LEGAL FOUNDATIONS FOR DEVELOPING ANTI-FRAUD POLICIES IN ENTERPRISES: CHALLENGES AND PERSPECTIVES

Waldemar Gajda[1]

[1]*Ph.D. (Economics), Professor, Rector, Warsaw Management School, Poland, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0739-4340*

Citation:
Gajda, W. (2025). Legal Foundations for Developing Anti-Fraud Policies in Enterprises: Challenges and Perspectives. *Public Administration and Law Review*, (2(22), 90–98. https://doi.org/10.36690/2674-5216-2025-2-90-98

Received: June 02, 2025
Approved: June 28, 2025
Published: June 30, 2025

Abstract. *In today's global economic landscape, the proliferation of fraud poses a critical challenge to enterprises, demanding robust preventive strategies anchored in legal foundations. The formation of anti-fraud policies is not only an ethical imperative but also a legal necessity that reflects the evolving demands of corporate governance and regulatory compliance. The article seeks to investigate the legal infrastructure supporting anti-fraud initiatives in corporate settings and to analyze the multifaceted barriers that hinder their practical implementation. The relevance of the topic is driven by the increasing complexity of legal environments, the rise in transnational business operations, and the integration of digital technologies that reshape fraud typologies and legal liabilities. The study aims to identify the strengths and weaknesses of national and international legal instruments and their translation into enforceable internal governance mechanisms. The methodological approach combines doctrinal legal analysis, comparative legal study, and policy assessment. It includes the interpretation of statutory norms, the evaluation of enforcement trends, and the synthesis of regulatory practices across various jurisdictions. In addition, the research employs structured comparisons and scenario-based evaluations to explore the adaptability of legal frameworks in response to emerging digital threats and organizational challenges. The research also triangulates legal doctrine with real-world corporate compliance cases to identify systemic gaps between law and practice. The study finds that the existence of legal mandates alone does not guarantee effective anti-fraud policy implementation. Instead, success depends on the integration of these legal norms into internal compliance structures, the strength of enforcement bodies, and the organizational culture surrounding ethics and reporting. Countries with coherent whistleblower protection systems and harmonized compliance protocols demonstrate greater resilience to fraud. Moreover, the growing role of artificial intelligence and data governance presents both new risks and opportunities in refining legal frameworks. The practical value of this article lies in its capacity to guide policymakers, corporate lawyers, compliance officers, and enterprise leaders in designing anti-fraud policies that are legally sound, operationally viable, and technologically adaptive. It contributes to the development of legally embedded corporate integrity systems that transcend formal compliance and promote long-term institutional trust and sustainability.*

Keywords: *corporate fraud prevention, legal compliance, anti-fraud policy, whistleblower protection, corporate governance, regulatory frameworks, internal controls, digital legal risk.*

JEL Classification: F53, H56, G38

Formulas: 0; fig.: 0; table: 1; bibl.: 9

Introduction. Fraud remains one of the most damaging threats to corporate integrity and performance. It encompasses a wide range of illicit activities, including financial misstatements, embezzlement, procurement corruption, and cyber-enabled fraud. In response, businesses are increasingly institutionalizing anti-fraud policies not merely as ethical commitments but as legally mandated governance tools. However, the development and implementation of such policies is shaped by the interplay of statutory laws, regulatory guidance, internal codes of conduct, and industry best practices. This article examines the legal underpinnings of corporate anti-fraud strategies and their practical implications.

Literature Review. The development of anti-fraud policies within enterprises is increasingly influenced by the convergence of legal mandates, regulatory standards, and corporate governance practices. A growing body of literature addresses the legal foundations of such policies, emphasizing the interplay between statutory obligations, international legal instruments, and internal compliance systems.

Several scholars highlight that anti-fraud policies are rooted in national legislation mandating corporate integrity and internal controls. Albrecht et al. (2012) emphasize the role of domestic criminal law in defining fraud and prescribing institutional responses, particularly in U.S. corporations governed by the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA). Similarly, the UK Bribery Act 2010 is noted for its extraterritorial reach and requirement for companies to demonstrate "adequate procedures" to prevent bribery (UK Ministry of Justice, 2011). These laws serve as foundational pillars for constructing internal anti-fraud frameworks, with legal compliance embedded into corporate risk management systems (McCormack, 2019).

