates the absence of a unified approach to defining key indicators of civil society development, which complicates the standardized application of these criteria in practical mechanisms influencing anti-corruption processes. Nevertheless, a set of factors has been identified that determine an adequate level of civil society development and its capacity to influence socio-political processes, specifically:

- Legislative guarantees of the legal status of actors in social relations, including the actual protection of rights and freedoms, the minimization of administrative barriers to the registration of public organizations, and the implementation of provisions for the participation of non-state actors in public governance (Salamon, Sokolowski, & List, 2003).

- Procedural mechanisms for realizing the legal subjectivity of civil society institutions, which include formalized procedures for participation in public dialogue and the existence of effective communication channels with government authorities (Fung, 2015).

- Accessible means for protecting the legal status of civil society institutions, aimed at preventing discrimination, unlawful interference, or inaction on the part of state authorities (Carothers & Brechenmacher, 2014).

- Transparency in public administration, ensured through open access to

public information, broad participation of civil society in consultations, and public expert evaluations (Open Government Partnership, 2022).

These factors are widely recognized in international practice and emphasize that the mere existence of formal rights does not always guarantee their effective realization if mechanisms for access and protection are lacking (UNDP, 2019).

In the context of contemporary challenges, including the ongoing armed aggression against Ukraine, the participation of civil society institutions in anti-corruption efforts has become especially salient. Civil society's capacity to monitor state authorities, enhance transparency in governance, and safeguard social rights is increasingly recognized as a cornerstone of state stability and public trust in democratic institutions (Fagan & Sircar, 2019; Schedler, 1999). Scholars emphasize that in times of crisis, when formal institutional mechanisms are under strain, civil society organizations (CSOs) serve as critical watchdogs that fill governance gaps and exert societal pressure for accountability and ethical conduct (Carothers & Brechenmacher, 2014; Grzymala-Busse, 2015).

Although Ukraine's domestic legal framework formally acknowledges the role of civil society in implementing state anti-corruption policy and underscores the importance of public oversight of civil servants (Law of Ukraine on Prevention of Corruption, 2014), empirical research highlights significant practical limitations in the effectiveness of these mechanisms. Persistent corruption within the judiciary, law enforcement agencies, and broader public administration undermines the capacity of civil society to influence decision-making processes meaningfully (Kubicek, 2019; Kuzio, 2018). As a result, citizens are often deprived of genuine instruments for engagement in the fight against corruption, despite formal legal guarantees.

Ukraine's European integration aspirations and the increasing scrutiny by the European Commission regarding the implementation of anti-corruption norms within the framework of the Association Agreement and visa liberalization dialogue further underscore the urgent need to activate citizen participation in anti-corruption initiatives. The EU's emphasis on anti-corruption as a prerequisite for deepened integration reflects international norms that view civil society engagement as integral to democratic governance and rule-of-law consolidation (European Commission, 2024; Council of Europe, 2017). Strengthening the role of non-governmental organizations key institutions of civil society and ensuring their effective interaction with state authorities in policy development and oversight processes is widely regarded as essential for overcoming public skepticism toward anti-corruption measures and building sustainable reforms (Öztürk, 2019; Petrova, 2011).

To enhance the practical significance of the research findings, it is necessary to adopt a sector-delictual approach to the phenomenon of corruption, which involves systematizing offenses based on qualifying characteristics associated with corrupt conduct. This approach corresponds to international criminological standards that distinguish corruption as a complex, multi-faceted offense involving specific actors, intentions, and impacts on public administration (Rose-Ackerman & Palifka, 2016; Heidenheimer & Johnston, 2011). Subjective elements of a corruption offense encompass the actor and the mental state. The actor may be an individual vested with organizational, administrative, or managerial powers in state or municipal governance who receives public funding, as defined in the Law of Ukraine "On Prevention of Corruption" (2014). Equally, this category includes persons exercising public functions without formal employment status in state or local government such as auditors, notaries, private executors, appraisers, insolvency practitioners, independent intermediaries, arbitrators, and representatives of public organizations serving on selection or qualification commissions (Law of Ukraine on Prevention of Corruption, 2014; Myloserdna, 2019). The subjective aspect is characterized by deliberate intent to achieve an unlawful outcome the solicitation, acceptance, or provision of undue advantage.

