

# An Empirical Investigation of Factors Motivating Corruption in Nigeria: Evidence from selected Public Sector Organisations in Nigeria

*Ugbomhe O. Ugbomhe, (PhD)*

Department of Business Administration  
Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria

*Oboh Joseph, (PhD)*

Department of Public Administration  
Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma,  
Edo State, Nigeria

*Prof. T. O. Agweda, (PhD)*

Department of Sociology,  
Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma,  
Edo State, Nigeria

## ABSTRACT

*The study empirically identified factors motivating corruption in public sector organisations in Nigeria. The main research design was survey research. Six public sector organisations were selected purposively and the population consisted all employees in the organisations under study. The sample size was 400. Questionnaire was the main research instrument and copies were proportionately distributed to all the organisations and returned in useable form. Hypotheses were tested using Pearson correlation with the aid of statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 20. The result of the test revealed among others that an increase in the level of ambiguity in rules and regulations in public sector organisations in Nigeria results to a corresponding increase in corruption in public sector organisations in Nigeria. The study concluded that motivation for corruption indicates that there are incentives that are internal and external to the individuals, which influence the dimension and level of corruption in the organisations. It was recommended that formal and informal rules in organisations should not be at odds with one another, should be clear and unambiguous to avoid creating fertile ground for corruption and unfettered access to corruption.*

**Keywords:** *Corruption, motivation, public sector organisations, ambiguity, rules and regulations.*

## Introduction:

Several human thoughts, motives, needs and resultant behaviours often work with those of others secretly and illegally result in some sorts of social problems (Ogunleye, 2006). One of such areas of secret agreement for an illegal purpose is the appearance of some conducts beneficial to one or few, but resulting in harm or damage to many people. Such conduct(s) is/are often referred to as corruption or corrupt conduct(s). Corruption is thus a malignant turnover, a cancer that eats its hosts to death. In Nigeria, it has brought too much blood and tears... (Ali, 2016). Corruption is a complicated and feature with multiple factors or many aspects that wears away the political

and socio-economic value of any country. It is also a global thing; capable of being understood only in its social contexts. It can be defined as anti-social bestowing conferring improper benefits contrary to legal and moral norms, and which underscores the authorities' capacity to secure the welfare of all citizen (Osoba, 2007). In Nigeria, corruption became the significant means of private accumulation during the decolonization period, in the absence of other means and came to shape political activities including competition after independence. There is a growing general concern regarding its spread because of so many factors, crime, unemployment, poverty, low rate of saving, unstable politics, etc. Factors motivating

corruption in public sector organisations in developing countries are more pronounced than advanced countries thus it remains a stumbling block to good management of public sector organisations. Corruption is a disease that introduces discrimination and arbitrariness in decision-making so that rules, regulations and procedures are bypassed or compromised within a course of action for self (material and non-material) gains (Nye, 1967); (Sen, 1999). Corruption is a decimal that happens again and again in Nigeria and has contributed largely to the underdevelopment of Nigeria (Uwak & Udofia, 2016). There is corruption in high places which covers from diversion of monies meant for infrastructural development, giving of bribes for contracting, misappropriate and misallocation of public funds to bribe in public offices. (Dike 2005) even the mad people on the street recognize the havoc caused by corruption- the funds allocated for their welfare vanish or dematerialize into the thin air (Dike, Africaeconomic.org) Again, even internally displaced people due to Boko Haram insurgency, militancy, gangsterism, killings in some parts of Nigeria recognize the destruction, damage or confusion caused by corruption. In his inaugural speech as the President of Nigeria in May 2015, President Muhammadu Buhari averred that "Corruption is the greatest bane of our society today. No society can attain anything near its full potential if it allows corruption to become the full blown cancer it has become in Nigeria (Adams, 2015) cited in (Osakede, Ijimakenwa, Adesanya, Ojo, Ojikutu & Abubakar 2015). (United Nations office on drugs and crime Viena, 2017) averred the following about corruption in Nigeria: Almost a third of Nigerian adults pay bribes when in contact with public officials; On average, almost one bribe is paid by every adult Nigeria per year; Roughly 400 billion Naira spent on bribes each year; Bride-payers in Nigeria spend one eighth of their salary on bribes; Nigerians regard bribery the third most important problem facing the country; Public officials in Nigeria show little hesitation in asking for bribe; Gender and age play a role in the vulnerability of citizens for bribery; High level of education and income give rise to a greater risk of briber; Individuality to refuse bribery may be caused by fear of negative after come; and Nigerians appear to have no faith in the capacity of authorities to deal with corruption.

The danger or perceive threat has swallowed nearly if not all the public sectors and private organisations in Nigeria. It has given birth to the absence of strong and capable state institutions that are necessary and required for promoting and protecting national security, integration, good governance and sustainable development (Alemika, 2018). The problem of corruption according to (Andvig, Fjeldstad, Amundsen, Sissener and Soreide 2000) has been observed either as a structural problem of politics or

economics, or as a cultural and individual moral problem. The after come of corruption in the country appears in so many dimensions affecting all sectors of human undertakings in Nigeria. Indeed, due to corruption, it is imperative to talk about weak leadership, poor public sector management, financial misallocation and misappropriation, inadequate infrastructure, poor service delivery, and moral decadence. The track of these whole things that are different from what is normal negatively affects the social, economic, and political life of Nigeria. Public sector organisations in Nigeria have become unremarkable, and are of medium quality or not very good and have consistently neglected the general wellbeing of the masses (Kayode, Adagbe and Ariyo, 2013). Public sector organisations are expected to be the drive of the economy which will grow national development but unfortunately and sadly, corruption has destroyed the very structure of the society thus restricting and constricting the effectiveness of the public sector organisations contributions to the growth and development of Nigeria. It has deprived and burlled the citizens of the social wellbeing, it is expected to be provided by government via these organisations inspite structural reforms in the public sector. The 1983 coup masterminded by Brigadier Sani Abacha as he was addressed then, it was "Compelled to seize power from the President Shagari government to save Nigeria and Nigerians from unrestrained corruption ineptitude and profligacy that had characterized both the federal and state government of the country (Dan Agbase former Newswatch magazine editor 1998 in Dike, Africaeconomic.org). For instance, the present Transparency International Corruption Index (IPC) put Nigeria 136th most corrupt nation to the world out of 174 that were evaluated in 2014. It is horrifying and astonishing that Nigeria is running in corruption without stopping instead of reducing. This rating is the worst in 6 years because in 2007, the corruption index put Nigeria as the 32<sup>nd</sup> most corrupt country out of 147 nations evaluated. In 2016, Nigeria was ranked 40th most corrupt in the latest Corrupt perception Index by (Transparency International 2008) today, Nigeria has backslide deeper into corruption and has move 12 steps backward for 136 in 2015 to 148 (Vanguard News 2018 in report to 2014 result. It therefore follows that corruption has actively, positively and truthfully come to stay in Nigeria and instead of reducing it is rather increasing in momentum and has really destroyed the economic political and social structure of Nigeria. Hence, Nigeria is as old as its corruption (Evans & Alenoghena, 2015).

Corruption in Nigeria carries consistently many kinds of dirty and unattractive woollen fabric. The situation has made so many people feel a lot of pains and lost hope in themselves as the money which would have

been used to reduce poverty in Nigeria are being guided into the pockets of a small group of individuals. The Achacha administration in 1993 – 1996 notoriously looted upwards of .3 billion dollars (Uzochukwu, 2013). The 2.1 billion US dollars budgeted for the purchase of arms to overpower Boko Haram insurgency group in Nigeria is nowhere to be found. The state of corruption did not spare anti-grift agencies in Nigeria as former chairman of the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) Ibrahim Lamorde was accused of fraudulently diverts over 1 trillion naira proceeds from corruption renounced by the agency (Adeyemi, 2016). This means that those who are appointed to oppose physically and fiercely counteract corruption are also found as the victim of the scene problem they fight. Many givers have been found guilty of it. The News Agency of Nigeria (NAN) reports that the former governor of Adamawa State Murtala Nyako is facing trial on court charges bordering on money laundering (Pulse, 2016). Recently, in May 2018 & June 2018, Rev. Jolly Nyam and Joshua Dariye governors of Taraba and Plateau States respectively were sentenced to 14 years imprisonment each over corruption charges. The National Assembly is not left out of corruption. Obasanjo on November 24, 2016 has described the National Assembly as a small cavern or an underground chamber of corruption (Jola, 2016) because members of the National Assembly pay themselves allowances for staff and officers they do not have as members. “The National Assembly is nothing but a business enterprise and the primary objective of the members is to make money for themselves”. (Lewis Obi in Uzochukwu, 2018). In Nigeria football, there are corrupt practices. A senior football officer and a club administration have been banned for ten years following their involvement in corruption, the football authority has announced” (BBC Sports News, 2013) cited in (Uzochukwu 2018). Match-fixing and corruption is a problem in Nigeria football, it has led to sanctions against a number of clubs, referees and officials (Oluwashina, 2013). Fraudulent internet activity is another form of corruption. The level of corruption in Nigeria has made many Nigerians show no respect to holy and Godly issues. This is seen in the report given by the spiritual director of Adoration Ministry, Enugu Nigeria (AMEN) news reports in December, 2014. According to the Director, Rev. Fr. Ejike Mbaka, the spiritual director impersonated him through websites and social media sites particularly face book. The bad guy used his picture to deceive people and collect money from them while claiming to be Rev Father Mbaka, not knowing that the Rev Fr. Is not in the face book and neither does him using a website with his name. Some tax officials are alleged to be using 2 types of receipt to collect revenue. One receipt is the original and hence genuine, while the second is usually a false one for the collecting for private use, thus depriving government of its legitimate revenue

(Bello-Imam 2005). It is alleged that unscrupulous officers rent fire arms to criminals who use them to harass the public and engage in high way robbery. The police is alleged to be collecting unauthorized fee before granting bail to anyone who is arrested.