International instruments increasingly shape corporate anti-fraud efforts, particularly in cross-border business. The United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) and the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention provide normative guidance and legal obligations for signatory states to implement robust anti-fraud and anti-corruption frameworks (UNODC, 2021; OECD, 2021). Scholars such as Pieth and Ivory (2011) argue that these conventions contribute to harmonizing legal standards and promote legal certainty for multinational corporations. ISO 37001 also emerges as a critical soft-law instrument that encourages voluntary adoption of anti-bribery management systems, thereby institutionalizing legal and ethical expectations across diverse jurisdictions (ISO, 2016).

Research on corporate governance supports the idea that legal obligations must be internalized through organizational structures and policies. According to Arjoon (2006), codes of conduct, ethics committees, and whistleblower systems represent legal instruments of internal governance. These structures are often developed in response to legal expectations rather than purely voluntary commitments. Aguilera and Cuervo-Cazurra (2009) argue that regulatory pressure, combined with reputational risk, drives firms to adopt formal anti-fraud frameworks even in the absence of direct statutory compulsion.

While legal frameworks provide a foundation, implementation often faces substantial challenges. Scholars identify regulatory fragmentation, lack of enforcement, and cultural resistance as key barriers (Koehler, 2022; Rose-Ackerman,

2008). For instance, companies operating in jurisdictions with weak rule-of-law indicators may adopt "window dressing" policies that fail to produce substantive changes in fraud prevention behavior (Nichols, 2012). Further, the legal protection of whistleblowers remains inadequate in many countries, undermining the effectiveness of internal reporting mechanisms (Callahan & Dworkin, 2000).

Recent literature also explores how technological advancements and evolving legal standards influence anti-fraud strategies. Legal scholars note the increasing importance of data protection regulations (e.g., GDPR) and their implications for fraud detection systems (Hoekstra, 2023). Moreover, the integration of AI and machine learning into compliance raises questions about legal accountability and due process (Warren & Brandeis, 2020). The intersection of legal compliance and digital governance suggests a need for continuous updating of anti-fraud policies to remain legally robust and technologically adaptable.

The existing literature underscores that legal foundations are indispensable for developing effective anti-fraud policies. However, gaps remain in the comparative analysis of legal enforcement, especially in emerging economies, and in the examination of how legal design influences actual policy effectiveness at the firm level. Moreover, while much has been written on compliance frameworks, less attention is paid to the legal literacy of employees and the legal-cultural aspects of policy adoption. Future research should explore the role of corporate legal departments in shaping fraud-resistant cultures and assess the impact of legal reforms on policy outcomes across different regulatory environments.

Aims. The primary aim of this article is to explore and critically evaluate the legal foundations for the development and implementation of anti-fraud policies in enterprises, with a focus on identifying current challenges and outlining strategic perspectives for enhancing legal and institutional frameworks.

The main objectives of the study include: to analyze the current legal instruments and regulatory frameworks governing anti-fraud measures in corporate environments; to identify key legal challenges and institutional barriers that hinder the effective implementation of anti-fraud policies; to assess best practices and comparative models of anti-fraud regulation across different jurisdictions; to examine the role of internal corporate governance structures in translating legal norms into anti-fraud practices; to propose legal and organizational recommendations for strengthening fraud prevention and detection mechanisms in enterprises.

The article hypothesizes that the effectiveness of anti-fraud policies in enterprises is not solely dependent on the existence of formal legal frameworks, but rather on the degree of their integration into internal governance systems, enforcement consistency, and the adaptability of legal mechanisms to digital and transnational fraud challenges.

Methodology. This study employs a qualitative legal research methodology grounded in doctrinal analysis and comparative legal review. The research is based on a structured examination of national and international legal instruments, regulatory frameworks, and corporate governance guidelines that relate to anti-fraud policies in enterprises. The primary focus is on identifying legal norms, principles, and institutional practices that support or hinder effective fraud prevention and detection.

The doctrinal component involves the interpretation and critical analysis of legislative texts, regulatory acts, corporate compliance standards, and relevant legal doctrines. This includes an assessment of legal obligations concerning internal controls, risk management, whistleblower protection, and enforcement mechanisms. Special attention is given to evaluating the consistency, comprehensiveness, and enforceability of these provisions within different legal systems.

