



Correction to: Crafting anti-corruption agencies' bureaucratic reputation: an uphill battle

Nicholas Bautista-Beauchesne¹

Published online: 27 March 2021
© Springer Nature B.V. 2021

Correction to: Crime, Law and Social Change
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-020-09928-9>

The original version of this article unfortunately contained mistakes introduced during the production process.

The corrections are given in the following list:

- (1) In article title, “Battle” should be “battle”.
- (2) In “Bureaucratic reputation and anti-corruption” section, fifth paragraph, first sentence, a new reference citation should be added at the end of the sentence as follows:

Hence, this article aims at better understanding ACAs as independent and autonomous agencies through the lens of their bureaucratic reputations - offering a unique window into their post-delegation dynamics [16, 51].

And the new reference is:

51. Tomic, S. (2019). *Leadership, institutions & enforcement: Anti-corruption agencies in Serbia, Croatia and Macedonia*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-020-09928-9>

✉ Nicholas Bautista-Beauchesne
nicholas.bautista-beauchesne@enap.ca

¹ École Nationale d'Administration Publique, 4750, Avenue Henri-Julien, bureau 5092, Montréal, Québec H2T 3E5, Canada

- (3) In Table 1, “Relevance for Anti-Corruption Agencies” should not be in bold. The correct Table 1 is now given below:

Table 1 Dimensions of the bureaucratic reputation of ACAs

| Reputational dimension | Relevance for Anti-Corruption Agencies |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Performative | Projecting an image of effectively implementing anti-corruption policies. Achieving repressive outputs such as cases, arrests, investigations. Achieving preventive outputs such as training, education, audits, risk management. Sustaining positive performance indicators over time, with the ability of pursuing corruption at all levels of society by creating innovative programs and policy solutions. |
| Moral | Displaying anti-corruption values such as integrity and honesty; cultivating norms of transparency, encouraging awareness, best practices, and ethical behavior. |
| Technical-Professional | Projecting an image of a competent staff which can maneuver the highly complex corruption environment and cases (i.e. legal, financial, criminological etc.); with the ability to deal with the inherent uncertainty of corruption (i.e. measuring impacts, perceptions, corruption levels). |
| Procedural | Appropriately following legal dispositions despite multiple jurisdictional and judicial hurdles; adhering to investigative and policing procedures regardless of the complexity of fighting corruption. Projecting a procedural even-handedness between cases regardless of political affiliation. |
| Main Audiences | Relevance for Anti-Corruption Agencies |
| The Political Sphere | Political actors and legislators are a critical audience to convince of institutional usefulness; they are essential account-holders which can modify the terms of delegation and discretionary processes: powers, budget, human/financial resources. High reputational stakes and intense accountability relationship. |
| The Media | Crucial audience in which to craft the ACA’s organisational image and convince external audiences of successful outputs; Critical forum in which an agency’s credibility can be crafted or hindered. |
| Citizens | Critical audience to change norms and opinions about corruption; essential source of whistleblower information and witness testimonies in court, as well as anti-corruption activism. |
| Bureaucratic Agencies | Very important audience to craft institutional relations and inter-agency collaboration. Facilitates cooperation between agencies for cases, information-sharing or coordinating regulatory capabilities. |
| The Private Sector | Important audience to change business norms, encourage cooperation from private firms, incite whistleblowing for witness testimonies or to report irregularities. |
| International Actors and NGOs | Frequently important audience to increase international ties with other global NGOs, judicial actors, governments or international police networks for information sharing and jurisdictional coordination. |
| Main regulated audiences | Public servants, private firms, business actors, politicians and potential corrupt individuals (both corruptor and corrupted). |

- (4) In “Conclusion” section, sixth paragraph, last sentence, citation for Table 3 should be deleted. The sentence should be rewritten as follows:

This may prove critical for the morally charged mandates of anti-corruption institutions as they grapple to fight an increasingly complex criminal phenomenon, while trying to win over and maintain public trust.

- (5) In the pdf version, the layout of the Table under "Qualitative coding scheme" section was incorrect. The correct Table is now given below:

| Name of node | Description |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Bureaucratic Autonomy | General statements which refer to the ability of the ACA to pursue its mandates without exogenous interference |
| (A) Capacities-unique-niche | Specific statements which pertain to the powers, capacities, programs which define the autonomy of the agency |
| (A) Legitimacy-Network | Specific statements which pertain to the building of institutional inter-agency networks and legitimacy that define the ACA's autonomy |
| (A) Preferences-independence | Specific statements which pertain to the political independence and organisational preferences of the agency. |
| Bureaucratic Reputation | General statements which refer to the organisational reputation and credibility of the agency. |
| (R) Moral | Specific statements which pertain to the values and normative dimension of the ACA's reputation |
| (R) Performance | Specific statements which pertain to performance indicators, outputs, and goals of the ACA. |
| (R) Procedural | Specific statements which pertain to the following of protocol, appropriate procedures, legal and judicial guidelines, and jurisdictions. |
| (R) Technical and Professional | Specific statements pertaining to the competence of the ACA's staff, their professionalism, the development of a unique technical expertise in fighting corruption. |
| Change and evolution of policies | General statements pertaining to the modifying of the policy environment surrounding the ACA, changes in anticorruption laws, or the addition of new institutions over time. |
| Citizens | General statements pertaining to the relationship with citizens as an accountability forum, fostering trust, and cooperation (i.e. witness testimonies). |
| Coordination and Cooperation | General statements pertaining to inter-agency relations with other bureaucratic agencies, coordination with other public agencies |
| Prevention | General statements pertaining to the different mandates of corruption prevention such as education, training, raising awareness, risk-management etc. |

The original article has been corrected.