Developed and developing countries have put in place various anti-corruption war and advocacy to surmount the danger of corruption in their systems. The United Nations (UN), International Monetary Fund (IMF) the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme and the African Union (AU) and few of such advocacies (Ogbeidi, 2012). The Nigeria government has initiated and put in place various measures and strategies to curb the incidence of corruption. These measures include setting up of anti-corruption agencies (such as independent corruption and other practices common (ICPC), Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC), office of the ombudsman, the auditor-general, Nigerian extractive industries transparency initiative (NEITI), budget monitory and price intelligence unit (BMPIU), e-governance, Nigerian investment promotion commission (NIPC), public procurement, public service reform (monetization to reduce waste and reduction or over-bloated personnel, reform of public procurement), the on-going sanitization in the Nigeria. National Petroleum cooperation (NNPC), (Adesina, 2015), Introduction of Treasuring Single Account (TSA), to block linkages and loopholes in the system, signing to the principle laid out in the new partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPDA) (Armstrong 2005), the setting up of special courts by federal government in each of the states in Nigeria in 2017 to prosecute those involved in financial crimes and other related offences, and the Peer Review Mechanism set up in 2003. Other efforts which Civil Service Handbook outlines include the code of ethics in government business, the guidelines for application, promotion, discipline issues by civil service commission, the Code of Conduct Bureau to surmount the conduct of political and public servants, the 5th schedule of the 1999 Federal constitution dealing with codes of behaviour for public office, the Code of Conduct Tribunal with the responsibility for trial and prosecution of all violation or breach of government business ethics, Dike, 2007 in *africaeconomicanalysis.org*). Other private anti-corruption initiatives include the following: information, media, the convention on business integrity (CBI), zero-corruption coalition (ZCC), and independent advocacy project (IAP), transparency international Nigeria. (Sowunmi, Raufu, Oketokun, Salako and Usifoh, 2010).

In 2017, Federal Government of Nigeria comes up with Whistle Blower policy. The policy has added a new stimulus, a force, energy to the anti-graft war. In less than a year of its inauguration, it has led to the recovery of amazing, overwhelming incredible amounts of stolen funds, thus proving to be an

effective and reliable mechanism to struggle for victory against corruption that seems to have permanently stopped the growth and development of the country since 1960 independence.

As of June 2017, ₦11.6 billion had been recovered and about ₦375.8m paid to 20 whistle blowers. Going by figures available from Presidential Advisory Committee against Corruption (PACAC) by June 5, 2017, total communication received by the Federal Ministry of Finance which is the government body to put into practice the whistle blower policy was 2,150 of these, 128 came via the Ministry whistle blower that receives reports ([www.whistle.fiance.gov.org](http://www.whistle.fiance.gov.org)). 1,192 were via phone calls (08098067946); 540 via SMS and 290 by e-mail ([www.whistlefiancice.gov.ng](http://www.whistlefiancice.gov.ng)).

According to (Onumah 2018) total number of tips received was 337, out of which 29 was classified and 308 unclassified, 53 of these tips came via phone calls, 105 via SMS, 120 via the website and 95 in e-mail. 205 tips from 205 agencies were classified as actionable. Within two months, by the middle of August, 2017, total communications received by the Federal Ministry of Finance via the various channels move up from 2150 to 5000 representing 56.2% increase. More than half of the actionable tips received according to the Minister of Finance, Mrs. Kemi Adeosun were from public servants (Onumah, 2018).

### Statement of the Problem:

Many studies on the factors motivating corruption in public organisations in Nigeria indicate contradictory results and conclusions. The factors motivating corruption in public organisations has not been fully confirmed and found in Nigeria environment. Factors in the area of corruption in the public sector organisations have continued to generate increased arguments among scholars and the like. Generally, it is believed that power distance low job satisfaction, ambiguities in rules and regulations lead to propensity for corruption in public sector organisations in Nigeria. This verbal contention required a proof on the tribune of empirical evidence in the domain of Nigeria data. The aforementioned are gaps in literatures that required to be filled in Nigeria and thus, this study is aimed at filling these gaps.

### Objectives of the Study:

The broad objective of this study is to examine the factors motivating corruption in organisations, with particular reference to Nigeria's public sector. Specifically, the objectives are as followed:

1. To determine the extent to which ambiguity in rules and regulations in public sector organisations in Nigeria influence propensity for corrupt behaviour in Nigeria public sector organisations.
2. To examine whether power distance in public sector organisations in Nigeria influences propensity for

corrupt behaviour in Nigeria public sector organisations.

3. To assess whether low job satisfaction in public sector organisations in Nigeria has significant relationship with propensity for corrupt behaviour in Nigeria public sector organisations.

### Research Questions:

1. To what extent does ambiguity in rules and regulations in public sector organisations in Nigeria influences propensity for corrupt behaviour in public sector organisations in Nigeria?
2. To what extent does power distance in public sector organisations in Nigeria influences propensity for corrupt behaviour in public sector organisations in Nigeria?
3. To what extent does low job satisfaction in public sector organisations in Nigeria influences propensity for corrupt behaviour in public sector organisations in Nigeria?

### Research Hypotheses:

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant positive relationship between ambiguity in rules and regulations in public sector organisation in Nigeria and levels of propensity for corrupt behaviour in Nigeria public sector organisations.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant positive relationship between power distance in public sector organisation in Nigeria and propensity for corrupt behaviour in Nigeria public sector organisations.

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant positive relationship between low job satisfaction in public sector organisation in Nigeria and propensity for corruption in Nigeria public sector organisations.

### Conceptual Clarification:

#### The Concept of Corruption:

The etymological pedigree of corruption is derivable from Latin word "corrupts" which means "to break". However, it is difficult to define corruption because there is no one single definition to produce convincingly the many different manifestations of the problem. In other words, the concept has no comfortable and at ease meaning. Thus, the concept has attracted a lot of definitions and it does seem almost everybody knows what the term cognates (Agba, 2010). According to Onigu, Otite in (Okoduwa 2007), although the ubiquity of corruption is otherwise acknowledged, its magnitude and character are defined by different social and cultural fields and time dimensions. Hence a universally agreed definition for corruption that will cover the complete range of human behaviour may be difficult to make precise (Okoduwa, 2007). This means that there is no crook-free definition or generally comprehensive accepted definition for the term corruption. Corruption is an

embracing word which stands not only for institutional deterioration cadence but also includes moral and personal delay such as bribery, favouritism, nepotism, cheating, sexual gratification and other unfair and unjust means taken by chance by an individual to remove forcefully some socially and legally prohibited favour (Dwived, 1967, cited in (Akindele, 2005). Transparency international sees it as the misuse of entrusted power for private gain. The World Bank and its agencies (IMF) referred to corruption as the abuse of public office by person or group of persons for private gain. Elsewhere, the word cognates the lowering down of individual's integrity in the performance of a duty particularly in relation to the state or state-owned organisations. The act of an official of judiciary person who in lawfully uses his/her office to procure such materials for his/herself or for another person contrary to defined rules and regulations against the freedom of others. For (Agbese, 1992) corruption is a feature so difficult to define yet it percolates every fabric of the society. It affects the military as well it stains and pollutes the hands of the civilians. He went further to define corruption as followed:

*“when we use our position in society to secure certain advantages, jumping a queue, being waved off at the checkpoint or making others bend the rules to accommodate our demands... by whatever means even if it is just “thank you” our action however innocent, however well-intentional, however with threatening to others, has corrupted a system or a convention or some rules and regulations in application.*

In this sense, even whatsoever form of seasonal gifts, free air tickets, lunch or dinner – “kola” it is no longer excepted since these are most likely to influence future causes of action and transactions the giver or receiver is thus corrupting protocol or breaking some rules and regulations in the society (Nigeria) etc (Okolo & Raymond, 2014).

