



Corruption and Public Service Delivery in Nigeria: Assessing the Effect of Accountability Deficits on Governance and Development Outcomes in Anambra State Civil Service Commission

By

AGUIYI, Ebelechukwu Obiageli-Jacinta

Department of Public Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

&

AGUIYI, Chukwuebuka C

Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Abstract

Corruption remains a major challenge to effective public service delivery and sustainable development in Nigeria, particularly where weak accountability mechanisms create opportunities for the misuse of public resources and administrative authority. This study examined corruption and public service delivery in Nigeria, with particular focus on the effect of accountability deficits on governance and development outcomes in the Anambra State Civil Service Commission, Awka. The study adopted a descriptive survey design and obtained primary data through a structured questionnaire administered to respondents in the Anambra State Civil Service Commission. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics and simple linear regression. The descriptive results, based on 367 respondents, showed generally positive perceptions of the existence of accountability-related challenges and their implications for governance and development outcomes, although responses varied across the six questionnaire items. The regression analysis revealed a weak positive relationship between poor accountability and governance and development outcomes. The study concludes that accountability deficits constitute a significant institutional factor in governance and development outcomes, although other institutional, administrative, financial, political, and organizational factors also contribute to these outcomes. The study recommends strengthening internal accountability, enhancing transparency in public-resource management, improving the capacity and independence of internal audit and monitoring units, and enforcing appropriate sanctions for accountability violations. These measures are expected to reduce opportunities for corruption, improve institutional effectiveness, and enhance public service delivery in Anambra State.

Keywords: Corruption, accountability deficits, governance, development outcomes, public service delivery.

1. Introduction

Corruption, a complex ethical challenge characterized by the misuse of public office for private gain, poses a significant obstacle to societal development and undermines fundamental institutions. The phenomenon of corruption deserves particular attention in the public service delivery of the Nigerian state, to diagnose the production of damaging social and political effects and to evaluate the limited reach of anti-corruption programmes. Sani (2015) asserts that corruption means many things to different scholars. However, there is a convergence of views that corruption is the antithesis of ethics. According to Okereke (2023), ethics is a system of moral principles and rules of conduct which forbid the betrayal of public trust, abuse and misuse of public office for untoward motive. It is, therefore, a science of morals and code of behavior for members of the public service and society in general in their relationship with politicians, bureaucrats and public at large in the conduct of public and indeed private business. Therefore, corruption is a situation which is bereft of ethics (Okereke, 2023).

Today, corruption is one of the greatest challenges and threats to any country's long-term economic health. It can reduce a country's wealth because it discourages investment and trade, as stated by the World Bank (2019). To be corrupt is to seek to acquire wealth or power dishonestly for personal gain at the expense of public good or to abuse one's position of public trust for private gain. Like the ubiquity of cockroaches in human society, corruption has persisted for a long time and continues to be a major issue in many of the world's developing economies. Corruption is no doubt a global phenomenon that has threatened and continues to threaten the developmental efforts in many nations. In Nigeria, eradicating corruption has been a major concern of successive government in the country because of its negative impact on good governance and effective service delivery. According to Adamu (2017), corruption exists in one form or order in all societies. The major difference in the case of Nigeria is the extent of its pervasiveness and its implication for good governance, its value system and political culture.

From the foregoing, corruption manifests itself in various dimensions. It could be in the form of bribery (which is the exchange of cash and/or other monetary benefits) to get undue advantage, favor or preferences. It could be inflating contracts or over-invoicing. It could be in the form of using one's position to promote certain parochial interests (like ethnicity, tribalism or even religion), as against merit in offering of jobs and political appointments. Corruption could be in the form of outright diversion or embezzlement of government money or lack of

accountability. In the political sphere, corruption manifests itself in terms of gerrymandering and other political manipulations like election rigging, bad leadership, nepotism, illicit tenure elongation and disregard for the principle of rule of law and fundamental human rights of opponents, intimidation or outright killing of political opponents or rivals. And in the economic sphere, it manifests itself in the form of ineffective service delivery, particularly in terms of absence and/or inadequate provision of infrastructural amenities that have a direct impact on the socio-economic well-being of the citizenry and collecting a full day's pay for less than a day's job. Its magnitude and manifestation are high and widespread. It has reached an alarming stage that even the international community dread doing any form of business with Nigerians or their government. To this end, Nigeria has constantly been rated as one of the most corrupt countries in the world (Asaju and Adagba, 2021).