The comparative element involves the examination of anti-fraud frameworks across several jurisdictions, including both civil law and common law countries. Jurisdictions were selected based on their institutional maturity, regulatory transparency, and relevance to the international business environment. The comparison aims to identify successful legal and policy approaches, as well as contextual challenges that may limit their transferability. Additionally, the study incorporates elements of applied legal analysis through the review of real-world corporate cases, compliance programs, and regulatory enforcement trends. This allows for the triangulation of legal theory with institutional practice, highlighting gaps between legal frameworks and their practical implementation in enterprise settings.The research also integrates policy analysis methods to explore strategic perspectives for legal reform. This includes scenario-based thinking and evaluation of emerging risks in the digital economy that affect the legal dimensions of fraud prevention. The methodology is descriptive, analytical, and normative in nature, aimed at formulating actionable legal and organizational recommendations.

Results. The legal foundation of anti-fraud policies in enterprises is inherently multilayered, encompassing national legislation, international regulatory standards, corporate governance principles, and internal operational protocols. This complex legal architecture provides the normative framework within which organizations are expected to develop preventive, detective, and corrective mechanisms aligned with the core principles of legality, proportionality, and transparency.

Countries differ in how they structure anti-fraud enforcement, including the strength of whistleblower protection and effectiveness of regulatory institutions. The table 1 below presents a comparative overview of National Anti-Fraud Legislation.

Table 1. Comparison of National Anti-Fraud Legislation

Country	Key Legislation	Whistleblower Protection	Enforcement Effectiveness
United States	FCPA	Strong (SOX, Dodd-Frank)	High
United Kingdom	UK Bribery Act	Moderate	Moderate
Germany	German Criminal Code (StGB)	Weak	Moderate
Ukraine	Anti-Corruption Law 2011	Limited	Low
Brazil	Clean Company Act	Weak	Low

Source: systematized by the authors

As shown above, enterprises operating internationally must navigate differing legal environments. For example, while the U.S. offers strong whistleblower

protections under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and Dodd-Frank Act, such legal safeguards are limited or weak in many emerging economies, reducing policy effectiveness.

At the national level, countries increasingly impose legal obligations on companies to establish systems for preventing, detecting, and responding to fraud. In the United States, the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA) and the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX) serve as pivotal statutes, requiring enterprises to maintain internal control systems and mandating personal accountability for financial reporting. Similarly, the UK Bribery Act 2010 imposes strict corporate liability for failure to prevent bribery, even abroad, and emphasizes the legal necessity of "adequate procedures." In civil law jurisdictions, such as Germany and Ukraine, criminal codes codify offenses such as embezzlement, forgery, and abuse of power, often accompanied by administrative enforcement through national anti-corruption agencies.

Complementing domestic frameworks are international instruments that provide a harmonized foundation for anti-fraud governance in multinational enterprises. The OECD Anti-Bribery Convention obligates signatory states to criminalize foreign bribery and implement compliance mechanisms within companies. The United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), ratified by over 180 countries, further mandates legal protections for whistleblowers, the criminalization of abuse of function, and the establishment of national anti-corruption bodies. Meanwhile, ISO 37001, a voluntary global standard, offers a procedural model for designing anti-bribery management systems, focusing on risk assessments, due diligence, and monitoring.

These legal instruments are institutionalized at the enterprise level through corporate governance codes and internal regulations. In many countries, stock exchanges and securities regulators require listed companies to establish codes of conduct, ethics committees, and whistleblower systems as conditions of listing. For instance, the OECD Principles of Corporate Governance recommend transparency in risk reporting and strong internal audit systems as means of preserving shareholder confidence. Within organizations, these obligations are translated into practice through internal documentation - such as compliance handbooks, anti-fraud charters, and disciplinary protocols - which formalize the mechanisms by which the enterprise operationalizes legal and ethical expectations.

Importantly, legal norms are not static - they evolve alongside the threat landscape. According to the ACFE's 2024 Report to the Nations, 52% of fraud cases occurred due to a lack of internal controls or override by management, and 43% were detected through tip-offs, particularly from employees. These figures suggest that legal rules alone are insufficient without institutional infrastructure, cultural reinforcement, and employee participation. This complexity gives rise to several significant implementation challenges.

Challenges in Policy Development and Enforcement: Legal Mandates Versus Institutional Realities. Despite the proliferation of legal frameworks, enterprises frequently encounter difficulties in translating legal mandates into effective anti-fraud practice (Table 2).

One of the most critical obstacles is regulatory fragmentation. Multinational enterprises must navigate a maze of differing laws, standards, and enforcement

regimes. While U.S.-based companies may be bound by FCPA extraterritorially, their operations in jurisdictions with weaker enforcement—such as parts of Latin America, Asia, or post-Soviet states—may expose them to unaligned or conflicting obligations. This fragmentation complicates policy harmonization and can lead to either overcompliance or legal exposure.

