

Accountability in the United States: Concepts, Mechanisms, and Challenges

I. Introduction

Accountability is a foundational principle in democratic governance and societal organization within the United States. At its core, it signifies the obligation of individuals and institutions holding positions of power or responsibility to answer for their actions, decisions, and performance to an authority capable of imposing consequences, whether rewards or sanctions.¹ This concept, derived from the Latin *computare* ("to count"), initially involved rendering a literal count of money or property entrusted to one's care, a meaning that endures in financial and budgetary accountability.³ However, it has evolved to encompass a broader sense of "giving an account"—explaining and justifying conduct.²

In the context of the United States, accountability is not a monolithic concept but rather a multifaceted imperative woven through the fabric of its political, legal, corporate, and social systems.² It underpins the legitimacy of government, the integrity of markets, and the trust necessary for social cohesion. The American system relies on a complex web of mechanisms—formal and informal, internal and external—designed to ensure that power is exercised responsibly and that those who wield it remain answerable to various constituencies, including the electorate, legal frameworks, shareholders, and the public at large. This answerability is coupled with the potential for consequences, ranging from electoral defeat and legal penalties to market repercussions and social censure, forming the essential duality of accountability.¹ Understanding accountability in the U.S. requires examining its theoretical underpinnings, its application across different domains, the specific institutions and mechanisms designed to enforce it, and the inherent challenges and ongoing evolution of this critical principle. This report will explore these dimensions, analyzing the conceptual foundations, diverse domains, key mechanisms, and notable challenges and failures related to accountability in the American context.

II. Conceptual Foundations of Accountability

The term "accountability" carries significant weight in discussions of governance, ethics, and organizational behavior, particularly within the Anglo-American tradition.³ While often used interchangeably with terms like responsibility and liability, accountability possesses distinct nuances.² Responsibility generally refers to the *obligation* to perform certain duties or tasks, while liability often denotes legal

answerability for the consequences of specific actions or contracts.³ Accountability incorporates elements of both but emphasizes the obligation to *report, explain, and justify* performance to an external entity or "forum" that has the authority to query, judge, and impose consequences.¹ This "account-giving relationship" is central: "A is accountable to B when A is obliged to inform B about A's (past or future) actions and decisions, to justify them, and to suffer punishment in the case of eventual misconduct".²

The concept's etymological roots in the Latin *computare* ("to count" or "calculate") highlight its historical connection to financial stewardship and bookkeeping.² This quantitative aspect persists in areas like fiscal accountability within government and corporate financial reporting.⁴ However, the meaning broadened early on to include more discursive forms of "giving an account," encompassing explanations and justifications for actions and decisions.³

Some scholars suggest that the prominence and specific development of the term "accountability" in English reflects the particular institutional structures and practices characteristic of Anglo-American democracies.³ It serves as a "hurrah-word," a universally desirable concept in democratic discourse, though its precise meaning can be elusive and context-dependent.⁷ Despite this apparent consensus on its desirability, defining accountability in practice remains complex, often described as meaning different things to different people.⁵

A useful framework defines accountability as "a relationship between an actor and a forum, in which the actor has an obligation to explain and to justify his or her conduct, the forum can pose questions and pass judgement, and the actor may face consequences".⁷ This actor-forum dynamic underscores that accountability is inherently relational and involves a power dynamic where the forum (e.g., voters, courts, oversight bodies, shareholders) can demand answers and potentially impose sanctions or offer rewards based on the actor's performance and explanations.¹ The potential for consequences—positive or negative—is what gives accountability its teeth and distinguishes it from mere reporting.¹ This dual nature, involving both answerability for actions and the imposition of consequences based on those actions, is fundamental to its role in ensuring responsible conduct and maintaining trust in institutions.¹

III. Domains of Accountability in the U.S.

Accountability in the United States manifests across several distinct but

interconnected domains: political, legal, corporate, and social. Each domain utilizes specific norms, structures, and mechanisms to hold relevant actors answerable for their conduct.

A. Political Accountability

Political accountability concerns the responsibility of public officials—both elected representatives and appointed administrators—to the citizens they serve.² In a democracy, this is a core tenet derived from the principle of popular representation.¹¹ Elected officials, such as the President, members of Congress, and state/local leaders, are held accountable primarily through the mechanism of free and fair elections.² Voters can assess the performance of incumbents and choose whether to retain them or replace them with challengers offering alternative policies.² This vertical accountability, flowing from the government to the citizenry, incentivizes representatives to act in the perceived interests of their constituents to secure reelection.² The effectiveness of this mechanism depends on factors like voter knowledge, the competitiveness of elections, and the frequency and term limits associated with the office.¹²

Beyond elections, political accountability operates through horizontal mechanisms, where state institutions oversee one another.¹⁶ The U.S. Constitution establishes a system of checks and balances among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, designed to prevent the concentration of power and provide avenues for mutual oversight.¹⁸ Examples include congressional oversight of executive agencies (hearings, budget control, impeachment), presidential veto power over legislation, and judicial review of executive actions and laws.¹² Administrative accountability applies to non-elected officials within government agencies, operating within hierarchical structures and subject to internal reviews, codes of conduct, and oversight by bodies like the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and Offices of Inspector General (OIGs).³ These mechanisms aim to ensure not only effective performance in the public interest but also adherence to laws and the prevention of corruption, maladministration, or abuse of power.³

B. Legal Accountability

Legal accountability involves holding individuals, public officials, and institutions responsible for their actions under the law, imposing sanctions for violations.¹⁶ It operates through both the criminal and civil justice systems.

- **Criminal Law:** Accountability in criminal law primarily focuses on punishing individuals who commit crimes. However, it extends beyond the direct perpetrator through concepts like accomplice liability, known in states like Illinois as the "law of accountability".²² Under this doctrine, a person can be held criminally responsible for another's actions if they intentionally aid, abet, solicit, or agree to help in the commission of an offense.²² This is further expanded by the "common design rule," where all members of a group engaged in a crime can be held liable for any foreseeable crimes committed by any member during the endeavor, even if not part of the original plan.²² This broadens accountability significantly, aiming to address coordinated criminal activity but also raising concerns about fairness, particularly when applied to minors or those with peripheral involvement who did not directly cause harm.²² The criminal justice system itself is subject to accountability pressures, with calls to address disparities, prosecutorial discretion, and judicial sentencing practices.²⁵ Mechanisms like the exclusionary rule (though potentially weakening) aim to hold law enforcement accountable for unconstitutional evidence gathering.²⁷ Restorative justice approaches also emphasize offender accountability through repairing harm to victims and the community.²⁸
- **Civil Law:** The civil justice system provides a crucial avenue for accountability, allowing individuals and entities to seek remedies for harm caused by others' actions or negligence.³⁰ A key mechanism for holding state actors accountable is 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which allows individuals to sue state and local officials who violate their constitutional rights while acting "under color of state law".³¹ The purpose is both to provide a remedy for the injured party and to deter future misconduct by officials.³⁰ However, the effectiveness of Section 1983 is significantly limited by the judicially created doctrine of qualified immunity, which shields officials from liability unless their conduct violates "clearly established" law, a standard critics argue is difficult to meet and often protects even egregious behavior.³¹ There is no direct statutory equivalent for suing federal officials, relying instead on the more limited *Bivens* doctrine, leading to calls for legislative reform.³¹ The Department of Justice also pursues civil actions against corporations and individuals for misconduct, emphasizing individual accountability as a deterrent.³⁴ Civil lawsuits serve broader accountability functions, such as deterring corporate negligence (e.g., unsafe products, environmental pollution) by imposing financial consequences, and holding powerful actors like prosecutors and judges accountable for misconduct through ethics complaints and other actions.³⁰

C. Corporate Accountability

Corporate accountability refers to a company's responsibility for its actions and their impact, extending beyond financial performance to shareholders to include ethical conduct, social responsibility, and environmental sustainability towards employees, communities, and the public.⁴ Key mechanisms include:

- **Financial Reporting and Auditing:** Public companies in the U.S. are legally required to publish accurate quarterly and annual financial reports detailing income and expenses.⁴ Independent auditors review these statements to ensure they are free from material misstatement, holding the company accountable for its financial reporting.⁴ The Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX) significantly strengthened these requirements in response to scandals like Enron and WorldCom, establishing the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB), mandating internal controls assessments (Section 404), requiring CEO/CFO certification of financial reports (Section 302), and enhancing penalties for fraud.³⁸ The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) plays a central role in enforcing these regulations, protecting investors, maintaining fair markets, and facilitating capital formation.⁴²
- **Corporate Governance:** This involves the systems of rules, practices, and processes by which a company is directed and controlled. Accountability mechanisms include board oversight (particularly independent audit committees mandated by SOX), shareholder rights, and codes of conduct.³⁷ Shareholder activism, where investors use their ownership stakes to influence corporate behavior through proposals, proxy contests, and engagement, serves as a significant accountability tool, often focusing on governance improvements, board composition, executive performance, and strategic changes.⁴⁶
- **Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and ESG:** Increasingly, companies are expected to be accountable for their environmental, social, and governance (ESG) performance.³⁷ CSR involves voluntary actions a company takes to operate ethically and sustainably, addressing impacts on society and the environment.⁵⁴ This can include environmental stewardship (reducing emissions, recycling), ethical labor practices, philanthropic activities, and community engagement.⁵⁵ While often voluntary, CSR reporting is becoming more common, driven by stakeholder pressure and ethical investing trends.³⁷ However, the effectiveness of CSR as an accountability mechanism is debated, with concerns about "greenwashing"—misleading claims about environmental or social performance—undermining its credibility.⁵³ Some frameworks, like the USMCA's Rapid Response

Labor Mechanism (RRM), attempt to introduce binding accountability for specific corporate social harms (labor rights) into international agreements.⁵²

- **Legal and Regulatory Liability:** Corporations are subject to laws prohibiting specific wrongdoings, such as fraud against the government (False Claims Act), securities fraud (enforced by SEC), environmental violations, and discrimination.⁴² Whistleblower provisions in laws like the False Claims Act and SOX encourage internal reporting and provide protection against retaliation, acting as a crucial internal accountability mechanism.⁴²

D. Social Accountability

Social accountability involves mechanisms through which citizens, civil society organizations, and the media hold those in power (both government and corporations) answerable for their actions and performance.²

- **Media Scrutiny:** A free and independent press plays a vital watchdog role by investigating and reporting on the actions of government officials and corporations, exposing wrongdoing, and informing the public.¹² This scrutiny can pressure officials to act responsibly and provides citizens with information needed to hold leaders accountable, particularly through elections.⁶⁶ Access to government information, facilitated by laws like FOIA, is crucial for effective media oversight.¹² However, challenges like declining trust in media, political polarization affecting perceptions of fairness, and the spread of misinformation can undermine this role.⁶⁶
- **Public Opinion and Social Norms:** Public opinion acts as a form of accountability, particularly in democracies where elected officials are sensitive to voter sentiment.² Social norms—shared expectations about appropriate behavior—also exert pressure on individuals and institutions to conform.⁷² Policies and institutional signals can shape perceptions of social norms, especially if the institutions are seen as accountable to the public.⁷² Violations of strongly held norms can lead to public backlash and reputational damage, incentivizing adherence.⁷³ However, partisan polarization can lead to differing evaluations of norms based on political advantage.⁷¹
- **Social Movements and Activism:** Organized citizen action, through protests, boycotts, petitions, and advocacy campaigns, is a powerful form of social accountability.⁴⁶ Movements like #MeToo and Black Lives Matter have effectively utilized social media to mobilize large numbers of people, share personal narratives, challenge powerful individuals and institutions, and demand accountability for issues like sexual harassment/assault and racial injustice/police

brutality.⁷⁵ These movements can bypass traditional gatekeepers, shift public discourse, and sometimes achieve tangible outcomes like investigations, policy changes, or personnel changes.⁷⁶ They exemplify how digitally enabled, decentralized activism can force accountability conversations, although translating this pressure into lasting systemic reform often requires engaging with formal legal and institutional processes.⁷⁵ Activist groups also target corporations through shareholder actions, public pressure campaigns, and calls for boycotts to hold them accountable for perceived harms.⁴⁶

Table 1: Key Mechanisms of Accountability in the U.S.

Domain	Mechanism	Primary Function/Purpose	Key Features/Limitations
Political	Elections	Select leaders, hold elected officials answerable for performance, provide citizen choice ²	Requires informed voters, competitive elections; periodic nature. ¹⁴
Political	Checks & Balances	Prevent abuse of power by distributing authority among branches (legislative, executive, judicial) ¹⁸	Constitutional basis; can lead to gridlock or inefficiency. ²⁰
Political	Impeachment	Remove federal officials for "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors" ⁸¹	Ultimate political check; requires high thresholds (House majority, 2/3 Senate conviction); definition of offenses evolves. ⁸²
Political/ Legal/ Corp	GAO/OIG Oversight	Investigate government spending/operations,	Independent, non-partisan (GAO); embedded within

		prevent fraud/waste/abuse, report findings to Congress/agencies ⁸⁵	agencies (OIGs); provide information/recommendations, lack direct enforcement power. ⁸⁸
Legal	Judicial Review	Courts review constitutionality/legality of laws and executive actions ¹²	Key check on legislative/executive power; depends on cases brought before courts; interpretations can evolve. ²⁰
Legal	Section 1983 Lawsuits	Provide civil remedy for violations of constitutional rights by state/local officials ³¹	Requires action "under color of state law"; effectiveness limited by qualified immunity. ³¹
Legal	Accomplice Liability / Law of Accountability	Hold individuals criminally responsible for crimes aided, abetted, or facilitated ²²	Extends liability beyond principal actor; uses "common design" and "natural/probable cause" doctrines; raises fairness concerns. ²²
Legal/ Social	Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)	Provide public access to government records, enabling transparency and oversight ⁷⁰	Promotes informed citizenry; subject to exemptions (privacy, security), potential delays, fees, redactions. ⁷⁰
Corporate	Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX)	Improve corporate financial reporting	Mandates internal controls (Sec 404),

		accuracy, prevent fraud, enhance auditor independence, executive accountability ³⁸	CEO/CFO certification (Sec 302), created PCAOB; compliance costs can be high. ³⁹
Corporate	SEC Regulation/Enforcement	Oversee securities markets, enforce disclosure rules, protect investors, prosecute fraud ⁴²	Central regulator for public companies; relies on disclosure and enforcement actions. ⁴²
Corporate	Shareholder Activism	Influence corporate governance/strategy through proposals, proxy contests, engagement ⁴⁷	Leverages ownership rights; effectiveness depends on support, company responsiveness; regulated by SEC rules. ⁴⁷
Corporate	Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)	Voluntary corporate actions addressing social/environmental impacts, ethical conduct ⁵⁴	Enhances reputation, attracts talent/customers; effectiveness debated, risk of "greenwashing". ⁵³
Social	Media Scrutiny	Investigate and report on government/corporate actions, inform public, act as watchdog ¹²	Crucial for transparency; challenged by bias, declining trust, misinformation, economic pressures. ⁶⁶
Social	Public Opinion / Social Norms	Shape expectations for behavior, influence electoral	Informal but powerful; influenced by media, events,

		outcomes, exert pressure for conformity ²	polarization; can be slow to change. ⁷¹
Social	Social Movements / Activism	Mobilize citizens to demand change/accountability through protests, boycotts, advocacy ⁴⁶	Can rapidly raise awareness, pressure targets (esp. via social media); translating pressure into systemic change is challenging. ⁷⁵

IV. Key Mechanisms and Institutions for Accountability

The United States employs a diverse array of mechanisms and institutions to operationalize accountability across its various domains. These range from foundational constitutional structures to specific legislative acts and oversight bodies, as well as less formal societal pressures.

