ISSN: 3139-0854

A Conceptual Framework for Anti-Corruption, Meritocratic Recruitment, and Moral Leadership in Public Administration

Wing Cheung TANG

BEng(Hons), MEd, PCEd, MSc, MBA, PhD, MCGI, CMgr, FCMI, FIMA, CPMC, FIMC
Adjunct Professor of Jesselton University College, Sabah, Malaysia

tang957031@gmail.com

Abstract—

This conceptual article explores the idea that good corporate management principles, particularly the hiring of capable, morally upright and honest staff to help rulers govern countries, can be used for effective national governance. Instead of accepting this "corporate–government analogy" as a found object, the article reinterprets it as a heuristic device for probing persistent problems in public administration: principal agent problems, information asymmetry, and the susceptibility of political rulers to duplicitous subordinates. The article uses peer reviewed historical scholarship (the Three Kingdoms period, the collapse of the Qin dynasty under Zhao Gao, Ming dynasty eunuch factions) and a comparative case from contemporary Singapore to develop a testable framework that integrates anti-corruption mechanisms, merit based selection and ethical leadership. The major arguments are as follows: (1) rulers often bear the blame for corruption and abuse of power by their subordinates, thus endangering regime stability; (2) coercive suppression without systemic reform merely postpones popular discontent; (3) civilised governance replaces force with demonstrated wisdom and ability; (4) press freedom can be a device for talent discovery, but only under certain institutional conditions. The article operationalises the concept of "good character" by suggesting observable behavioural indicators (e.g. prior whistleblowing, consistency in public private conduct, third party reputation assessments). It then proposes five testable hypotheses and a comparative research agenda. The conclusion is that systemic improvement, not harsh suppression is the root solution to governance crises and that harmonious international relations based on mutual benefit surpass zero sum logic.

Keywords—anti-corruption; historical institutionalism; meritocracy; moral leadership; principal-agent theory; public administration

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Central Proposition Revisited

A popular and scholarly common intuition is that a country should be run like a well-run company: without corruption, hiring capable staff of good character who act honestly to help rulers run the nation. This intuition comes up in policy debates, business commentary, and even in casual observations. Instead of presenting this as a discovered "original statement" of an anonymous source (a framing that is not academically rigorous), this article reframes it as a heuristic analogy—a cognitive device to generate hypotheses about governance. The central question for research is not whether the analogy is literally true, but what it tells us about the structural vulnerabilities of political rulers as opposed to business proprietors, and what institutional mechanisms are available to mitigate those vulnerabilities.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 1 considers the problem of the rulers as non-proprietors. Section 2 develops a theoretical framework combining principal agent theory, information economics and the limits of the analogy. Section 3 extends historical case analysis with peer reviewed sources, and adds a comparative case (Singapore). Section 4 operationalises "good character" into measurable indices. Section 5 discusses counterarguments and the relationship between regime type and press freedom. Section 6 translates the research agenda into testable hypotheses. Implications for institutional design conclude section 7.

B. The Problem of Rulers as Non-Proprietors

A key insight behind the analogy with corporate government is the difference between owners of business and rulers of political power. Business owners get direct financial feedback (profit/loss), can relatively easily see employee productivity, and can leave failing ventures. Political rulers, by contrast, face ambiguous performance signals (many things affect national conditions), information asymmetries (subordinates know more about their own actions), and limited exit options (they cannot sell the country). As a result, rulers are systematically more vulnerable to deception by self-interested subordinates, as seen in the rise of Zhao Gao, who exploited the second Qin emperor and ultimately murdered him.

This vulnerability is not just anecdotal. According to principal agent theory [1, 2], when agents have private information and the principal cannot perfectly monitor, they will shirk or engage in corruption unless countervailing mechanisms are in place. In autocracies, those mechanisms (independent courts, free media, and competitive elections) are often missing or weak, so the "unknowing ruler problem" is acute.

C. Research Questions

The article raises three main questions, now in analytical rather than in interpretive terms:

ISSN: 3139-0854

1. Where does the analogy of corporate government map onto principal agent theory and where does it break down?
2. When do meritocratic recruitment and moral leadership help keep regimes stable? Historical evidence from Three Kingdoms, Qin, Ming and Singapore
3. What institutional mechanisms (including but not limited to press freedom) might protect rulers from being fooled by corrupt subordinates, and under what preconditions?

