



# International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

## Enhancing Fraud Prevention and Ethical Business Practices: The U.S. Corporate Governance Approach and its Global Influence

**Remi Omogbeme**

Independent Researcher, Lagos, Nigeria

\* Corresponding Author: **Remi Omogbeme**

---

### Article Info

**ISSN (online):** 2582-7138

**Volume:** 06

**Issue:** 02

**March-April 2025**

**Received:** 18-01-2025

**Accepted:** 12-02-2025

**Page No:** 230-237

### Abstract

This paper explores the role of the U.S. corporate governance framework in enhancing fraud prevention and promoting ethical business practices, with a focus on its global influence. The aim is to critically assess the effectiveness of U.S. governance mechanisms, such as the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX), the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA), and internal controls, in fostering transparency and accountability within organizations. A qualitative approach was used, analyzing relevant case studies, legislation, and scholarly articles to examine both successes and failures in fraud prevention. Key findings reveal that while the U.S. model provides valuable tools for combating fraud, its applicability in other regions is influenced by cultural, economic, and regulatory differences. The paper highlights the challenges of applying U.S. governance standards globally and calls for a more adaptable, context-sensitive approach. The implications of this study suggest that for corporate governance frameworks to be effective internationally, there is a need for greater global cooperation and the development of harmonized standards that balance local and global expectations. Finally, the paper proposes directions for future research to examine the evolving relationship between emerging technologies, cultural factors, and corporate governance in the fight against fraud and unethical practices.

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJMRGE.2025.6.2.230-237>

**Keywords:** Corporate Governance, U.S. Corporate Governance Model, Fraud Prevention Mechanisms, Corporate Scandals

---

### 1. Introduction

Corporate governance, defined as the system by which companies are directed, controlled, and held accountable, plays a pivotal role in ensuring the long-term sustainability of businesses and protecting stakeholder interests (Olori and Ladi, 2020) <sup>[32]</sup>. It encompasses practices that promote transparency, accountability, and ethical behavior, ensuring that management actions align with shareholder and societal expectations. However, recent decades have witnessed a surge in corporate scandals globally, ranging from financial fraud to ethical misconduct. Incidents such as the Enron collapse and more recent cases like Wirecard have underscored the systemic vulnerabilities within corporate governance frameworks, leading to calls for stricter regulations and enforcement mechanisms (Hossain, Hasan, and Hasan, 2024) <sup>[18]</sup>.

In this context, the United States corporate governance framework has emerged as a significant model due to its comprehensive legislative approach and emphasis on fraud prevention and ethical accountability. The enactment of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (SOX), for instance, has been widely recognized for enhancing internal controls, improving financial reporting standards, and mandating executive accountability (Kang, Liu and Qi, 2010) <sup>[23]</sup>. The U.S. framework's influence extends beyond its borders, shaping governance reforms in regions such as Europe and Asia, where policymakers often adopt or adapt its key principles to suit local regulatory environments (Aronson, 2006) <sup>[4]</sup>.

The significance of this topic lies in its relevance to contemporary business environments, where globalization has heightened the need for consistent and effective governance practices. As multinational corporations operate across jurisdictions with varying regulatory standards, the U.S. model provides valuable insights into fostering corporate integrity and mitigating risks of fraud and ethical lapses. However, critics argue that the U.S. framework may not be universally applicable, given cultural and institutional differences that influence governance practices worldwide (Clarke, 2009) <sup>[7]</sup>. This paper seeks to achieve three primary objectives. First, it critically evaluates the U.S. corporate governance framework's role in preventing fraud and promoting ethical business practices. Second, it explores the framework's global influence, examining its adaptability and limitations in diverse regulatory contexts. Third, it addresses the broader implications of adopting U.S. governance principles in an increasingly interconnected world. Central to this analysis are the following research questions: (1) How effective is the U.S. corporate governance model in addressing fraud and ethical lapses? (2) To what extent has this model influenced global corporate governance practices? (3) What lessons can be drawn from its successes and shortcomings?

The thesis of this paper argues that while the U.S. corporate governance framework has significantly advanced fraud prevention and ethical standards, its universal applicability requires critical examination, particularly in regions with distinct cultural, legal, and economic systems. By dissecting the successes and limitations of the U.S. model, this paper contributes to the ongoing discourse on strengthening corporate accountability and fostering a culture of ethical business globally.

## 2. Literature Review

Corporate governance has long been a subject of scholarly and practical interest due to its critical role in mitigating risks, promoting transparency, and fostering ethical business practices (Olori and Ladi, 2020) <sup>[32]</sup>. This section reviews key theoretical frameworks and models, provides an overview of U.S. corporate governance principles, examines mechanisms for fraud prevention and ethical practices, and evaluates the global influence of the U.S. approach.

### 2.1 Theoretical frameworks and models in corporate governance

The foundation of corporate governance is supported by several theoretical models, each offering insights into organizational accountability and stakeholder relationships. Agency Theory, introduced by Jensen and Meckling (1976) <sup>[20]</sup>, underscores the conflict of interest between principals (shareholders) and agents (managers). This theory emphasizes mechanisms like performance-based incentives and monitoring to align managerial actions with shareholder interests. While Agency Theory has been influential, critics argue that its shareholder-centric focus neglects broader stakeholder considerations (Al-Faryan, 2024) <sup>[3]</sup>. Stakeholder Theory, advanced by Freeman (1984) <sup>[15]</sup>, broadens the scope by positing that organizations have a responsibility to various stakeholders, including employees, customers, suppliers, and the community. This perspective aligns with contemporary governance trends emphasizing corporate social responsibility (CSR) and sustainability. However, its practical implementation remains challenging due to competing stakeholder interests.

