

## **Governance, Corruption and Nigeria's Post-Independence Growth Crisis**

**IJEOMA, UCHENNA C.**

*Coordinator Soc. Sc./Arts, Centre for Distance & e-Learning,  
University of Nigeria, Nsukka.*

**ATTAMA PAULINUS IKECHUKWU**

*Dept. of Public Administration & Local Government Studies  
University of Nigeria, Nsukka.*

---

### **ABSTRACT**

The paper looks at the interplay between governance, corruption and growth as biggest undoing of the state of Nigeria. Weak governance and corruption have impeded sustainable growth tremendously and can be represented equally as being predominantly responsible for the development crisis that has engulfed Nigeria. The paper describes the connection between good governance and effective democratic institutions as a way to bring Nigeria out of the current development crisis. It states the need to intensify the anti-corruption crusades with a strong mandate to the anti-graft agencies to prevent the executive arm of government from exerting undue control. The paper relies on the sequential analytic approach in data analysis and adopted good governance model as a theoretical compass. It recommends stiffer penalties and strong democratic institutions capable of "just application" of rules as disincentive to corrupt practices. Similarly, we promote radical reorientation and self-awareness growth to instigate the emergence of a dynamic civil society that will make politicians behave responsibly in the fulfilment of their responsibilities.

**KEYWORDS:** Governance; Corruption; Growth Crisis; Nigeria.

---

Date of Submission: 07-08-2020

Date of Acceptance: 21-08-2020

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The existing global concerns about corruption have contributed to the introduction of the UN Convention against Corruption with the aim of establishing effective control of the ever-spreading corruption phenomenon. Especially in Africa. Corruption seems to have become a major governance and sustainability challenge. Indeed, the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Reports (2006: 92) observed that most corrupt countries in the world are still found in Sub-Sahara Africa. This finding has brought Sub-Saharan Africa to global attention with a view to rising corruption prevalence and repositioning perceptions of governance in the region. Corruption has been one of the issues that has gained significant attention at both public and private fora since 1960, when Nigeria became independent. Akindele (2005: 12) has aptly demonstrated through a retrospective analysis of politics from independence to date that corruption has permeated so deep into the fabrics of Nigerian society.

Six years after independence and eventual military invasion, Nigeria's first military coup is inextricably related to the fragile impacts of corruption on Nigerian body politics. For example, Major Nzeogwu, leader of the first coup, remarked in his speech that;—our enemies are the political profiteers, soldiers, the men in high and low places that seek bribes and demand ten percent, those that seek to keep the country divided permanently so that they can remain in office as ministers and V.I.Ps of wastel (cited in Iyare 2008:42). To him, the tribalists, the nepotists, those who make the country look big for nothing before international circles, those who have distorted our culture and reversed the Nigerian political calendar with their words and actions (Iyare 2008:42) have so far remained the stumbling block for Nigeria 's search for growth. Except in the few sectors where there seem to have been some semblances of growth. The Nigerian State is, in essence, a victim of high-level corruption triggered by bad governance and weak institutions that are also slowing national development and recycling the state's political, religious and community crises. The economic and political landscape of Nigeria is imbued with corruption and colossal misuse of power. Just as the National Planning Commission Report (2005:17) observed, The main causes of policy failure were institutional corruption and low levels of transparency and accountability. Nigeria's forms and patterns of corruption include unorthodox and dishonest trade, misappropriation or theft of funds, kickbacks, under and over invoicing, bribery, misleading claims, abuse

of office, collection of illegal tolls and other malfeasant activities. This is because corruption does not only seem to deny the people resources due for their well being, it also denies external assistance to the people.

The Obasanjo government proclaimed zero tolerance on corruption, with the transition to civilian rule in 1999. One of the Government's major measures was the establishment of the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) and Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC). To a large extent, the New Order succeeded in arraigning some high-profile officials of the state, especially ex-governors. However the resources of these organizations were seriously undermined by political desperation and greed. State managers have made efforts since 1999 to dramatically reduce the scope of corruption mainly for rivals or suspected enemies. Simultaneously those favoured have continued unchecked to thrive and re-establish new ties and avenues. Undoubtedly, corruption now seems to have been a permanent feature of Nigerian politics and seems to have been thoroughly institutionalized into the domain of the country's culture and value system. The growing number of energetic Nigerian youth roaming the country is also pathetic. A 2009 study reported that Nigeria's national unemployment levels between 2000 and 2019 showed that the number of unemployed people was 31.1% in 2000; 31.6% in 2001; 12.6% in 2002; 14.8% in 2003; 13.4% in 2004; 11.9% in 2005; also in 2006 it was 13.7%; in 2007 14.6%; in 2008 14.9%; in 2009 19.7% 2010-2019 52% (National Bureau of Statistics 2009:238). The Central Bank of Nigeria Annual Report (2019) still revealed that unemployment rate rose from 19.7 in 2009 to 21.1% in 2010 and 23.9% in 2011 (cited in Ladan 2012:7). In fact, a situation whereby, there is a decade of strong real GDP of 6.5% economic growth, and in the same period, unemployment rate continues to rise annually from 11.9% in 2005 to 19.7% in 2009, and over 37% in 2013% (Ogunmade, 2013) is an indication that something is fundamentally wrong with the Nigerian state.