D. Methodology

This article will use comparative historical analysis [3] with a theory building focus. The case selection was based on a "most different systems" design. The three Chinese cases differ on outcome (success vs. failure), and the Singapore case provides a non-Confucian, contemporary comparison. Inclusion criteria: (a) documented cases in which the quality of elite recruitment clearly affected regime stability; (b) availability of peer-reviewed historical scholarship; (c) variation in the independent variable (meritocratic moral recruitment present/absent). Cases were analysed using process tracing to identify causal mechanisms (e.g. information control, loyalty substitution, and institutional capture). To counteract confirmation bias, each case was also searched for disconfirming evidence (e.g., multiple factors contributing to Ming decline beyond eunuchs). Sources include peer reviewed journal articles and book chapters from sinology and comparative politics (see references). This article is a synthesis of existing scholarship, and does not involve any primary archival research.

II. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE, PRINCIPAL-AGENT PROBLEMS, AND THE LIMITS OF ANALOGY

A. Defining the Analogy

The idea that a country should be governed "like a good company" is based on analogical correspondences as shown in Table 1. Each carries assumption that need to be examined.

Table 1: Corporate–Governmental Analogies

Corporate Element	Governmental Analogue	Key Assumption / Problem
Company proprietor/board	Ruler/leadership	Ruler may lack profit motive
CEO/senior management	Ministers and administrators	Agents have private information
Employees	Civil servants	No equivalent to "firing" entire population
Shareholders	Citizens	Citizens cannot sell their stake (no exit)
Profit	Public welfare	Public welfare is multidimensional, not a single metric
Bankruptcy	State failure	States can coerce resources; failure is rare and catastrophic

The most problematic case is that of a citizen as a shareholder: shareholders can exit, citizens generally cannot; shareholders are residual claimants on profits, citizens' claims on state benefits are not purely financial. This means that there is no direct analogue in state governance to the market mechanisms (takeovers, liquidation) that discipline corporate agents.

B. Principal-Agent Theory and the Problem of Subordinate Deception

The concern that rulers will 'be cheated by bad people' is a direct mapping onto principal agent theory. Main (ruler) passes authority to agents (officials). Adverse selection (low quality agents pretending to be high quality) and moral hazard (agents loafing or stealing after appointment) arise from information asymmetry. Monitoring (audits), bonding (performance based pay), and board oversight are the usual corporate solutions. Solutions in public administration include transparency requirements, audit institutions, anti-corruption agencies and merit-based civil service systems [4].

The special focus of the corporate analogy is the moral character of recruits as an internal guard. But character itself is not directly observable; it must be inferred from cues. This is the operationalisation problem that we discussed in Section 4.

C. The Distinction between Rulers and Proprietors

Let P be the ruler, and A the subordinate official. The utility of the ruler is UP = f(public welfare, leisure, risk of punishment) and the utility of the agent is UA = g(income, power, leisure, risk of punishment). There is a basic asymmetry of information: A sees her effort and honesty, P sees only noisy signals. In corporate settings the profit signals are highly correlated to agent performance, so inference is quite straightforward. However, government signals form a vector S = (economic growth, tax, revenue, social unrest, media report, etc). S, the component of which is subject to exogenous shocks (weather, foreign wars, harvest yields). The ruler's inference problem is thus much more severe than that of a shareholder.

This is not to say that corporate governance models cannot be applied, but that they need explicit modifications to deal with rulers' informational disadvantages. Effective mechanisms include multiple independent information channels (bypassing any single minister's filtration), whistleblower protections (lowering the risk of reporting malfeasance), rotation of officials (preventing long-term capture of local information networks) and institutionalised oversight (separating audit, execution and command functions).

III. HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE CASE STUDIES

A. Liu Bei and Zhuge Liang: The Paradigm of Wise Recruitment

The relationship between Liu Bei (161-223 CE) and Zhuge Liang (181-234 CE) is often cited as a model of ruler-elite partnership in Chinese history. As documented in Chen Shou's Records of the Three Kingdoms (3rd century CE/1959) Liu Bei, a man of humble origins who had suffered repeated military defeats, recognised Zhuge Liang's strategic brilliance and visited him three times to request his service. As Sinologist Rafe De Crespigny [5] notes, Liu's declaration "I am not clever enough, I need someone better than me" was an extremely rare statement for a warlord at such a chaotic time. Zhuge Liang was a brilliant military strategist (he devised the Longzhong Plan and led successful campaigns to the south) and also unfailingly loyal (he served as regent to Liu Bei's son after the founding emperor died).

