



## Corruption and the Public Sector in Nigeria

Ifeyinwa Arum<sup>1\*</sup>, Solomon Olufunmi Likinyo<sup>2</sup> and Feyisara Olaitan Eunice<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1-3</sup> Department of Political Science, Ekiti State University Ado – Ekiti, Nigeria

\* Corresponding Author: **Ifeyinwa Arum**

---

### Article Info

**ISSN (online):** 2583-8261

**Volume:** 04

**Issue:** 03

**May-June 2025**

**Received:** 03-03-2025

**Accepted:** 05-04-2025

**Page No:** 36-42

### Abstract

There is a growing world -wide interest over corruption in the past decades. This is not unconnected to the fact that it affects all countries and it has a disastrous effect on the economy and development of any country. This greater recognition that corruption can impede development has ignited the interest of developing countries including Nigeria. Corruption has been identified as the country's greatest obstacle to development. Many governments in Nigeria have initiated many policies and programmes to curb this menace but sadly corrupt practices have remained unabated. This paper has set some objectives for itself. First, is to identify the causes of corruption in Nigeria. Second, is to discuss the impacts of corruption. Third, is to analyze the challenges of eradicating corruption in Nigeria. Market – Centered Perspective and Low Risk, High Benefit theory were utilized as the theoretical framework. The secondary sources of data were utilized. Narrative report and descriptive essay were utilized as methods of data analysis. The study recommends that the anti – corruption agencies should be revamped and restructured. The EFCC should not be made to investigate, prosecute and recover looted assets alone. A different agency should be incorporated to recover looted assets because allowing only an agency to perform the three functions encourages re - looting of already recovered assets. The 1999 constitution should be reviewed and the power of the executive should be curtailed. The power to appoint, sack and promote the Chairmen of anti – corruption agencies should be taken away from the executive to avoid them being used by the ruling party to hunt perceived opponents.

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJSSER.2025.4.3.36-42>

**Keywords:** Development, Economy, Governance, Economic Inequality, International Organizations

---

### Introduction

Corruption is a universal challenge with remarkable impacts which has endured for centuries and has continued to confront or stand against modern global governance. It remains a constant challenge worldwide subverting democratic values, good governance and sustainable development. It affects all countries and no country is unsusceptible to it regardless of its socio – economic level, though the conformation and magnitude might differ from country to country. The devastating impact of corruption worldwide has necessitated the introduction of many programmes by the International community to combat corruption. For example the African Union (AU), the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nation (UN), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank (WB) have introduced conditionalities, course of actions and strategies to deal with corruption (Shabbir and Anwar, 2007)<sup>[32]</sup>. The United Nations Convention against Corruption specifically provided a legal framework to combat corruption. This international instrument has been approved by 37 countries and signed by 137 countries.

---

Corruption is very pervasive in the developing countries and has further dealt with their political, social and economic lives. Akkihal, e tal (2002) <sup>[21]</sup> rightly contend that corruption is pervasive in developing countries because of their tendency to interfere considerably in their economies, often in the attempt to conduct and manage economic activity in order to promote and achieve their yearnings and lofty desire for development. Arguing further, they submit that these regulatory measures though they are disappearing in many developing countries, continue to prompt opportunities for people in the public sector to allocate scarce resources in a way to suit themselves at the detriment of the country. Corruption has especially remained endemic in developing countries including Nigeria. Obuah (2010) <sup>[25]</sup> rightly observes that corruption accounts for 20% of the GDP of Nigeria. Similarly Ibrahim (2024) <sup>[15]</sup> points out that the Nigerian economy has lost an estimated \$550 billion in the last 60 years to corruption. Corruption in the developing countries including Nigeria often work together with the already fragile rule of law, lean political freedoms, and economic inequalities, leading to a decline in the economic growth, continued or sustained poverty and lack of public trust in governance structures. It also contravenes the rule of law, causing monopoly of the State and abuse of power. As a result of endemic corruption in Nigeria, we can specifically talk about weak leadership, poorly executed services, insufficient infrastructure, poor public sector management, moral decadence and financial misconduct.