Despite this pervasive issue of unemployment, it has remained increasingly difficult to isolate or demphasize the effects of unemployment on the current development crisis. The truth now is that unemployment seems to have overgrown the State's ability and is also leading people to participate in illegal activities that stagnate development. In the opinion of Salawu (2010:348), Unemployment is rising the number of people willing to kill or be killed at the token gain for a given path. Which explains why the nation is basically unstable. The increasing number of crime in the South West, the ridiculous kidnapping in the South East, the fresh attacks by the Niger Delta rebels and the religious crisis in Northern Nigeria that incubates Boko Haram terrorist activity Of course, these manifestations of insecurity have further compounded the crisis of development in Nigeria and also appear to have disconnected the people from the State.

Given its implications for the country's quality of governance and overall growth, this paper seeks to create the vital connection between bad governance, weak state anti-corruption policies, and the failure of the anti-graft campaign and the degree to which it has contributed to Nigeria's current development crisis, and provide solutions to address the danger. Hence the paper empirically addresses issues linking governance and corruption to the present development crisis in Nigeria.

**Governance, corruption and development: theoretical and conceptual discourses.** Strict academic debates have been held discussing the impacts of governance and corruption on the overall growth of a given society (Ogundiya 2010; Kaufmann 2000; Oyovbaire 2007). Some of these attentions have recently turned to corruption due to a increasing awareness of its dire consequences for the better governance and democratic development (Kaufmann 2000:2). Governance is a dynamic term that looks wider than corruption. That is because in the act of allocating state resources, governance includes interrelated structures, organizations, and individuals. Ogundiya (2010:202) Described governance as the process of allocating resources through State instruments to achieve public gain. For him, governance encompasses institutional and systemic structures, decision-making processes, policy creation and capacity to execute, staff growth, knowledge flows, and the essence and style of leadership within a political structure. For him,

Governance is related to politics, it is conceptually different. However, as a human phenomenon, governance is exercised within a given socio-cultural context and belongs to a broader department of politics. While politics is the authoritative allocation of values or who gets what, when and how, governance is the process and mechanisms of allocating the values without jeopardising the principle of equity, justice and fairness. Therefore, it is through the practical application of the authority and the processes of governance that the powers of the state acquire meaning and substance (Ogundiya 2010:202-203).

In the same way, Kaufmann (2000:3) earlier described governance as exercising authority for the common good through formal and informal practices and institutions. Governance encompasses the selection, monitoring and replacement of governments that include the ability to formulate and implement sound policies and respect for the institutions that govern the citizens and the state economic and social interactions (Kaufmann, 2000). He is of the opinion that governance could be divided into three broad categories, each containing two components such as:

1. (a) Voice and accountability which includes civil and political liberties and freedom of the press, and (b) political stability and lack of violence.

2. (b) Government effectiveness which includes the quality of policymaking and public service delivery, and (b) the lack of regulatory burden.
3. (c) The rule of law that includes protection of property rights and an independent judiciary, and (b) control o corruption (Kaufmann 2000:4-5).

Therefore, governance is a dynamic structure, process, relationships, and structures in the United Nations Development Program report (UNDP 1999), in which individuals and groups express their desires, exercise their legal rights, fulfil their responsibilities, and mediate their differences. Leftwich (1993 ) argued that governance is tailored to the institutional and technological aspects (cited in Ghana Centre for Democratic Development 2001:9). Governance primarily has to do with the structure and procedures of formulating and executing state policies directed towards the overall aim of society. Such processes include policy creation, management of public resources, protecting and coordinating citizens, guiding state agencies (including private institutions) to ensure transparency and equity of justice in running day-to-day government business. Governance involves structures and processes as well as the proceedings of the structures and processes (Oyovbaire 2007:5). As the method of exercising political power to control a nation's affairs, Adamolekun (2002:42) further puts it in a simple perspective. For him, the main elements of governance are: rule of law, freedom of expression and association, free and fair election, responsibility, probity and transparency, and leadership focused to outcomes.

Precisely, the Kratz's as in Nwanegbo (2009:7) definition of governance as — Government in action helps us to understand that the process by which the executive and its bureaucratic machinery implement the state policy, public bureaucracy at all levels, is and can be seen as governance. Governance can function as a mechanism in any organization of any size: from a single human being to all of humanity; and it can work for any reason, whether good or bad or not for profit or not (see Nwanegbo 2009). Indeed, a reasonable or rational goal of governance may be to ensure (sometimes on behalf of others) that an organization produces a worthwhile pattern of good results while avoiding a pattern of bad circumstances that is unwanted. Perhaps the most moral or natural aim of governance is to maintain a dignified pattern of good on behalf of those governed, while preventing an unwanted one. The ideal purpose, obviously, would assure a perfect pattern of good with no bad.