Stewardship Theory, as proposed by Donaldson and Davis (1991) <sup>[10]</sup>, challenges the assumptions of Agency Theory by

suggesting that managers act as stewards of organizational resources, driven by intrinsic motivations such as trust and shared goals. This theory supports governance structures that promote collaboration and trust, though critics argue it may underestimate the potential for self-interest. Together, these theories provide a framework for analyzing governance structures and their effectiveness in promoting fraud prevention and ethical practices.

### 2.2 Overview of U.S corporate governance principles

The U.S. corporate governance framework is underpinned by several landmark regulations aimed at enhancing transparency, accountability, and ethical behavior. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (SOX) is a cornerstone of modern governance, introduced in response to corporate scandals like Enron and WorldCom. SOX mandates stricter internal controls, enhances financial reporting standards, and holds executives accountable through provisions like Section 302 (certification of financial reports) and Section 404 (assessment of internal controls) (Kang, Liu and Qi, 2010) <sup>[23]</sup>. While SOX has significantly reduced accounting irregularities, critics highlight its high compliance costs, particularly for smaller firms (Epps and Guthrie, 2010) <sup>[13]</sup>.

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 further strengthens governance by addressing systemic risks in the financial sector. It introduces measures like executive compensation disclosures, whistleblower protection, and the establishment of the Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC). However, the act's effectiveness has been debated, with some arguing that it imposes excessive regulatory burdens without fully addressing underlying issues (Acharya *et al*, 2011) <sup>[2]</sup>.

Despite these advancements, the U.S. governance framework is not without limitations. Its emphasis on compliance may inadvertently foster a "box-ticking" mentality, potentially undermining the cultivation of a genuine ethical culture.

### 2.3 Fraud prevention and ethical practices

Fraud prevention and the promotion of ethical practices are central to corporate governance. Mechanisms such as internal audits, whistleblower programs, and the use of advanced data analytics have been widely studied for their effectiveness in detecting and mitigating fraud. Ogwiji and Isiaka (2022) <sup>[31]</sup>, highlight the role of strong internal controls in reducing fraud risk, emphasizing the need for a culture of integrity and accountability. Similarly, studies by Resende, Porto, and Gracia (2024) <sup>[37]</sup>, demonstrate that ethical business culture, characterized by values like transparency, fairness, and respect, significantly reduces the likelihood of unethical behavior.

Case studies further underscore the importance of governance in fraud prevention. For example, the failure of Wirecard in Germany revealed significant lapses in regulatory oversight and internal controls, contrasting sharply with the stricter governance practices mandated by SOX. This highlights the critical role of governance in building organizational resilience against fraud.

However, the effectiveness of these mechanisms depends on their implementation and the broader cultural context. Research by Mishra and Tikoria (2021) <sup>[28]</sup>, suggests that ethical leadership is a key determinant of an organization's ethical climate, yet its influence is often undermined by conflicting business priorities or weak enforcement.

### 2.4 Global influence of U.S corporate governance

The U.S. corporate governance model has had a profound impact on global practices, serving as a benchmark for

governance reforms in various regions. For instance, the adoption of SOX-inspired regulations in countries like Japan (with the Financial Instruments and Exchange Act) and the European Union (with the 8th Company Law Directive) reflects the influence of U.S. governance principles (Wells and Fuminaga, 2016; Tiron-Tudor and Boța-Avram, 2013) [42, 40].

These regulations emphasize transparency, internal controls, and executive accountability, mirroring the core tenets of SOX.

However, the global application of U.S. governance principles is not without challenges. Clarke (2009) [7] argue that differences in legal, cultural, and institutional contexts can hinder the effectiveness of transplanted governance models. For example, the stakeholder-oriented governance structures prevalent in European countries may conflict with the shareholder-centric approach of U.S. regulations. Similarly, in emerging markets like China and India, governance reforms often face resistance due to entrenched cultural norms and weaker enforcement mechanisms.

Critics also highlight the risk of regulatory overreach. The extraterritorial application of U.S. laws, such as the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA), has drawn criticism for imposing compliance burdens on foreign firms while sometimes failing to address local governance challenges effectively.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Research Approach

This paper adopts a qualitative research approach to critically analyze the U.S. corporate governance framework and its influence on fraud prevention and ethical business practices. Qualitative methods are well-suited for exploring complex regulatory frameworks, evaluating case studies, and examining the interplay between governance principles and organizational outcomes (Lima and McLymont, 2021) [24]. Through an interpretive lens, this study synthesizes insights from scholarly literature, legislative texts, corporate reports, and case studies to develop a comprehensive understanding of the subject.