The accountability dimension of corruption is particularly important because the absence of effective mechanisms for monitoring, reporting, justification, and sanctioning official conduct creates an environment in which corrupt practices can persist. Public officials who are not adequately required to account for decisions, expenditures, contracts, and institutional outcomes may have greater opportunities to misuse public resources without fear of consequences. Thus, accountability deficits can reinforce corruption by weakening institutional checks and balances and creating conditions of impunity. Nkwede et al. (2023) observed that the persistence of corruption in Nigeria's public service has contributed to difficulties in achieving public-sector goals and delivering the benefits of government to citizens. Similarly, Ibietan (2023) argues that accountability, transparency, responsibility, and responsiveness are fundamental to the capacity of Nigeria's public bureaucracy to contribute meaningfully to national development.

Public service delivery is the process by which public services, such as healthcare, education, infrastructure, and sanitation, are provided to citizens by government entities. It is crucial for social and economic development, as it gives effect to government policies, manages public affairs, and ensures that the needs of the public are met. According to Ibietan, 2023, public service delivery constitutes one of the principal mechanisms through which government translates public policies, programmes, and resources into tangible benefits for citizens. In a democratic system, citizens expect public institutions to operate transparently, responsibly, efficiently, and in accordance with established rules and procedures. Accountability is particularly important because it requires public officials and institutions to explain and justify the use of public resources, decisions, and actions, while also making them subject to scrutiny



and sanctions where necessary. In this regard, effective accountability is not merely an administrative principle but an essential foundation for responsive governance and quality public service delivery (Adejuwon, 2012). Recent scholarship on Nigeria continues to identify corruption, weak transparency, and inadequate accountability as significant obstacles to effective public service delivery (Alabi & Efeurhobo, 2026; Nkwede et al., 2023). Within this national context, the Anambra State Civil Service Commission represents an important institutional setting for examining the relationship between corruption, accountability, governance, and public service delivery.

As a key institution within the state public service system, the Commission plays an important role in the administration and management of the state's civil service. Its effectiveness depends not only on the availability of financial and human resources but also on the integrity, transparency, responsibility, and accountability of officials responsible for managing public affairs. Where accountability mechanisms are inadequate, administrative resources may be vulnerable to misuse, while institutional decisions and processes may become less responsive to established standards of efficiency and public interest. Against this background, the article examines corruption and public service delivery in Nigeria, with particular attention to the effect of accountability deficits on governance and development outcomes in the Anambra State Civil Service Commission. By investigating this relationship, the study seeks to contribute empirical evidence to the broader debate on corruption control, public-sector accountability, institutional effectiveness, and sustainable development in Nigeria. It is expected that the findings will provide useful insights for strengthening accountability mechanisms, reducing opportunities for corrupt practices, improving administrative performance, and ultimately enhancing the capacity of the Anambra State Civil Service Commission to contribute effectively to public service delivery and development.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Corruption remains a major impediment to effective public administration and public service delivery in Nigeria. Despite successive government initiatives, institutional reforms, and anti-corruption programmes, corrupt practices continue to manifest in various forms, including bribery, contract inflation, embezzlement, diversion of public resources, nepotism, abuse of office, and poor accountability. The persistence of these practices has raised serious concerns about the capacity of public institutions to efficiently utilize public resources and

deliver services in ways that promote good governance and sustainable development. Adamu (2017) noted that although corruption exists in virtually all societies, its pervasive nature and consequences for governance and public institutions make it particularly problematic in Nigeria. Similarly, Asaju and Adagba (2021) observed that the magnitude and widespread nature of corruption in Nigeria have continued to undermine the country's developmental efforts. One of the most significant manifestations of corruption in the public service is accountability deficit. Accountability requires public officials to provide explanations and justifications for their decisions, actions, expenditures, and management of public resources. Where such mechanisms are weak or ineffective, public officials may have opportunities to misuse public resources without adequate scrutiny or sanctions. Consequently, weak accountability can create an institutional environment in which corrupt practices become normalized and difficult to control.