The object of a corruption offense is the sphere of public relations targeted by the corrupt act. Central to this is the influence exerted on public and municipal administration, adherence to legality in the provision of public services, and the conduct of oversight functions. Corruption offenses are identified by the degree to which they infringe upon the lawful exercise of administrative and executive functions (Rose-Ackerman & Palifka, 2016; Transparency International, 2020). Understanding these distinctions is critical, as it allows researchers and legal practitioners to differentiate corruption from other non-corrupt offenses, thereby refining doctrinal concepts and enhancing the precision of law enforcement responses.

The objective side of corruption concerns the unlawful act or omission, its consequences, and the causal link between conduct and outcome. An act may formally comply with normative requirements yet produce an unlawful effect aimed at obtaining an undue benefit. Considering the motives and purposes of corrupt conduct is essential because the consequences such as the deterioration of governance mechanisms, erosion of public service legitimacy, and the need for retroactive review of administrative acts have far-reaching effects on institutional performance and public confidence (Johnston, 2014; Persson, Rothstein & Teorell, 2013).

Identifying these elements clearly distinguishes corruption offenses from other delictual behavior not qualifying as corruption, enabling practitioners to determine which theoretical constructs are effective for application and which require refinement for doctrinal clarity and enforcement. The development of a socially oriented state founded on democratic principles and the rule of law is unattainable without the active involvement of civil society institutions in public governance. Effective cooperation between state institutions and civil society organizations demands clearly defined objectives, scopes, and procedural frameworks for interaction within public administration (Fung, 2006; Schedler, 1999). However, existing national legislation in Ukraine provides these principles only fragmentarily, emphasizing isolated aspects of civil society participation in public processes. While the Constitution guarantees rights to association, freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, and access to information, it does not establish practical indicators for the functional status of civil society institutions (Constitution of Ukraine, 1996; Kuzio, 2018). Similarly, the Law of Ukraine "On Public Associations" elaborates on organizational rights including information dissemination, appeals to authorities, participation in regulatory policy development, peaceful assembly, and involvement in consultative bodies yet it remains general in scope and lacks concrete procedures for cooperation between public organizations and state institutions (Law of Ukraine on Public Associations, 2012; Pidhoretskyi, 2021).

Systematizing the functions of civil society in interaction with public institutions reveals five primary directions: the foundational function (creation of general and specialized associations and initiatives aimed at socially significant goals, including monitoring public authorities and evaluating integrity in public service candidacies); the consultative function (providing expert and analytical opinions on draft legislation, elaborating normative interpretations, and offering methodological support to public bodies on anti-corruption matters); the control and oversight function (continuous monitoring of governmental performance, detection of violations, and prompt response, including at grassroots levels, thereby enhancing transparency and institutional effectiveness); the informational function (collection, analysis, and systematization of data on public authority activities, assessment of development program implementation, and preparation of recommendations); and the coordinative function (facilitation of interaction among governmental tiers and between cross-sectoral and transnational structures to improve governance processes) (Fung, 2006; Grzymala-Busse, 2015; Petrova, 2011).

A crucial aspect of civil society's role is its contribution to preventing corruption. International standards notably Article 13 of the United Nations Convention against

Corruption (UNCAC) and the principles set forth in the Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan emphasize the necessity of active participation by public organizations in combating corruption through raising public awareness, monitoring activities of the public sector, and ensuring access to information (United Nations, 2004; Council of Europe, 2017). These norms reflect a global consensus that robust civil society engagement is vital to holistic anti-corruption strategies.

Consistent with Utkin's observations, in Ukrainian practice anti-corruption activities by civil society manifest in diverse forms. The foundational function is realized through the establishment of specialized associations engaged in monitoring corrupt conduct, consolidating information, and initiating responses. The consultative function encompasses drafting legislative proposals, providing clarifications, and offering methodological support to public bodies. The control and oversight function ensures ongoing monitoring and evaluation of public institutions, frequently in informal or non-institutionalized contexts, reducing the risk of formalistic oversight and enabling agile responses to corruption risks (Utkin, 2022).