Table 2. Challenges in Developing Anti-Fraud Policies

Challenge	Description	Recommended Strategy
Regulatory Fragmentation	Different legal requirements across jurisdictions hinder policy harmonization.	Establish legal risk maps and harmonized core policies.
Inconsistent Enforcement	Enforcement varies in effectiveness, weakening deterrence.	Strengthen oversight institutions and compliance audits.
Cultural Resistance	Organizational inertia and tolerance of unethical practices limit impact.	Foster ethical leadership and training programs.
Limited Whistleblower Protection	Employees fear retaliation, reducing fraud reporting.	Implement anonymous reporting tools and legal safeguards.
Digital Fraud Complexity	Lack of regulation over digital evidence complicates fraud detection.	Update digital laws and invest in cyber-compliance tools.

Source: systematized by the authors

A second major issue is insufficient enforcement. Even when robust legal statutes exist, enforcement capabilities may be undercut by institutional weaknesses, limited regulatory capacity, or political interference. According to the ACFE, the median duration of occupational fraud schemes is 12 months, and many persist undetected due to weak regulatory ecosystems, especially in high-risk sectors like procurement or government contracting.

Third, corporate resistance and cultural inertia often undermine policy effectiveness. Internal resistance to compliance initiatives—particularly in hierarchically rigid organizations or those with authoritarian leadership—can lead to superficial adherence. Fraud risk assessments, even when conducted, may be seen as formalities rather than substantive governance exercises.

The vulnerability of whistleblowers remains another critical challenge. Although tip-offs are the most effective fraud detection method, with nearly half of cases discovered this way, legal protections for whistleblowers vary significantly. In many jurisdictions, there are insufficient legal safeguards against retaliation, leading to employee reluctance to report misconduct—especially when management is implicated.

Finally, digital complexity adds a new dimension to fraud. As fraudsters increasingly exploit cyber vulnerabilities—through phishing, data manipulation, or ransomware—the law often lags behind technological innovation. Legal ambiguity over digital evidence, data jurisdiction, and cyberliability makes enforcement difficult. The $1 trillion annual global cost of digital fraud, as estimated in 2023, underscores the urgent need for legal reform in this space.

Strategic Perspectives for Strengthening Legal Compliance: From Regulatory Text to Organizational Reality. Addressing the aforementioned challenges requires a proactive, strategic, and legally anchored compliance architecture. First and foremost, enterprises must engage in legal risk mapping — a systematic analysis of jurisdiction-specific legal obligations, enforcement trends, and

fraud typologies. This practice enables companies to tailor their policies to local conditions while maintaining alignment with international benchmarks.

Second, legal and compliance functions must no longer operate in silos. Cross-functional integration — between legal counsel, risk managers, auditors, and IT security teams—is critical to building a holistic anti-fraud defense. This is particularly relevant in detecting collusion schemes, which, according to ACFE, result in losses four times higher than frauds committed by individuals.

Third, companies should pursue policy standardization, whereby a core set of global anti-fraud principles is adopted company-wide, with appendices addressing jurisdiction-specific legal nuances. This not only ensures legal coverage but enhances employee understanding and policy coherence.

Fourth, training and legal literacy initiatives should be embedded into organizational culture. Employees must be trained not only in fraud indicators but also in the legal consequences of complicity, retaliation, or inaction. The fact that 82% of companies revise their internal controls only after a fraud incident, as reported by ACFE, points to a reactive mindset that can be replaced through education.

Lastly, technological and legal innovation must be embraced. Enterprises should deploy AI-based compliance monitoring, real-time alerts for suspicious transactions, and automated risk scoring tools. From a legal standpoint, these technologies should be accompanied by updated compliance protocols that address algorithmic accountability, data privacy, and evidentiary admissibility.

Discussion. The findings of this study affirm the critical role that legal infrastructure plays in shaping the integrity of corporate governance frameworks. While numerous jurisdictions have introduced anti-fraud regulations and corporate accountability standards, their effectiveness varies significantly depending on enforcement mechanisms, institutional maturity, and corporate culture. One of the key takeaways is that the mere existence of laws and policies is insufficient unless embedded within a coherent compliance ecosystem supported by leadership, employee engagement, and regulatory oversight.