(Nye 1967) describes corruption as “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”. In the same manner, (Khan, 1996) defined corruption as “a behaviour that deviates from the formal rules of conducts governing the actions of someone in a position of public authority because of private-regarding motives such as wealth, power, or status”. According to him, this includes such behaviours like bribery (use of reward to prevent the judgment of a person in a position of trust); nepotism (bestowal of patronage by reason of ascriptive relationship rather than merit); and misappropriation (illegal appropriation of public resources for private-regarding use). He noted a further separation between

individual corruption and organisational or institutional corruption. (Heidenheimer 1989) provided a generally used definition of corruption as a transaction between private and public sector actors through which collective goods are illegally converted into private-regarding payoffs.

(Kuta, 2010) defines corruption as the rerouting of the natural course of events, with a view to conferring undue advantage on an individual or a group of individuals. (Kuta 2010) deposed that corruption is an action or inaction which gives advantages or bestows undue favour on a person that he or she is not legally or morally entitled to. It is any form of illegitimate self-enrichment or the conferment of same on any individual to the detriment of the society. It is synonymous with moral decay, un-cleanliness, want of character and value deterioration”. (Osoba 1996) as cited in (Dike 2005) averred that corruption is an anti-social behaviour awarding improper benefits in opposition to legitimate and moral norms, and which undermine the authorities to improve the living conditions of the people.

(Anand, Ashforth and Joshi 2004) see corruption as the “the misuses of authority for personal, subunit and/or organisational gain”. This definition – misuse of authority implies nothing else than behaviour that deviates from an expectation relying upon power given to workers or representatives – is a very general one. It differs from more particular ones that confine the use of the term corruption to an involvement of the use of public power. The concept of authority as used in the above definition according to (Beugre 2010) is extended to include the ability for an individual to have access to information or to have the capacity to engage in some forms of action. Such definition according to (Szwajkowski 1985) is not confined to the authority vested in a formal position. In fact, the only power required for organisational illegality is the power to accomplish the act (Szwajkowski, 1985).

Personal corruption and organisational corruption have been differentiated by (Aguilera and Vadera 2008). They described personal corruption as abuse of authority for personal benefit and organisational corruption as the crime that is committed by the use of authority within organisations for personal gains. Corruption in the public sector concentrates on the action of holders of public office and is further grouped as political or bureaucratic based on the hierarchical level of the official (Andvig, Fjeldstad, Amundsen, Sissener & Soreide, 2000). There is also corruption between private organisations and political agencies (private-to-public) (Glynn & Azbug, 2002) or within the private sector (private-to-private) (Gopinath, 2007). These groupings refer to the context within which corruption takes place. Organisational perspective of corruption has been assessed by many authors.

In legal terms, corruption is where the law is clearly informed. Hence, a legal interpretation of corruption provides clearly demarcated boundary between what is a corrupt activity and what is not. "If an official's act is prohibited by laws established by the government, it is corrupt; if it is not prohibited. It is not corrupt even if it is abusive or unethical (Gardner 1993) in <http://www.no/document/faqs>. The legal approach provides a neutral and unchanging method of adjudication potentially emotive and perception determined concepts of corruption. From this perspective, corruption encompasses individual influence over public policies, laws, rules and regulations, institutions by clothed private intents at the experience of the public interest. Cultural change may be necessary to hinder corrupt behaviour. The legal approach down-play the role of moral discretion and is constrained by clearly defined edicts (Bryne, 2007).

Corruption in organisations is about individuals or groups "action evil within an organisational context" rather than single "evil actors carrying out solitary actions" Darley, 1996 cited in (Umoh, 2005). Corruption in organisation includes dishonest and illegitimate behaviour demonstrated particularly by people in authority for their private gain. It is a sign of many difficulties with contemporary organisations. It involves more than one party. It takes a pattern of organisational crime. In most circumstances, an organisation can be set up in corruption to beget corruption. Existing forms of corruption in organisations have been divided into two- corruption on behalf of the organisation (bribing, insider dealing, illegal price agreement) and corruption against the organisation (self-dealing, theft, embezzlement, misappropriation), often designated as organisational or corporate crime and occupational crime (Coleman, 1987).

Prof. Alemika, a member of presidential committee on anti-corruption (PCAC) in Nigeria said that nepotism was the cause of corruption in Nigeria. (Alemika 2018) averred that nepotism is the allocation of resource be it employment, admission, contracts, location of infrastructure, among others, to associates, relatives, religious and groups as a favour without following due process. Corruption resulted from wide spread nepotism which was the consequence of people disregarding merit and equity in allocating resources or treasures in the nation.

*"it has engendered erosion of institutional norms, capability and inefficiency in the use of human and natural resources, feeling of marginalization that has fueled inter-group animosity and conflicts".*

According to him, "it breeds incompetence and erosion of values that facilitated transparency, justice, productivity, national security and development".

### **An Evolutionary view of Corruption in the Individual and in the Organisation:**

A child is thought to be greedy by the parents, teachers and elderly members of the family. Those who could not obey their parents, teacher and the elderly members of the family/society grew up with greedy and fetish habit (Forbes, 2011). Thus, the seed of corruption is plated in a child when he/she is soft, tender, sensitive, yielding, delicate, weak (nesh). Forbes believes that many people are not aware that corruption has its roots other than politics and government in the society. In this context, (Forbes 2011) identify the family, the school, the attitude of the people towards established values and popular culture and physical survival as the root cause of corruption.

Corruption begins at home. According to Forbes;

*"whenever parents or guardians give or promise a return in every service child does, it creates a bad signal. Every time we tolerate them in not returning changes or bribe them in doing errands, slowly, corruption is tolerated. As the person moves out of the comforts of the home, all the values he proceed and learned from it, he carries with him. So, strong moral foundation at home supplanted by strong character education in school or churches is significant so that actual events happening in the community may not weaken individual desire to be righteous". Corruption starts to come into being when family values get worsen or degenerated"*

(Ndokwu 2010) opine that most parents introduce their children into behaviour unexpected by others. (Ndokwu 2010) posit that;

*"some children grew up in corruption because they were trade in bribery, some parents come home to discuss their business which indicates corrupt practices in the presence of their children who then see those corrupt practices as normal ways of doing things. ....bribery teachers or principals to obtain admission for the children, these students know about the arrangement and it goes into their heads, so they believe undisciplined"*

The school too contributes to the cancerous culture of corruption. Many schools more often than not are fertile ground for children to learn how to be corrupt instead of teaching anticorruption attitude to children from an early age (Syabril, 2009). "if teachers allow their children to cheat during the examinations, they allow their children to learn how to be corrupt" (Mochtar Buchori cited in Syahril, 2009). Where teachers fail to instill honesty and integrity in children from the tender age, it tell the children that corruption

is a way of life. Some schools in Nigeria engage external hands in public examination to excel in performance, so as to make more enrolments next time. This is what (Uzoigwe, 2010) called mass cheating, and they grew in this culture throughout their life.

The disposition of people toward established values and popular culture is another area in evolution of corruption. Political patronage, materialism, consumerism, fixing, giving of “kolanut” in appreciation, and the like. Illegitimate business owners, gambling lords, tax payers, traffic violators are all in the domain of bribery (Forbes, 2011). Politicians both the new and the old are exploited by people in elections periods to enable them remain in power and authority. Organisations consists individuals from different background as leaders and followers and corruption occurs at individual and international levels (Quadri, 2009), Corruption find its way into the organisation. First, via the groups before it can become socialized. This is based on Waken’s (2004) model which explains how behaviour different from an unexpected like corruption creep into an organisation. Each individual comes into the organisation with his or her beliefs and values (Wallen, 2004 cited in Osinbajo, 2013). The defiant values that motivate corruption are informally socialized into the organisation via the individual in the various formal and informal groups in the organisation (Ashforth & Amand, 2003). Wrongly directed leadership or followership gives rise to intentional and unintentional corruption. This is due to non-motivated / non-regulated workforce, micro-management and ineffective entrepreneurship (Qadri, 2009).

### Types and Forms of Corruption:

Corruption according to (Heidenheimer 1989), manifests in varied situations and degree. (Olatunde 2007) identified three ideal-types of corruption. These types are as followed: (1) public office-centred; (2) market –centred; and (3) public interest-centred.

Public office-centred corruption is behaviour which goes off from course fall outside the formal duties of a public role because private-regarding (close family, personal, private, clique) pecuniary or status gains; or infringes rules against the exercise of certain types of private-regarding influence (Nye, 1967). In market-centred corruption a corrupt civil servant sees his (public) office as a (separate) business, the income of which he will seek to maximize. According to (Van Klaveren, 1957) the office then becomes a maximizing unit. The size of his income depends upon the market situation and his talents for finding the point maximal gain on the public (or clients’) demand curve. (Friedrich, 1966) averred that in public interest-centred corruption, the pattern of corruption can be said to exist whenever a power-holder, charged with doing certain things is (by monetary or other rewards) not legally provided for, induced to take actions which

favour whoever provides the rewards and thereby does damage or cause pains to the public and its interests.