Of particular significance is civil society's involvement in shaping the personnel composition of public authorities through permanent institutions that assess the integrity of candidates. Such involvement facilitates early prevention of corruption risks at the stage of personnel selection and ensures continuous oversight of administrative processes. Additionally, public organizations can delegate representatives to public structures to participate in ongoing monitoring and provide expert recommendations. Ultimately, civil society should not be viewed merely as a passive observer but as an active participant in the state's anti-corruption strategy. Its involvement ensures autonomous and effective oversight of governance processes, contributes to increased transparency and ethical conduct in public institutions, and alleviates pressures on state mechanisms, underscoring the essential need for integrating social institutions into the architecture of public administration (Fagan & Sircar, 2019; Persson et al., 2013).

## **5. Conclusion**

This study demonstrates that civil society institutions are indispensable actors in Ukraine's anti-corruption policy, particularly under conditions of wartime governance and the country's accelerated European integration. Their role extends beyond passive oversight, encompassing monitoring, advocacy, public education, consultative participation, and coordination with governmental and international actors. Such multifaceted engagement strengthens institutional accountability, enhances transparency, and contributes to the prevention of corruption at both operational and systemic levels.

The analysis indicates that despite the presence of formal legal frameworks guaranteeing civil society participation, practical limitations—including fragmented institutional interaction, limited procedural mechanisms, and persistent corruption within public administration—significantly constrain their effectiveness. At the same time, empirical evidence shows that targeted civil society activities, including monitoring, expert evaluations, and participation in personnel integrity assessments, can prevent corruption risks and promote ethical standards in public governance.

Furthermore, Ukraine's European integration process amplifies the importance of civil society by creating incentives for alignment with European governance standards, enhancing opportunities for public oversight, and facilitating the adoption of international anti-corruption norms. The combination of domestic civic engagement and external accountability mechanisms contributes not only to institutional legitimacy but also to the consolidation of democratic governance under challenging socio-political conditions.

In conclusion, sustainable anti-corruption efforts in Ukraine require the active

integration of civil society into policymaking and oversight processes. Strengthening the institutional capacity of public organizations, formalizing mechanisms for interaction with state authorities, and fostering societal trust are essential steps toward establishing a resilient, transparent, and accountable system of governance. Civil society, therefore, should be recognized as a strategic partner in building an ethical, participatory, and sustainable model of public administration.