The perception of public office as a lawful and principal way of gathering wealth is an age – long practice in Nigeria. Corruption in Nigeria was very prevalent during the colonial rule. Ogunyemi (2014) succinctly identified the four forms of financial corruption in colonial Nigeria. They are corrupt acts committed in the discharge of expenditure duties, corrupt acts committed on revenues, outright disregard for established control and audit rules and direct theft and fraud. According to him, he further notes that the worst form of corruption then was forgery which was intensified during the period of decolonization. During the colonial administration, forged payment vouchers of the government of Northern Region led to a combined loss of £5,400, in Lagos, £4,409 – 15s – 7d was lost through forgery by fraudulent officers at the Department of Posts and Telegraphs and at Warri, in the Department of Prisons, £1,062 11s 3d was also lost as a result of forgery of payment vouchers. In Ibadan, the sum of £52 9s 2d was also lost through forgery of payment voucher (Osoba, 1996) <sup>[29]</sup>. After independence, the Nigerian elites who succeeded the colonialists were also very corrupt like their predecessors. For instance, Nnamdi Azikiwe who was Head of Government between 1960– 1966 was accused of using his position to rechannel whooping sums of money into his bank, African Continental Bank (ACB) thereby resolving the bank's problem of persistent scarcity of operating capital and in the process significantly enriching himself. In the same way, the G. B. A. Coker Commission of Inquiry of 1962 into six Western Nigeria public corporations detected how Awolowo and his associates in the Action Group misappropriated money from the Cocoa Marketing Board, property of the people of the Western Region (Osoba, 1996) <sup>[29]</sup>. The political elites in the then three dominant parties tried each to seize power in order to loot the country's resources. This led to major crisis in the country. The crisis includes the census crisis (1962), the Action Group crisis (1962), the

Federal Election crisis (1964), the Western Nigeria Election crisis (1965) and eventually the military coup of 1966. The military like their civilian counterparts were also corrupt and continued with looting and other fraudulent activities. Military rule in Nigeria was characterized by many despicable cases of unscrupulous and illegal enrichment by many high ranking officers, lack of budgetary discipline and financial prudence. Nwosuji (2015) <sup>[22]</sup> rightly argues that military regimes repressed the rule of law, encouraged the wanton looting of the treasury, destroyed public institutions and introduced a secret and non - transparent culture in the running of government business and also took corruption to its highest degree. In 1999, democracy was reintroduced with the inauguration of the Fourth Republic. By then, corruption has been institutionalized in both the private and public sector. The then President, Mr. Olusegun Obasanjo established the Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC) and the Independent Corrupt Practice Commission (ICPC) majorly to combat corruption at all levels especially at top levels of the society. Though these agencies tried to carry out their work diligently but they faced many challenges that did not allow them to make much progress. They became tools in the hands of the ruling political elites to punish perceived opponents. Previous Nigerian leaders also made attempts to fight corruption through establishment of various agencies or programmes, sadly, none of them was able to curb corruption in Nigeria. For instance, during the First Republic, the Head of State made various Acts to curb corruption and they include the Criminal Justice Act of (1966), the Public Officers Act of 1966, the Extradition Act of 1966, the Extradition Act of 1967 and Corrupt Practices Act, 1975. The Buhari/Idiagbon regime introduced the War Against Indiscipline, the Babangida regime introduced the Audit – Alarm System (AAS). Some agencies were also established in 1990 to curb corruption in Nigeria. They include Criminal Code Act of 1990, Criminal Procedure Act of 1990, Panel Code of 1990, Robbery and Fire Arms Special Provision Act of 1990, National Drug Law Enforcement Agency of 1990, Company and Allied Matters, Finance Act of 1990. The Abacha regime (1993 – 1998) introduced the War Against Indiscipline and Corruption (WAIC). Despite all these measures taken by the government to combat corruption, corrupt practices continue to deepen. Solving the issue of corruption in Nigeria requires a thorough understanding of its various forms, causes, effects, strategies, best practices and potential advancements in anti – corruption measures. This paper has set some objectives for itself. First is to identify the causes of corruption in Nigeria. Second, to discuss the impacts of corruption. Third, is to analyze the challenges of eradicating corruption in Nigeria. Market – Centered Perspective and Low Risk, High Benefit theory were utilized as the theoretical framework. The secondary sources of data were utilized. Narrative report and descriptive essay were utilized as methods of data analysis.