Natufe (2006: 1) conceptualized governance as the processes and systems by which a government manages the resources of a society to address socio-economic and political challenges in the polity. According to Kaufman in Natufe (2006: 1), governance on the other hand embodies —the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised for the common good. In a closely related definition, the World Bank (1999: 2) stated that governance is how control is exercised in controlling the economic and social development capital of a county. There is a need for governance whenever a group of people come together to accomplish a goal, and it involves decisions that establish goals, assign authority, or check results. This consists of either a separate phase or a particular part of the cycle of management or leadership. From the above definitions, it means that governance is the use of institutions, structures of authority and even collaboration to allocate resources and coordinate or control activity in society or the economy. This definition though looks good, but it is very broad in context. Instead of that, we may need to agree with the view that described governance as the collection of mechanisms that allow the organization to make the best decisions as fast as possible.

The introductory explanations of the aforementioned definition often introduce us to governance characteristics, which should be the basis for assessing governance definitions. Therefore, governance can also be seen as the role of leadership for the realization of the common good in a given place (see Ikelegbe and Osumah 2007). This position can be collaborated taking the World Bank (1999:2) identified three key aspects of governance, which are:

- i. The form of a political regime,
- ii. The process by which authority is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development; and
- iii. The capacity of governance to design, formulate and implement policies and discharge functions.

In general terms, governance occurs in three broad ways:

1. Through networks involving public-private partnerships (PPP) or with the collaboration of community organizations.
2. Through the use of market mechanisms whereby market principles of competition serve to allocate resources while operating under government regulation
- 3 Through top-down methods that primarily involve governments and the state bureaucracy.

These governance modes often appear here in terms of hierarchy, markets, and networks. By the way, one thing is evident from that, governance covers everything in society and it has at its heart the control issues of governing, organizing both the actions and the people and material to achieve the desired aim. Thus, the

principle of governance can be extended to as broad as a nation-state as desired, to companies, to non-profits, to NGOs, to alliances and other organizations, to project teams, and to any number of citizens engaged in a purposeful operation. Governance is therefore a multifaceted concept which involves many aspects of the management of human life and activities (see Nwanegbo 2009).

The organisations that do stuff will no longer be hierarchical pyramids, with much of the real oversight at the top. They will be networks of stress interlaced chains, where control is loose, power diffused, and plural decision centers. Decision-making will become an increasingly complex process of multilateral blockage both within and outside the organization that believes it has announced or at least announcing, the decision. Because organizations will be horizontal, the way they are governed is likely to be more collegial, consensual, and consultative.

At the other hand, corruption is of course a universal problem, with complex causes; its net impact is generally considered negative to all societies, especially developing countries (Ghana Center for Democratic Development 2001:6). Corruption is a common word, and has become part of daily use (Adebayo 2004:19-20). In reality, corruption in Nigeria has become a household name, and so it seems to have been integrated into the national life. Huntington (1968:59), defined the concept as abuse of public office for private ends. For him, corruption is a behaviour of public officials which deviates from accepted norms in order to serve private ends. Speaking at the Global Forum on fighting corruption, Al Gore argued that corruption is —a cold, vicious, often violent sacrifice of citizen security for a narrow, greedy, private, personal profit on the part of a crooked official (cited in Iyare 2008:40). Corruption is a —behaviour that deviates from the formal rules of conduct governing the actions of someone in a position of public authority because of private-regarding motives such as wealth, power, or status (Khan 1996:12). Jean François (1998) argued along the lines that corruption in Africa is closely associated with neopatrimonialism and clientelism, and that the basis for the entrenched corruption in Africa is mainly the lack of distinction between public and private (cited in Andvig J, Fjeldstad O, Amundsen I, Sissener T and Søreide 2001:19).

Arguably, structural corruption appears to be more bureaucratic and political in nature in Nigeria over the decades. This is because the ruling class has proven to be the key promoters of corruption; the continued high prevalence of corruption in Nigeria stems from the fact that, beyond structural failures, leaders seem to have penetrated escaping roots in the growth of anti-corruption crusade, as a result, political corruption has been on its peak with overwhelming monumental negative effects and consequences in Nigerian political system. It defies the laws of tradition that govern the political system. Political corruption involves manoeuvring the structures and laws of the state for the benefit of a person or party. Political corruption is a divergence from current state rational-juridical standards and principles, and leads to institutional decay. Corruption promotes economic decay, social and political instability, perverts the ability of the state to foster rule of law, and eventually corrodes trust and undermines legitimacy (Ghana Centre for Democratic Development 2001:6). It is the —behaviour that deviates from the formal duties of a public role (elective or appointive) because of private regarding (personal, close family, private clique) wealth or status gains (Nye 1967:416). In terms of security implications, former U N Secretary General Kofi Anan explained that corruption causes enormous harm by impoverishing national economics, threatening democratic institutions, undermining the rule of law and facilitating terrorism (Webb 2005 cited in Economic Commission for Africa 2009:209).