A. Elections

Elections serve as the cornerstone of political accountability in the American democratic system.¹² They provide the primary mechanism through which citizens hold their elected representatives answerable for their performance in office.¹⁴ By requiring officials to periodically submit to the judgment of the electorate, elections empower voters to select leaders and sanction those whose performance is deemed unsatisfactory.² This system of "contingent renewal" incentivizes incumbents to act in ways they believe will secure reelection, theoretically aligning their actions with public interest.¹⁵ Elections function both retrospectively, allowing voters to judge past performance, and prospectively, shaping future policy by influencing who holds power and the incentives they face.¹⁵ However, the effectiveness of elections as an accountability tool is contingent upon several factors, including voter awareness and knowledge, the degree of electoral competition, the clarity of responsibility for outcomes, and the influence of factors other than performance (e.g., partisanship, campaign finance).¹⁴ Furthermore, term limits can curtail the accountability function by preventing voters from rewarding effective incumbents.⁹⁸

B. Checks and Balances

Embedded within the U.S. Constitution is the principle of checks and balances, which

modifies the separation of powers among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.¹⁸ This system is designed to prevent any single branch from accumulating excessive power and to ensure mutual oversight.¹⁹ Each branch possesses specific powers that can limit or influence the actions of the others, creating multiple points of potential accountability.¹⁸ Key examples include:

- The President's power to veto legislation passed by Congress.¹⁸
- Congress's power to override a presidential veto (requiring a two-thirds majority in both houses).²⁰
- Congress's authority over funding (appropriations) and its power to impeach and remove federal officials, including the President and judges.²⁰
- The Senate's role in confirming presidential appointments (Cabinet members, federal judges) and ratifying treaties.¹⁸
- The judiciary's power of judicial review, allowing courts to invalidate laws or executive actions deemed unconstitutional.¹²

This structure of dispersed power and mutual constraint embeds accountability within the very architecture of the federal government, forcing negotiation and shared power.²⁰ While essential for preventing tyranny and promoting deliberation, this system can also lead to gridlock and make decisive action more difficult.⁸⁰ The constant interplay and potential for conflict among the branches serve as ongoing mechanisms of horizontal accountability.¹⁶

C. Impeachment

Impeachment is a specific and powerful constitutional mechanism for holding federal officials accountable for serious misconduct.⁸¹ The Constitution grants the House of Representatives the "sole Power of Impeachment" (the power to bring charges) and the Senate the "sole Power to try all Impeachments".⁸³ Officials, including the President, Vice President, and federal judges, can be impeached for "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors".⁸¹ This standard, inherited from English practice, is understood to encompass not just indictable crimes but also abuses of power, violations of public trust, and offenses against the state itself.⁸²

The process involves the House investigating and approving articles of impeachment by a simple majority vote.⁸¹ If impeached, the official faces trial in the Senate, presided over by the Chief Justice in presidential impeachments.⁸² Conviction requires a two-thirds vote of Senators present and results in mandatory removal from office; the Senate may also vote to disqualify the individual from holding future

federal office.⁸² Impeachment is fundamentally a political process with legal elements, intended as a crucial check on the executive and judicial branches rather than a standard criminal proceeding.⁸² Its use is relatively rare, particularly against presidents, reflecting its gravity and the high political threshold for conviction.⁸¹ It serves as an ultimate accountability tool for egregious misconduct that undermines the constitutional order.⁸²

D. Oversight Bodies: GAO and OIGs

Congress has established specialized bodies to enhance its oversight capabilities and promote accountability within the executive branch.

- **Government Accountability Office (GAO):** Often called the "congressional watchdog," the GAO is an independent, non-partisan agency working for Congress.⁸⁵ Established by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, its mission is to examine how taxpayer funds are spent, evaluate federal programs, and provide objective, fact-based information and recommendations to Congress and federal agencies to improve efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability.⁸⁵ GAO conducts audits, evaluations, and investigations, often at the request of congressional committees or as required by statute.⁸⁹ Its work covers the full breadth of government activities and aims to identify financial savings and operational improvements.⁸⁹ While GAO lacks direct enforcement power, its reports carry significant weight and inform legislative and administrative actions.⁸⁹ It serves as a critical information-gathering and evaluation arm for Congress, enhancing fiscal, process, and program accountability.⁸
- **Offices of Inspector General (OIGs):** Established by the Inspector General Act of 1978 and subsequent amendments, OIGs exist within numerous federal agencies.⁸⁷ Led by Inspectors General (IGs), these offices are designed to be independent units tasked with preventing and detecting fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement within their specific agency.⁸⁸ They conduct audits, investigations, inspections, and evaluations of agency programs and operations.⁸⁸ IGs have a dual reporting responsibility—to their agency head and directly to Congress—keeping both informed about problems and corrective actions.⁸⁸ They possess significant statutory authorities, including access to agency records and the ability to hire staff independently, intended to safeguard their operational autonomy.⁸⁸ OIGs provide specialized, embedded oversight, contributing significantly to agency-level accountability.⁸⁸ The Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) coordinates the IG community.⁸⁷ However, ensuring true independence and the effective implementation of OIG

recommendations remain ongoing considerations.⁸⁸

E. Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)

Enacted in 1966, the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) is a key legislative tool promoting government transparency and accountability.⁷⁰ It provides the public—including citizens, journalists, researchers, and organizations—a statutory right to request access to records held by federal executive branch agencies.⁹¹ The underlying principle is that an informed citizenry is vital to democracy and that access to government information allows the public to understand government operations and hold officials accountable.⁹¹ As Justice Brandeis noted, "sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants," and FOIA embodies this idea.⁷⁰ Agencies are required to disclose requested information unless it falls under one of nine specific exemptions (e.g., protecting personal privacy, national security, law enforcement investigations, confidential business information) or three exclusions.⁷⁰ FOIA also requires agencies to proactively publish certain information, such as rules and policies, in the Federal Register.⁷⁰ Requesters can seek judicial review if an agency denies access to records.⁷⁰ While a powerful tool, FOIA's effectiveness can be limited by the scope of exemptions, agency processing times and backlogs, potential fees, redactions, and the need for requesters to identify the correct agency and describe records with reasonable specificity.⁹³ Nonetheless, FOIA remains a critical mechanism enabling media scrutiny, public oversight, and legal challenges, thereby bolstering government accountability.¹²

F. Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX)

Passed in 2002 in response to major corporate accounting scandals like Enron and WorldCom, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX) represents a landmark piece of legislation aimed at restoring investor confidence and enhancing corporate accountability.³⁸ SOX mandated significant reforms targeting corporate governance, financial reporting, auditing, and executive responsibility for publicly traded companies in the U.S..³⁸ Key provisions include:

- **Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) (Title I):** Established an independent board to oversee the audits of public companies, ending the accounting profession's self-regulation and setting standards for audit quality and ethics.³⁹
- **Auditor Independence (Title II):** Imposed stricter rules to ensure auditor independence, prohibiting auditors from providing certain non-audit services

(like consulting) to their audit clients and requiring rotation of lead audit partners.³⁹

- **Corporate Responsibility (Title III):** Required CEOs and CFOs to personally certify the accuracy and completeness of financial reports (Section 302), taking direct responsibility for disclosures.³⁸ It also mandated independent audit committees on corporate boards responsible for overseeing the external auditor.³⁹
- **Enhanced Financial Disclosures (Title IV):** Most notably, Section 404 requires management to establish, maintain, and annually assess the effectiveness of internal controls over financial reporting (ICFR), with external auditors attesting to management's assessment (for larger companies).⁴⁰ This focus on internal process integrity is central to ensuring reliable financial data.⁹⁵ SOX also mandated disclosures of off-balance-sheet transactions and material changes.³⁸
- **Corporate and Criminal Fraud Accountability (Titles VIII, IX, XI):** Increased criminal penalties for securities fraud, document destruction/alteration related to investigations, and certifying false financial reports. It also provided enhanced protections for corporate whistleblowers.³⁸

SOX fundamentally reshaped the landscape of corporate governance and accountability in the U.S., increasing transparency, strengthening oversight, and placing greater personal responsibility on executives and auditors.³⁸ While compliance, particularly with Section 404, involves significant costs, the act is widely credited with improving the reliability of financial reporting and restoring trust in capital markets.⁴⁰