### Literature Review

The Oxford Advanced Dictionary (2000) defines corruption as dishonest or illegal behavior, especially of people in authority. Gould (1991) <sup>[13]</sup> sees corruption as a fraudulent and unlawful occurrence that contains a set of moral deviation from moral standards of society, causing loss of respect for and confidence in duly constituted authority. Sandholtz and Koetzle (2000) <sup>[30]</sup> argue that corruption is

behavior adopted by a public official that is an aberration from existing values or expected norms. Morris (1991) <sup>[20]</sup> contends that corruption is a political behavior contrary to political norms. According to World Bank (1997) <sup>[39]</sup>, corruption is the abuse of public office for private gain. According to Osoba cited in Aluko (2009) <sup>[3]</sup> corruption is an anti – social behavior granting inappropriate advantage which is contradictory to legal and moral norms, and weakening the capacity of the authorities to improve the living conditions of the people. Ogunyemi (2014) sees corruption as a social vice that awards some rewards on culprits at the expense of their victims, be they individuals or sovereign states. Uwak and Udofia (2016) <sup>[38]</sup> note that corruption is the abuse of power by public office holders by enriching themselves, friends and loved ones to the expense of the general populace. The International Monetary Fund defines corruption as misuse of authority or trust for private benefit; and is an exercise carried out not only by public officials but also by those in positions of trust or authority in private enterprises or non – profit organizations (Wolfe and Gurgun 2000). The UNDP (2004) <sup>[37]</sup> defines corruption as the “abuse of public power, office or authority for private advantage – through bribery, extortion, influence peddling, nepotism, fraud or embezzlement. The Transparency International (TI) (2007) <sup>[33]</sup> submits that corruption is an improper or illicit behavior of the public sector officials by abusing the power conferred on them for their private gain. Corruption has permeated every arm of government and has largely contributed to the crisis of development experienced by the country. Dela Rama *et al* (2022) <sup>[8]</sup> rightly postulate that corruption in elections and the legislature decreases accountability and misinterprets representation in policy making; corruption in the judiciary endangers the rule of law; and corruption in public administration results in the inefficient supply of services. Osoba (1996) <sup>[29]</sup> submits that corruption is an anti – social behavior giving inappropriate benefits that is contradictory to legal and moral norms and which threatens the authorities’ ability to secure the welfare of all citizens. The public sector is the part of the economy that is owned and supervised by the government, and distributes basic services to the citizens. It is the means by which the government provides amenities to the public. Such amenities include welfare, infrastructure, security, social justice, education, health care and a means of regulating or managing the economy. Individuals who work in government departments and agencies are known as public servants.

Corruption can take various forms which include bribery, lobbying, fraud, favouritism, embezzlement, nepotism, patronage, contract inflation, ghost workers, extortion etc. Corruption can weaken democracy, policy making and economic growth. It can sabotage social equity, leading to social divides and potential civil unrest. Corruption threatens human development, negatively affects progress and weakens the achievement of the sustainable development goals. According to UNODC (2023) <sup>[35]</sup>, public sector corruption adds considerably to the costs of public goods and services, results to the misallocation of public resources, alters access to key resources, threatens development, makes countries vulnerable to cruel foreign interference, undermines policy making and implementation, and erodes public confidence in government. Despite various anti – corruption efforts, it remains a significant challenge. Public sector corruption means the abuse of public office for private

benefits, mismanagement of entrusted authority for private benefits. Corruption is the single greatest impediment to economic and social development. It distorts development by weakening rule of law and sabotaging the institutional foundation on which economic growth depends. It threatens good government, fundamentally disorganizes public policy, results to the misallocation of resources, negatively affects private sector development and particularly impairs the poor. Corruption is a global issue with remarkable socio – economic impacts requiring an extensive understanding of its different forms and manifestations to effectively combat it. Corruption hurts the poor and the vulnerable the most, raising costs and decreasing access to basic services such as health, education, social programmes, and even justice. It sabotages democracy, weakens policy making and threatens economic growth. It worsens inequality and decreases private sector investment to the detriment of markets, job opportunities and economies. It can also negatively impact a country’s response to emergencies, leading to needless suffering and at worst, death. Overtime, it can affect citizen’s trust and confidence in their leaders and institutions, necessitating social friction and encouraging the risk of fragility, conflict and violence. It distorts investment, reduces economic growth and alters the composition of government spending often to the detriment of the poor. Sarjito (2023) <sup>[31]</sup> rightly maintains that every year USD\$1 trillion is paid in bribes around the world, improving the lives of the corrupt and robbing generations of the future.