Nkwede et al. (2023) observed that persistent corruption and weaknesses in accountability have contributed to difficulties in achieving public-sector objectives in Nigeria, while Ibietan (2023) emphasized the importance of accountability, transparency, responsibility, and responsiveness to the effective performance of the Nigerian public service. The problem becomes more critical when accountability deficits translate into poor governance and adverse development outcomes. Public service institutions are expected to convert government policies, programmes, and resources into tangible services and benefits for citizens. However, when public officials fail to account adequately for public resources and institutional decisions, resources may be diverted, misallocated, or inefficiently utilized. Such situations can undermine administrative effectiveness, weaken institutional responsiveness, reduce the quality of public services, and constrain the capacity of government institutions to achieve their developmental objectives. Adejuwon (2012) therefore identifies accountability and good governance as important conditions for effective public service delivery, while recent studies continue to associate corruption, inadequate transparency, and weak accountability with poor public-sector performance in Nigeria (Alabi & Efeurhobo, 2026; Nkwede et al., 2023). Consequently, the study is confronted with the problem of determining whether and to what extent poor accountability, as a manifestation of corruption, affects governance and development outcomes in the Anambra State Civil Service Commission, Awka. Addressing this problem is important because evidence on the relationship between accountability deficits and institutional outcomes could provide a basis for strengthening accountability mechanisms,

improving administrative performance, reducing opportunities for corrupt practices, and enhancing the effectiveness of public service delivery in Anambra State.

1.2 Conceptual Review

Corruption

Corruption refers to the abuse of public offices for private gain. According to Transparency International (2020), corruption manifests in various forms such as bribery, embezzlement, nepotism, electoral fraud, and misuse of public resources. In the Nigerian context, corruption has become systemic and institutionalized, affecting all levels of government. Corruption remains an ubiquitous concept that qualifies for negative behaviors despite the efforts of scholars in arriving at a consensus definition. Ubiquity makes constructing a definition for corruption to present several difficulties, because like many other forms of behavior, it is an elusive and complex phenomenon, (Khan, 2021). Therefore, defining what corruption is depends upon personal gain, breaking the rules, how often it happens and the value of the gifts, (Lawton, 2018). In most social science discussions, scholars define corruption in terms of deviations from legal norms themselves, but this norm-based definition has tended, however, to allow discussion to take place at the cost of ruling out some important activities, which in everyday sense would be considered corrupt, (Edevbaro, 2018). In administrative studies, corruption is mostly referred to as the act of diverting public interest or public good for personal gain and the diversion conforms to this discourse. Similarly, corruption is also an act of giving, promising or offering wrongful satisfaction or compensation, (Salminen & Olli-Pekka, 2016). It is like an iceberg, in which only the tip can be seen and only known facts can be taken into consideration, because of its complex nature, (Huberts, Lasthuizen & Peeters, 2021).

Corruption can represent different interests, and it is not only necessary to talk about corruption, but also the attitude and performance of the political system or state agencies towards corruption, (Lou, 2025). The study views corruption as involving behaviors that deviate from set rules, sabotage of accountability for ulterior motive, and any sinister act that is aimed at compromising the system for pecuniary interests against established standards permissible by law and morality to the detriment of democratic governance. This is more so in view of the disaggregated perceptions formed around national values and leadership creed. For example, what constitutes corruption and how to isolate it vary from one system or culture to the other. Of course, while some cultures and political systems consider corruption as normal

ways of life, the reverse is the case in other climes. This is where the peculiar case of Nigeria comes in; to buttress the fact that corruption is relative to norms and predominant political culture in each environment. But despite the mosaic meanings ascribed to corruption to reflect geographical characteristics, the practice of democracy has unveiled the obscure nature of corruption. It is now easier to spot how corruption manifests, its impact on development and the global concerns about it.

Public Service Delivery

Public service is a government department or body that oversees making plans for and carrying out government policies (Nevin, 2019). It is a very important part of the government's policy. It gives technical and professional advice to the government based on its expertise, knowledge, and years of service. It also develops programs and options for completing government projects based on the resources that are available. It also keeps track of and evaluates programs and projects that are already underway. It also makes sure that all government policies are put into place so that the goals can be reached (Omisore, 2015). The Public Service also refers to all organizations that exist as part of government machinery for implementing policy decisions and delivering services that are of value to the citizens.

The Nigerian Public Service is simply an agglomeration of all organizations that exist as part of government machinery for the delivery of services. As an arm of government that determines how the objectives of government are carried out and how resources are allocated among the various competing demands in the country, it occupies an important position in determining the quality of life of the citizenry through the state apparatus. That is where the necessity of good governance comes in. According to Asaju and Adagba (2022), the Nigerian Public Service includes the Civil Service, often referred to as core service, consisting of line ministries and extra ministerial agencies; the Public bureaucracy or the enlarged Public Service which made up of service of the State and National Assembly, the Judiciary, the Armed Forces, the Police and other Security agencies, paramilitary services (i.e. Customs, Immigration, Prison service, Civil Defence Corps etc.); parastatals and agencies i.e. regulatory agencies, educational institutions, research institutions, social services, and commercially oriented agencies etc.