The comparative analysis highlights that countries with robust whistleblower protection and specialized enforcement bodies tend to exhibit higher compliance and lower incidence of fraud-related losses. In contrast, jurisdictions lacking enforcement rigor or political independence often become vulnerable to superficial policy adoption. These findings point to a persistent implementation gap between the legal text and organizational practice. In many cases, companies adopt formal anti-fraud frameworks for reputational purposes or regulatory compliance without meaningful integration into decision-making or operational behavior.

The intersection of digital transformation and legal compliance emerged as another pressing area for policy innovation. As fraud schemes increasingly leverage technological loopholes, legal frameworks must evolve to cover data-driven environments. The complexity of digital forensics, evidence validation, and international jurisdiction over cybercrime presents new legal challenges that current national laws are not always prepared to address. This underscores the need for

transnational legal cooperation and adaptive legislation that supports real-time compliance monitoring and digital risk mitigation.

Another important aspect uncovered in the study is the role of internal governance structures in operationalizing legal obligations. Enterprises that successfully translate legal norms into practice typically do so through integrated compliance units, ethical leadership, and comprehensive employee training. By institutionalizing legal awareness and creating secure reporting channels, such companies foster an environment where fraud prevention becomes a shared responsibility, not just a legal checkbox.

The sdudy also recognizes the importance of cross-functional collaboration between legal, audit, cybersecurity, and human resources departments. A siloed approach to compliance undermines early detection and response capabilities. Therefore, a strategic shift toward a unified governance model—where legal frameworks are supported by interdisciplinary implementation—offers the most promising path toward sustainable anti-fraud cultures.

the analysis reveals that the global convergence of anti-fraud standards—through conventions like UNCAC, OECD guidelines, and ISO standards—provides a solid base for harmonization, especially for multinational enterprises. However, localization remains crucial. Policies must be tailored to national legal contexts, organizational size, and sector-specific risks to ensure both legal adequacy and practical relevance.

Conclusion. The development of anti-fraud policies in enterprises requires more than ethical commitment; it necessitates a legally grounded and dynamically evolving compliance infrastructure. Legal systems, both national and international, offer the foundation upon which corporate fraud prevention strategies are built. However, without addressing enforcement gaps, regulatory inconsistencies, and the challenges posed by digital fraud, policy implementation risks being symbolic. By adopting a strategic, legally integrated approach, enterprises can not only meet legal obligations but also foster institutional trust and long-term sustainability.

Author contributions. The authors contributed equally.

Disclosure statement. The authors do not have any conflict of interest.

References:

1. Aguilera, R. V., & Cuervo-Cazurra, A. (2009). Codes of Good Governance. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 17(3), 376–387.
2. Albrecht, W. S., Albrecht, C. O., Albrecht, C. C., & Zimbelman, M. F. (2012). *Fraud Examination* (4th ed.). Cengage Learning.
3. Arjoon, S. (2006). Striking a Balance between Rules and Principles-based Approaches for Effective Governance: A Risk-based Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 68(1), 53–82.
4. Callahan, E. S., & Dworkin, T. M. (2000). The State of State Whistleblower Protection. *American Business Law Journal*, 38(1), 99–142.
5. Hoekstra, A. (2023). Compliance in the Age of Data Regulation: Fraud Detection under GDPR. *European Law Review*, 48(2), 112–130.
6. ISO. (2016). *ISO 37001: Anti-Bribery Management Systems — Requirements with Guidance for Use*. International Organization for Standardization.
7. Koehler, M. (2022). The FCPA in a Global Marketplace. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 64(1), 20–40.
8. McCormack, W. (2019). Corporate Governance and the Law: Regulation, Risk and Compliance. *Modern Law Review*, 82(4), 657–682.
9. Nichols, P. M. (2012). The Business Case for Complying with Bribery Laws. *American Business Law Journal*, 49(2), 325–368.
10. OECD. (2021). *OECD Anti-Bribery Convention: Implementation Report*.

11. Pieth, M., & Ivory, R. (2011). *Corporate Criminal Liability: Emergence, Convergence, and Risk*. Springer.
12. Rose-Ackerman, S. (2008). Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences, and Reform. *Cambridge University Press*.
13. UNODC. (2021). *United Nations Convention against Corruption*. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
14. UK Ministry of Justice. (2011). *Guidance about Procedures Which Relevant Commercial Organisations Can Put into Place to Prevent Persons Associated with Them from Bribing (UK Bribery Act Guidance)*.
15. Warren, S. D., & Brandeis, L. D. (2020). The Legal Implications of AI in Corporate Compliance. *Harvard Law & Tech Review*, 4(1), 5–26.