G. Shareholder Activism

Shareholder activism refers to actions taken by shareholders—often institutional investors or specialized activist funds—to influence a corporation's behavior, policies, or governance structure.⁴⁸ It functions as a market-based accountability mechanism, leveraging ownership rights to pressure management and boards.⁴⁷ Activists typically acquire a stake in a company they perceive as underperforming or poorly managed and then advocate for changes aimed at enhancing shareholder value.⁴⁸ Tactics range from private engagement with management and boards to public campaigns involving press releases and open letters, nominating alternative director candidates in proxy contests, and submitting shareholder proposals for inclusion in the company's proxy statement under SEC Rule 14a-8.⁴⁶ Common activist goals include pushing for board refreshment (replacing long-tenured directors), demanding CEO

changes, advocating for specific strategic actions (like selling the company or spinning off divisions), or seeking changes in capital allocation (share buybacks, dividends).⁴⁸ The rise of the universal proxy card has made it easier for activists to target specific directors.⁴⁸ While sometimes confrontational, activism often leads to negotiated settlements between the activist and the company.⁴⁹ Shareholder activism serves as an external check, pushing for greater accountability, transparency, and performance from corporate leadership.⁴⁷

H. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) represents a company's commitment to operate ethically and contribute to sustainable development by considering the social and environmental impact of its business activities.⁵⁴ It encompasses a range of voluntary actions beyond legal requirements, often categorized into environmental (reducing pollution, sustainability), social/ethical (fair labor practices, human rights, diversity), philanthropic (charitable donations, community support), and economic (responsible financial practices) responsibilities.⁵⁴ Companies engage in CSR for various reasons, including enhancing brand reputation, attracting and retaining employees and customers, mitigating risks, and potentially improving long-term financial performance.⁵⁵ CSR reporting, though often voluntary, is increasingly common as stakeholders demand greater transparency about non-financial performance.³⁷

However, the effectiveness of CSR as a genuine accountability mechanism is subject to significant debate and criticism.⁹⁶ A major concern is "greenwashing"—the practice of misleading stakeholders about a company's environmental or social performance through vague, irrelevant, or unsubstantiated claims.⁵³ This deceptive marketing can erode trust, misdirect investment, and undermine the credibility of legitimate CSR efforts.⁵³ Critics argue that voluntary CSR initiatives are often insufficient to ensure meaningful corporate accountability and may serve primarily as public relations tools rather than drivers of substantive change.⁵⁹ This has led to calls for more binding regulations, enhanced transparency, third-party verification, and stronger enforcement mechanisms to ensure corporate claims align with actual practices.⁵³ The concept of Business and Human Rights (BHR), focusing specifically on corporate responsibility to respect human rights and provide access to remedy, emerged partly in response to perceived limitations of broader CSR frameworks.⁹⁶

I. Media and Public Opinion

The media and public opinion serve as crucial, albeit informal, mechanisms of social accountability in the U.S..¹² The media acts as a "watchdog," investigating and reporting on the actions of government officials and corporations, thereby holding them up to public scrutiny.⁶⁶ This function is vital for informing citizens, shaping public opinion, and creating pressure for accountability.⁶⁶ Research suggests most Americans believe media scrutiny helps prevent political leaders from misconduct.⁶⁹ Media coverage can influence policy agendas and electoral outcomes.⁶⁸ Public opinion itself exerts pressure, as elected officials are generally responsive to constituent views, and both governments and corporations are sensitive to reputational damage resulting from negative public perception.² Social norms, reflecting collective expectations of behavior, are reinforced or challenged through public discourse, often mediated by the media.⁷²

However, the effectiveness of media and public opinion as accountability tools faces challenges. Declining public trust in the media, perceptions of bias (particularly along partisan lines), the proliferation of misinformation and disinformation, and economic pressures on the news industry can weaken the media's watchdog role.⁶⁶ Political polarization can also lead partisans to discount critical media coverage of their own side or evaluate norms based on political expediency rather than principle.⁶⁹ Despite these challenges, the media's capacity to disseminate information and frame issues, coupled with the power of public sentiment, remains a significant force for accountability.⁶⁶

Table 2: Landmark Legislation and Doctrines Shaping U.S. Accountability

Law/Doctrine	Established/Enacted	Core Purpose re: Accountability	Key Impact/Provisions
U.S. Constitution (Checks & Balances)	1789	Distribute power among branches (legislative, executive, judicial) to prevent tyranny and ensure mutual oversight ¹⁸	Separation of powers, specific checks (veto, impeachment, confirmation, judicial review). ¹⁸

U.S. Constitution (Impeachment)	1789	Provide a mechanism to remove federal officials for serious misconduct ("high Crimes and Misdemeanors") ⁸¹	House impeaches, Senate tries; requires 2/3 Senate vote for removal; ultimate political check. ⁸²
Administrative Procedure Act (APA)	1946	Establish procedures for federal agency rulemaking and adjudication, allow judicial review of agency actions ⁷⁰	Basis for challenging agency actions as "arbitrary, capricious"; foundation for regulatory transparency/accountability. ¹²⁶
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)	1966	Grant public right to access federal agency records, promoting transparency and government accountability ⁷⁰	Mandates disclosure unless records fall under specific exemptions; enables public/media oversight. ⁷⁰
42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Civil Rights Act of 1871)	1871	Provide a federal civil cause of action against state/local officials violating constitutional rights ³¹	Key tool for holding state actors accountable in court; effectiveness limited by qualified immunity. ³¹
<i>Bivens</i> Doctrine	1971 (Supreme Court)	Recognize implied right to sue federal officials for certain constitutional violations ³²	Limited avenue for federal official accountability; scope significantly narrowed by subsequent court decisions. ³²

Inspector General Act	1978	Establish independent OIGs within federal agencies to combat fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement ⁸⁷	Mandates audits/investigations; dual reporting to agency head and Congress; promotes internal agency accountability. ⁸⁸
Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX)	2002	Reform corporate governance, financial reporting, and auditing after major scandals; protect investors ³⁸	Created PCAOB, mandated internal controls (Sec 404), CEO/CFO certification (Sec 302), enhanced auditor independence, increased penalties. ³⁹
Qualified Immunity	Judicially Created	Shield government officials from civil liability unless conduct violates "clearly established" rights ³¹	Protects officials from frivolous suits but heavily criticized for hindering accountability for misconduct. ³¹
Accomplice Liability / Law of Accountability	State Law (Varies)	Hold individuals criminally liable for crimes they aid, abet, or facilitate ²²	Extends criminal responsibility beyond the principal actor based on intent and participation; includes doctrines like "common design". ²²

V. Social Movements and Accountability

Social movements have become increasingly potent forces in demanding accountability from both government and corporate entities in the United States, often leveraging public pressure and media attention to challenge perceived injustices or harms.⁴⁶ Utilizing tactics such as protests, boycotts, petitions, and

sophisticated public awareness campaigns, these movements mobilize citizens to hold powerful actors answerable.⁴⁶

The digital age has profoundly reshaped social accountability movements. Platforms like Twitter (now X), Facebook, and Instagram enable rapid mobilization, widespread dissemination of information, and the amplification of personal narratives, often bypassing traditional media gatekeepers.⁷⁵ Movements such as #MeToo and Black Lives Matter exemplify this dynamic.⁷⁵

The #MeToo movement, catalyzed by a viral hashtag in 2017 following earlier work by Tarana Burke, brought unprecedented global attention to the pervasiveness of sexual harassment and assault.⁷⁷ Millions shared personal stories online, creating immense public pressure that led to investigations, resignations, and legal consequences for numerous high-profile individuals across various sectors.⁷⁷ The movement shifted public discourse, increased awareness, and contributed to policy discussions and some legislative changes regarding workplace harassment and non-disclosure agreements.⁷⁷

Similarly, the Black Lives Matter movement, originating in 2013 in response to the acquittal of George Zimmerman and gaining massive traction following subsequent incidents of police violence against Black Americans (notably the murder of George Floyd in 2020), used its hashtag to galvanize global protests against racial injustice and police brutality.⁷⁵ The movement focused public attention on systemic racism within the criminal justice system, leading to widespread debate, some local policing reforms, and increased corporate statements and commitments regarding racial equity.⁷⁶ Policing and police violence remained a consistent theme in #BlackLivesMatter discourse over the decade.⁷⁶

These movements demonstrate the power of decentralized, digitally-enabled activism to rapidly build momentum, shape public narratives, and force accountability conversations onto the public agenda.⁷⁵ They effectively challenge established power structures by mobilizing collective action and leveraging public outrage.⁴⁶ However, while highly effective at raising awareness and demanding immediate consequences for individuals or specific incidents, translating this public pressure into durable, systemic institutional or legal reforms often proves more challenging.⁷⁶ Achieving long-term change typically requires sustained engagement with the slower, more complex processes of legislative action, policy implementation, and institutional transformation, areas where the initial energy of mass mobilization can be difficult to

maintain or channel effectively. Furthermore, the framing of these movements can sometimes intersect with populist dynamics, pitting "the people" (e.g., marginalized groups) against perceived elites based on specific ideologies like racial equality or feminism, which can influence political responses and societal divisions.⁷⁵

VI. Challenges and Failures in Accountability

Despite the extensive array of mechanisms designed to ensure accountability in the United States, significant challenges persist, and notable failures have occurred across governmental and corporate spheres. These failures often highlight systemic weaknesses and prompt calls for reform.