The combination of disparity in governance, corruption and other structural and political contractions has continued to intensify Nigeria's development crisis. In reality it remains difficult to conceptualize creation. After the end of World War II the term seems to be in a state of flux; with emphasis shifted from the economic growth perspectives (GDP) to measuring the wellbeing of —man or empowering people to overcome their daily needs. As Chandler (2007:367) rightly observed development has been redefined, taking the emphasis away from traditional economic indicators of GDP and trade and broadening out the concept to take in psychological and material factors related to the measurement of human well-being. More importantly, it has concerned itself currently with driving the course of beneficial and positive advancement today without compromising the future of tomorrow. That is sustainable development, development of today that does not compromise further existence (see Nwanegbo, 2013). Governance and corruption are definitely two separate things but they influence one another. It will be far from growth to have a community facing the problems of bad governance and corruption. Governance and corruption are in fact the bane of Nigerian national development. And there seems to be broad agreement that the present Nigerian development crisis is closely associated with governance and corruption problems. Africa's and indeed Nigeria's economic crisis is a big part of the discussion that prompted the use of the term — good governance. The World Bank has used the good governance model as a response to African leaders' gross mismanagement, which seems to be a big cause of development crisis.

This model is based on the premise that efficient and good governance can be a developmental prerequisite. It will reduce corruption, and reposition prosperity for the economy. Effective governance model is a prerequisite for growth, for the World Bank. Good governance is distinguished by increased engagement of

the public and participation in governance; improved institutional mechanism; adherence to the ideals of the rule of law; enhancement of human rights; and transparency and accountability (Federal Government of Nigeria Report, 2002:111). However, the model emphasizes the notion that the absence or partial presence of the specified values in any policy promotes corruption, as well as the fact that a State's governance efficiency plays a vital role in its ability to prevent corruption, which in turn defines the level of development and growth. Hence, the good governance model is based on its ability to tackle institutional setbacks and evolving anticorruption reforms to repositioning socio-economic and political fortunes of a nation.

### **Governance of Anti-Corruption and the State of Corruption in Nigeria**

Nigeria has been engaging many laws and institutions since independence in an effort to eradicate corruption and intronitize good governance. This necessitated the promulgation between 1966 and 1996 of such decrees and laws. Those include: the order for the audit of properties by the public office No. 5 of 1966, the Corrupt Practices Decree of 1975, the Jaji Declaration of 1979, the —Ethical

Revolution of 1981-1983, the —War Against Indiscipline of 1984, National Orientation Movement of 1986 and Mass Mobilization for Social Justice and Economic Recovery and Self Reliance (MAMSER) 1987 and the War Against Indiscipline and Corruption (WAIC) 1996. Thus, the above could be described as eras in which various governments seek to establish a single agency that would assist address the incidences of corruption. However, politicization of some of the agencies and highly centralized administrative structure that act at the behest of the chief executive hindered progressive fight against corruption.

By 1999, when the nation returned to civilian rule under Olusegun Obasanjo's leadership, many anti-corruption programs were launched. Institutions and laws such as the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC), the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC), the Accountability Programs of Extractive Industries (NEITI), the 2004 Money Laundering Act, the Due Process Mechanism in public procurements, the freedom of information act 2011, are all institutions and laws aimed at attacking the threat of corruption. The EFCC between 2003 and 2010 has taken 700 cases to court, with a record of over 400 convictions, assets worth #1trillion forfeited, while some cases are still pending before the court and has till 2010 recovered over \$6.5billion (Waziri 2010:2). This surpasses the ICPC's 241 persons prosecuted in 127 cases from inception in 2001 to 2007.

Therefore, the initiative of the EFCC may not be unconnected to the fact that the EFCC in particular has been granted a broad range of responsibilities that seem to have encroached on other relevant agencies' responsibilities. For instances, according to the EFCC establishment act (2004:6-7) the commission is saddled with the following functions:

- (i) the enforcement and the due administration of the provisions of this Act;
- (ii) the investigation of all financial crimes including advance fee fraud, money laundering, counterfeiting, illegal charge transfers, futures market fraud, fraudulent encashment of negotiable instruments, computer credit card fraud, contract scam, etc.;
- (iii) the co-ordination and enforcement of all economic and financial crimes laws and enforcement functions conferred on any other person or authority;
- (iv) the adoption of measures to identify, trace, freeze, confiscate or seize proceeds derived from terrorist activities, economic and financial crimes related offences or the properties the value of which corresponds to such proceeds;
- (v) the facilitation of rapid exchange of scientific and technical information and the conduct of joint operations geared towards the eradication of economic and financial crimes;
- (vi) collaborating with government bodies both within and outside Nigeria carrying on functions wholly or in part analogous with those of the Commission concerning -
- (vii) the identification, determination, of the whereabouts and activities of persons suspected of being involved in economic and financial crimes,
- (iii) the exchange of personnel or other experts,
- (iv) the establishment and maintenance of a system for monitoring international economic and financial crimes in order to identify suspicious transactions and persons involved,
- (v) maintaining data, statistics, records and reports on person, organizations, proceeds, properties, documents or other items or assets involved in economic and financial crimes; (vi) undertaking research and similar works with a view to determining the manifestation, extent, magnitude, and effects of economic and financial crimes and advising government on appropriate intervention measures for combating same
- (vii) dealing with matters connected with the extradition, deportation and mutual legal or other assistance between Nigeria and any other country involving Economic and Financial Crimes; (l) The collection of all reports relating suspicious financial transactions, analyse and disseminate to all relevant Government agencies;