#### 3.2 Data Sources

The primary data sources includes

1. Legislation and regulatory documents such as the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (2002) and Dodd-Frank Act (2010), which serve as the foundation of U.S. corporate governance principles.
2. Case studies of high-profile corporate frauds (e.g., Enron, WorldCom, Wirecard) and ethical lapses to illustrate governance failures and successes.
3. Peer-reviewed journal articles and academic publications to provide theoretical and empirical insights into governance frameworks, fraud prevention mechanisms, and ethical practices.
4. Global governance reports, including those from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and World Bank, to contextualize the influence of U.S. governance models on international practices.

These diverse sources facilitate a nuanced analysis of the principles, effectiveness, and adaptability of U.S. corporate governance frameworks in both domestic and global contexts.

### 3.3 Scope and limitations

The scope of this study is limited to corporate governance practices in the post-Sarbanes-Oxley era, focusing primarily on the financial and technology sectors due to their significant exposure to fraud and ethical challenges. The study emphasizes the role of governance in fraud prevention and ethical culture building, with particular attention to the mechanisms mandated by U.S. legislation and their global impact.

However, certain limitations must be acknowledged. First, the qualitative nature of the study precludes quantitative validation of governance outcomes, such as statistical correlations between governance reforms and reduced fraud incidence. Second, the study excludes an in-depth examination of non-U.S. governance systems beyond their interactions with U.S. practices. Finally, given the evolving nature of governance practices and regulatory frameworks, the findings may not fully account for recent developments or emerging trends.

Despite these constraints, the methodological approach enables a critical evaluation of the U.S. corporate governance model, providing insights into its strengths, limitations, and global applicability. By synthesizing diverse perspectives, the study contributes to the broader discourse on enhancing corporate accountability and ethical business practices.

### 4. Analysis and discussion

#### 4.1 Fraud prevention strategies in the U.S. corporate governance framework

The U.S. corporate governance framework incorporates robust fraud prevention mechanisms designed to uphold transparency, accountability, and integrity within organizations. Central to this framework are internal audits, whistleblower protections, and compliance programs, each addressing different aspects of fraud prevention.

Internal audits are integral to the U.S. governance system. By systematically evaluating an organization's internal controls, these audits help identify irregularities, ensuring that financial and operational practices adhere to regulatory standards. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (SOX) mandated rigorous internal controls, with Section 404 requiring management to assess and certify their effectiveness (Ettredge, Li, and Sun, 2006) [14]. This measure directly addressed the systemic weaknesses exposed by corporate scandals such as Enron and WorldCom. However, while internal audits have proven effective in detecting fraudulent activities, their implementation is costly and resource-intensive, posing significant challenges for smaller firms (Pirzada and Rehman, 2013) [34].

Whistleblower protections are another critical component of fraud prevention. Under SOX and later enhanced by the Dodd-Frank Act of 2010, whistleblowers are provided with legal protections and financial incentives to report misconduct (Shaw, 2018) [38]. For example, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) whistleblower program has recovered billions of dollars based on actionable tips. Notably, the program awards whistleblowers a percentage of the sanctions collected, further encouraging disclosures (Hurwitz and Kovacs, 2016) [19]. SEC, 2023). However, critics highlight potential drawbacks, including misuse of the system and the ethical dilemmas whistleblowers may face, such as fear of retaliation despite legal safeguards.

Compliance programs play a pivotal role in fraud prevention by promoting adherence to laws and ethical standards. U.S.

Corporations are required to implement training sessions, risk assessments, and monitoring mechanisms to ensure organizational integrity. For example, the Federal Sentencing Guidelines encourage organizations to establish compliance programs as part of mitigating penalties for corporate wrongdoing. However, compliance programs often risk becoming superficial "check-the-box" exercises unless actively integrated into a company's culture (Deciu, 2020) <sup>[9]</sup>.

#### 4.2 Ethical business practices

U.S. corporations emphasize ethical business practices to foster stakeholder trust and long-term sustainability. These practices include the development of codes of conduct, leadership accountability, and the cultivation of values-driven cultures.

Codes of conduct provide formal guidelines for acceptable behaviors and decision-making within organizations. They typically cover areas such as conflict of interest, anti-bribery measures, and employee conduct. While these codes are an essential governance tool, their effectiveness depends on enforcement and alignment with corporate values. Studies show that when codes of conduct are coupled with frequent communication and training, they significantly enhance ethical awareness among employees (Enofe, Ogbaisi and Mboto, 2014) <sup>[12]</sup>.

Leadership accountability is also a cornerstone of ethical governance in the U.S. The concept of "tone at the top" underscores the importance of executives in setting ethical standards and fostering a culture of integrity. SOX's requirement for CEOs and CFOs to personally certify the accuracy of financial statements exemplifies this accountability (Geiger and Taylor, 2003) <sup>[16]</sup>. However, there is ongoing debate about whether focusing heavily on leadership absolves employees at other levels from taking responsibility for ethical practices (Child, 2018) <sup>[6]</sup>.

In addition, many U.S. corporations actively work to build values-driven cultures. Companies such as Google and Johnson and Johnson prioritize integrity, respect, and transparency as organizational pillars, integrating these values into their operations. However, even with strong ethical frameworks, cultural inconsistencies may arise in multinational corporations operating in diverse regulatory environments.