A. Case Studies of Accountability Failures

Examining specific instances of failure provides concrete illustrations of how accountability systems can break down.

- **1. Corporate Scandals: Enron and WorldCom:** These early 2000s scandals became emblematic of catastrophic corporate accountability failures.⁴¹ Key breakdowns included:
 - *Aggressive and Fraudulent Accounting:* Enron utilized mark-to-market accounting abuses and Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) to inflate earnings and hide massive debt.⁴¹ WorldCom improperly capitalized operating expenses to mask losses.⁴¹
 - *Executive Misconduct:* Top executives at both companies lacked integrity, oversaw fraudulent schemes, and misled investors.⁴¹
 - *Auditor Complicity:* Arthur Andersen, auditor for both firms, failed in its oversight role due to conflicts of interest (lucrative consulting fees), lack of independence, and ultimately, obstruction of justice through document shredding in the Enron case.⁴¹
 - *Weak Internal Controls and Board Oversight:* Both companies suffered from inadequate internal controls and insufficient oversight from their boards of directors, enabling the fraud to persist.⁴¹ The consequences were devastating: shareholders lost billions, thousands of employees lost jobs and pensions, both companies collapsed into bankruptcy, executives faced criminal convictions, and Arthur Andersen ceased to exist as a major accounting firm.⁴¹ These failures were the direct catalyst for the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, a sweeping reform aimed at preventing similar breakdowns through stricter regulations on internal controls, executive

certification, auditor independence, and oversight.³⁸

- **2. Government Project Failure: Healthcare.gov Launch:** The October 2013 launch of the federal health insurance marketplace website, Healthcare.gov, was widely regarded as a major government failure.¹³² Key accountability issues included:
 - *Poor Government Oversight:* The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) failed to develop a clear procurement strategy, adequately vet contractors, or provide sufficient oversight during development.¹³² Leadership seemed unaware of basic project management requirements and underestimated the project's technical complexity.¹³²
 - *Inadequate Contractor Management:* There was no clearly designated lead integrating contractor, leading to confusion and lack of coordination among the multiple vendors involved.¹³² CMS failed to hold contractors accountable for poor performance despite warning signs.¹³²
 - *Technical Execution Failures:* The project suffered from poor software development practices, insufficient and delayed testing (especially load testing), and a failure to manage the complex integration required between various government databases and private insurers.¹³² The result was a website plagued by crashes, glitches, and an inability for users to enroll, causing significant public frustration, undermining a key policy initiative (the Affordable Care Act), and eroding trust in the government's ability to manage large IT projects.¹³²
- **3. Systemic Government Failures:** Beyond specific projects, broader systemic failures have occurred. Examples include the inadequate federal response to Hurricane Katrina (2005), regulatory failures contributing to the 2008 financial crisis, intelligence failures regarding weapons of mass destruction in Iraq (2003), failures in oversight leading to the Fort Hood shooting (2009) or the I-35W bridge collapse (2007), and widespread fraud within federal programs, with estimated annual losses ranging from \$233 billion to \$521 billion between 2018-2022.¹³³

These diverse cases underscore that significant accountability failures, whether corporate or governmental, rarely stem from a single isolated cause. Instead, they typically arise from a confluence of interacting factors, such as inadequate oversight structures, critical gaps in internal controls, conflicts of interest that compromise judgment, a lack of transparency that allows problems to fester, poor risk management practices, and sometimes, deliberate misconduct by key actors.⁴¹ These failures often expose deeper, systemic vulnerabilities within organizations or regulatory frameworks and frequently serve as powerful catalysts, driving demand for

substantial reforms designed to address the identified weaknesses and prevent recurrence.⁴¹

B. Systemic Challenges to Accountability

Several systemic factors present ongoing challenges to achieving effective accountability in the U.S.:

- **Qualified Immunity:** This judicial doctrine significantly hinders the legal accountability of state and local officials by shielding them from civil liability for constitutional violations unless their conduct violates rights that were "clearly established" at the time—a standard often difficult for plaintiffs to meet.³¹ Critics argue it creates a near-insurmountable barrier to redress for victims of official misconduct.³²
- **Lack of Federal Official Liability:** Unlike the statutory basis for suing state officials (Section 1983), there is no clear, comprehensive federal statute allowing individuals to sue federal officials for constitutional violations. Reliance on the judicially created and subsequently narrowed *Bivens* doctrine leaves a significant gap in accountability for federal actors.³¹
- **Regulatory Capture and Weak Enforcement:** Agencies tasked with overseeing industries or enforcing laws may lack sufficient resources, political will, or independence, potentially leading to weak enforcement or "regulatory capture," where the agency becomes overly aligned with the interests it regulates.³⁰ This can undermine the effectiveness of regulatory accountability, as seen in contributing factors to the 2008 financial crisis or environmental oversight challenges.³⁰
- **Information Asymmetry:** A fundamental challenge is that those being held accountable (e.g., government agencies, corporate executives) often possess far more information about their operations and decisions than those attempting to hold them accountable (Congress, the public, shareholders).¹¹ Mechanisms like FOIA aim to reduce this gap, but they have inherent limitations, making effective external oversight difficult.¹¹
- **Greenwashing and CSR Limitations:** The voluntary nature of many CSR initiatives and the difficulty in verifying corporate claims about social and environmental performance ("greenwashing") limit CSR's effectiveness as a robust accountability mechanism.⁵³ Lack of standardized metrics and independent verification makes it hard to distinguish genuine efforts from public relations exercises.⁵⁹
- **Complexity and Scale:** The sheer size, scope, and complexity of modern

government programs and large corporations make comprehensive monitoring and accountability inherently difficult.¹¹ Oversight bodies may struggle to keep pace with evolving risks and specialized operations.⁸⁸

- **Political Polarization:** Increasing partisan divisions in the U.S. can undermine accountability efforts. Partisans may be more likely to excuse misconduct by their own side, view oversight mechanisms (like media scrutiny or impeachment) through a partisan lens, or disagree on fundamental accountability standards and norms, weakening their collective force.⁶⁹

C. The Tension Between Accountability and Other Values

Implementing accountability mechanisms often involves navigating inherent tensions and trade-offs with other important societal and institutional values:

- **Efficiency:** Measures designed to ensure accountability—such as multiple layers of review, detailed reporting requirements, or strong checks and balances—can sometimes slow down decision-making, increase costs, and lead to inefficiency or gridlock.⁸⁰ The compliance costs associated with regulations like SOX are a frequently cited example.⁴⁰
- **Independence:** There is often a tension between holding actors accountable and preserving necessary operational or decisional independence. This is prominent in debates about judicial accountability versus judicial independence¹² and ensuring auditor independence while maintaining a working relationship with the client company.³⁹ Excessive political interference in the name of accountability can undermine the impartial functioning of courts or expert agencies.
- **Discretion:** Accountability mechanisms often aim to constrain or guide the discretion exercised by officials (e.g., police officers, prosecutors, agency administrators).²⁵ However, some level of discretion is often necessary for effective and nuanced decision-making in complex situations. Striking the right balance between controlling potential abuses of discretion and allowing for necessary flexibility is a constant challenge.²⁵
- **Innovation and Risk-Taking:** An overly punitive or risk-averse accountability environment could potentially stifle necessary innovation, experimentation, and prudent risk-taking in both government and the private sector. The fear of blame or litigation for outcomes that turn out poorly, even if decisions were reasonable at the time, might discourage bold action.³²