- (viii) taking charge of, supervising, controlling, coordinating all the responsibilities, functions and activities relating to the current investigation and prosecution of all offenses connected with or relating to economic and financial crimes;
- (vx) the coordination of all existing economic and financial crimes, investigating units in Nigeria;
- (x) maintaining a liaison with office of the Attorney-General of the Federation, the Nigerian Customs Service, the Immigration and Prison Service Board, the Central Bank of Nigeria, the Nigeria Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency, all government security and law enforcement agencies and such other financial supervisory institutions in the eradication of economic and financial crimes;
- (xi) carrying out and sustaining rigorous public and enlightenment campaign against economic and financial crimes within and outside Nigeria and;
- (xii) carrying out such other activities as are necessary or expedient for the full discharge of all or any of the functions conferred on it under this Act etc.

Incidences of corruption have remained strong, however, given the existence of these institutions and rules. The EFCC act's duplication of ICPC roles also leads to the inability of these organizations to nib the problem out of the bud. In reality, these institutions' contradictory roles and the unhealthy policy that makes the mediocre take on critical positions in the institutions appears to have made the fight against corruption unachievable at least for the nearest future. Indeed, another major challenge is the selective and partial application of the laws. For instance, under the tenure of the former president Obasanjo the EFCC seems to have been used to witch-hurt opposition politicians while cronies and allies of the government were flourishing in corrupt practices. The implication is that the more the nation creates anti-graft agencies that are mainly dependent on executive control, conflicts and competitions among these agencies would always stall progress and provide escaping root for offenders.

#### **Governance, Corruption and the Crisis of Development in Nigeria**

Scholars have engaged in the debate of corruption with many analytical and theoretical steps, and their submissions and analyses do not seem to have diminished the ever-increasing incidences of corruption. Indeed corruption has remained so rampant in post-colonial Nigeria at all levels of government. For example Ribadu (2006) gave a graphic summary of the situation. He termed the period between 1979 and 1998 —the darkest period in Nigeria's history of corrupt regimes. The civilian administration of 1979 - 1983 was bedevilled with profligacy, —wanton waste, political thuggery and coercion...disrespect for the rule of law...bare faced, free for all looting of public funds through white elephant projects (cited in Fagbadebo 2007:30-31).

According to him:

Corrupt public servants and others in the private sector bestrode the nation, masquerading as captains of business and power brokers with tainted and stolen wealth and demanded the rest of us to kowtow before them. The period of military regime was pathetic. Under them, corruption became the sole guiding principle for running affairs of state. The period witnessed a total reversal and destruction of every good thing in the country (cited in Fagbadebo 2007:31).

In addition to Ribadu's findings, flagrant abuse of public office and misuse of public funds culminated in the mid-1990s military regime. As a result, for the two consecutive years between 1996 and 1997, Nigeria has been the most corrupt country in the world's unenviable place (see Transparency International, 2009). The Obasanjo administration established itself with the return to civilian rule in 1999 the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) and the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC). The Ribadu led EFCC was reputed for the trial and conviction of former Bayelsa State Governor, Deprieye Alamiesiegha and former Inspector General of Police Tafa Balogun and other high profile prosecutions especially among the ruling elites. It is important to note that, given the efforts of the EFCC, a return to civil rule is full of major official corruption, particularly by the governors and other political collaborators, and selective prosecution has occurred (as described above). For example, although Obasanjo was engaging in holy anti-corruption sermons, his government was heavily embroiled in impropriety over privatization of public enterprises (Iyare 2008:47) and other situations. Iyare further explained that enterprises were sold to friends and acolytes of the regime in shady circumstances. In follow-up to this, Ndibe declared that:

Obasanjo has a lot to answer for. How was Nigerian's oil blocks sold during his watch? Can he affirm that the Nation's largesse was never conferred on foreign and local agents fronting for him, his relatives or friends? Where did he afford the huge cost of building his private university? How did his farm which was in a feeble financial state in 1999 turn into a juggernaut and cash mint, making a reported monthly profit of N30 million? How about the large farmlands he acquired in other parts of the country, how did the cash materialize? (Emphasis added, cited in Iyare 2008:47).