### Theoretical Underpinning

Market – Centered Perspective, this theory does not have a single universally recognized proponent. Atakpa and Akpan (2015) cited in Okwuwada (2024) <sup>[28]</sup> maintain that the main thrust of this theory is that corruption takes place as a result of public officials using their positions or influences to boost their personal gain, treating public resources as a means to achieve private gain. It emphasizes the function of economic inducement and market forces in navigating corrupt behavior. Some people working in the public sector see their position as a way of squeezing money out of people through collecting bribes before they will perform their duties.

Low Risk, High Benefit Theory: it posits that when punishment for offense committed is light, people will be discouraged from getting involved in corruption but when it is grave, people will be afraid of engaging in illegal or illicit practices (Ijewereme, 2015) <sup>[16]</sup>. In Nigeria, when people are convicted for engaging in corrupt practices, they might be given light punishment like, they might be asked to refund a paltry sum of money or they might seize some of their assets or there might be no punishment at all. This has continued to perpetuate corrupt practices in Nigeria.

### Causes of corruption in Nigeria

- **Weak institutions:** many of the institutions in the country are weak due to many reasons including poor leadership, lack of finance, low capacity, poor salary and so on. Usman *et al* (2015) <sup>[36]</sup> maintain that weak institution is a state of decline or powerlessness of government agencies to effectively discharge some of the responsibilities of the State. People take advantage of the weakness of institutions to perpetuate all manner of corrupt practices. Nzereogu (2024) <sup>[23]</sup> rightly notes that when government institutions are weak it means that

they lack the ability to carry out their functions effectively and they also lack the internal mechanism to ensure checks and balances in their operations. This creates opportunity for government officials to become overbearing and begin to carry out all forms of corrupt practices since there is lack of effective means to check their activities or conduct.