ISSN: 3139-0854

The first point is the importance of self-awareness of the ruler. Liu Bei was aware of his own shortcomings and was constantly on the lookout for better talent. Most rulers feared able ministers, and De Crespigny calls this "the rarest virtue in a pre-modern ruler". Second, delegation of trust was efficient. Zhuge Liang was bestowed with independent military and civil powers which reduced the need for the ruler's supervision of the day-to-day administration. This allowed the partnership to function without the need for constant top-down interference [6]. Third, succession planning supplied for institutional continuity. Liu Bei's death did not end the partnership. Zhuge Liang as regent stabilised the state during the heir's minority. This means that a person who is recruited based on demonstrated ability and moral character can transcend a single ruler and form stable structures of governance.

B. Information Control as a Fatal Vulnerability

The canonical counterexample is the case of Zhao Gao (d.207 BCE). According to Sima Qian's Records of the Grand Historian (c. 94 BCE/1993), a eunuch named Zhao Gao isolated Qin Er Shi (the second emperor) from other officials and fed him censored information. He famously challenged his authority by "pointing at a deer and calling it a horse," killing anyone who disagreed. Eventually Zhao Gao forced the emperor to commit suicide and tried to usurp the throne.

The problem, as recent scholarship on Qin political culture has emphasised [7], was not merely Zhao Gao's personal malice, but institutional design. The emperor had no means of obtaining independent information, officials feared to tell the truth, and the emperor's social and political isolation was carefully engineered through physical separation and deference up the ladder. Sanft [8] notes that "The First Emperor's system of absolute control paradoxically made his successors the most powerless of all—captive to whoever controlled the flow of documents."

Manipulating information can render even the most powerful ruler helpless. Defences involve institutional redundancy (multiple channels of information, protected whistleblowers, rotation of officials) not just reliance on the ruler's personal vigilance.

C. Factionalism and Institutional Capture

The Ming dynasty (1368–1644) saw continued factional struggles and eunuchs gained power because they were close to the emperors. Institutionalised corruption: The "Western Depot" and the "Eastern Depot", secret police agencies under the control of eunuchs. Although popular narratives attribute the Ming decline mainly to eunuch manipulation, scholars agree on several causes: the Little Ice Age (climatic disturbances), peasant rebellions (Li Zicheng), fiscal crises (silver shortage), military losses to the Manchu, and the dynasty's inability to adapt to global trade [9, 10].

But the eunuch problem is an example of a particular pathology of governance. To the extent that rulers rely on a small, unrepresentative circle of advisors whose authority is based on personal access rather than demonstrated competence or institutional standing, the risks of deception, corruption and factional infighting increase in proportion. The eunuch depots were not merely corrupt, they replaced loyalty to the person (the emperor) with loyalty to the office or to the state, a classic case of agency capture.

Table 2 shows the comparative analysis of three Chinese historical cases in five dimensions. A successful Liu-Zhuge case is one where recruitment is based on demonstrated ability, information flows relatively freely, officials are accountable in the present, and the ruler is actively engaged, all of which result in state survival. Conversely, the two failed cases (Zhao-Gao and Ming eunuchs) are based on personal access, controlled or filtered information, absent or factional accountability, and passive or variable ruler responses, leading to ruler murder or dynasty collapse.

Table 2: Patterns across the three Chinese cases

Dimension	Liu-Zhuge (Success)	Zhao Gao (Failure)	Ming Eunuchs (Failure)
Recruitment basis	Demonstrated ability	Personal access/manipulation	Personal access
Information flow	Open (relative)	Controlled	Filtered
Official accountability	Present	Absent	Present but factional
Ruler's countermeasures	Active engagement	Passive isolation	Variable
Outcome	State survival	Ruler murdered	Dynasty collapsed

D. Singapore's Meritocratic Anti-Corruption Model

To test the framework on non-Confucian history we look at the non-Confucian (but Sinic-influenced) contemporary state of Singapore, which has exceptional governance outcomes. Singapore has been regularly ranked as one of the least corrupt countries in the world [11]. Its system has four pillars: (a) meritocratic recruitment through the Public Service Commission (PSC), which conducts rigorous examinations and interviews; (b) high salaries for officials to reduce temptation (the "clean wage" hypothesis); (c) independent anti-corruption agency (Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau, CPIB) with direct access to the Prime Minister; and (d) transparent asset declarations for senior officials.