Indeed, under Jonathan Goodluck's, administration, Nigeria appeared to have been bedevilled with corruption. A Global Financial Integrity Report (2013) stated that Nigerian Leaders from 2000 to 2010 have stolen 3.047 trillion Naira placing the country 7<sup>th</sup> in the world's money laundering index (see Daily Sun February 15, 2013). The Nigeria's corruption perception index has remained higher even under democratic governance. For instance, table 1 below shows that Nigeria is rated as one of the World's most corrupt Nation by Transparency International between 1996 and 2014.

**Table 1: Nigeria's corruption perception index by Transparency International from 1996 to 2014**

Years	Score	Position	Total number of most corrupt Nations
1996	0.6	54	54
1997	1.7	52	52
1998	1.9	81	85
1999	1.6	98	99
2000	1.2	90	90
2001	1.0	90	91
2002	1.6	101	102
2003	1.4	132	133
2004	1.6	144	145
2005	1.9	152	158
2006	2.2	142	179
2007	2.2	147	180
2008	2.7	121	180
2009	2.5	130	180
2010	2.4	134	189
2011	2.4	143	183
2012	27	139	174
2013	25	144	175
2014	27	136	174

**Source:** Adapted from *Jaja Nwanegbo* (2015) with update by the authors.

Reference to the table 1 above, it could be argued that while General Abacha's military junta appears, in Ribadu's opinion (2006), to be identified as Nigeria's darkest time in the history of corruption, we emphasize that even Obasanjo and Jonathan's civilian administrations, with all their pretensions, performed below expectations in the battle against corruption. Sermonising Nigerians without exemplary character could not have been enough to checkmate the spread. Two years into Obasanjo's first tenure, Nigeria was rated 90 out of 90 most corrupt Nations (see Transparency International 2009). Hence, corruption took a very high position, especially during the first tenure of Obasanjo led civilian regimes (1999-2003), with huge revenues, but wasteful spending, and nothing to show in terms of physical developments.

Explaining this further Robinson (2004), noted that:

—Nigerian government exported 20 billion (US dollars) worth of oil in the year 2003, but its people still scrape by on an average wage of just a dollar per day—oil money has often been wasted in kickbacks and bribes. The country's economy has struggled with years of mismanagement (cited in Fagbadebo 2007:33).

The consequence is that the ongoing rise in corrupt practices has also resulted in increased poverty, crime and insecurity leaving growth practically stagnant or even elusive. Oyewole (2010:3) noted that corruption is also causing economic inequality in the public sector by diverting public expenditure into capital projects where bribes and kickbacks are more prevalent. For him, officials may increase the technical complexity of public sector projects to conceal or pave way for such dealings, thus further distorting investment. Corruption also reduces compliance with building, climate, or other legislation, decreases the quality of government services and facilities, and raises government budgetary pressures. Kaufmann (2000) previously synthesized the main economic costs of corruption using different research from most corrupt societies to cover:

- Misallocation of talent including under utilization of key segments of society

- Less domestic and foreign investment
- Distorted enterprise development and growth of the unofficial economy
- Distorted public expenditures and public investments, and deteriorated physical infrastructure
- Lower public revenues and lower prevalence of the rule of law as a public good - Overly centralized government

Corruption appears to encourage unnecessary waste, divert resources and sustains ineffectiveness. For instance, Agbo (2009:55) explained that in Nigeria, more than \$400 billion has been reportedly stolen from the treasury by Nigeria's leaders between 1970 and 2007. With the return to civil rule in 1999, the program of stealing by the ruling class seems to have exploded from a brush fire into an all-consuming conflagration. There are several incidences of contract scam, bribery and abandoned projects both at the Local, State and Federal level. The consequences are that the country is denied investment and economic resources with this degree of waste to corruption, which increases poverty, need, strain, and struggle in politics. Such search for artificial scarcity also appears to be associated with the country's numerous conflicts. The result, in fact, is not just that development programs are impeded; it destroys and truncates the functionality of the existing structures, scares away investors and kills confidence in the country's possible investors. Societies of this typology may perhaps perpetually remain underdeveloped.

### **Crisis in governance and development in Nigeria**

Nigeria's governance, corruption and growth are inextricably connected. Governance and corruption are two distinct concepts that influence each other in any particular society in the process of achieving growth. Governance and corruption are still one of the big problems inhibiting growth in Nigeria (see Oyovbaire 2008; Okunade 2008;

Achebe 1983). This situation —has given rise to abuse of power, brazen corruption, disregard for due process and the rule of law, intolerance of political opposition, abuse of the electoral process and the weakening of institutions (Harriman 2006:2) which negates the basic principles of governance. The ideal governance process ensures that constitutionalism is strictly adhered to, providing a conducive administrative atmosphere with less uncertainty, and fostering the State's ability to fairly deliver justice, equitably distribute and allocate values that also enhance rapid development.

In the realization of the above, Obasanjo's civilian government constituted two anti-graft agencies Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) and Independent Corrupt Practices and other Offences Commission (ICPC) between 1999 and 2003 in an effort to address the challenges of poor governance that incubat corruption. Yet the fact that Nigerian leaders do not put themselves and their actions under control to law seems to be a major challenge of these institutions in the discharge of their mandate. As a result, Nigeria appears to be facing crisis of governance that seems to have implications on development.