Service here implies tangible and intangible goods and services provided by the government to improve the well-being of the citizenry. Carlson et al. (2025) conceptualized service delivery as the relationship between policy makers, service providers and poor people.

According to them, it encompasses services and support systems that are typically regarded as a state responsibility. These include social services (primary education and basic health services), infrastructure (water, sanitation, roads and bridges) and services that promote personal security (justice, police etc). In Nigeria, government constitutes the major service provider through the Public Service, which is a mandatory institution of the state under the 1999 Constitution of Nigeria.

Accountability Deficits

Accountability is a fundamental principle of democratic governance and public administration because it establishes the obligation of public officials and institutions to explain, justify, and take responsibility for their decisions, actions, and use of public resources. Bovens (2007) conceptualizes accountability as a relationship in which an actor is obliged to explain and justify conduct to a forum that can question the conduct and pass judgment, with the possibility of consequences. This conceptualization emphasizes three essential elements of accountability: the obligation to provide information, the responsibility to justify actions, and the possibility of sanctions or corrective measures. In the public service, accountability therefore requires officials to demonstrate that their decisions and use of public resources are consistent with established laws, rules, ethical standards, and the public interest. Accountability also involves mechanisms through which government officials and public institutions are subjected to oversight by legislatures, courts, audit institutions, civil society organizations, the media, and citizens. The World Bank (2004) explains that accountability is closely connected with the capacity of citizens and institutions to demand explanations from service providers and public officials and to impose consequences where obligations are not fulfilled. Accountability consequently serves both a corrective and preventive function in public administration. It can expose misconduct after it occurs while simultaneously discouraging officials from engaging in unethical or corrupt behaviour.

In the context of public service delivery, accountability is particularly important because government officials administer resources that belong to the public. Adejuwon (2012) argues that accountability and good governance are essential to improving public service delivery because they encourage public officials to act responsibly and in accordance with established institutional standards. Accountability requires public servants to demonstrate how public funds are utilized, how decisions are reached, and whether institutional objectives are

being achieved. Where accountability is effective, citizens and oversight institutions are better positioned to evaluate government performance and demand improvements in service delivery.

Accountability deficit therefore refers to a condition in which established mechanisms for holding public officials and institutions responsible for their decisions, actions, performance, and use of public resources are weak, ineffective, absent, or poorly enforced. It may manifest through inadequate financial reporting, weak auditing, limited transparency, ineffective supervision, failure to investigate misconduct, non-enforcement of sanctions, concealment of information, and limited opportunities for citizens to scrutinize government activities. Accountability deficits can create opportunities for corruption because public officials may perceive that the likelihood of detection or punishment for misconduct is low. In this regard, Rose-Ackerman and Palifka (2016) emphasize that weak institutional controls and inadequate enforcement mechanisms can facilitate corrupt behaviour by reducing the risks associated with the abuse of public authority. Accountability deficits can also arise when formal accountability institutions exist but lack the independence, capacity, resources, or political support required to perform their functions effectively. Thus, the mere existence of audit departments, legislative oversight committees, codes of conduct, procurement regulations, or anti-corruption agencies does not necessarily guarantee effective accountability. What is important is whether these mechanisms function effectively and whether violations attract appropriate consequences. Bovens et al. (2014) observe that accountability is meaningful only when institutional arrangements create genuine opportunities for information, questioning, judgment, and consequences.

In Nigeria, accountability deficits have remained a significant concern in the public sector because of persistent challenges associated with corruption, weak institutional oversight, inadequate transparency, and ineffective enforcement of administrative rules. Nkwede et al. (2023) contend that strengthening accountability mechanisms is important for addressing corruption and improving the performance of the Nigerian public service. Similarly, Ibietan (2023) identifies accountability, transparency, responsibility, and responsiveness as important components of an effective public service capable of contributing to national development. Thus, accountability deficit can be understood as an institutional weakness that potentially facilitates corruption and undermines the effective management of public resources. Accountability deficits, therefore, refer to inadequacies or weaknesses in the mechanisms through which officials of the Anambra State Civil Service Commission are required to explain, justify, and take responsibility for their decisions, actions, expenditure of public

resources, and institutional performance. The concept encompasses weak monitoring, inadequate reporting, ineffective auditing, limited transparency, poor enforcement of sanctions, and failure to hold officials responsible for administrative misconduct.