Three categories of corruption were identified by (Evans 2010). The first is incidental corruption. This is small-scale. It involves junior public officials, such as policemen or customs officers. It produces significant public alienation, it has little macro-economic costs, but it is often hard to curb. The second type is systematic corruption. This is corruption that affects an entire government departments or parastatals. (Bryne 2007) deposed that systematic or endemic corruption is an interested and essential part of the economic, political and social system, when it is deep-noted in a wider situation that helps sustain it. The form of corruption is not a different form of corruption but rather a situation in which the key institutions and processes of the state are routinely dominated and used by corrupt individual and groups and in which most individuals who have no alternatives to declining into corruption officials. Examples include Nigeria, Kenya, Cameroun, etc. It can have a considerable adverse effect on government revenues; it may divert trade and/or development; it can only be dealt with by sustained reform. The third category is systematic corruption, that is, kleptocracy or government by theft.

In this situation honesty becomes irrational, and there is a great developmental impact. The political landscape in Nigeria is a clear example of this type of corruption in systematic corruption Political corruption according to (Bryne 2007) is any transaction between private and public sector actors via which collective goods are illegally converted into private regarding payoffs. Political corruption is different form bureaucratic corruption because it involves political decision makers (politicians). Political corruption or grand corruption occurs at the high level of the political system when politicians and state agents trusted to make and enforce the laws in the name of the people, are using this authority to sustain their powers status and wealth. In other words, political corruption is when the laws and regulations are infringed by the rulers, leaders, side-stepped, ignored or even tailored to fit their interest. Political corruption also takes place at the policy formulation end of politics and such rules are formulated in favour of those in power and authority. political corruption include buying votes, discrimination in the selection of candidates for elective and appointive position, voting without accreditation, dubious sources of part funds, jobs for supporters and corruption of the legal process (buying judges and policemen, malicious prosecutions).

Sporadic corruption is the opposite of systematic corruption and it takes place irregularly and hence it does not threaten the institutions of control nor the economy as such. It is not incapacitating but can sap the economy of resources.

(The United Nations Manual on Anti-Corruption Policy 2001) discussed the following forms of corruption: Bribery; Embezzlement, Theft and Fraud; Extortion; Exploiting a Conflict of Interest/Influence Peddling, Insider Trading; Favouritism, Nepotism and Clientelism; Offering or receiving of an unlawful gratuity, favour or illegal commission; Illegal Political Contributions; and Money laundering.

(Afolabi 2007) and (Agbaje 2004) summarize various forms of corruption in Nigeria to include advanced fee fraud (known as 419) misappropriation or diversion of funds, kickbacks, money laundering, bribery, false declarations, abuse of office, unconventional and fraudulent trade practices, under-and-over invoicing, collection of illegal tools, unauthorized use of resources for private gain, impairment of integrity, virtue or moral principles, misuse of official power for selfish motive, perversion of public rules, refusal to declare one's assets on the assumption and expiration of public office, using one's official status to toil the administration justice, the thwarting of the electoral process to make free and fair election impossible and faulty recruitment of mediocre or totally unsuitable candidates in preference to candidates of high merit in the Nigerian public service. Corruption is inescapably pervasive in Nigeria; no one is free from it either as a doer or as a victim (Iyada, 2012).

### Consequences of Corruption:

(Evans 2010) deposed that the costs and consequences of corruption are far reaching as its multiplier effects touch all the sectors and sections of the political and socio-economic units of the nation. ICPC (2014) as cited in (Evans and Alenoghena 2015) posits that corruption in Nigeria engenders governmental instability, emasculates democratic institutions and impedes economic development. The far-reaching costs and consequences of corruption as identified by (Evans 2010) include the following: One, corruption is far from being a victimless crime as it infringes the fundamental human rights to fair treatment. All individuals are entitled to be treated fairly, and when one person bribes a public official he acquires a privileged status in relation to others. He becomes an insider while others are made outsiders (and the more outside they are – the very poor, the landless, the needy, the vulnerable, women, ethnic minorities- the more they will be hurt). Two, corruption results in biased decision-making, as considerations of personal enrichment takes priority over the establishment of rights for all. Government expenditure will be prioritized based on opportunities to extort bribes rather than on the basis of public welfare and business organisations will be preferred on the basis of their willingness to pay. The poor vulnerable and needy may then pay the cost of bribes tactically and technically through higher prices for essential services. Three, corruption leads to limitation or

breaking of civil and political rights, for example, bribing a judge or court official, interfering with the electoral process, granting timber rights in an area where indigenous tribes gain their living, and bribery a Vice-Chancellor of a University or his agent. When corrupt leaders waste money, siphon off national resources and build up foreign debt (so that government revenues are diverted into debt-servicing), or when the shadow economy flourishes at the expense of the above-board economy, then government revenue is reduced (Evans, 2010). It results in a combination of scandalous wealth among the ruling class with growing poverty, misery and degradation among the people of Nigerians. Political life has become dominated by winner-take-all factional struggles, political cynicism and violence while the economy and social institutions have been driven into decay (Osoba, 2007).

The (World Development Report, 1997) states that even in countries where corruption is not harmful, corruption had an adverse impact on economic performance, because the higher transaction costs and increased uncertainty put off potential investors. The ramifications of the cost of corruption also have environmental consequences. Lansen Olsen cited in (TI Newsletter, 1998) observes "political corruption is a major feature of the political habitat in which wildlife conservation efforts sink or swim". When corruption infringes regulations designed to protect the environment, everybody suffers in the long-term, as the loss of primary forest lead rise to local climate change, soil erosion, etc., but it is the poor ready and vulnerable who have smallest resources with which to sustain the trying effects of environmental degradation.

For the common man, corruption adds to the cost of goods and services, as an avoidable cost gets added to the usual legitimate costs (Evans, 2010). Day to day transactions becomes unwieldy, slow and complex and the honest get punished while the dishonest go unpunished or unharmed. Citizens end up having to pay bribes for valid, justifiable, public services that they are entitled to, while the illegitimate earnings from such bribes protuberates the black money in circulation and brings in serious displacement or twists to the economy. The workability of governmental interventions for social welfare or other public good becomes inefficient as seepages hinder or stop genuine delivery or use of resources. International institutions also are always wary to assist countries where corruption is high. The value of merit becomes weakened and the rule of law breaks down as anything can be done (or not done) so long payment is made. The general breakdown of checks and balances enhances an amoral culture that gradually spread to all aspects of life, wears away institutions and weakens the quality of life.



Corruption does not encourage honest effort and valuable economic activities, and breeds nepotism and inefficiency. Prof Alimeka, a member of presidential committee on Anti-corruption (PCAC) in Nigeria said that nepotism was the cause of corruption in Nigeria. Alimeka (2018) averred that nepotism is the allocation of resources be it employment, admission, contracts, location of infrastructure among others, to associates, relatives, religious and groups as a favour without following due process.

*“Corruption resulted from wide spread nepotism which was the consequence of people disregarding merit and equity in allocating resources or pressure in the nation. It has engendered erosion of institutional norms, capability and inefficiency in the use of human and material resources, feeling of marginalization that has fueled inter-group animosity and conflicts. According to him, it breeds incompetence and erosion of values that facilitated transparency, justice, productivity, national security and development”.*

According to (Oladele 2013) corruption promotes poverty, it creates the condition for political instability, it contributes to blanket criminalization of Nigerians particularly the youth, it enhances the existence of an underground or illegal economy, causes serious social harms. It leads to ‘information distortion’ as it ‘cooks the books’; and ‘a high level of corruption can make public policies ineffective’ (Sen, 1999). Corruption makes the image of a nation no longer look bright. In Nigeria, corruption has reached proportions that are difficult to get rid of and has negatively affected the fabric of society in significant ways (Okoduwa, 2007). In the opinion of (Okoduwa 2007), it has created the sad paradox of widespread and dehumanizing poverty in the midst of adequate natural and human resources. The incapacitating effects of corruption are manifested in the erosion of the institutional and administrative capacity of government, the decayed infrastructure and grotesque services delivery across all sectors and sections of the economy. (Agba 2010) stressed that the impact of corruption is evident in the epileptic nature of Nigerian power sector, educational institutions, decay in infrastructural facilities like roads, communications, inefficient and ineffective security outfits, and many others. Corruption causes dawdling of files in offices, excess queues, port congestion, election irregularities, police extortion of toll fees and ghost workers syndrome (Evans and Alenoghena, 2015).