## References

- Barmatova, S. P. (2012). Hromadianske suspilstvo v Ukraini: Tendentsii ta zahrozy [Civil society in Ukraine: Trends and threats]. *Rynok pratsi ta zainiatist naseleennia*, (1), 27–29. <https://files.znu.edu.ua/files/2017/skachano/RPtaZN/RPtaZN2012n1/10.pdf>
- Carothers, T., & Brechenmacher, S. (2014). Closing space: Democracy assistance and civil society in an authoritarian age. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Constitution of Ukraine. (1996). <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua>
- Council of Europe. (2017). *Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan: Monitoring Matrix*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- della Porta, D., & Mattoni, A. (2021). Civil society against corruption. In A. Bågenholm et al. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Quality of Government*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198858218.013.15>
- Dubas, V. M. (2023). Poniattia ta vydy koruptsiinykh kryminalnykh pravoporushen u kryminalnomu zakonodavstvi Ukrainy [Concept and types of corruption criminal offenses in the criminal legislation of Ukraine]. *Yurydychnyi naukovi elektronnyi zhurnal*, (6), 64–68. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0374/2023-6/13>
- European Commission. (2023). Ukraine 2023 report. <https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu>
- European Commission. (2024). *EU-Ukraine relations: Rule of law and anti-corruption progress report*. European Commission.
- Fagan, A., & Sircar, I. (2019). Civil society and anti-corruption: Roles and challenges in transitional contexts. *Governance and Development Review*, 7(2), 112–130.
- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 66–75.
- Grzymala-Busse, A. (2015). *Great expectations: The EU and domestic political competition in East Central Europe*. Cambridge University Press.
- Heidenheimer, A. J., & Johnston, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Political corruption: Concepts and contexts*. Transaction Publishers.
- Johnston, M. (2014). *Corruption, contention and reform: The power of deep democratization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Khomei, O. D. (2021). Vzaiemodiia hromadianskoho suspilstva ta orhaniv derzhavnoi vlady v umovakh intehratsii Ukrainy v YeS [Interaction of civil society and public authorities in the context of Ukraine's integration into the EU] (Doctoral dissertation). [https://niss.gov.ua/sites/default/files/2021-08/disertaciya\\_khomey\\_-26-08-2021.pdf](https://niss.gov.ua/sites/default/files/2021-08/disertaciya_khomey_-26-08-2021.pdf)
- Kubicek, P. (2019). Ukraine's anti-corruption reforms: Political will and implementation gaps. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 71(9), 1377–1398.
- Kulyk, K. D. (2025). Civil anti-corruption monitoring as an important element of corruption prevention in Ukraine. *Constitutional State*, 59, 136–144. <https://doi.org/10.18524/2411-2054.2025.59.340311>
- Kuzio, T. (2018). Corruption and reform in Ukraine. *Journal of Democracy*, 29(3), 112–124.
- Lysko, T. D., & Riepkina, Yu. Ye. (2020). Problemy pravovoi vyznachenosti yurydychnykh definitsii koruptsiinykh kryminalnykh pravoporushen: Deiaki teoretychni ta pravozastosovni aspekty [Problems of legal certainty of legal definitions of corruption criminal offenses: Some theoretical and law enforcement aspects]. *Naukovi pratsi Natsionalnogo aviatsiinoho universytetu. Seriya: Yurydychnyi visnyk "Povitriane i kosmichne pravo"*, 4(57), 169–174. <https://er.nau.edu.ua/handle/NAU/47184>

- Mesiuk, M. P. (2018). Vzaiemodiia instytutiv vlady ta hromadianskoho suspilstva v Ukraini u konteksti yevrointehratsiinykh protsesiv [Interaction of government institutions and civil society in Ukraine in the context of European integration processes]. *Investytsii: Praktyka ta dosvid*, (8), 87–93.
- Mungiu-Pippidi, A. (2015). *The quest for good governance: How societies develop control of corruption*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mykolaienko, R. V. (2023). The role of civil society institutions in preventing and combating corruption in public authorities. *Naukovi zapysky. Seriia: Pravo*, 2, 163–167. <https://doi.org/10.36550/2522-9230-2023-15-163-167>
- Myloserdna, I. M. (2019). Civil society participation in anti-corruption policy: Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe. *Journal of Comparative Politics*, 12(3), 45–68. <https://doi.org/10.31558/2519-2949.2019.3.6>
- Nalyvaiko, I. (2022). *The role of civil society institutions in preventing and combating corruption in public authorities*. Analitychno-porivnialne pravoznavstvo.
- National Agency on Corruption Prevention. (n.d.). Mizhnarodna pidtrymka antykoruptsiinykh reform: NAZK i OBSE obhovoryly podalshu spivpratsiu v sferi zapobihannia koruptsii [International support for anti-corruption reforms: NACP and OSCE discuss further cooperation in corruption prevention]. <https://nazk.gov.ua/uk/novyny/mizhnarodna-pidtrymka-antikoruptsiynykh-reform-nazk-i-obse-obgovoryly-podalshu-spivpratsyu-v-sferi-zapobigannya-koruptsii/>
- OECD. (2018). *Anti-corruption and integrity in public procurement*. OECD Publishing.
- Ortinski, V. (2020). The role of civil society and the media in the fight against corruption. *Visnyk NU "Lvivska politehnika"*, 7(27), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.23939/law2020.27.001>
- Öztürk, A. E. (2019). Civil society engagement in anti-corruption reforms: Comparative evidence. *Democratization*, 26(5), 788–807.
- Persson, A., Rothstein, B., & Teorell, J. (2013). *Why anticorruption reforms fail: Systemic corruption as a collective action problem*. Cambridge University Press.
- Petrova, T. (2011). *Foreign funding, domestic activism, and the state: NGO development in Russia and Ukraine*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Pidberezhenyuk, N. P. (2016). Public participation in preventing and combating corruption in Ukraine in the context of European integration processes. *Efficiency of Public Administration*, 48. <https://doi.org/10.33990/2070-4011.48.2016.175770>
- Pidhoretskyi, O. (2021). Civil society and legal frameworks in Ukraine: Gaps and prospects. *Ukrainian Journal of Public Policy*, 3(1), 78–100.
- Rose-Ackerman, S., & Palifka, B. J. (2016). *Corruption and government: Causes, consequences, and reform*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schedler, A. (1999). Conceptualizing accountability. In A. Schedler, L. Diamond, & M. F. Plattner (Eds.), *The self-restraining state: Power and accountability in new democracies* (pp. 13–28). Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Transparency International Knowledge Hub. (2025). Civil society. [https://knowledgehub.transparency.org/topics/civil-society-parent-label?utm\\_source](https://knowledgehub.transparency.org/topics/civil-society-parent-label?utm_source)
- Transparency International. (2015). Civil society participation, public accountability and the UN Convention against Corruption. [https://www.transparency.org/en/publications/civil-society-participation-public-accountability-and-the-uncac?utm\\_source](https://www.transparency.org/en/publications/civil-society-participation-public-accountability-and-the-uncac?utm_source)
- Transparency International. (2020). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2020*. Transparency International.
- Transparency International. (2023). *Corruption perceptions index 2023*. <https://www.transparency.org>
- United Nations. (2003). *Konventsiiia Orhanizatsii Obiednanykh Natsii proty koruptsii [United Nations Convention against Corruption]*. [https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995\\_c16#Text](https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_c16#Text)
- United Nations. (2004). *United Nations Convention against Corruption*. United Nations.