- **Inadequate legal framework, poor law enforcement and judiciary inefficiency:** inadequate laws and inept judiciary is an enabler of corrupt practices in a system. In Nigeria, due to inadequate funding, limited resources and greed, the judiciary is highly compromised and can easily twist the law at will to suit their selfish interest. Due to culture of impunity that is promoted by the judiciary; where perpetrators of corrupt practices enjoy immunity and are not adequately punished or are not even punished at all can encourage the incidences of corrupt practices to continue to be on the increase. Muoma (2024) <sup>[21]</sup> surmises that Nigeria has a dual legal system; whereby they use both common law and sharia law and some of their laws are outdated, some were introduced during the colonial period and are no longer in tune with modern times. There is also the problem of overlapping laws which leads to confusion. These challenges make the legal system complex and susceptible to manipulation by the judiciary.
- **Socio – economic disparities:** there is wide gap between the rich and the poor. The political class in Nigeria appropriates humongous salaries for themselves while the other salary earners are poorly paid. Ekeruche (2017) <sup>[9]</sup> rightly pin points that the legislatures in Nigeria are one of the highest paid in the world earning \$118,000 a year. Arguing further, she submits that the inflated cost of governance comes at the detriment of infrastructures and investments. All these encourage the other citizens who watch the opulent life the politicians live, engage in corrupt practice in order to live like the politicians. Workers salaries many times are not even paid as at when due and their salaries cannot even take care of their basic needs. These encourage workers to engage in corrupt practices so that they would be able to take care of their needs. Banyawa (2021) <sup>[5]</sup> rightly observes that excess poverty can lead to breeding a society filled with violence, crime, and corrupt people and this is detrimental to the overall development of the country.
- **Lack of political will:** political will here involves the demonstration of genuine aspiration of political leaders and significant stakeholders to check perceived causes and effects of corruption in the society. Lack of political will is when political leaders and their cronies are corrupt and are unwilling to act against it for fear of losing political support or for their sole benefit. For corruption to be eradicated, the political class must necessarily support stakeholders to ensure that the menace is put in check. Hopkinson and Pelizzo (2006) rightly opine that to eradicate corruption effectively, the support of the government and the parliament is above all required. If there is lack of political will at the top, there will be a general absence of commitment to enforce laws and punitive measures. Similarly, Ugoani (2016) <sup>[34]</sup> avers that almost all national anti – corruption agencies see political will as the main prerequisite for their effective operation.
- **Culture of impunity:** impunity is lack of punishment for misconduct or crime. It has remained a persistent issue in Nigeria’s governance. In Nigeria, people who are caught engaging in corrupt practices are many times not punished and this has encouraged many people to be engaged in corrupt practices since there is no punishment for being corrupt. Jega (2023) <sup>[18]</sup> rightly points out that political leaders are persistently accused of using public funds for private gain but only few of them have been held liable for their actions despite public anger and indignation. Ojo (2024) <sup>[27]</sup> contends that many Nigerians see problem of leadership, followership, corruption, nepotism, lack of rule of law, tribalism, and incompetence as our bane to development. He argues that to him, impunity surpasses all the other aforementioned factors. He also notes that there have been several allegations of corruption and abuse of office against successive EFCC Chairmen, which is why they are routinely removed unceremoniously. Nuhu Ribadu 2003 - 2007, Farida Waziri 2008 – 2011, Ibrahim Lamorde 2011 – 2015 and Ibrahim Magu 2015 – 2020, all served as EFCC Chairmen but were all unceremoniously removed from office for allegedly involving in corrupt practices (Sahara Reporters, 2020) <sup>[40]</sup>. The fact that one was not punished made the successor to tow this line and this has perpetuated corruption in office in Nigeria.
- **Lack of transparency and accountability:** corruption prospers where government spending and public budget are veiled in secrecy and is largely controlled by the executive branch. The culture of transparency and accountability in all decision making processes effectively removes exploitation and corruption. A system that its activities are opaque and the citizens are not carried along by the government enthrones or engenders corruption. Ogundajo *et al* (2020) <sup>[26]</sup> rightly submit that the Federal government lost billions of naira as a result of blatant abuse of procedures, monumental and the absence of transparency in the award of contracts in the public sector
- **Political patronage:** public workers are sometimes appointed through political patronage instead of through merit. Some of them were appointed so as to compensate them for the role they played during election and they see it as an opportunity which can last for only four years and therefore is to be maximized through engaging in all forms of corrupt activities just to recoup the money and time they used to support the politician. Some of them are related to these politicians who will want to protect them when they engage in corrupt practices. Asabor (2024) <sup>[4]</sup> rightly contends that political patronage is a fast and effectual way used by Nigerian politicians to strengthen and control power and to reward those who contributed to their electoral ambition. He added that the effect of patronage in governance structure is deep as it encourages incompetence, inertia and corruption
- **The granting of office immunity to President, Governors and some politicians:** the Nigerian constitution granted immunity to some office holders and this is one reason corruption by this set of people is very high. The fact that they cannot be prosecuted or questioned while in office encouraged them to loot the resources of the country without any form of fear. A

former military officer, General Ishola Williams rightly pin points that the immunity clause in the 1999 constitution encourages corrupt acts by politicians because the law protects them from arrest and prosecution for engaging in unscrupulous activities whilst in office. (Channelstv, 2024) <sup>[7]</sup>. Ibrahim (2024) <sup>[15]</sup> notes that unless the immunity clause in the constitution is reviewed and removed, corruption will never abet and it will continue to hinder development in Nigeria

- **Loss of ethical and moral values:** this has encouraged corruption in no small measure. People respect those who have money without caring how they made the money. Corrupt people are celebrated and honoured by giving them chieftaincy titles. This is one reason corrupt practices might not abet very soon