#### 4.3 Case Studies

##### 4.3.1 Failures in governance:

High-profile corporate scandals illustrate the devastating consequences of weak governance. For instance, Enron and WorldCom are emblematic of systemic fraud. Enron used complex off-balance-sheet entities to conceal debt, while WorldCom inflated revenues through improper accounting practices. These failures exposed significant deficiencies in oversight, internal controls, and executive accountability, ultimately leading to the implementation of SOX (Gordon, 2003; Sidak, 2010) <sup>[17, 39]</sup>.

##### 4.3.2 Recent Developments:

The 2020 collapse of Wirecard, a German payment processor, serves as a contemporary example of governance failure. Despite being subject to European regulations, Wirecard's management engaged in fraudulent practices to inflate assets and hide liabilities (Jo *et al* 2021) <sup>[21]</sup>. This case demonstrates the continued relevance of U.S.-style governance mechanisms, such as independent audits and robust whistleblower systems, in addressing fraud on a global scale (John, Makhija and Ferris, 2014) <sup>[22]</sup>.

##### 4.3.3 Success Stories:

Several companies illustrate the effectiveness of strong governance and ethical practices. Microsoft has consistently prioritized transparency and compliance, supported by a robust internal audit system and a strong ethical culture (Li, 2024) <sup>[25]</sup>. Similarly, Procter and Gamble has received recognition for its governance practices, which include leadership accountability and comprehensive compliance programs (P&G, 2024) <sup>[33]</sup>. These examples highlight how effective governance frameworks can enhance organizational resilience and stakeholder trust.

#### 4.4 Global influence of U.S. corporate governance practices

The U.S. corporate governance framework has served as a global benchmark, particularly in fraud prevention and ethical business practices. Countries such as Japan, India, and Brazil have incorporated elements inspired by U.S. regulations, such as the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX) and the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA). For instance, Japan introduced the Financial Instruments and Exchange Act, which mandates internal controls and emphasizes auditor independence, paralleling SOX requirements (Wells and Fuminaga, 2016) <sup>[42]</sup>. Similarly, India's Companies Act of 2013 includes provisions for independent directors and stricter corporate disclosures, reflecting U.S. governance principles (PWC, 2013) <sup>[35]</sup>.

Globalization has played a significant role in disseminating U.S. governance practices. Multinational corporations (MNCs), cross-border investments, and global stock exchanges often require companies to align with internationally recognized governance standards. For example, companies listed on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) must adhere to stringent governance requirements regardless of their home country. This integration has reinforced the prominence of U.S. practices globally, pushing organizations to adopt more robust anti-fraud measures and ethical business models (John, Makhija and Ferris, 2014) <sup>[22]</sup>. However, the wholesale adoption of U.S. practices is not universal. While some countries adapt these measures to their regulatory and cultural contexts, others resist due to sovereignty concerns or the perceived imposition of Western-centric norms.

#### 4.5 Comparative Analysis

U.S. corporate governance practices differ markedly from those in the United Kingdom (UK), the European Union (EU), and Asia. While the U.S. emphasizes a shareholder-centric model, prioritizing investor protection and financial accountability, the UK and EU focus on stakeholder inclusivity (Meier and Meier, 2013) <sup>[26]</sup>. The UK's Corporate Governance Code, for example, encourages broader stakeholder engagement and places greater emphasis on board effectiveness and leadership accountability. Similarly, the EU emphasizes sustainability and social responsibility in governance, aligning with its broader regulatory agenda (Weber, 2024) <sup>[41]</sup>.

In Asia, corporate governance varies widely. Japan, influenced by both Western practices and traditional norms, employs a hybrid model that balances shareholder interests with stakeholder concerns, including employees and suppliers. China, on the other hand, integrates governance principles with state control, reflecting its unique political and economic framework (OECD, 2024) <sup>[30]</sup>.

Fraud prevention and ethical practices also differ across these regions. The U.S. approach is highly regulatory, with laws like SOX and FCPA imposing strict penalties for non-

compliance. In contrast, the UK relies on a "comply or explain" model, which provides flexibility in governance practices while encouraging accountability through public disclosure (Mintz, 2006) <sup>[27]</sup>. In Asia, enforcement mechanisms can be inconsistent due to varying levels of regulatory capacity and cultural norms that may prioritize relationships over rules (OECD, 2024) <sup>[30]</sup>.

Despite these differences, commonalities exist. Global governance frameworks increasingly emphasize transparency, auditor independence, and risk management, driven by international organizations such as the OECD and the World Bank. These shared principles reflect the broader influence of globalization in harmonizing corporate governance standards.

#### 4.6 Challenges and limitations

The adoption of U.S. corporate governance practices in other countries is not without challenges. One major obstacle is the cultural divergence between the U.S. and other regions. For example, whistleblower systems, integral to U.S. governance, face resistance in collectivist cultures where loyalty to the organization or group often outweighs individual accountability (Park *et al*, 2020). In country like South Korea, hierarchical structures and societal norms may discourage employees from reporting misconduct, limiting the effectiveness of such measures (Chang, Wilding and Shin, 2017) <sup>[5]</sup>.

Regulatory capacity is another significant limitation. While developed economies like Japan and the UK have the infrastructure to enforce stringent governance standards, emerging markets often lack the resources and institutional frameworks necessary for implementation. For instance, internal audits and compliance programs mandated by SOX require substantial investment, which can be prohibitive for companies in developing countries (Elshahoubi *et al* 2019) <sup>[11]</sup>.