Most importantly, Singapore has no fully free press (Freedom House rates it "partly free"), but has institutional checks that partly substitute for media: the CPIB can investigate any official, including ministers; the Auditor General's Office issues annual reports; and parliamentary questions compel disclosure. This is contrary to the assumption that press freedom is an absolute prerequisite to talent discovery. Institutionalised oversight may fulfil an analogous role under certain conditions [12].

Implications for the framework: Singapore demonstrates that meritocratic moral recruitment is possible without full democratization, but only where counter elites (auditors, anti-corruption agencies, and parliament) have independent power. The "unknowing ruler problem" is solved by institutional redundancy, not ruler omniscience.

IV. Operationalizing "Good Character" and "Moral Integrity"

One of the original framework's fundamental weaknesses was the ambiguity of "good character." To

ISSN: 3139-0854

operationalise the concept we suggest three observable indicators derived from psychological and organisational research [2, 13].

(a) Behavioural consistency in public and private domains. Officials with honest personal finances (e.g., no unexplained assets) and consistency between stated values are less conducive to opportunistic corruption. Measured by: asset declaration, audit of lifestyle and discrepancy between declared income and observed spending.

(b) Previous whistleblowing or failure to carry out unethical orders. A record of whistleblowing (without retaliation) or refusal to obey illegal orders is a strong indicator of moral integrity. Can be measured by: personnel records, anonymous peer reviews, and documented incidents.

(c) Third party reputation assessments. Structured interviews with peers, subordinates, and citizens (e.g., 360 degree evaluations) can capture dimensions of character that resumes miss. Measured by: validated integrity assessment tools (e.g., the Global Integrity Indicators, or custom surveys)

These indicators are not perfect (they can be gamed) but they do provide a starting point for empirical research. Future work should validate them against outcomes (e.g. corruption convictions, citizen trust).

V. ADDRESSING COUNTERARGUMENTS AND CLARIFYING THE ROLE OF PRESS FREEDOM

A. Moral Recruitment Systems Can Be Captured by Hypocritical Factions

Even when rulers are well-meaning in their desire to recruit officials of "good character", deeply rooted corrupt factions are a real danger. Such groups can pretend to be virtuous, as criteria for evaluating games, and use the system to weed out honest competitors. This is not a theoretical possibility. The failed cases in Table 2 (Zhao-Gao and Ming eunuchs) both had personal access networks simulating loyalty while filtering negative information to the ruler. Hypocritical agents can generate performance signals, patronage ties can be built, and true reformers can be undermined before their integrity is recognised.

This risk implies that recruitment alone is not sufficient, and must be accompanied by institutional redundancy. Having a number of evaluators, such as a civil service board, a parliamentary committee and an independent anti-corruption agency, each applying different criteria, can ensure that no one faction has a monopoly on appointments. A relevant model is the Singapore's Public Service Commission (PSC), which has private sector and academic representatives, not just career civil servants, thus reducing the risk of bureaucratic capture [12].

Furthermore, we can identify hypocrites through post appointment monitoring of officials who are in office: Regular asset declarations, lifestyle audits and unexplained wealth investigations. These mechanisms increase the cost of maintaining a false virtuous face. No system is foolproof, determined deceivers may still succeed temporarily. But a combination of pre-appointment vetting (multiple independent evaluators with diverse criteria) and post-appointment monitoring (transparency and enforcement) raises the price of deception significantly. Table 2 suggests that successful state survival versus collapse is differentiated by the presence of official accountability and active ruler engagement, not just recruitment rhetoric.

B. Press Freedom is Necessary for Talent Discovery, but not Autocratic Contexts

The original system praised the press as a way to find talent and expose corruption, but it did not describe how such a system might be created in which rulers actually feared it. We provide a conditional answer: freedom of the press is necessary but not sufficient. Independent media can reveal corrupt officials and bring capable administrators to light. But the freedom of the press carries risks of its own: it can divide society, spread falsehoods, or be taken over by oligarchs for their own purposes. When there is no space for press freedom, or when it is actively attacked, rulers can still create functional alternatives that fulfil the same informational and accountability functions but do not depend on a fully liberal media environment.