### Challenges

- **Politicization of anti – corruption agencies:** many of the anti – corruption agencies are tools used by the political class to witch hunt perceived opponents. The constitution gave the executive enormous power that has necessitated the abuse or misuse of power. The executive has the power to appoint, sack and pay the chairmen of these anti – corruption agencies and this has made them to be very loyal and willing to carry out their instruction for fear of the dire consequences of disobeying their orders. Obiyan (2018) <sup>[24]</sup> rightly suggests that anti – corruption crusade must be devoid of selective investigation, arrest and prosecution. It must also not be used to demonise and annihilate members of the opposition as well as perceived enemies and critics. This, according to him, can make nonsense of the country's fight against corruption.
- **Slow judicial processes and lack of high – profile convictions:** the judicial processes are many times very slow and there is a cliché that says justice delayed is justice denied. Most times when people are taken to court they waste so much time that the public lose interest and they quietly “kill” the case. Sometimes, people who are convicted bribe their way through and the judges end up giving them little punishment or acquitting them. This, discourages anti – corruption agencies from carrying out their work judiciously. The Deputy Head of Ibadan Zonal Office of EFCC, Kazeem Oseni, rightly opined that slow judicial system as a result of defense lawyers and interlocutory appeals are the major hindrance against efforts of the anti – graft agency in the fight against corruption (Feyisipo, 2017) <sup>[12]</sup>.
- **Selective prosecution:** some of these anti – corruption agencies select who they can prosecute and who not to prosecute because they take orders from the executive. Sometimes they prosecute only the poor who cannot afford to bribe them. A coalition of 30 anti – corruption civil society organizations have accused the EFCC of selective prosecution in handling corruption cases particularly concerning former Kano State Governor. The group said, Ganduje, now the National Chairman of the All Progressive Congress, has evaded prosecution multiple times and that him and his wife have also disregarded the law by failing to appear before the Kano High Court on April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2024 and yet nothing was done to them (Adeuyi, 2024) <sup>[1]</sup>.

- **Lack of autonomy by anti - corruption agencies:** these anti graft agencies are usually not given free hand to do their jobs and this has affected their ability to do their job effectively. Mikali *et al* (2017) <sup>[19]</sup> rightly contends that the autonomy of these institutions will necessarily entail that they have special courts or tribunals for treating their cases instead of going to federal high courts or state high court which will make the cases to be susceptible to the manipulations of the state or federal government. Odekunle (1986) cited in Eme *et al* (2017) <sup>[10]</sup> maintains that the problem with fighting corruption in Africa is that everybody in government, the Head of State, Ministers, Local government Chairmen, Secretary to the Local Government are all profoundly involved.
- **Inadequate funding and resources:** anti – corruption agencies suffer from budgetary restrictions, militating against their ability to conduct thorough investigations and enforce the law effectively. They are also understaffed and this has affected their performance. At the 2018 budget defense, Senator Chukwuka Utazi bemoaned that the Independent and Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC) had been greatly debilitated with poor funding. He also argues that the meager money budgeted for fighting corruption is not for fighting corruption but it is rather to watch it happen. Another Senator, Senator Isa Misau (Bauchi) supporting Utazi, lamented that the staff strength of the Commission which was put at 800 personnel is a pointer that the country is not taking the fight against corruption seriously considering the estimated population of the country which was put at 180 million (ICPC Bulletin, 2018).
- **Weak public support:** the agencies do not enjoy public support which is necessary in order to curry cooperation and support which is very much needed if these agencies must succeed. Bryne *et al* (2010) rightly contends that public opinion can be an important tool in advancing an agency's work or pulling it down. If public opinion is in the favour of an anti corruption agency, they will enjoy citizens support and they are able to change the country's culture.
- **Corruption within anti – corruption agencies:** this is one of the problems of these agencies. For instance, all the former EFCC Chairmen such as Nuhu Ribadu 2003 - 2007, Farida Waziri 2008 – 2011, Ibrahim Lamorde 2011 – 2015 and Ibrahim Magu 2015 – 2020 were all unceremoniously removed from office for allegedly involving in corrupt practices (Sahara Reporters, 2020) <sup>[40]</sup>.

### Impacts of corruption in Nigeria

- **Governance:** A situation where the government lacks the resources to provide welfare services, it will definitely lead to bad governance. It can also erode the legitimacy of the government and the public trust on the government
- **Economic development:** corruption negatively affects service delivery and also impacts on the overall development of the country. When resources that could be used to provide goods and services are diverted into private hands, this can lead to lack of good roads, lack of constant electricity, lack of good hospitals and availability of expensive goods. Corruption negatively affects economic growth. This is because it discourages

investment, production, effective service delivery and ultimately overall development