Additionally, the extraterritorial reach of U.S. laws such as the FCPA poses compliance challenges for foreign firms. These laws often clash with local regulations, creating legal ambiguities and increasing the risk of penalties. Critics argue that such practices represent a form of regulatory imperialism, imposing U.S. values on jurisdictions with distinct governance philosophies (Clarke, 2009) <sup>[7]</sup>.

Lastly, the U.S. model's focus on shareholder interests has drawn criticism for prioritizing short-term financial gains over long-term sustainability. This approach may not align with the stakeholder-oriented governance models prevalent in Europe or the community-focused frameworks observed in parts of Asia (Clarke, 2009) <sup>[7]</sup>. These differences highlight the need for tailored governance solutions that respect local norms while upholding global standards of transparency and accountability.

### 5. Implications and recommendations

#### 5.1 Policy Implications

Policymakers worldwide must recognize the interconnected nature of global business and adopt strategies that strengthen fraud prevention and ethical practices across borders. One key recommendation is the development of harmonized international governance standards through organizations like the OECD or G20. These standards should provide clear guidelines on transparency, whistleblower protections, and anti-fraud mechanisms, while allowing flexibility to accommodate regional cultural and regulatory nuances.

Additionally, governments should enhance cross-border collaboration on fraud prevention, such as through data-sharing agreements and joint enforcement mechanisms. For

instance, expanding initiatives like the International Anti-Corruption Coordination Centre can improve responses to transnational financial crimes (NCA, 2024) <sup>[29]</sup>. Policymakers should also incentivize corporate compliance through tax benefits or reduced regulatory burdens for companies that adopt robust ethical frameworks and independent audits.

#### 5.2 Corporate Practices

Businesses must go beyond regulatory compliance to establish proactive governance and ethical standards. First, corporations should implement continuous training programs on fraud prevention and ethical behavior for employees at all levels. Studies show that employee awareness significantly reduces the likelihood of unethical practices (Abdzaid, 2024; Coffie, Ansah and Ellis, 2023) <sup>[1, 8]</sup>.

Second, fostering a culture of integrity and accountability is essential. Leadership must set the tone by adhering to ethical practices and encouraging transparency. Companies should establish robust whistleblower mechanisms, ensuring confidentiality and protection from retaliation, which can be achieved through anonymous reporting platforms.

Additionally, integrating technology into governance processes, such as the use of artificial intelligence for fraud detection or blockchain for transparent record-keeping, can significantly improve oversight (PwC, 2023) <sup>[35]</sup>. Regular third-party audits and public reporting on governance performance can further build stakeholder trust and accountability.

#### 5.3 Future research directions

Despite the growing emphasis on corporate governance, gaps remain in understanding its global application and effectiveness. Future research should explore how U.S. governance principles can be contextually adapted to diverse economic and cultural environments. For example, examining the intersection of governance practices and cultural dimensions, such as collectivism or power distance, can provide insights into successful adaptations.

Another critical area of study is the impact of emerging technologies, such as machine learning, on fraud prevention strategies. Research could investigate how these tools can predict and mitigate fraudulent activities without infringing on privacy or creating systemic biases.

Lastly, longitudinal studies evaluating the outcomes of governance reforms across different industries and regions would provide valuable insights into best practices and areas for improvement. Such research is essential for evolving governance frameworks that remain effective amid changing global business dynamics.

By adopting these recommendations and advancing research, policymakers and corporations can collaboratively address the rising challenges of fraud and ethical lapses, contributing to a more transparent and accountable global business environment.

### 6. Conclusion

The study examined the U.S. corporate governance framework as a model for enhancing fraud prevention and promoting ethical business practices, while analyzing its global influence. It highlighted how U.S. mechanisms, such as the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX), the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA), and whistleblower protection policies, have shaped a regulatory environment that prioritizes transparency, accountability, and ethical behavior. This paper argued that these governance principles have established a benchmark for addressing corporate misconduct, offering valuable lessons for other jurisdictions.

A key insight from this analysis is that a robust corporate governance framework is indispensable in combating fraud and fostering ethical standards. Effective governance is not solely a regulatory requirement but a strategic imperative that enhances stakeholder trust, organizational resilience, and long-term profitability. Mechanisms like independent audits, compliance programs, and leadership accountability create a culture where ethical decision-making thrives. However, the discussion also underscored that the U.S. model, while influential, is not without limitations. Challenges such as cultural divergence, regulatory disparities, and criticisms of shareholder-centric governance highlight the need for adaptable approaches that respect local contexts.

The findings emphasize the urgent need for global cooperation in promoting ethical business practices and fraud prevention. As globalization continues to blur economic and regulatory boundaries, countries must harmonize governance standards while addressing regional challenges. International organizations such as the OECD and the United Nations must play a central role in fostering collaboration, providing guidance, and monitoring compliance to create a universally applicable governance framework.

In conclusion, while the U.S. model offers valuable tools and insights, its global application requires sensitivity to cultural, economic, and institutional diversity. Policymakers, corporations, and researchers must work collectively to address these complexities, ensuring that corporate governance evolves to meet the demands of a dynamic and interconnected global economy. By prioritizing ethical leadership and robust fraud prevention strategies, businesses can contribute to a more sustainable and accountable future.