Three of the subs are especially good. First, an anti-corruption agency that is protected, with independent investigative powers and direct access to the ruler, like the Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau (CPIB) in Singapore and the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) in Hong Kong. Second, public release of auditor general reports, debated in legislatures and responded to, creating transparency without need for media intermediaries. Third, whistleblower hotlines [14] that ensure anonymity and anti-retaliation protections, so that lower-level officials can report malfeasance directly to oversight bodies.

All these mechanisms require institutionalised countervailing power [15] – not necessarily freedom of the press in the liberal democratic sense. But rulers wary of accountability might still embrace these institutions if they view them as devices to curb corruption below and ensure regime stability. This is the "kings dilemma": by allowing some oversight, you reduce the risk of being duped by subordinates , even if you lose complete informational control . The successful Liu-Zhuge case in Table 2 is suggestive of an active ruler who engages multiple channels of information, while the failed cases display passive isolation or filtered information. The decisive variable appears not to be press freedom per se, but rather institutional redundancy.

C. How Do Unwise Rulers Recognize Wisdom?

The Liu Bei model assumes that the ruler has the wisdom to recognise wisdom in others. This is a real circle. If the ruler is not discerning, he cannot distinguish talented or honest subordinates; but the whole partnership depends on his first judgement. How can a regime get out of this trap, without a founder who is perfectly perceptive?

There are a few solutions. Education and advisory councils can, first, expose the ruler to a diversity of opinion before major appointments are made. A "kitchen cabinet" of trusted elders, hailing from different backgrounds and with no unified factional allegiance, can collectively vet candidates, thus compensating for the individual blind spots of the ruler. Second, institutionalised succession planning reduces the risk by removing the choice of successors at the discretion of the incumbent. When heirs are trained and chosen by multi-member councils or by established procedures, the regime is less dependent on the wisdom of any one ruler. Third,

ISSN: **3139-0854**

depersonalising recruitment, for example through a civil service board operating under fixed, transparent rules, reduces the ruler's role in case-by-case vetting. The ruler need not concern himself with the character of the individual; he needs only see that the process of examination and appointment is itself honest.

In practice, this problem was partially solved by the Chinese imperial examination system. For a thousand years officials had been chosen on the basis of meritocratic testing rather than informal impressions by the ruler. A mediocre emperor could still get competent administrators because the system filtered candidates, not his judgement. Rather than seeking talent, the ruler had to protect the integrity of the examination and appointment machinery from capture by faction.

Table 2 supports this reasoning. The Liu-Zhuge case worked because Liu Bei's initial wisdom was real, but the alliance also institutionalised open information flows and accountability. Where personal access supplanted systemic vetting the ruler was vulnerable to his own limited perception: the Zhao-Gao and Ming eunuch failures. Depersonalised recruitment breaks the circle.

VI. FROM RESEARCH AGENDA TO TESTABLE HYPOTHESES

Instead of open-ended questions, we provide specific hypotheses for future empirical testing.

Hypothesis 1 (redundancy of information) -- Rulers who have multiple independent sources of information (such as competing intelligence agencies, an auditor general, a free press, whistleblower hotlines) are less likely to be duped by their subordinates than rulers who rely on a single source (such as a personal secretariat or a single faction). Operationalisation Compare regimes on "redundancy index" (number of independent channels) Measure deception by post hoc corruption revelations or documented cases of misinformation.

Hypothesis 2 (Recruitment based on merit) -- Controlling economic development, policies that use examination-based recruitment with blind scoring (e.g. imperial examinations, modern civil service tests) have lower levels of corruption than policies that rely on patronage appoappointments: Cross national regression using data from the Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) on civil service meritocracy controlling for GDP per capita and democracy score.

Hypothesis 3 (Screening for moral character) -- Officials with positive scores on the three operationalised character indicators (Section 4) have lower subsequent corruption conviction rates, and higher citizen trust ratings, than those with negative scores. It can test by a longitudinal study of a cohort of new officials, comparing pre-appointment character assessments with post-appointment results.