- **Social equity:** it channels money to only the rich and those in privilege position therefore discouraging social equity
- **Decreased quality of goods and services:** corruption can lead to availability of low quality goods and services. Unscrupulous and corrupt people will produce low quality goods and services in order to make profit without considering the effect of the goods on the citizens. When citizens are pauperized by corrupt officials, producers will want to produce cheap goods that the masses can afford thereby producing low quality goods
- **Increased inequality:** Corruption can encourage a wide gap between the rich and the poor. When those who have access to government are corrupt, they amass wealth to the detriment of the masses that will remain poor. This encourages violent crimes, kidnapping, social vices including violent protests by the masses
- **Undermined effectiveness of social welfare programmes:** Corruption can impact negatively on the distribution of social welfare programmes. Through corrupt practices, goods meant for the poor can be diverted and embezzled by those who are supposed to distribute them. This will make nonsense of one of the primary goals of the government which is provision of welfare goods
- **Deterred foreign investment:** corruption discourages foreign investment. People shy away from investing in countries that are corrupt
- **Decreased trust in leaders and institutions:** when corruption is common, it makes the government to lose the trust, the confidence, and the support of the citizens. Every government needs the support of the people in order to perform well
- **Undermined democracy and good governance:** corruption will definitely lead to bad governance and undermined democracy. It encourages the abuse of human rights as people who dare to report corrupt cases are victimized. It erodes democratic ethos like respect for rule of law, transparency, accountability and equality

### Conclusion

Corruption has remained an impediment to the progress of Nigeria and has continuously thwarted the achievement of noble national goals, irrespective of the vast natural and human resources. It is doubtless that corruption is very costly to both governments and businesses and has mostly affected the poor and the vulnerable. Fighting corruption is very necessary if a country must progress.

### Recommendation

- The 1999 constitution should be reviewed and the power of the executive should be curtailed. The power to appoint, sack and promote the Chairmen of anti – corruption agencies should be taken away from the executive to avoid them being used by the ruling party to hunt perceived opponents
- Government should introduce and make compulsory courses like ethic studies, essentials of anti – corruption laws, and courses that will make students to be contented with what they have and to eschew all forms of corrupt

practices

- The anti – corruption agencies should be revamped and restructured. The EFCC should not be made to investigate, prosecute and recover looted assets alone. A different agency should be incorporated to recover looted assets because allowing only an agency to perform the three functions encourages re - looting of already recovered assets
- Orientation programmes should be organized to preach against our present value system where people see public office as an avenue to corner wealth to their generations. Nigerians should be orientated to begin to see governance as a way of serving the masses and not for self -serving

### References

1. Adeuyi S. CSOs accuse EFCC of selective prosecution. Daily Trust 2024 Oct 11.
2. Akkihal R, Smith HN, Adkins R. The economics of corruption in developing countries. Coastal Business Journal 2002;1(1):39-46.
3. Aluko YA. Corruption in Nigeria: concepts and dimensions. In: Enweremadu DU, Okafor EE, editors. \*Anti-corruption reforms in Nigeria since 1999: issues, challenges and the way forward\*. IFRA Special Research Issue 3; 2009. p. 1-8.
4. Asabor I. Patronage politics: the silent killer of Nigeria's governance and development. Modern Ghana 2024 Nov 14.
5. Banyawa S. Bridging the gap between the rich and the poor in Nigeria. Daily Trust 2021 Mar 9.
6. Byrne E, Arnold A, Nagano F. Building public support for anti-corruption efforts. World Bank and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC); 2010. p. 5-11.
7. Channeltv. 1999 constitution encourages impunity by granting immunity to corrupt politicians – retired general. 2024 Jun 14. Available from: <https://www.channelstv.com>
8. Dela Rama MJ, Lester ME, Staples W. The challenges of political corruption in Australia, the proposed Commonwealth Integrity Commission Bill (2020) and the application of the APUNCAC laws. Laws 2022;11(1):7.
9. Ekeruche MA. Inequality in Nigeria is worse than it looks. Stears 2017 Dec 20.
10. Eme OI, Samuel II, Chidubem EE. African anti-corruption agencies: challenges and prospects. Management Studies and Economic Systems (MSES) 2017;3(4):222-43.
11. Falola T. Corruption in the Nigerian public service: 1945–1960. In: Mbaku JM, editor. Corruption and the crisis of institutional reforms in Africa. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press; 1998. p. 133-65.
12. Feyisipo A. The lamentation of EFCC: 'slow judicial process, tactics of defence lawyers slowing fight against corruption. Business Day 2017 Sep 3.
13. Gould DJ. Administrative corruption: incidence, causes and remedial strategies. In: Farazmand A, editor. Handbook of comparative and development public administration. New York: Mercel Dekker Inc.; 1991.
14. Hopkinson N, Pellizzo R. The role of government and