### **The Concept of Public Sector:**

The public sector is that part of the economy that is owned and controlled by the government (Okoduwa, 2007). It is the operational spot within which the

government interacts to the people and delivers its duties to them. These duties include among others, security, welfare, education, social infrastructure, social justice, and an enabling regulatory or deregulatory framework on the economy. The parastatal agencies, and ministries and government departments which make up the public sector and their aggregated functions constitutes the government/people interface, the quality of which molds assessment of governance by the public. (Egbue 2006) refers to public service as the bureaucratic arm of the government that is centrally located in the socio-economic arena of most African countries. In the observation of (Egbue 2006), this is because it makes vital contributions to policy formulation and has virtually sole responsibility for implementation of government policies that govern all aspects of socio-economic and political life. It is thus the sector of government that facilitates and coordinates day-to-day operations of private enterprise. Public service activities thus have profound implications for international trade, local economic activities, as well as linkages within and between both areas. Corruption by public sector organisations destroy slowly the interface between the government and the other arms of the economy, hence oversetting to poor governance and giving birth to criticism of government. In Nigeria, the public sector is very outstanding because the government is the number one driver of the economy. It therefore implies that everything deliberately done or not done in order to infringe laid down procedures for official transaction in the public sector is corruption (Egbue, 2006); (Okoduwa, 2007). This can be observed in the area of procurement, internal staff issues such as training, promotion, recruitment, selection, placement and demotion, transfer, retirement, termination, dismissal, etc.

According to (Waziri 1991) cited in (Osibanjo, 2013) acts of corruption which are found in the public sector organisations manifest in these ways:

1. Diverting government junior workers and equipment for private work on farms or buildings sites.
2. Misuse of estacode allowance by very senior officials of the government.
3. Unlawful use of official stationery such as envelopes, papers, typewriters, etc by public officials for their clubs or associations’ correspondence.
4. Tampering with contract documents and payment vouchers.
5. Diverting of drugs and other hospital equipment belonging to the government by some workers.

The 1988 Local Government Guides for local government administrators cited in (Amayah, 2000) identify common corrupt or fraudulent acts in the public sector to include:

1. Diversion of government revenue by public officials
2. Overpayment of salaries and allowances to staff

3. Payment for jobs not executed
4. Unauthorised variation of contracts
5. Deliberate irregularities in the management of accounting procedures.
6. Inflation of contract sums by public officials
7. Payment to ghost workers

(Amayah 2000) also listed the following corrupt and fraudulent acts in the public sector in the form of printing of revenue receipts illegally by revenue collectors, forging of authorized signatures to cheque, falsification of accounts and outright collection of bribes by public officials before carrying out their schedule of duties also occur.

Some of the corrupt acts that have prolonged the existence of corruption in the Nigerian public service as stated by (Olatunde 2007) include:

1. Nepotism, tribalism, favouritism and cronyism in promotion exercises.
2. Transfer to locations of Bank to favour friends or punish perceived enemies.
3. Nomination of less-deserving and “over-trained” friends and relations for more training/courses while other more deserving persons are neglected.
4. Selective repairs/refurbishment of staff quarters slanted favour of friends/executives.
5. Inordinate use of the Bank’s time, vehicles and other assets.
6. Contract Process – Inside dealing in contract awards; registration of multiple companies; Manipulation of bidding and tender process; Manipulation of market survey findings; Use of unqualified persons-relatives, friends in execution of contracts for pecuniary benefits; Padding/inflation of contract cost; Favourable inspection reports for shoddy jobs for pecuniary benefits.
7. Favouritism in the disposal of outdated items/board vehicles.
8. Preferential allocation of estate flats to favour persons to the detriment of more deserving persons.
9. Nomination of friends for assignments considered lucrative
10. Claiming lunch allowance while on duty tour and collecting allowances for duty tours not undertaken.

(Edikan and Emen 2008) listed in detail all sorts of corrupt acts or fraudulent practices committed by public servants of different Public Sector organisations in Nigeria.

#### **Civil Service:**

- i. Falsification of records, issuance of false documents such as receipts, is also common in the Civil Service.
- ii. Reported cases of ghost workers deliberately introduced by top government officials are dominant.

- iii. Inflating quotation prices and collaboration with contractors for such reasons are common cases in the Civil Service.
- iv. Delay in processing individual or public documents without unjustified inducement is prevalent in the Civil Service.

#### **Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC):**

- i. Delivery of fake voting materials in some State also exists.
- ii. Announcement of wrong candidate after election; all of which tantamount to corruption in the system.
- iii. Non-delivery of voting materials on time for voters to cast their votes abound.
- iv. Alteration of voting results in favour of a candidate of their choice.

#### **Police Service:**

Several cases of corruption also exist in the Nigerian Police Force like:

- i. Destruction/loss of case files.
- iii. Extortion of money from motorists on the road.
- iii. Wrongful detention.
- iv. Looting or indicting innocent citizens in an attempt to carry out a search in one’s house.

#### **Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN):**

- i. The senior officers tend to sell off transformers that were meant for public use.
- ii. Cancellation of bills.
- iii. Award of illegal contracts.
- iv. Giving bills that are not in line with meter readings.

#### **Educational Institutions/Research and Examination Bodies:**

- i. Arbitrary award of marks or certificates under financial or sexual inducement.
- ii. Corruption through copyright and plagiarism.
- iii. Inflation of figures in lieu of prices for awarding contract or sponsored research.
- iv. Under favouritism in promotion and selection for award or study leave.
- v. Leakage of examination papers.
- vi. Registration of examination through the Internet to avoid exam fee being carted away by their coordinators.
- vii. Operation of illegal Universities/Polytechnic/College of Education campuses.
- viii. Inflation of traveling expenses.
- ix. Appointment of unqualified officials under favouritism or undue process.
- x. Falsification of result and other data.

**Banking Sector:**

Corruption in the banking sectors occurs the following forms.

- i. Cheating of customers.
- ii. Conspiracy offering of ratification to influence judgement or attract favour.

**The Judiciary, Executive and the Legislative Arms of Government:**

The sector has recorded prolong cases of corruption in addition to the others. Other forms of corruption engaged in this sector according to (Umoh, 2005) include the following:

- Counterfeiting.
- Issuing of wrong judgment as a consequence of bribe.
- Making unlawful claims for self-enrichment.
- Using of their position to influence award of contract, job employment, undue promotion/ appointment.
- Report from Code of Conduct Bureau has it that most people from National Assembly and office of the Secretary to the Government of the Federation, do not declare their asset which is also a form of corruption.
- Sponsoring or passing bills under ethnic, party or financial interest.
- Discretionary allocation of oil block (Ezekwesili, 2018)

**Factors Motivating Corruption in Organisations:**

This work adopted the view of organisation as a product of human agency (Iyayi, Iyayi & Osibanjo, 2013). In opposition to those views which see the organisation as a system or structure with machine – like qualities that can engage in self-regulation and whose subsystems behave, exercise power and make decisions, the organisation can be taken is incidental to the actions of members who have interests and projects that the actions are planned to accomplished. In this situation, the organisation becomes both product of and a mechanism arranged for realizing the interest and projects of individual members (Iyayi, Iyayi & Osibanjo, 2013). On the basis of this model, corruption does not just happen; it is not an unintended repercussion of system functioning but an intended repercussion or aftercome of organisation arranged as both product and mechanism the actions of its members; and that individuals are not corrupt by nature; rather they become corrupt because of conscious choices they exercise amidst variety of factors. It is in the this context that (Iyayi, Iyayi and Osibanjo 2013) posited: “The fact that the choice are made at the level of consciousness and that conditions are then created existing conditions are taken advantage of to give effect to the choice shows that corruption is incentivized”. (Iyayi & Osinbajo, 2013). It is exactly in this sense that it is necessary to

understand, identify and speak of the intended factors motivating corruption in public sector organisations. Some of these factors are extrinsic to the individual while others are intrinsic. The range and level of these incentives affect the scope and level of corruption in the organisation. (Iyayi, Iyayi and Osibanjo 2013) theorized and explain some of these incentives: (i) an impurity culture; (ii) the nature of the sanctions regime; (iii) tardiness of records and record keeping; (iv) ambiguity in the organisation; (v) power distance; and (vi) poverty and the fear of poverty.

**Theoretical Framework:**

This study is anchored on Idealistic theory by (Nkom, 1982). According to (Nkom, 1982) cited in (Uwak and Udofia 2016). What people see as the ideal influences their decision, actions and inaction in the society? Based on this, people in the society who find themselves in position of authority hold the opinion that their actions are the ideal and probably the best. One thing should be noted that the action of person could be best for the person but not the best for the whole people. Idealism according to (Uwak and Udofia 2016) has to do with what is in opposition to realism which talks about what ought to be.

According to this theory, corruption is caused by selfish ideas that are common in the value system in the society. Then what this implies is that the perception of corruption by individual in the society give rise to the rising current of immoral and amoral activities which does not enhance development and it is seen the siphoning, embezzlement and looting of public fund, meant for public use for private gains. This argument serves as a tribune for private gains which two schools of thought – The traditional and the modern schools addressed.

The traditional approach views corruption and other unethical activities as the corruption of traditional African culture, norms, ethics, values and belief system by our colonizer through policy of assimilation later association and indirect rule in French-speaking and English-speaking West Africa countries respectively. The colonization of Africa lead Africans to accept European culture thereby ignoring the African culture and weakening of traditional values reserved.