## 7. References

1. Abdzaid A. The role of self-awareness in avoiding unethical behavior in the workplace. *Technium Business and Management*. 2024;(8):34–47. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381843250\\_The\\_role\\_of\\_self-awareness\\_in\\_avoiding\\_unethical\\_behavior\\_in\\_the\\_workplace/link/668174ae0a25e27fbc19f227/download?\\_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7InBhZ2U0IjwWJsaWNhdGlvbil sInByZXZpb3VzUGFnZSI6bnVsbH19](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381843250_The_role_of_self-awareness_in_avoiding_unethical_behavior_in_the_workplace/link/668174ae0a25e27fbc19f227/download?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7InBhZ2U0IjwWJsaWNhdGlvbil sInByZXZpb3VzUGFnZSI6bnVsbH19). Accessed 22 Nov 2024.
2. Acharya VV, Cooley T, Richardson M, Sylla R, Walter I. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act: Accomplishments and limitations. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*. 2011;23(1):43–56. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1745-6622.2011.00313.x>. Accessed 20 Nov 2024.
3. Al-Faryan MA. Agency theory, corporate governance and corruption: An integrative literature review approach. *Cogent Social Sciences*. 2024;10(1). Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379925748\\_Agency\\_theory\\_corporate\\_governance\\_and\\_corruption\\_an\\_integrative\\_literature\\_review\\_approach/link/6622036439e7641c0bd7c8cb/download?\\_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7InBhZ2U0IjwWJsaWNhdGlvbil sInByZXZpb3VzUGFnZSI6bnVsbH19](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379925748_Agency_theory_corporate_governance_and_corruption_an_integrative_literature_review_approach/link/6622036439e7641c0bd7c8cb/download?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7InBhZ2U0IjwWJsaWNhdGlvbil sInByZXZpb3VzUGFnZSI6bnVsbH19). Accessed 20 Nov 2024.
4. Aronson BE. What can we learn from U.S. corporate governance? A critical analysis. *Journal of Law and Politics*. 2006;2. Available from: [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN\\_ID920865\\_code427378.pdf?abstractid=920865&mirid=1](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID920865_code427378.pdf?abstractid=920865&mirid=1). Accessed 20 Nov 2024.
5. Chang Y, Wilding M, Shin M. Determinants of whistleblowing intention: Evidence from the South Korean government. *Public Performance and Management Review*. 2017;40(4). Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15309576.2017.1318761>. Accessed 22 Nov 2024.
6. Child J. Downward accountability. In: Ciaran D, Grahame T, editors. *Corporate Governance in Contention*. Oxford Academic; 2018. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198805274.003.0009>. Accessed 21 Nov 2024.
7. Clarke T. A critique of the Anglo-American model of corporate governance. *Comparative Research in Law and Political Economy*. 2009;15. Available from: <https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1129&context=clpe>. Accessed 20 Nov 2024.
8. Coffie RB, Ansah MO, Ellis FA. The role of employee moral awareness in promoting ethical leadership: Towards reducing organisational deviance in Ghana. *Business Ethics and Leadership*. 2023;7(1):82–95. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370042030\\_The\\_Role\\_of\\_Employee\\_Moral\\_Awareness\\_in\\_Promoting\\_Ethical\\_Leadership\\_Towards\\_Reducing\\_Organisational\\_Deviance\\_in\\_Ghana/link/643ae015e881690c4bd7e9e5/download?\\_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7InBhZ2U0IjwWJsaWNhdGlvbil sInByZXZpb3VzUGFnZSI6bnVsbH19](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370042030_The_Role_of_Employee_Moral_Awareness_in_Promoting_Ethical_Leadership_Towards_Reducing_Organisational_Deviance_in_Ghana/link/643ae015e881690c4bd7e9e5/download?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7InBhZ2U0IjwWJsaWNhdGlvbil sInByZXZpb3VzUGFnZSI6bnVsbH19). Accessed 22 Nov 2024.
9. Deciu V. Impact of compliance programs on organizational psychology. *Psychology*. 2020; 11:1862–75. Available from: <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=105953>. Accessed 21 Nov 2024.
10. Donaldson L, Davis JH. Stewardship theory or agency theory: CEO governance and shareholder returns. *Australian Journal of Management*. 1991;16(1):49–64.
11. Elshahoubi I, Eltraiki F, Jaballa J, Bazina E. Challenges to compliance with corporate governance mechanisms and accountability in emerging markets: Evidence from Libyan listed companies. *Journal of Governance and Regulation*. 2019;8(9):24–41. Available from: <https://journals.indexcopernicus.com/publication/2499479>. Accessed 22 Nov 2024.
12. Enofe AO, Ogbaisi S, Mboti OH. Ethical codes of conduct and employee behavior. *Nasarawa Journal of Administration*. 2014;1(1):136–49. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364309259\\_ETHICAL\\_CODES\\_OF\\_CONDUCT\\_AND\\_EMPLOYEE\\_BEHAVIOUR/link/63455ace9cb4fe44f31d8455/download?\\_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7InBhZ2U0IjwWJsaWNhdGlvbil sInByZXZpb3VzUGFnZSI6bnVsbH19](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364309259_ETHICAL_CODES_OF_CONDUCT_AND_EMPLOYEE_BEHAVIOUR/link/63455ace9cb4fe44f31d8455/download?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7InBhZ2U0IjwWJsaWNhdGlvbil sInByZXZpb3VzUGFnZSI6bnVsbH19). Accessed 21 Nov 2024.
13. Epps RW, Guthrie CP. Sarbanes-Oxley 404 material weaknesses and discretionary accruals. *Accounting Forum*. 2010;34(2):67–75. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0155998208000768>. Accessed 20 Nov 2024.
14. Ettredge ML, Li C, Sun L. The impact of SOX section 404 internal control quality assessment on audit delay in the SOX era. *Auditing: Journal of Practice and Theory*. 2006;25(2):1–23.
15. Freeman RE. *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman; 1984.
16. Geiger MA, Taylor P. CEO and CFO certifications of financial information. *Accounting Horizons*. 2003;17(4). Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228389391\\_C](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228389391_C)