- parliament in curbing corruption in Central and Eastern Europe. In: Stapenhurst R, Johnston N, Pellizzo R, editors. *The role of parliament in curbing corruption*. Washington DC: The World Bank; 2006. p. 251-63.
15. Ibrahim A. Removing immunity for corrupt political office holders. *Daily Trust* 2024 May 15.
  16. Ijewereme OB. Anatomy of corruption in the Nigerian public sector: theoretical perspective and some empirical explanations. *SAGE Open* 2015.
  17. Independent Corrupt Practices & Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC). Nigeria not ready to fight corruption with poor funding of ICPC – Senate. *ICPC Bulletin* 2017 Dec 27. Available from: <https://icpc.gov.ng>
  18. Jega H. Impunity in Nigeria. *Legal Research and Analysis* 2023 May 27.
  19. Mikali IK, Madya T, Ainuddin M, Abdullah I. Challenges in combating corruption in Nigerian democratic dispensation and its possible solutions. *Penerbit UTHM* 2017. p. 53-61. Available from: <https://publisher.uthm.edu.my>
  20. Morris SD. *Corruption and politics in contemporary Mexico*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press; 1991.
  21. Muoma VC. Legal reforms and access to justice in Nigeria: challenges and opportunities. *African Law Students Association – Nigeria Chapter* 2024 Jul.
  22. Nwosuji E. EFCC and ICPC the anti-corruption fight. *Global Journal of Applied, Management and Social Sciences (GOJAMSS)* 2015;10:38-47.
  23. Nzereogu DC. Weak institutions – a challenge to good governance in Nigeria: a review of Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC). *Nnadiabube Journal of Religion, Culture and Society (NJRCS)* 2024;4(1):78-85.
  24. Obiyan AS. Buhari: democracy in full bloom or autocracy in the ascent? A public lecture delivered at Centre for Constitutionalism and Demilitarisation, Lagos; 2018 Dec 4.
  25. Obuah E. Combating corruption in a “failed” state: the Nigerian Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC). *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 2010;12(1):1-27.
  26. Ogundajo GO, Oyedokun GE, Ajibade AT. Accountability and transparency in the Nigerian public service: a study of selected local government in Ogun State in Nigeria. *Islamic University in Uganda (IUIU) Journal* 2020. p. 64-73.
  27. Ojo J. How impunity fuels Nigeria’s underdevelopment. *The Punch* 2024 Oct 23.
  28. Okwuwada N. Organized corruption an impediment to the socio-economic survival of Nigeria: an MDAs perspective. *Munich Personal RePEc Archive (MPRA)* 2024 Oct 9.
  29. Osoba SO. Corruption in Nigeria: historical perspective. *Review of African Political Economy*. 1996;23(69):371-86.
  30. Sandholtz W, Koetzle W. Accounting for corruption: economic structure, democracy, and trade. *International Studies Quarterly*. 2000;44(1):31-50.
  31. Sarjito A. Political corruption and how to combat it. *Journal of Governance*. 2023;8(4):563-82.
  32. Shabbir G, Anwar M. Determinants of corruption in developing countries. *The Pakistan Development Review*. 2007;46(2):751-64.
  33. Transparency International (TI). *Global corruption report: corruption in judicial systems*. Cambridge University Press; 2007.
  34. Ugoani JN. Political will and anti-corruption crusade management in Nigeria. *Independent Journal of Management & Production (IJM&P)*. 2016;7(1):72-97.
  35. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). \*Anti-corruption module 4 key issues: manifestations and consequences of public sector corruption; c2023.
  36. Usman A, Romle AR, Bashir A. Institutional weakness and conflict management in Nigeria: the need for collaborative governance. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*. 2015;1(11):1-7.
  37. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). *Anti-corruption: practice note (final version); 2004*. Available from: [http://www.undp.org/governance/docs/AC\\_PN\\_English.pdf](http://www.undp.org/governance/docs/AC_PN_English.pdf)
  38. Uwak UE, Udofia AN. Corruption in Nigeria’s public sector organizations and its implications for national development. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 2016;7(3):27-35.
  39. World Bank. *Helping countries combat corruption: the role of the World Bank; 1997*. Available from: <http://www.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/index.cfm>
  40. Sahara Reporters. Ribadu, Waziri and Magu: EFCC’s history of chairpersons with unceremonious exits. 2020 Jul 8.