The modern perspective views corruption as the institutionalization of traditional institutions. The theory contended that corruption is associated with many traditional practices like presentation of gift, to show appreciation, ethnic loyalty and other myopic and parochial behaviour prevailing in Africa society. All these are likely to influence people in the society to look at the ideal as against what ought to be which is the actual. The theory is linked to this work because it shows that key factor which influence actions and inactions of individual in public sector organisation like people’s ideas which condition their culture and

behaviour as well as social and moral value are common in Nigeria. These unintentionally condition the way and manner people act and behave in Nigeria.

**Methodology:**

**Research Design:**

The research design adopted for this study is the survey research design. This is because the objective was to examine the nature of the relationship that exists between factors motivating corruption in public sector organisations and level of propensity for corruption. To achieve this, data that are pertinent to the variables of studies were collected and analyzed. Survey research designed was also adopted because many questions were asked about a particular topic, giving a sufficient flexibility in the analysis.

**Population of the Study and Sampling Procedure:**

The target population of the study consisted all employees of public sector organisations in Nigeria which include Nigerian Police Force, University of Lagos, Power Holding Company of Nigeria, Federal Ministries, Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, Independent National Electoral Commission. These organisations were selected using convenient stratified random sampling methods. This technique involves the selection of independent, convenient samples from a number of sub-population within the population. The study population consists all employees of the selected public sector organisations. This population figure was given in the table below:

**Table 1: Population Table**

S/N	Organisation	Population of Employees
1	Federal Ministries	218,000
2	Nigerian Police Force	350,000
3	Power Holding Company of Nigeria	56,000
4	University of Benin, Benin City	4,700
5	Independent National Electoral Commission	14,000
6	Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation	11,756
	<b>Total</b>	<b>654,456</b>

Source: Fieldwork, 2018

**Sample Size Determination:**

The sample size was determined using Taro Yamane (1964) formula cited in (Nabuife and Nwogwugwu 2017) which states as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

- where: N = Population
- n = Sample size
- e = Level of error (0.05)
- I = Unit (is constant)

**Distribution of copies of Questionnaire to each organisation:**

Bowley (1926) allocation formula cited in Chiekezie, Onwuchekwa & Nwobodo (2017) was used to determine the number of copies of questionnaire to be administered to each organisation. Thus,

$$n = \frac{n \times NH}{N} \quad k$$

$$n = \frac{654,456}{1 + 654,456(0.05)^2} = 400$$

Where: n = Sample size

Nh = stratum allocation

NH = Stratum population

N = Overall population

$$N_{h_{\text{Federal Ministries}}} = \frac{400 \times 218,000}{654,456} = 133,$$

$$N_{h_{\text{NPF}}} = \frac{400 \times 350,000}{654,456} = 214,$$

$$N_{h_{\text{PHCN}}} = \frac{400 \times 56,000}{654,456} = 34,$$

$$N_{h_{\text{UNIBEN}}} = \frac{400 \times 4,700}{654,456} = 3$$

$$N_{h_{\text{INEC}}} = \frac{400 \times 14,000}{654,456} = 9,$$

$$N_{h_{\text{NNPC}}} = \frac{400 \times 11,756}{654,456} = 7$$

Stratum allocation for:

- Staff of Federal Ministries = 133
  - Staff of Nigeria Police Force = 214
  - Staff of Power Holding Company of Nigeria = 34
  - Staff of University of Benin, Benin City = 3
  - Staff of Independent National Electoral Commission = 9
  - Staff of Nigeria National Petroleum Corporation = 7
- 
- 400

Hence, the sample population was 400 comprising 133 Staff of Federal Ministries; 214 Staff of Nigerian Police Force; 34 Staff of Power Holding Company of Nigeria; 3 Staff of University of Benin; 9 Staff of Independent National Electoral Commission and 7 Staff of Nigeria National Petroleum Corporation.

**Instrument of Data Collection:**

The instrument for data collection was questionnaire. For more objective responses and easy analysis, the questionnaire was structured in a 5-point Likert format. The points are Strongly Agree (SA) - 5, Agree (A) - 4, Undecided (U) - 3, Disagree (D) - 2, and Strongly Disagree (SD) - 1. A total of 400 copies of questionnaire were distributed in appropriate population to the focused organisation in person, after which 400 copies were retrieved.

**Validity of Instrument:**

Face and content validity was employed in making sure the instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. A copy of the questionnaire was sent to validation in University of Benin, Department of Education foundation as they requested. The objective and the hypotheses were also sent to them to ensure they are in alignment. After various corrections were made to the original questionnaire, it was certified valid.

**Reliability of the Instrument:**

What is paramount in empirical studies is consistency of responses. To ensure this, Spearman Brown Half reliability technique was used. The result obtained is given in the reliability table below:

Cronbach's Alpha	Value		
0.972	<b>Part 1:</b>	No. of items	20
0.958	<b>Part 2:</b>	No. of items	20
	<b>Total No. of Items</b>		<b>40</b>

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Formula used in calculating the reliability is given below:

$$T_{SB} = \frac{2r_{hh}}{4r_{hh}}$$

Where:  $r_{hh}$  = Pearson correlations of scores in the two half tests

**Techniques of Data Analysis:**

To analyze the data obtained for the study, the descriptive and simple regression was adopted. The cut-off mean 3.0 was used to analyze the research questions stated. Pearson correlation technique was used to find the nature of relationship that exist between independent and independent variables. It was analyzed using 0.5 level of significant. This will guide the interpretation of the result. If the P-value obtained is less than .05, it means that the relationship is significant.

**Analysis and Interpretation of Data:**

The below table 2 indicates an acceptance remark for all statements in response to investigative questions on ambiguity in rules and regulations and a grand mean of 3.32 which is above the threshold of 3.0

The below table 3 indicates an acceptance remark for all statements in response to investigative questions on power distance and a grand mean of 3.33 which is above the threshold of 3.0

The below table 4 indicates an acceptance remark for all statements in response to investigative questions on job satisfaction and a grand mean of 3.30 which is above the threshold of 3.0.

The below table 5 indicates an acceptance remark for all statements in response to investigative questions on

level of propensity for corruption and a grand mean of 3.31 which is above the threshold of 3.0.

**Test of Hypothesis:**

**Correlations:**

		Propensity For Corruption	Ambiguity In Rules	Power Distance	Job Satisfaction
Propensity for Corruption	Pearson Correlation	1	.993**	.995**	.994**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.000	.000
	N	400	400	400	400
Ambiguity in Rules	Pearson Correlation	.993**	1	.998**	.995**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.000	.000
	N	400	400	400	400
Power Distance	Pearson Correlation	.995**	.998**	1	.993**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.001
	N	400	400	400	400
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.994**	.995**	.993**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.001	
	N	400	400	400	400

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Discussion of Findings:**

The Pearson correlation for hypothesis one shows a p-value of .001 at 2-tailed test and a correlation coefficient of .993 which is high. The null hypothesis is rejected at 5% confidence level and the alternate accepted that there is a significant positive relationship between ambiguity in rules and regulations and levels of propensity for corrupt behaviour in Nigeria public sector organisations. A unit increase in the level of ambiguity in rules and regulations in public sector organization in Nigeria will result to a corresponding increase in corrupt behaviour in the organizations. The findings is not at variance with the findings of (Khan (1996) who observe that the green pasture for corruption in the organisation is where there are ambiguous rules and regulations surrounding what action constitutes corruption and the consequence of such action. The result of this study does not contradict the previous position taken by the (World Development Report, 1997) that whenever formal and informal rules are usually at odds with one another systemic corruption exists.

In hypothesis two, the correlation reveals a p-value of .000 at 2-tailed test and a correlation coefficient of .995 which is high. The null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative accepted that there is a strong positive relationship between power distance and level of propensity for corruption in public sector

organisations in Nigeria. A unit increase in power distance at public sector organizations in Nigeria will bring about a direct increase in the levels of propensity for corruption. This finding is in agreement with the study of (Morgenson and Rosner, 2011) who claim that the powerful effect this power distance can have not just with a single firm but whole global economy. The power to act unilaterally in the case of power distance is not due to an absence of fear or shame. It is enabled by the difference between those in power and those without it. The difference is consciously constructed and maintained to ensure that the powerful can act without the risk of challenge from the followers. That is, decision-making in public sector organisations in Nigeria is regarded as activity of management and participation in decision making is seen as an infringement to management prerogative. Thus employees are not moved in decision-making. Everyone is not assumed to have equal right. Workers are not perceived to have the potentials to contribute to the decision-making process.

For hypothesis three Pearson correlations indicates a p-value of .001 at 2-tailed test and a correlation coefficient of .994 which is high. The null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate accepted that there is a significant relationship between low job satisfaction and level of propensity for corrupt behavior in public sector organisations in Nigeria such that a unit increase in low job satisfaction will bring about a corresponding increase in employee level of propensity for corrupt behaviour. The findings is in line with (Dike 2005) and (Yoo 2010) who deposed that low job satisfaction, low pay, low social status, and too much work resulting from low morale among workers are the prime causes of corruption in organisations.