As such, the result of a breakdown in governance is not only persistent on poor quality of life, but also a development crisis that has assumed alarming dimensions and has also affected virtually all sectors of the Nigerian political system. For example, Adeyemo (2009 ) observed that, despite over N85 trillion acquired between 1999 and 2008, the states and federal government cannot fix collapsing and decaying infrastructures (cited in Inokoba and Kumokor 2011:145). Good governance incorporates effectiveness and responsiveness of leaders, groups, institutions and even individuals in the act of governance. It advances institutions that plust development, narrowed down or sliced off avenues that allow corrupt practices. It is worthy to note that development would remain to evade any society (particularly Nigeria) that fails to fix its administrative processes in such a way that it could curb excesses of the rulers and the ruled.

## **II. CONCLUSION**

It has been proven from our study that two major drivers of Nigeria's development crisis are bad governance and the ever-increasing official corruption in both the private and public sectors of the economy. Indeed, huge government-generated revenues could not be properly accounted for; much of which had made their way into private pockets. Through less institutional ability to monitor the trend, Nigerian society's rapid growth in corruption and weak governance has culminated in the current development crisis. Except in some cases where sectoral growth has been reported it does not have any established effect on the system as a whole. Moreover, sustainability has never been achieved, as development is easily stalled, it does not have any fair effect. We hereby conclude, therefore, that solving these growth problems is the only solution for saving Nigerian democracy, which is already experiencing significant blows.

## **REFERENCES**

- [1]. Abimbola, J. & Adesote S. (2011). *Terrorism and National Security in the Niger Delta Area of Nigeria. National Security and Resource Management in Nigeria*. Lagos: Mono expressions.
- [2]. Abimbola, J.O. (2012) *Terrorism and Boko Haram Insurgency in Nigeria*, Lagos: Mono Expressions.



- [3]. Achebe, C. (1983). *The Trouble with Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers Ltd.
- [4]. Adamolekun, L. (2002). —Governance Context and Reorientation of Government; in L. Adamolekun. (ed) *Public Administration in Africa, main issues and selected country studies*. Ibadan, spectrum books limited.
- [5]. Adebayo, A. (2004), *Power in Politics*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- [6]. Agbo, A. (2009). *A Catalogue of Failures*. Tell Magazine, June 8,2009, P.37.
- [7]. Akindele, S. (2005), *A Critical Analysis of Corruption and its Problems in Nigerian*. *Anthropologist* 7 (1): 7-18.
- [8]. Andvig, J., Fjeldstad, O., Amundsen, I., Sissener, T. and Soreide T. (2001). *Corruption A Review of Contemporary Research*. Bergen: Chr. Michelsen Institute Development Studies and Human Rights.
- [9]. Chandler, D. (2007). *The Security-Development Nexus and the Rise of 'Anti-Foreign Policy'*. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 10 (8): 362–386.
- [10]. Daily Sun Newspaper, (2013). *Fighting Money Laundering to Reducing Corruption in Nigeria*. Editorial, February 15, pp 13.
- [11]. Economic Commission for Africa, (2009). *African Government Report II*. Oxford University Press.
- [12]. EFCC, (2004). *Economic and Financial Crimes Commission Establishment Act*. Abuja: June
- [13]. 4.
- [14]. Enweremadu, D. (2010). *Why Do Some Corrupt Regimes Promote Economic Development? Nigeria and Indonesia in Comparative Perspective*. Being a Paper Delivered at the Departmental Seminar Series organized by the Department of Political Science, University of Ibadan, April 28.
- [15]. Fagbadebo, O. (2007). *Corruption, Governance and Political Instability in Nigeria*. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations* 1 (2): 028-037
- [16]. Federal Republic of Nigeria, (2002). *Sustainable Development in Nigeria: Ten Years After Rio (UNCED), Draft National Assessment Report for Presentation at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South-Africa*.
- [17]. Ghana Centre for Democratic Development, (2001). *Governance, Democracy and Development in Africa: A Cultural Approach*. A Paper Present at the International Conference on the Cultural Approach to Development in Africa: Darkar. December 10-14.
- [18]. Heneke, (1986). 'Nigeria Foreign policy in a globalizing world by' Obute. In NAPSS
- [19]. *Journal of politics and international relations*, Vol.1 4th edition 2005.
- [20]. Hugher C.W. (2002). "Reflections on Globalization, Security and 9/11." Cambridge
- [21]. *Review of International Affairs*. New York: Longman Vol. 15 No.3.
- [22]. Huntington, S. (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- [23]. ICPC, (2007). *Nigeria Anti-Corruption War*. The Monitor: Abuja. October 14.
- [24]. Ikelegbe, A. and Osumah, O. (2007). *The Peoples Democratic Party and Governance in Nigeria (1999-2007)*. *Journal of Social Sciences* 19 (3): 185-199.
- [25]. Inokoba, P. and Kumokor, I. (2011). *Electoral Crisis, Governance and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria*. *Journal of Social Science* 27 (2): 139-148.
- [26]. Iyare, T. (2008). *Corruption and the Crisis of National Values*, in Oyovbaire (ed) *Governance and Politics in Nigeria, The IBB and OBJ Years*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- [27]. Jaja N. and Jude O. (2015). *Governance, Corruption and Crisis of Development in Post-Independence Nigeria*. *African Journal of Politics and Society* 1 (1): 24-44
- [28]. Kaufmann, D. (2000). *Improving Governance and Controlling Corruption: New Empirical Frontiers and the Case for Collective Action*, in M. Gabriel R. Staphenurst and M. Thomas (eds), *The Role of Bilateral Donors in Fighting Corruption*. Maastricht: World Bank Institute.
- [29]. Khan, (1996). *A Typology of Corrupt Transactions in Developing Countries*. *IDS Bulletin* 8,
- [30]. (5): 17-30
- [31]. Ladan, T. M. (2012). *The Functioning of the Local Government System in a Federalist Constitution: Controversies, Comparisons and Consensus*. A Paper Presented at the 13<sup>th</sup> Anniversary and Extraordinary General Assembly National Conference on Rediscovering the Nigerian Local Government System in the Emerging Constitution: Enugu. November, 28.
- [32]. National Bureau of Statistics, (2009). *Social Statistics in Nigeria*. Abuja: The NBS Publication.
- [33]. National Planning Commission, (2005). *National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy, (NEEDS)*, Abuja.
- [34]. Natufe, I. (2006). *Governance and Politics in Nigeria, A Lecture Delivered on the Staff and Graduate Seminar of the Department of Political Science & Public Administration, University of Benin, Benin-City, on November 21<sup>st</sup>*.

