Competent Questioning

An Anti-Corruption Governance Concept

Author: Mike Masoud

Publisher: The American Anti-Corruption Institute (AACI)

Publication Date: April 27, 2026

Official Publication Page: https://www.theaaci.net/Competent-Questioning

Authored by Mike Masoud. Published by The American Anti-Corruption Institute (AACI). © 2026 Mike Masoud. All rights reserved. The American Anti-Corruption Institute (AACI) publishes this concept with permission of the author.

Copyright and Rights Management

© 2026 MOH'D J.J. Masoud, also known as Mike J. Masoud. All rights reserved.

Authored by Mike Masoud. Published by The American Anti-Corruption Institute (AACI) under a non-exclusive license granted by the author.

No part of this work may be reproduced, distributed, modified, or used commercially without prior written authorization from the copyright owner or The American Anti-Corruption Institute (AACI), as authorized publisher.

For inquiries, contact: info@theaaci.com

Suggested Citation

Masoud, M. (2026) *Competent Questioning: An Anti-Corruption Governance Concept*. The American Anti-Corruption Institute (AACI). Available at: https://www.theaaci.net/Competent-Questioning (Accessed: April 27, 2026).

Competent Questioning

Definition

Competent Questioning is the disciplined ability of those entrusted to govern, manage, audit, regulate, or approve to ask clear, relevant, timely, and evidence-seeking questions that expose corruption risks before they mature into misconduct, loss, scandal, or institutional failure.

It is not ordinary curiosity. It is not ceremonial inquiry. It is not asking questions to create the appearance of oversight.

A question is merely the trigger for oversight; the real governance work begins with evaluating the answer. Competent Questioning requires the oversight body to be as disciplined in assessing the quality of the evidence provided as it is in asking the question itself. If an answer relies on vague assurances, circular reasoning, or superficial documentation, a truly competent overseer treats that "answer" as a new signal of potential risk, not as a resolution of the inquiry.

Competent Questioning is the practical application of professional skepticism, a mindset foundational to international auditing standards, such as ISA 200. It requires an attitude that includes a questioning mind and a critical assessment of evidence. While often associated with external auditors, this mindset is a governance necessity for those entrusted to manage, regulate, and approve. It is the refusal to accept assertions at face value, particularly when those assertions are presented without verifiable data or in areas of high discretion.

Competent Questioning is a capability for corruption prevention. It depends on knowledge, judgment, professional skepticism, ethical courage, and an understanding of how authority, incentives, internal control weaknesses, conflicts of interest, and governance failures can be exploited.

Core Proposition

The quality of anti-corruption oversight cannot exceed the quality of the questions asked by those entrusted to govern, manage, audit, regulate, and approve.

This proposition reflects a simple institutional truth: weak questions protect weak systems. Vague questions produce vague answers. Uninformed questions allow misconduct to hide behind procedure, titles, reports, and formal approvals.

Competent questions force clarity. They require evidence. They challenge assumptions. They expose the difference between what is documented and what is real.

Why This Concept Matters

Fraud and corruption often survive because the right questions are never asked at the right time.

A board may ask whether a policy exists but fail to ask whether it is enforced.

A manager may ask whether a transaction was approved, but fail to ask whether the approval was independent, legitimate, and free from conflicts of interest.

An auditor may ask whether supporting documents are available, but fail to ask whether they reflect genuine economic substance.

A regulator may ask whether an institution submitted the required reports, but fail to ask whether those reports reveal measurable anti-corruption safeguards or merely performative compliance.

In each case, the problem is not silence. The problem is low-quality questioning.

Competent Questioning matters because corruption rarely announces itself. It hides in routine approvals, trusted relationships, urgency, discretion, technical complexity, delegation, weak documentation, and the institutional fear of asking uncomfortable questions.

How Competent Questioning Lowers Corruption Risk

Competent Questioning reduces corruption risk by improving oversight quality before decisions are made, funds are released, contracts are awarded, exceptions are granted, reports are approved, or misconduct becomes public.

It helps institutions:

1. Identify hidden conflicts of interest before decisions are finalized.
2. Challenge unexplained exceptions to policies and controls.
3. Test whether approvals are legitimate or merely formal.
4. Detect unusual relationships with third parties, consultants, agents, suppliers, or politically exposed persons.
5. Expose weak segregation of duties and concentration of authority.
6. Assess whether internal control is operating in substance, not only documented on paper.
7. Demand evidence rather than accepting assurances.
8. Escalate warning signs before they cause institutional damage.

Competent Questioning does not replace internal control, audit, governance, or regulation. It strengthens them.

A control system is weaker when those operating, supervising, or relying on it do not know what to ask.

Weak Questions Versus Competent Questions

The difference between weak questioning and competent questioning is the difference between comfort and accountability.