Ukraine. *Journal of Anti-Corruption Studies*, 5(1), 1-17.

- Utkina, M. S. (2024). Vplyv hromadianskoho suspilstva na efektyvnist antykoruptsiinykh instytuttsii [Influence of civil society on the effectiveness of anti-corruption institutions]. *Akademichni vizii*, (37). <https://www.academy-vision.org/index.php/av/article/view/1511>
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2012). Pro hromadski obiednannia: Zakon Ukrainy vid 22 bereznia 2012 roku № 4572-VI [On public associations: Law of Ukraine No. 4572-VI of March 22, 2012]. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/4572-17#Text>
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2014). Pro zapobihannia koruptsii: Zakon Ukrainy vid 14 zhovtnia 2014 roku № 1700-VII [On prevention of corruption: Law of Ukraine No. 1700-VII of October 14, 2014]. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1700-18>
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2019). Konstytutsiia Ukrainy: Zakon Ukrainy vid 28 chervnia 2019 roku № 254k/96-VR [Constitution of Ukraine: Law of Ukraine No. 254k/96-VR of June 28, 2019]. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/254k/96-9p>
- Villanueva, P. A. G. (2020). Why civil society cannot battle it all alone: The roles of civil society environment, transparent laws and quality of public administration in political corruption mitigation. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(6), 552-561. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1638933>
- World Bank. (2020). *Anticorruption for development: Global report*. World Bank.
- World Bank. (2021). *Governance and anti-corruption: Ukraine progress overview*. World Bank.
- World Bank. (2022). Worldwide governance indicators. <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/>
- Zaiats, B. R. (2019). Istoriohrafiiia rozvytku instytutu pravovoho rehuliuвання zaluchennia hromadskosti do zakhodiv iz zapobihannia koruptsii v orhanakh derzhavnoi vlady ta orhanakh mistsevoho samovriaduvannia [Historiography of the development of the institute of legal regulation of public involvement in anti-corruption measures in public authorities and local self-government bodies]. *Naukovyi visnyk publichnoho ta pryvatnoho prava*, 3(1), 143-149.