Successfully designing and implementing accountability systems in the U.S. requires acknowledging and navigating these inherent trade-offs. An overemphasis on

accountability at the expense of efficiency might lead to paralysis, while excessive focus on independence or discretion without sufficient checks can open the door to abuse of power or poor performance. The "right" balance is often context-dependent and subject to ongoing political and societal negotiation.³²

VII. Conclusion: The Enduring Importance and Evolving Nature of Accountability in the U.S.

A. Synthesis: A Multifaceted Imperative

Accountability stands as a cornerstone principle within the American system of governance and societal organization. Fundamentally, it embodies the dual requirements of answerability—the obligation to explain and justify actions—and the potential for consequences based on performance and conduct.¹ Rooted deeply in democratic ideals and the rule of law, it serves as a vital mechanism for ensuring that power is exercised responsibly, whether in the political, legal, corporate, or social sphere.¹¹ Rather than a single, uniform concept, accountability in the U.S. manifests as a complex constellation of interrelated norms, practices, institutions, and mechanisms designed to foster transparency, integrity, and responsiveness.²

B. Interplay of Mechanisms

The pursuit of accountability in the U.S. relies on a diverse and overlapping array of tools. Formal mechanisms established by law and the Constitution include regular elections, the intricate system of checks and balances, judicial review, legislative oversight facilitated by bodies like the GAO and OIGs, specific statutes creating liability (e.g., Section 1983, SOX), and transparency mandates like FOIA.² These are complemented and often activated by informal mechanisms rooted in civil society, such as media scrutiny, the influence of public opinion and social norms, shareholder activism, and the mobilizing power of social movements.¹² These mechanisms rarely operate in isolation; their effectiveness often depends on their interplay. For instance, FOIA empowers investigative journalism and legal challenges; election outcomes are shaped by public opinion influenced by media coverage and social movements; corporate reforms like SOX were direct responses to failures exposed by market reactions and media attention.¹⁵ This interconnectedness underscores the systemic nature of accountability in the American context.

C. The State and Future of Accountability

Despite its centrality, accountability in the U.S. faces persistent and evolving challenges. Doctrines like qualified immunity limit legal recourse against official misconduct, while gaps remain in holding federal officials liable.³¹ The complexity of modern governance and corporate structures strains oversight capacity, and information asymmetries continue to pose obstacles.¹¹ The rise of "greenwashing" highlights the limitations of voluntary corporate accountability measures.⁵³ Furthermore, political polarization threatens to erode consensus on accountability standards and weaken the perceived legitimacy of oversight mechanisms⁶⁹, contributing to declining public trust.⁷⁴

Yet, accountability is not static. Its standards, focus, and mechanisms continually evolve in response to major failures (like Enron or Watergate), technological advancements (which enable new forms of digital activism and require new ethical considerations, e.g., AI ethics), and shifting societal expectations regarding corporate behavior and government responsiveness.² The ongoing debates around police reform, corporate ESG responsibilities, and platform accountability demonstrate this dynamic nature.

Ultimately, maintaining and strengthening accountability across all sectors—political, legal, corporate, and social—remains a vital and continuous task essential for the health of American democracy, the integrity of its institutions, and the promotion of responsible conduct. It requires ongoing vigilance from citizens, robust oversight from dedicated institutions, a commitment to transparency, and a willingness to adapt and reform mechanisms in response to new challenges and demonstrated failures.²¹ The pursuit of effective accountability is not a destination but an enduring process fundamental to the American experiment.

引用文献

1. www.britannica.com, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/accountability#:~:text=accountability%2C%20principle%20according%20to%20which,to%20issue%20rewards%20or%20punishment.>
2. Accountability - Wikipedia, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Accountability>
3. Accountability | Definition & Examples | Britannica, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/accountability>
4. Accountability: Definition, Types, Benefits, and Example - Investopedia, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/a/accountability.asp>
5. A Cross-Disciplinary Review of the Concept of Accountability - DIMACS, 5 月 2,

2025 にアクセス、

<http://archive.dimacs.rutgers.edu/Workshops/TAFC/TAFCWorkshop-SURVEY.pdf>

6. What is personal accountability, and why does it matter in the workplace? | Nulab, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://nulab.com/learn/collaboration/what-is-personal-accountability-in-the-workplace/>
7. Defining Accountability (Chapter 1) - Measuring Accountability in Public Governance Regimes - Cambridge University Press, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/measuring-accountability-in-public-governance-regimes/defining-accountability/3946D103AFDCE7E9E4CCBDEAE3B7D099>
8. Who Is Accountable? To Whom? For What? How? | U.S. GAO, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.gao.gov/products/112501>
9. Full article: Accountability: Construct definition and measurement of a virtue vital to flourishing - Taylor & Francis Online, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17439760.2022.2109203>
10. ACCOUNTABILITY Definition & Meaning - Merriam-Webster, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/accountability>
11. Who Is Accountable? To Whom? For What? How? | U.S. GAO, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.gao.gov/products/111071>
12. U.S. GOVERNMENT > Introduction to the U.S. System > Principles of Democracy - USInfo.org, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、https://usinfo.org/enus/government/overview/government_dem.html
13. Government Accountability - Principles of Democracy, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.principlesofdemocracy.org/government-dem>
14. Election - Representation, Voter Choice, Accountability - Britannica, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.britannica.com/topic/election-political-science/Functions-of-elections>
15. THE PURPOSE AND LIMITS OF ELECTORAL ACCOUNTABILITY Finlay Malcolm - Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://jesp.org/index.php/jesp/article/view/2241/410>
16. Accountability to the Law | United States Institute of Peace, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.usip.org/guiding-principles-stabilization-and-reconstruction-the-web-version/rule-law/accountability-the-law>
17. Political Accountability: Vertical, Horizontal, and Diagonal Constraints on Governments - V-Dem, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、https://www.v-dem.net/media/publications/pb_22_final.pdf
18. Branches of the U.S. government | USAGov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.usa.gov/branches-of-government>
19. Checks and Balances - Ben's Guide, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://bensguide.gpo.gov/j-check-balance>
20. Checks and balances | Definition, History, & Facts - Britannica, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.britannica.com/topic/checks-and-balances>

21. Accountability - (Honors US Government) - Vocab, Definition, Explanations | Fiveable, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://fiveable.me/key-terms/hs-honors-us-government/accountability>
22. Accountability Theory - Restore Justice Foundation, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.restorejustice.org/legal-explainer/explainer-accountability-theory/>
23. Can I Be Held Accountable for a Crime That Someone Else Committed? | Arlington Heights, IL Criminal Law Attorney, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.scottandersoncriminaldefense.com/arlingtonheightscriminallawyer/can-i-be-held-accountable-for-a-crime-that-someone-else-committed>
24. Criminal Law: Accountability for the Acts of Others - Open Casebooks, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://opencasebook.org/casebooks/9294-criminal-law/as-printable-html/6/>
25. Inequality in the Criminal Justice System and Accountability - American Military University, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.amu.apus.edu/area-of-study/legal-studies/resources/inequality-in-the-criminal-justice-system-and-accountability/>
26. Scrutiny & Accountability | Criminal Justice Alliance, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.criminaljusticealliance.org/systems-change/scrutiny-accountability/>
27. How to Hold Police and Criminals Accountable - Vanderbilt Law School, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://law.vanderbilt.edu/how-to-hold-police-and-criminals-accountable/>
28. Accountability - (Intro to Law and Legal Process) - Vocab, Definition, Explanations | Fiveable, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://fiveable.me/key-terms/introduction-law-legal-process/accountability>
29. Balanced and Restorative Justice Practice: Accountability, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://oijdp.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh176/files/pubs/implementing/accountability.html>
30. Safety and Accountability: What is the Purpose of the Civil Justice System? | Mitchell Hoffman & Wolf | Chicago Personal Injury Lawyers, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://mitchellhoffmanwolf.com/blog/safety-and-accountability-what-is-the-purpose-of-the-civil-justice-system/>
31. Accountability for Government Agents | Cato Institute, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.cato.org/cato-handbook-policymakers/cato-handbook-policymakers-9th-edition-2022/accountability-government-agents>
32. Promoting Accountability: State and Federal Officials Shouldn't Be ..., 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/promoting-accountability-state-federal-officials-shouldnt-law/>
33. S.3415 - Constitutional Accountability Act 117th Congress (2021-2022), 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/3415>
34. Office of the Deputy Attorney General | INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTABILITY | United