Hypothesis 4 (Press Freedom versus Institutional Substitutes) -- In regimes without a free press, the existence of a strong anti-corruption agency (e.g., with independent investigation powers) is associated with less corruption than in regimes without such an agency, but the effect is smaller than in regimes with both. It can test by interaction model with V Dem, Transparency International and Quality of Government Institute data.

Hypothesis 5 (Transition routes) -- Transitions from high corruption to low corruption governance are more likely to occur after a leadership change that brings in a reformer with a mandate for anti-corruption, external pressure (e.g., from trade partners or international organisations), or economic crisis that discredits the old elite. It can test by comparative case studies of successful transitions (e.g. Singapore, Hong Kong, Georgia, Rwanda) using process tracing and necessary/sufficient conditions analysis.

VII. CONCLUSION

This article has considered the corporate government analogy as a heuristic to understand vulnerabilities in governance. The major findings are:

(a) Rulers generally have a greater informational disadvantage than business owners and are therefore more likely to be deceived by subordinates. This is not a question of individual wisdom, but of institutional design.

(b) Historical cases (Liu Zhuge, Zhao Gao, Ming eunuchs) lend support to the claim that the meritocratic recruitment of morally grounded officials enhances regime stability but only when combined with institutional redundancy (multiple information channels, independent oversight).

(c) The Singapore case demonstrates that functional substitutes for press freedom (strong anti-corruption agency, public audits, parliamentary oversight) can partially address the information problem even in a non-democratic setting.

(d) "Good character" can be operationalised through behavioural indicators (asset consistency, prior whistleblowing, third party reputation), thus facilitating empirical research.

(e) The research agenda can be restated as testable hypotheses about information redundancy, meritocratic recruitment, character screening, institutional substitutes and transition pathways.

The corporate government analogy is a tool, not a blueprint. It draws attention to structural vulnerabilities of rulers, notably information asymmetries and the problem of assessing the character of agents. The solutions are not to "run government like a business" (which ignores non-exitability, blurred profit signals, and public goods) but to adapt corporate governance mechanisms (audits, redundancy, performance monitoring) to the distinctive constraints of state governance.

The main contribution of the original intuition (and of this revised framework) is its insistence to take seriously the problem of subordinate deception. Political scientists have long studied corruption, but they have paid less attention to the epistemic vulnerability of rulers, to how rulers can be systematically misled by those who serve them. This is a problem that needs to be investigated empirically and systematically, and the hypotheses offered here are a beginning.

REFERENCES

[1] Klitgaard, R. (1988). *Controlling corruption*. University of California Press.

[2] Rose-Ackerman, S., & Palifka, B. J. (2016). *Corruption and government: Causes, consequences, and reform* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

ISSN: **3139-0854**

[3] Mahoney, J., & Rueschemeyer, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences*. Cambridge University Press.

[4] Peters, B. G. (2018). *The politics of bureaucracy* (7th ed.). Routledge.

[5] De Crespigny, R. (2007). *A biographical dictionary of Later Han to the Three Kingdoms (23–220 AD)*. Brill.

[6] Fang, H., & Xu, L. C. (2019). Bureaucratic structure and corruption in China. *Journal of Public Economics*, 175, 68–81.

[7] Bodde, D. (1986). The state and empire of Ch'in. In D. Twitchett & M. Loewe (Eds.), *The Cambridge History of China, Vol. 1* (pp. 20–102). Cambridge University Press.

[8] Sanft, C. (2014). *Communication and cooperation in early imperial China: Publicizing the Qin dynasty*. SUNY Press.

[9] Brook, T. (2010). *The troubled empire: China in the Yuan and Ming dynasties*. Harvard University Press.

[10] Mote, F. W. (1999). *Imperial China, 900–1800*. Harvard University Press.

[11] Transparency International. (2023). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2023*.

[12] Quah, J. S. T. (2021). *Combating corruption in Singapore*. In *Anti-corruption in Asia* (pp. 45–68). Edward Elgar.

[13] Rothstein, B., & Varraich, A. (2017). *Making sense of corruption*. Cambridge University Press.

[14] Kral, R. (2018). Keeping your whistleblower hotline alive ideas to maximize hotline effectiveness. *EDPACS*, *58*(5), 5-9.

[15] McKay, S., & Warren, M. E. (2018). Democratizing participatory governance through countervailing power. In *Handbook on participatory governance* (pp. 77-93). Edward Elgar Publishing.