### Conclusion:

Corruption is a vice which has intentional dimension, outrageous, gigantic and horrifying in nature, vulgarly rampant in developing economics and obstructively disastrous and existing in all parts of a place or things in nearly all less developing countries of the world. Corruption is not only endemic, alarming and gradually to affect all parts of Nigeria, it has entered the fatal state in the country (Achebe, 1983). In Nigeria, several efforts have been made with severe support from international organisations/donor agencies to prevent the further rise in the greed of corruption in Nigeria public sector. In spite of this, new cases are still being reported each day. The crux of the matter is that organisation is seen as a product of human agency. Incentives for corruption in organisations indicates that there are factors that are internal and external to the individuals and the levels of the incentives affect the dimension and level of corruption in the organisation.

### Recommendations:

On the basis of the findings for the study, the following recommendations are put forward:

1. Formal and informal rules should not be at odds with one another. Rules and regulations should be clear, unambiguously and technically easy to understand to avoid creating fertile grounds for corruption.
2. The power distance between members of an organisation should be narrowed to prevent incentive for corrupt behavior on the part of the managers in the organisation. High power distance enables those with a lot of power to act with impunity without risk of challenge from those without power and authority.
3. Employees in public sector organisations should be given sufficient wages and create opportunities for small income gap which are conducive to a reduction in corruption. When there is higher job satisfaction, the propensity to accept bribes is reduced and economic creed in career building is checked with creation of small income gaps.
4. The factor of agency should be addressed. This concerns human agents who must make a decision about how to proceed in corrupt situation. This human agent is between factors and the occurrence of corruption. Towards this, policy makers, regulators and practitioners should motivate public sector organisations to ensure that agency is exercised positively against corrupt behaviour. The size of negativity of agency detects in form of propensity for corruption in the organisation.
5. Spirituality at workplaces should constitute part of the anticorruption mechanism to manage the factors that motivate corruption in public sector organisations.
6. Proper training to leaders and appropriate guidance to followers is needed to keep away from organisational corruption.

### References:

- Achebe, C. (1983). *The Trouble with Nigeria*, Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publication.
- Adams, (2015). Installation and Operations Guide.
- Adesina, A. (2015). The institute of public administration and anti-corruption, July August 13 and 10.
- Adeyemi, O. (2016). *10 Biggest Complex Cares that Shook Nigeria in 2016*, Nigeria: Green News Publication.
- Afolabi, G.K. (2007). Contextual perception of corruption in contemporary Nigeria. In *Corruption and the Challenge of Human Development*. A publication of the Program on Policy, Conflict and Strategic Studies, School of Management and Social Science, Babcock University Press Ltd.

- Agba, M.S. (2010). Combating corruption for sustainable development growth in Nigeria: exploring the paradigm of diving option. *International Business and Management*, 1(1), 16 – 21.
- Agbaje, A. (2004). Corruption, accountability and good governance: Reflection on governance in Nigeria Fourth Republic 1999 – 2003. *International Review of Politics and Development*, 2(2), 501-520.
- Agbese, D. (1992). Corruption: The palm oil that stains the fingers of the giver and the receiver. *NewsWatch*, May 9, 5(109-115), 9-15
- Aguilera, R.V. and Vadera, A.K. (2008). The dark side of authority: antecedents, mechanisms, and outcomes of organisational corruption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77, 431 – 449.
- Akindele, S.T. (2005). Analysis of corruption and its problems in Nigeria. *Anthropologist*, 7(1), 7-8.
- Alemika, E. (2018). *Nepotism cause of corruption in Nigeria*. Annual Leadership Lecture and Graduation of the 9th Set of African Centre for Leadership, Strategy and Development (Centre LSD) School, Abuja, Nigeria.
- Ali, Y. (2016). Restraining the monster: Practices ways of fighting corruption in Nigeria. Keynote address delivered at the interactive session with stakeholders on corruption issues in Nigeria organised by the Nigerian Bar Association. *Anti – corruption commission* on 24th May 2016 held at the Hilton Hotel, Abuja.
- Amayah, A.F. (2000). *Evolving accounting procedure for fraud control in the public sector in Nigeria* [Internet]. Retrieved April, 20, 2018 from [www.dspace.unijos.edu.ng](http://www.dspace.unijos.edu.ng).
- Anand, V., Ashforth, B.E. and Joshi, M. (2004). Business as usual: The acceptance and perpetuation of corruption in organisations. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(2), 39 – 53.
- Andvig, J.C., Fjelstand, O., Amundsen, I., Sissener, T. and Soreide, T. (2000). Research on corruption: a policy-oriented survey. Being the final report of a research commissioned by NORAD for Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) and Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI), December 2000.
- Armstrong, P., Segal, N. and Davis, B. (2005). Corruption governance, South Africa, a pioneer in African. The South Africa Institute of International Affairs. Global Best Practice Report No. 1.
- Bello-Imam, I.B (2015). The war against corruption in Nigeria: problems and prospect [Internet]. Retrieved July 3, 2018 from: <http://www.searchworks.stanford.edu>
- Beugre, C.D. (2010). Resistance to socialization into organisational corruption: a model of deontic justice. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25: 533 – 541.
- Bryne, E. (2007). *The moral and legal development of corruption: Ninetieth and Twentieth Century in Ireland*. PhD Thesis, University of Limerick [Internet]. Retrieved 18 June 2018 from: <http://www.elaine.le>.
- Coleman, J. W. (1987). Toward and integrated theory of white-collar crime. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93, 496-439.
- Dike, V.E. (2005). Corruption in Nigeria: A new paradigm for effective control. [Internet] Retrieved [www.africaeconomicanalysis.org](http://www.africaeconomicanalysis.org).
- Edikan, N.E. and Emem, E.A. (2008). Nigeria government, the public sector and the fight against corruption: the role of information and communication technology. *International NGO Journal*, 3(10), 162-166.
- Egbue, N.G. (2006). Africa: Cultural dimensions of corruption and possibilities for change. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(2), 83 – 91.
- Evans, B.R. (2010). The cost of production, A Tearfund discussion paper on corruption, *development and the poor*.
- Evans, O. and Alenoghena, R. (2015). Corruption effects on Nigeria; Aggregate and sectional estimates using VAR. *Journal of Economic and Financial Studies*, 3(2), 41-48.
- Forbes, G. M. (2011). *Beginnings of Corruption Basis for Preventive Measures in the Future*, New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Friedrich, C.J. (1966). Political pathology. *The Political Quarterly*, 37, 68 – 75.
- Gardner, J.A. (1993). Legal definition of corruption. [Internet]. Retrieved 18 June 2018 from <http://www.no/document/faq5>.
- Glynn, M.A. and Azbug, R. (2002). Institutional identity: symbolic isomorphism and organisational names. *Academy of Management* 45(1), 267 – 80.
- Gopinath, C. (2007). Recognizing and justifying private corruption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(1), 747 – 754.
- Heidenheimer, A.J. (1989). Perspectives on the perception of corruption. In A.J. Heidenheimer, M. J and V.T. LeVine (1989), *Political Corruption: A Handbook*, London: New Brunswick.
- Iyada, D. (2012). Corruption: Definitions, theories and concepts. *Arab Journal of Business and Management Review*, 2(4). [Internet]. Retrieved June 21, 2018 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12815/0002257>
- Iyayi, F., Iyayi, O. and Osibanjo, O. (2013). A strategic incentives theory of corruption in organisations. Being paper presented at the