- States Department of Justice, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.justice.gov/archives/dag/individual-accountability>
35. The Accountability Project - Civil Rights Corps, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://civilrightscorps.org/accountability/>
36. Congresswoman Norma Torres Co-leads Reintroduction of Bicameral Legislation Holding Judiciary Accountable to Its Employees, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://torres.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/congresswoman-norma-torres-co-leads-reintroduction-of-bicameral-legislation-holding-judiciary-accountable-to-its-employees>
37. Corporate Accountability: Definition, Examples, Importance - Investopedia, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/corporate-accountability.asp>
38. What is Sarbanes-Oxley Act 2002? | A Comprehensive Summary - Pathlock, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://pathlock.com/learn/sarbanes-oxley-act-summary/>
39. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act: A Comprehensive Overview - AuditBoard, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://auditboard.com/blog/sarbanes-oxley-act>
40. Sarbanes-Oxley Act: What It Does to Protect Investors - Investopedia, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/sarbanesoxleyact.asp>
41. From Independence to Regulation: A Look into Major Accounting ..., 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
https://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2767&context=utk_chanhonoproj
42. The SEC's Evolving Role: What It Means for Workers in 2025 - Sodales Solutions, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.sodalessolutions.com/the-secs-evolving-role-what-it-means-for-workers-and-corporate-regulation-in-2025/>
43. Mission - SEC.gov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.sec.gov/about/mission>
44. In the Midst of Revolution: The SEC, 1973-1981 (Corporate Governance and Accountability), 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.sechistorical.org/museum/galleries/rev/rev04b.php>
45. The Sarbanes Oxley Act, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://sarbanes-oxley-act.com/>
46. What we do - Corporate Accountability, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://corporateaccountability.org/what-we-do/>
47. Shareholder Rights and SEC Policy - Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.iccr.org/issues/shareholder-rights/>
48. U.S. Shareholder Activism Review 2024 and a Look Toward 2025, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2025/03/12/u-s-shareholder-activism-review-2024-and-a-look-toward-2025/>
49. Shareholder Activism – 2024 Review and 2025 Outlook, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2025/03/14/shareholder-activism-2024-review-and-2025-outlook/>

50. Shareholders' Rights & Shareholder Activism 2024 - USA - Global Practice Guides, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://practiceguides.chambers.com/practice-guides/shareholders-rights-shareholder-activism-2024/usa/trends-and-developments>
51. Holding Companies Accountable through Shareholder Activism - Green America, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.greenamerica.org/blog/holding-companies-accountable-through-shareholder-action>
52. Corporate Accountability by Treaty: The New North American Rapid Response Labor Mechanism | American Journal of International Law - Cambridge University Press, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-journal-of-international-law/article/corporate-accountability-by-treaty-the-new-north-american-rapid-response-labor-mechanism/EBFEA2D185357FD4CB1CC36C0647C271>
53. From the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and the Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Criteria to the Greenwashing Phenomenon: A Comprehensive Literature Review About the Causes, Consequences and Solutions of the Phenomenon with Specific Case Studies - MDPI, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/17/5/2222>
54. Corporate Social Responsibility: A Strategic Imperative For Modern Businesses - Forbes, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbesbusinesscouncil/2024/10/11/corporate-social-responsibility-a-strategic-imperative-for-modern-businesses/>
55. What Is CSR? Corporate Social Responsibility Explained - Investopedia, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/corp-social-responsibility.asp>
56. Why Corporate Social Responsibility Matters | Greater Houston Community Foundation, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://ghcf.org/articles/corporate-social-responsibility/>
57. 16 Brands Doing Corporate Social Responsibility Successfully - Digital Marketing Institute, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://digitalmarketinginstitute.com/blog/corporate-16-brands-doing-corporate-social-responsibility-successfully>
58. 15 Eye-Opening Corporate Social Responsibility Statistics - HBS Online, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://online.hbs.edu/blog/post/corporate-social-responsibility-statistics>
59. Greenwashing in the era of sustainability: A systematic literature review - Virtus InterPress, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://virtusinterpress.org/IMG/pdf/cgsrv9i1p2.pdf>
60. Greenwashing in ESG: Identifying and Addressing False Claims of Sustainability, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/386587782_Greenwashing_in_ESG_Identifying_and_Addresssing_False_Claims_of_Sustainability

61. Greenwashing in Corporate Social Responsibility: A Dual-Faceted Analysis of Its Impact on Employee Trust and Identification - MDPI, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/15/22/15693>
62. A SCOPING REVIEW OF GREENWASHING - Scholars' Bank, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/bitstreams/f873c574-4002-4094-a6ef-bdd2f45dd1ec/download>
63. Unveiling the truth: greenwashing in sustainable finance - Frontiers, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/sustainability/articles/10.3389/frsus.2024.1362051/full>
64. Corporate Accountability - Correia & Puth, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://correiaputh.com/practice-areas/unpaid-wages-severance/corporate-accountability/>
65. Corporate Legal Accountability - Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/big-issues/corporate-legal-accountability/>
66. The role of the media in democracies: what is it, and why does it matter?, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://constitution-unit.com/2024/01/30/the-role-of-the-media-in-democracies-what-is-it-and-why-does-it-matter/>
67. How Does the Media Hold Government Officials Accountable? - CountyOffice.org - YouTube, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XChbL3opMiA>
68. The Impact of the Media | American Government - Lumen Learning, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://courses.lumenlearning.com/atd-monroecc-american-government/chapter/the-impact-of-the-media/>
69. Most Americans say media criticism helps hold politicians accountable | Pew Research Center, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2024/12/02/most-americans-continue-to-say-media-scrutiny-keeps-politicians-from-doing-things-they-shouldnt/>
70. The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA): A Legal Overview | Congress.gov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46238>
71. Full article: Democratic norm erosion and partisanship in the United States, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13510347.2025.2470764>
72. The expressive function of public policy: renewable energy mandates signal social norms, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10799732/>
73. Social norm change: drivers and consequences - PMC, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10799731/>
74. America's Crisis of Civic Virtue | Journal of Democracy, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/americas-crisis-of-civic->

[virtue/](#)

75. The Nexus between Activism and Populism Amid Global Protests and Digital Media - ECPS, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.populismstudies.org/the-nexus-between-activism-and-populism-amid-global-protests-and-digital-media/>
76. Social Media, Online Activism and 10 Years of #BlackLivesMatter | Pew Research Center, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2023/06/29/blacklivesmatter-turns-10/>
77. Talking about Black Lives Matter and #MeToo - SMU Scholar, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、https://scholar.smu.edu/context/law_faculty/article/1703/viewcontent/34WisJLGenderSoc109.pdf
78. Fighting for Change in the 21st Century: An Examination of Social Activism and the Role of Social Media in the US and France - Fordham Research Commons, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、https://research.library.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1123&context=international_senior
79. Corporate Accountability | Amnesty International USA, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.amnestyusa.org/issues/business-and-human-rights/corporate-accountability/>
80. Checks and balances: what are they, and why do they matter? | The Constitution Unit Blog, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://constitution-unit.com/2023/01/19/checks-and-balances-what-are-they-and-why-do-they-matter/>
81. How federal impeachment works | USAGov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.usa.gov/impeachment>
82. Impeachment and the Constitution - Congress.gov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46013>
83. About Impeachment - U.S. Senate, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.senate.gov/about/powers-procedures/impeachment.htm>
84. ArtII.S4.1 Overview of Impeachment Clause - Constitution Annotated - Congress.gov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/artII-S4-1/ALDE_00000282/
85. www.gao.gov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.gao.gov/about#:~:text=GAO%2C%20often%20called%20the%20%22congressional,money%20and%20work%20more%20efficiently.>
86. Government Accountability Office | house.gov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.house.gov/the-house-explained/legislative-branch-partners/government-accountability-office>
87. IGET | Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency; IGET, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、<https://www.ignet.gov/>
88. Statutory Inspectors General in the Federal Government: A Primer ..., 5 月 2,