- EO\_and\_CFO\_Certifications\_of\_Financial\_Information/link/00b7d51ea96823fc0500000/download?\_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijpb7InBhZ2U0iOiJwdWJsaWNhdGlvbilInByZXZpb3VzUGFnZSI6bnVsbH19. Accessed 21 Nov 2024.
17. Gordon JN. Governance failures of the Enron board and the new information order of Sarbanes-Oxley. *Connecticut Law Review*. 2003;35:1125. Available from: [https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4470&context=faculty\\_scholarship](https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4470&context=faculty_scholarship). Accessed 21 Nov 2024.
  18. Hossain M, Hasan L, Hasan M. Corporate governance as a global phenomenon: Evolution, theoretical foundations, and practical implications. *Journal of Financial Risk Management*. 2024;13:342–75. Available from: <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=134127>. Accessed 20 Nov 2024.
  19. Hurwitz HM, Kovacs J. An overview of the SEC whistleblower award program. 2016. Available from: <https://news.law.fordham.edu/jcfl/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2016/05/An-Overview-of-the-SECs-Whistleblower-Award-Program.pdf>. Accessed 21 Nov 2024.
  20. Jensen MC, Meckling WH. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs, and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 1976;3(4):305–60. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0304405X7690026X>. Accessed 20 Nov 2024.
  21. Jo H, Hsu A, Llanos-Popolizio R, Vergara-Vega J. Corporate governance and financial fraud of Wirecard. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*. 2021;6(2):96–106. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbm.2021.6.2.708>. Accessed 21 Nov 2024.
  22. John K, Makhija AK, Ferris SP. Corporate governance in the US and global settings. *Advances in Financial Economics*. 2014;17.
  23. Kang Q, Liu Q, Qi R. The Sarbanes-Oxley act and corporate investment: A structural assessment. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 2010;96(2). Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0304405X1000022X> [Accessed 2024 Nov 20].
  24. Lima W, McLymont FN. Qualitative research methods: A critical analysis. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*. 2021;11(2):189–199. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351787645\\_Qualitative\\_Research\\_Methods\\_A\\_Critical\\_Analysis/link/6381d522c2cb154d292c98ef/download](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351787645_Qualitative_Research_Methods_A_Critical_Analysis/link/6381d522c2cb154d292c98ef/download) [Accessed 2024 Nov 20].
  25. Li Y. Microsoft's business model and strategy adjustment under ESG standard. *Advances in Economics Management and Political Sciences*. 2024;79(1):327–332. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380193736\\_Microsoft's\\_Business\\_Model\\_and\\_Strategy\\_Adjustment\\_under\\_ESG\\_Standard/link/6630f5497091b94e93e7472b/download](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380193736_Microsoft's_Business_Model_and_Strategy_Adjustment_under_ESG_Standard/link/6630f5497091b94e93e7472b/download) [Accessed 2024 Nov 21].
  26. Meier H, Meier NC. Corporate governance: An examination of U.S. and European models. *Corporate Board: Role*. 2013;9(2):6–11. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291250331\\_Corporate\\_governance\\_AN\\_examination\\_of\\_US\\_And\\_European\\_models/link/5afe2963a6fdcc3a5a0282c0/download](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291250331_Corporate_governance_AN_examination_of_US_And_European_models/link/5afe2963a6fdcc3a5a0282c0/download) [Accessed 2024 Nov 22].
  27. Mintz S. A comparison of corporate governance systems in the U.S., UK and Germany. *Corporate Ownership and Control*. 2006;3(4):24–34. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298035839\\_A\\_comparison\\_of\\_corporate\\_governance\\_systems\\_in\\_the\\_US\\_UK\\_and\\_Germany/link/5ad222a2aca272fdaf798b4c/download](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298035839_A_comparison_of_corporate_governance_systems_in_the_US_UK_and_Germany/link/5ad222a2aca272fdaf798b4c/download) [Accessed 2024 Nov 22].
  28. Mishra B, Tikoria J. Impact of ethical leadership on organizational climate and its subsequent influence on job commitment: A study in hospital context. *Journal of Management Development*. 2021;40(5):438–452. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-08-2020-0245> [Accessed 2024 Nov 20].
  29. NCA. International anti-corruption coordination centre. Available from: <https://www.nationalcrimeagency.gov.uk/what-we-do/crime-threats/bribery-corruption-and-sanctions-evasion/international-anti-corruption-centre> [Accessed 2024 Nov 22].
  30. OECD. Corporate governance in Asia: A comparative perspective. *Corporate Governance*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2024. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264189300-en> [Accessed 2024 Nov 22].
  31. Ogwiji J, Isiaka L. Assessing the effect of internal control system on risk management of financial services firms in Nigeria. *Journal of Business and Management*. 2022. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/go.GetApp.html?interested=true&originCh=footerLoggedOut&\\_sg=NTa1VrfZ8vVZXaQga8F2o99eWwdPwTAH4v8m\\_3Dotz5Sbx5gi\\_QsTbUylArRNlbo4GorXknXt6zGLEEJdZwk3\\_Q0](https://www.researchgate.net/go.GetApp.html?interested=true&originCh=footerLoggedOut&_sg=NTa1VrfZ8vVZXaQga8F2o99eWwdPwTAH4v8m_3Dotz5Sbx5gi_QsTbUylArRNlbo4GorXknXt6zGLEEJdZwk3_Q0) [Accessed 2024 Nov 20].
  32. Olori WO, Ladi SJ. Corporate governance and organisational survival in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. *Journal of Resources and Management*. 2020;64. Available from: <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/327152359.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwi20tWkjuuJAxXVQ0EAHTnrPE0QFnoECBUQAQ&usq=AOvVaw0jwkSshqhL1SAOf4xXPBI> [Accessed 2024 Nov 20].
  33. P&G. Structure and governance: Corporate governance overview. Available from: <https://us.pg.com/structure-and-governance/corporate-governance-overview/> [Accessed 2024 Nov 21].
  34. Pirzada K, Rehman N. Evaluating the factor of cost and benefit of internal audit. *Research Journal of Accounting and Finance*. 2013;4(14). Available from: <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234629694.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwihqd-g3uyJAxWQVUEAHXPOJQgQFnoECCoQAQ&usq=AOvVaw2L0KaxURnwP0Fabmy8hWis> [Accessed 2024 Nov 21].
  35. PwC. Companies act, 2013: Key highlights and analysis. Available from: <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.pwc.in/assets/pdfs/publications/2013/companies-act-2013-key-highlights-and-analysis.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwIUuyJAxWvU0EAHT8XJBIQFnoECCwQAQ&usq=AOvVaw07Mm3d20Mz0MCRQArpeWd-> [Accessed 2024 Nov 21].
  36. PwC. Impact of artificial intelligence on fraud and scam. Available from:

- [https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.pwc.co.uk/forensic-services/assets/impact-of-ai-on-fraud-and-scams.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwiDp6aum-2JAxWgTkEAHcLMJecQFnoECCMQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1noSxy6MG\\_jIG9EL73IX8N](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.pwc.co.uk/forensic-services/assets/impact-of-ai-on-fraud-and-scams.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwiDp6aum-2JAxWgTkEAHcLMJecQFnoECCMQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1noSxy6MG_jIG9EL73IX8N) [Accessed 2024 Nov 22].
37. Resende MM, Porto JB, Gracia FJ. Can we decrease unethical behavior at work? The role of ethical culture, ethical culture strength and collective moral identity. *Current Psychology*. 2024;(3):7153-7166. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12144-023-04615-z#citeas> [Accessed 2024 Nov 20].
38. Shaw TW. When text and policy conflict: Internal whistleblower under the shadow of Dodd-Frank. *Administrative Law Review*. 2018. Available from: [https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://administrativelawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/10/ALR\\_70.3\\_Shaw.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwiDq5uD4OyJAxVUW0EAHYhHDMgQFnoECBYQAQ&usg=AOvVaw2d02cmwb5FpK6PzMw8Vt8p](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://administrativelawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/10/ALR_70.3_Shaw.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwiDq5uD4OyJAxVUW0EAHYhHDMgQFnoECBYQAQ&usg=AOvVaw2d02cmwb5FpK6PzMw8Vt8p) [Accessed 2024 Nov 21].
39. Sidak JG. The failure of good intentions: The WorldCom fraud and the collapse of American telecommunications after deregulation. *Yale Journal on Regulation*. 2010;20(2):207-267. Available from: [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN\\_ID335180\\_code021001500.pdf?abstractid=335180&mirid=1](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID335180_code021001500.pdf?abstractid=335180&mirid=1) [Accessed 2024 Nov 21].
40. Tiron-Tudor A, Bota-Avram C. European union directive: The 8th company law directive on disclosure and transparency. In: Idowu SO, Capaldi N, Zu L, Gupta AD, editors. *Encyclopedia of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer; 2013. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28036-8\\_316](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28036-8_316).
41. Weber B. The difference between corporate governance in the UK and the US. *Corporate Governance Institute*. 2024. Available from: <https://www.thecorporategovernanceinstitute.com/insights/news-analysis/difference-between-corporate-governance-uk-and-united-states/> [Accessed 2024 Nov 22].
42. Wells CP, Fuminaga T. The effect of financial instruments and exchange act of Japan article 63 amendments on existing article 63 exemption operators. *National Law Review*. 2016. Available from: <https://natlawreview.com/article/effect-financial-instruments-and-exchange-act-japan-article-63-amendments-existing> [Accessed 2024 Nov 20]