- [35]. Nwanegbo, J. (2009). Governance and Human Security in Anambra State 1999 – 2007. A Ph.D Thesis submitted to the Department of Political Science, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- [36]. Nwanegbo, J. (2013). Youth, Democracy and National Development: An Introductory Notes, in J. Tsuwa and C J. Nwanegbo (edited) Youth, Democracy and National Development. Makurdi: Sap Publishing House.
- [37]. Nye, J. (1967). Corruption and Political Development. *American Political Science Review* 61 (2): 417-427.
- [38]. Ogunmade, O. (2013). \$600bn Stolen by Nigerian Elite since Independence. ThisDayLIVE. Retrieved on 19/6/13 [www.thisdaylive.com/article/\\$600bn-stolen-by-nigerian-elite](http://www.thisdaylive.com/article/$600bn-stolen-by-nigerian-elite).
- [39]. Ogundiya, S. (2010). Democracy and Good Governance: Nigeria's Dilemma. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations* 4 (6): 201-208.
- [40]. Okunade, B. (2008). Leadership: The Big Challenge. An Inaugural Lecture Delivered at the University of Ibadan, November 6<sup>th</sup>.
- [41]. Oyovbaire, S. (2007). The Crisis of Governance in Nigeria. Being a lecture Delivered at 23<sup>rd</sup> Convocation Ceremony of the University of Portharcourt March 15<sup>th</sup>
- [42]. Oyovbaire, S. (2008). Governance and Politics in Nigeria, The IBB and OBJ Years. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- [43]. Oyowole, O. (2010). Corruption: Challenge to Good Governance and Development in Nigeria. A Lecture Delivered at 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of St Charles Grammer School Osogbo. August 7<sup>th</sup>.
- [44]. Ribadu, N. (2006). Corruption: the Trouble with Nigeria <http://www.gam-ji.com/articl5000/NEWS5530.htm>.
- [45]. Salawu, B (2010). Ethno-Religious Conflicts in Nigeria: Casual Analysis and Proposal for New Management Strategies. *European Journal of Social Sciences* 13 (3): 345-353.
- [46]. Transparency International, (2006). Corruption perception Index (CPI) 2006 Table, Source: [http://www.transparency.org/news-room/in\\_focus/2006/cpi\\_table](http://www.transparency.org/news-room/in_focus/2006/cpi_table).
- [47]. Transparency International, (1999). Corruption perception Index: 1995- 2009, Berlin. Compendium of African Governance Performance: Good Governance and Conflict Management: New York. p. II
- [48]. Waziri, F. (2010). EFCC Recovers \$6.5b, 1trillion Assets Seized. Abuja: Economic Confidential.
- [49]. Waitr, E.V (1972). Terror and resistance: A study of political violence. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [50]. Widinson, P. (2013). Political terrorism. New York: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- [51]. World Bank, (1999). Compendium of African Government Performance: Good Governance and Conflict Management for Durable Peace and Sustainable Development, UNDP.N.Y Vol. II. Liberia.

IJEOMA, UCHENNA C.. "Governance, Corruption and Nigeria's Post-Independence Growth Crisis." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(8), 2020, pp. 10-19.