- 2025 にアクセス、 <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/r/r45450>
89. About | U.S. GAO, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.gao.gov/about>
90. Checks and Balances System to Know for AP US Government - Fiveable, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://fiveable.me/lists/checks-and-balances-system>
91. About the Freedom of Information Act - DEA.gov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.dea.gov/foia/about-foia>
92. FOIA.gov - Freedom of Information Act, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.foia.gov/>
93. Freedom of Information Act: Frequently Asked Questions ... - FOIA.gov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.foia.gov/faq.html>
94. Sarbanes-Oxley Act - Article - SailPoint, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.sailpoint.com/identity-library/sox?elqct=PaidMedia&elqchannel=TechDay>
95. SOX 404: Requirements, Exemptions, and Compliance Checklist - Exabeam, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.exabeam.com/explainers/sox-compliance/sox-404-requirements-exemptions-and-compliance-checklist/>
96. Corporate Social Responsibility Versus Business and Human Rights - UW Law Digital Commons, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1733&context=faculty-articles>
97. Accountability — - ACE Electoral Knowledge Network, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://aceproject.org/main/english/ei/eib03.htm>
98. Term Limits and Electoral Accountability - LSE, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://personal.lse.ac.uk/sturmd/papers/wp/smart-sturm.pdf>
99. Impeachment - Wikipedia, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impeachment>
100. How does impeachment work? - League of Women Voters, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.lwv.org/educating-voters/how-does-impeachment-work>
101. Government Accountability Office (GAO) | USAGov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.usa.gov/agencies/government-accountability-office>
102. 5.5 Government Accountability Office (GAO) - CIO Council, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.cio.gov/handbook/key-organizations/gao/>
103. What GAO Does, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.gao.gov/about/what-gao-does>
104. 5.6 Office of the Inspector General (OIG) - CIO Council, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.cio.gov/handbook/key-organizations/oig/>
105. The Office of Inspector General | Federal Trade Commission OIG, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://oig.ftc.gov/what-you-need-know-about-office-inspector-general>
106. Frequently Asked Questions | Office of Inspector General - Oig.dhs.gov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、 <https://www.oig.dhs.gov/about/faqs>
107. Freedom of Information Act - Obama White House website, 5 月 2, 2025 にア

- セス、 <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/realitycheck/the-press-office/freedom-information-act>
108. FOIA Frequently Asked Questions - Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://department.va.gov/accountability/freedom-of-information-act-and-privacy-act-requests/foia-frequently-asked-questions/>
109. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX) - Hyperproof, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://hyperproof.io/sarbanes-oxley-act/>
110. Sarbanes-Oxley Act: Transforming Corporate Accountability - Quartr, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://quartr.com/insights/investor-relations/sarbanes-oxley-act-transforming-corporate-accountability>
111. The Important Legacy of the Sarbanes Oxley Act, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2022/08/30/the-important-legacy-of-the-sarbanes-oxley-act/>
112. SOX 404 Explained: What You Need to Know - AuditBoard, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://auditboard.com/blog/sox-404/>
113. SOX 404 Explained: Demystifying Sarbanes-Oxley Act Section 404 - A-LIGN, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.a-lign.com/articles/sox-404-explained-demystifying-sarbanes-oxley-act>
114. What is Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX) Section 404? - Appsiian Security, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://appsiiansecurity.com/sox-compliance/sarbanes-oxley-act-sox-section-404/>
115. SOX 404: Management's Guide to Internal Controls Assessment - ManageEngine, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.manageengine.com/log-management/compliance/sox-compliance-sec-404.html>
116. What Are SOX Controls? Best Practices for Defining Your Scope - AuditBoard, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://auditboard.com/blog/sox-controls/>
117. The Lasting, Positive Impact of Sarbanes-Oxley, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2021/12/20/the-lasting-positive-impact-of-sarbanes-oxley/>
118. The Role of Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Image in Times of Crisis: The Mediating Role of Customer Trust - PMC, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8394849/>
119. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and its Influence on Organizational Reputation, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378306350_Corporate_Social_Responsibility_CSR_and_its_Influence_on_Organizational_Reputation
120. Full article: Corporate Social Responsibility in a Competitive Business Environment, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00220388.2019.1694144>
121. From Corporate Responsibility to Corporate Accountability - UC Law SF Scholarship Repository, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、

https://repository.uclawsf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1200&context=hastings_business_law_journal

122. Greenwashing and the Ethics of CSR - IJFMR, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/5/27029.pdf>
123. No End in Sight? A Greenwash Review and Research Agenda - PMC, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11288790/>
124. (PDF) Human Rights and Corporate Accountability: Advocating for Corporate Social Responsibility - ResearchGate, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383533547_Human_Rights_and_Corporate_Accountability_Advocating_for_Corporate_Social_Responsibility
125. Corporate Social Accountability - Journal Article - Stanford Law School, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://law.stanford.edu/publications/corporate-social-accountability/>
126. Reasoned Explanation and Political Accountability in the Roberts Court - The Yale Law Journal, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
https://www.yalelawjournal.org/pdf/130.Eidelson_yxudi65h.pdf
127. Improving Regulatory Accountability: Lessons from the Past and Prospects for the Future - Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer&httpsredir=1&article=1006&context=caselrev>
128. The Rise and Fall of WorldCom: Story of a Scandal - Investopedia, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/w/worldcom.asp>
129. Corporate Governance Failures: Case Studies and Lessons Learned - Attorney Aaron Hall, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://aaronhall.com/corporate-governance-failures-case-studies-and-lessons-learned/>
130. Enron Scandal and Accounting Fraud: What Happened? - Investopedia, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.investopedia.com/updates/enron-scandal-summary/>
131. Lessons from Enron Accountability and Trust - UC Davis Business Law Journal, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://blj.ucdavis.edu/archives/2/1/lessons-enron>
132. Case Study 17: The Disastrous Launch of Healthcare.gov - Henrico ..., 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.henricodolfing.com/2022/12/case-study-launch-failure-healthcare-gov.html>
133. Decoding Flawed Gov Failure: An Easy, Smart Guide, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/decoding-gov-failure-guide>
134. A Cascade of Failures: Why Government Fails, and How to Stop It - NYU Wagner, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
https://wagner.nyu.edu/files/faculty/publications/Light_Cascade_of_Failures_Why_Govt_Fails.pdf
135. Enforcement Actions Against Individuals: Case Studies | FDIC.gov, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.fdic.gov/bank-examinations/enforcement-actions->

[against-individuals-case-studies](#)

136. Fraud Risk Management: 2018-2022 Data Show Federal Government Loses an Estimated \$233 Billion to \$521 Billion Annually to Fraud, Based on Various Risk Environments - GAO, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-24-105833>
137. "Accountability in the Administrative Law Judiciary: The Right and the " by Edwin L. Felter Jr, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/naalj/vol30/iss1/2/>
138. Political accountability - (US History – 1945 to Present) - Vocab, Definition, Explanations, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
<https://fiveable.me/key-terms/united-states-history-since-1945/political-accountability>
139. (PDF) Greenwashing in Corporate Social Responsibility: A Dual-Faceted Analysis of Its Impact on Employee Trust and Identification - ResearchGate, 5 月 2, 2025 にアクセス、
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375476685 Greenwashing in Corporate Social Responsibility A Dual-Faceted Analysis of Its Impact on Employee Trust and Identification](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375476685_Greenwashing_in_Corporate_Social_Responsibility_A_Dual-Faceted_Analysis_of_Its_Impact_on_Employee_Trust_and_Identification)