- conference of the Academy of Management (Nigeria) at the University of Lagos on 20th February.
- Jola, S. (2016). Senators make ₦15m monthly. Reps ₦10m – Ex-president says. *Pulse Nigerian News publications*.
- Kayode, A., Adagba, S. and Ariyo, S. (2013). Corruption and service delivery: The case of Nigeria public service, *Wudpecker Journal of Public Administration*, 1(1), 001-006.
- Khan, M. (1996). A typology of corrupt transactions in developing countries. *IDS Bulletin*, 8(5).
- Kuta, D.A. (2010) The legislature and Nigeria's anti-corruption war. *Nigerian Tribune*, Wednesday, 20 October.
- Morgenson, G. and Rosner, J. (2011). *Reckless Endangerment: How Outsized Ambition, Greed, and Corruption led to economic Armageddon*, New York: Times Books.
- Nabuife, E.K.N and Nwogwugwu, N.O. (2017). Managing cottage industries in a period of economic recession: A study of selected Cottage industries in Anambra State, Nigeria, Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.
- Ndokwu, N.O. (2010). Corruption, corrupt practical and honest leadership in Nigeria. *Universal Journal of the Association of Young Journalists*. [Internet]. Retrieved 20<sup>th</sup> June, 2018 from: [www.ayjw.org/articles.php?id=391314](http://www.ayjw.org/articles.php?id=391314)
- Nkom, S. (1982). Ethical Revolution as an Antidote for Corruption in Nigeria, Paper presented at the *N.A.S.A Annual Conference* held in Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, 10 – 13.
- Nye, F.I. (1967). Values family and a changing society. *Journal of marriage and the family*, 27, 241-8.
- Ogbeidi, M. (2012). Political leadership and corruption in Nigeria since 1960. *A Socio-Economic Analysis Journal of Nigeria Studies* 1(2), 1-25.
- Ogunleye, J.A (2006). The way out of corruption. *The Social Sciences*, 1(3), 226 -230.
- Okoduwa, R.A. (2007). Combating corruption in the public sector and the role of the ICPC. A paper presented at a seminar organized by Central Bank of Nigeria for its senior staff. [Internet] Retrieved 12 July, 2018 [www.cenbank.ogr/.../publications/.../transparency2007.pdf](http://www.cenbank.ogr/.../publications/.../transparency2007.pdf).
- Okolo, P. and Raymond, A.O. (2014). Corruption in Nigeria. The possible way out. *Global Journal of Human Social Science – F Political Science*, 14(7), 1-9.
- Oladele, K. (2013). Causes and consequences of corruption: the Nigerian experience. [Internet]. Retrieved July 2nd 2018 from <http://www.africanleadershp.co.uk>.
- Olatunde, S.O. (2007). Tackling corruption and corrupt tendencies through application of due process: the CBN experience. A paper presented at a seminar organized by Central Bank of Nigeria for its senior staff [internet]. Retrieved 30th December, 2017 from [www.cenbank.ogr/.../publications/.../transparency2007.pdf](http://www.cenbank.ogr/.../publications/.../transparency2007.pdf).
- Oluwashina, O. (2013). Nigeria official banned for bribe, *BBC Sport News*, Lagos.
- Onumah, C. (2018). African Centre for Media and Information Literacy [Internet]. Retrieved June 20, 2018 from: [www.pmnewsnigeria.com](http://www.pmnewsnigeria.com)
- Osakede, K., Ijimakenwa, S., Adesanya, T., Ojo, A., Ojikutu, O. and Abubakar, A. (2015). Corruption in the Nigeria public sector: An impediment to good governance and sustainable development. *Review of Public Administration and Management*, 4(8), 1-12.
- Osibanjo, O.O. (2013). Strategic motivation for corruption in Nigeria public organisations. A research proposal presented to the Department of Business Administration in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral degrees (PhD) in Business Administration, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria.
- Osoba, S.O. (1996). Corruption in Nigeria: Historical Perspectives. *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 23, No. 69, A Tribute to A. M. Babu, pp. 371-386.
- Osoba, S.O. (2007). Corruption in Nigeria: historical perspectives [Internet]. Retrieved 18 June 2018 from <https://www.tandtonline.com>.
- Pulse News Agency (2016). Federal Government to revealed ex-Governors 30 bank accounts in court. *Pulse Nigeria News Publication*.
- Qadri, M.I. (2009). Managerial corruption: a conceptual critique on institutional corruption. [Internet]. Retrieved 20th June, 2018 from [http://ezinearticles.com/?expert=mohammad\\_ilyas\\_qadri](http://ezinearticles.com/?expert=mohammad_ilyas_qadri).
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development of Freedom*, New York: Ankor Books.
- Sowunmi, F.A; Raufu, A.A; Oketokun, F.O; Salako, M.A and D.O.Usitoh (2010). The rule of media in curbing corruption in Nigeria. *Research journal in information technology*, 2(11), 7-23.
- Szwajkowski, E. (1985). Organisational illegality: theoretical integration and illustrative application. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 558 – 567.
- TI Newsletter (September 1998, 13). Citing Associated Press, June 24.



Transparency International (2008). Corruption perception index 2008. [Internet] Retrieved 7th January 2018 from [www.transparency.org](http://www.transparency.org).

Umoh, S.M. (2005). Management Theory. Department of Business Management, M.Sc/PhD Lecture Note, EBSU, Abakaliki, Nigeria, 2005/2006 Session.

United Nations Manual on Anti-corruption Policy (2001). [Internet] Retrieved 30th June, 2017 from <http://www.unode.org/pdf/crimegapublications/manual.pdf>.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2017). Corruption in Nigeria: Bribery, Public experience and response [Internet]. Retrieved 21 June 2018 from <https://www.unodc.org>.

Uwak, U.E. and Udofia, A.N. (2016). Corruption in Nigeria’s public sector organisation and its implications for national public sector organisations and its implications for national development. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(13), 26-34.

Uzochukwu, M. O. (2013). Challenges in Nigeria and solution on how to resolve them. [Internet]. Retrieved July 1 2018 from <http://soapboxie.com>

Uzochukwu, M.O. (2018). Corruption in Nigeria: Review, causes, effects and solutions [Internet] Retrieved 2nd June 2018 from <http://soaphoxis.com>

Uzoigwe, G.O. (2010). Corruption in education and assessment systems: the WAEC experience in Nigeria. [Internet]. [www.iaea.info/documents/paper\\_1162d1b538.pdf](http://www.iaea.info/documents/paper_1162d1b538.pdf)

Van Klaveran, J. (1957). The concept of corruption. In Heidenheimer, A.J., Johnston, M. and LeVine, V.T. (1989). *Political Corruption: A Handbook*, New Brunswick.

Waziri, A. A. (1991). Anatomy of corruption and other economic crimes. In Awa et al (ed.). *Perspectives in Corruption and other Economic Crimes in Nigeria*, Lagos.

WDR (1997). *World Development Report*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Yoo, B. (2010). Korea’s police anti-corruption plan: In part of action in corruption prone areas. *Police Forces*, 93. [Internet] Retrieved 20th December, 2017 from [www.oecd.org/site/adboecdanti-corruptioninitiative](http://www.oecd.org/site/adboecdanti-corruptioninitiative)

**Table 2: Ambiguity in Rules and regulations**

S N	Item	Mean	%	SD	Decision
1	There are no defined rules and regulations for curbing competition in the organization	3.28	19.78	9.16	Accepted
2.	Rules and regulations are not documented and circulate to all workers.	3.26	19.69	8.93	Accepted
3	Rules are not clear.	3.33	20.09	9.04	Accepted
4	Rules, procedures and guidelines of your organization concerning corruption are not clear enough and ambiguous.	3.37	20.30	9.09	Accepted
5	Rules, procedures and guidelines of your organization clearly do give detail of acts that are regarded corrupt.	3.34	20.14	9.00	Accepted

Source: Field work, 2018

**Table 3: Power Distance**

SN	Item	Mean	%	SD	Decision
1.	Employees in higher hierarchy (positions) do not make most decision with the inputs of followers (subordinates)	3.31	24.90	9.20	Accepted
2.	Employees in higher hierarchy (positions) avoid social interactions with employees in higher positions.	3.29	24.75	9.28	Accepted
3.	Managers rarely delegate crucial responsibilities to their subordinates.	3.33	25.03	9.23	Accepted
4.	Subordinates should not disagree with decision taken by those at the helm of affairs.	3.37	25.33	9.09	Accepted

Source: Field work, 2018

**Table 4: Job Satisfaction**

S/N	Item	Mean	%	SD	Decision
1.	My take home pay is not commensurate with my performance on the job.	3.29	20.11	9.11	Accepted
2.	I am not fairly handles in the organization.	3.29	20.08	8.99	Accepted
3.	I have been denied promotion	3.18	19.43	8.98	Accepted
4.	I am not on the appropriate level based on my experience and qualification.	3.21	19.64	8.90	Accepted
5.	Workers are not compensated for contributions made in the organization.	3.39	20.74	9.18	Accepted

Source: Field work, 2018

**Table 5: Propensity for corruption**

S/N	Item	Mean	%	SD	Decision
1.	There is nothing wrong in using my position to help my friends or family.	3.31	16.67	9.15	Accepted
2.	Workers are only appointed or promoted on basis of godfathers.	3.35	16.87	9.10	Accepted
3.	Only individuals who are corrupt are those making it in Nigeria.	3.30	16.60	9.04	Accepted
4.	One cannot be successful in life if he or she is not corrupt.	3.38	16.99	9.10	Accepted
5.	I will not mind using my position in the organization to my benefit so long I do not break the law.	3.29	16.55	9.05	Accepted
6.	Rewards, placements and promotions are not justifiably and justice ably assessed on the basis of objective criteria specified in the rules and procedures handbook/manual of the organization.	3.24	16.31	9.04	Accepted

Source: Field work, 2018

**Table 6: Summary of Findings**

SN	Hypotheses	R	P-Value	Remark	Decision
1	There is no significant relationship between level of ambiguity in rules/regulations and levels of propensity for corrupt behaviour in public sector organisation in Nigeria.	0.993	0.001	<0.05	Accept H1
2	There is no significant relationship between power distance and the levels of propensity for corrupt behaviour in public sector.	0.995	0.000	<0.05	Accept H1
3	There is no significant relationship between the level of job satisfaction and the levels of propensity for corrupt behaviour in public sector organisations in Nigeria.	0.994	0.000	<0.05	Accept H1

Field work, 2018

\*\*\*\*\*