A weak question asks:

“Was the consultant approved?”

A competent question asks:

> *"Who beneficially owns the consultant, what legitimate services were performed, how was the fee benchmarked, who approved the engagement, were government touchpoints involved, and was the approval free from conflicts of interest?"*

A weak question asks:

> *"Do we have a whistleblowing policy?"*

A competent question asks:

> *"How many reports were received, how were they investigated, what protection was provided to reporters, what retaliation risks were identified, and what corrective actions were taken?"*

A weak question asks:

> *"Was the procurement process followed?"*

A competent question asks:

> *"Were specifications tailored to favor a bidder, were competing bids genuine, who influenced the evaluation criteria, and were any exceptions approved by conflicted personnel?"*

A weak question asks:

> *"Did management review the risk assessment?"*

A competent question asks:

> *"What corruption risks were identified, how were they quantified, which controls were tested, what residual exposure remains, and who is accountable for reducing it?"*

Weak questions invite confirmation. Competent questions demand examination.

Relationship to Anti-Corruption Competence

Competent Questioning cannot exist without competence.

A person cannot ask a serious question about a matter he does not understand. If the question is unclear, incomplete, or technically weak, the answer will usually be the same.

This is why anti-corruption competence is not optional awareness but a governance necessity.

Those entrusted with authority must understand corruption schemes, fraud indicators, internal control principles, governance duties, conflicts of interest, procurement risks, money laundering exposure, third-party risks, whistleblowing systems, accountability

mechanisms, and the ways artificial intelligence, digital systems, data governance, automated controls, and technology-enabled misconduct are reshaping institutional risk. Without that understanding, their questions remain shallow.

Shallow questions create false assurance.

Competent questions create pressure for truth.

Relationship to The AACI Ten Principles of Fighting Corruption

Competent Questioning supports The AACI Ten Principles of Fighting Corruption by helping convert the principles into practical oversight behavior.

It supports **effective internal control** by testing whether controls work in practice.

It supports **effective and good governance** by requiring boards and senior management to ask evidence-based questions.

It supports **power and accountability** by challenging those who exercise discretion, approve exceptions, or control resources.

It supports **investment in corruption prevention** by showing why training and competence must reach those who make and approve decisions.

It supports **quantification of corruption exposure** by moving institutions beyond vague assurances and toward measurable risk understanding.

Competent Questioning is, therefore, not a soft communication skill. It is a governance discipline.

Relationship to SFC 200: Competence

Competent Questioning is directly aligned with SFC 200: Competence.

Competence determines whether a person can recognize risk, interpret evidence, challenge explanations, identify control weaknesses, and understand the consequences of approval or inaction.

Without competence, questioning becomes superficial. With competence, questioning becomes a preventive instrument.

A competent person does not merely ask whether something was done. He asks whether it was done properly, lawfully, independently, transparently, and in a manner that lowers corruption exposure.

Practical Application

Organizations should embed Competent Questioning into:

- Board and committee oversight
- Executive decision-making
- Internal audit planning
- Compliance reviews
- Procurement approvals
- Third-party due diligence
- Whistleblowing investigations
- Risk assessment meetings
- Regulatory supervision
- Training for managers and those charged with governance

The objective is not to create a culture of suspicion. The objective is to create a culture where authority is questioned intelligently before it causes damage.

Competent Questioning protects institutions from passive oversight, ceremonial compliance, and blind reliance on titles, policies, or reports.

Conceptual Position

Competent Questioning is an anti-corruption oversight capability. It links competence to inquiry, inquiry to evidence, and evidence to accountability.

Those entrusted to govern, manage, audit, regulate, and approve cannot rely solely on formal authority, reports, policies, or assurances. They must have the knowledge and judgment to ask questions that test substance, expose weaknesses, and clarify responsibility.

Under this concept, questioning is not a procedural formality. It is a disciplined mechanism through which institutions convert authority into accountable oversight.

For Further Engagement

To explore how your institution can apply Competent Questioning or to request a briefing or presentation, please contact:

info@theaaci.com

Learn more about The Ten Principles of Fighting Corruption: https://www.theaaci.net/Principles-of-Fighting-Corruption

Subscribe to The AACI Dispatch: https://www.linkedin.com/newsletters/the-aaci-dispatch-7321647166328827904/

Reference Note

The discussion of professional skepticism in this concept draws on International Standards on Auditing ISA 200, which reflects professional skepticism as an attitude that includes a questioning mind and a critical assessment of evidence.

Reference: International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB) (2025) *Handbook of International Quality Management, Auditing, Review, Other Assurance, and Related Services Pronouncements, Volume 1: International Auditing Practice Notes (IAPNs), International Standards on Auditing (ISAs), and International Standards on Quality Management (ISQMs)*. Available from the official IAASB website. Accessed: April 27, 2026.