Governance

Governance is a broad concept that concerns the processes, institutions, structures, and relationships through which public affairs are managed, and collective decisions are made and implemented. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 1997) defines governance as the exercise of economic, political, and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels. This definition highlights that governance extends beyond government and incorporates the processes through which citizens, institutions, and public authorities interact in managing public affairs. The World Bank (1992) similarly conceptualizes governance in terms of the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development. This perspective establishes an important relationship between governance and development because the quality of institutions and administrative processes influences the ability of governments to formulate and implement policies effectively. Governance therefore encompasses such principles as accountability, transparency, participation, responsiveness, effectiveness, efficiency, rule of law, and equity.

Good governance represents the application of these principles in ways that promote public interest and improve institutional performance. Kaufmann et al. (2010) identify several dimensions of governance, including voice and accountability, political stability, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law, and control of corruption. These dimensions demonstrate that governance is multidimensional and that accountability is an integral component of effective governance. A government may have formal institutions and policies but still experience poor governance when public officials are not accountable, institutions are ineffective, corruption is widespread, and the rule of law is weak. Governance is particularly important in public service institutions because it determines how administrative authority is exercised and how public resources are transformed into services. Effective governance requires institutions to operate according to established rules, maintain transparency in decision-making, respond to citizens' needs, and remain accountable for institutional performance. The OECD (2020) emphasizes that effective public governance depends on institutions that are responsive, reliable, transparent, and accountable. Consequently, weak

governance can result in inefficient resource allocation, poor policy implementation, corruption, and declining public confidence.

Development

Development is a multidimensional concept that extends beyond economic growth to encompass improvements in people's social, economic, political, and institutional well-being. Sen (1999) conceptualizes development as the expansion of substantive human freedoms and argues that development should be assessed by the extent to which individuals are able to lead lives they have reason to value. This perspective shifts attention from economic indicators alone toward broader improvements in human welfare, opportunities, capabilities, and institutional conditions. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 1990) similarly places human well-being at the centre of development and emphasizes people's opportunities to live long and healthy lives, acquire knowledge, and enjoy a decent standard of living. Development therefore includes improvements in education, healthcare, employment, infrastructure, security, social inclusion, and access to essential public services. In this sense, public institutions play a critical role because they provide many of the services and create the institutional conditions necessary for improving citizens' quality of life.

Development also has an institutional dimension. North (1990) argues that institutions are fundamental to economic and social outcomes because they structure human interactions and influence incentives. Effective public institutions establish predictable rules, protect public interests, allocate resources efficiently, and create conditions that support sustainable development. Conversely, weak institutions characterized by corruption, poor accountability, and ineffective administration can constrain development by encouraging resource wastage and undermining public confidence. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) further demonstrate the multidimensional character of development. The United Nations (2015) emphasizes the importance of inclusive institutions, access to quality services, poverty reduction, education, health, decent work, infrastructure, and peace and justice in achieving sustainable development. Of particular relevance to accountability and governance is Sustainable Development Goal 16, which seeks to promote peaceful and inclusive societies, provide access to justice, and build effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions at all levels. This establishes an explicit connection between institutional accountability and development outcomes.

Development, therefore, refers to improvements in institutional effectiveness, public infrastructure, socioeconomic welfare, administrative capacity, and the general ability of government to achieve intended policy and service-delivery objectives. Development outcomes within the Anambra State Civil Service Commission are therefore considered in relation to the Commission's capacity to contribute to effective governance, efficient administration, implementation of government programmes, and improved public service delivery.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

The adoption of theoretical framework in management and social sciences greatly helps in the analysis and even understanding of concepts from some theoretical point of view and/or orientation. Therefore, the theoretical framework of analysis adopted in this study is Group theory. The proponents of this theory are Arthur F. Bentley, David Truman, David Garson (1908). The group theory comprises of the elitist perception and the pluralist conception of society. The assumption of this theory holds that the interactions of groups are the basis of public service delivery and political life (Bentley, 1908). The theorist emphasized and recognized the pluralistic and multi-interest groups, political parties' affiliations, religious leanings and denominational nature of a state. They argued that governance is a group affair, and each group is competing against each other's power to access public goods. Since governance is a group affair and each group competing against each other sometimes leads to corruption in attempts to outsmart or maneuver. While groups are in competition, those that think that their interest cannot be secured nor protected have the tendency of engaging in corrupt practice to secure and protect their interest.

1.4 Methodology

In this study, **descriptive survey design** was adopted because it was considered appropriate in gathering the necessary data for the completion of this study. The study area is Anambra State Civil Service Commission. The Anambra State Civil Service Commission (ASCSC) is a key government agency responsible for managing the civil service workforce in Anambra State. It plays a central role in ensuring efficiency, discipline, and professionalism within the state public service. Simple random sampling techniques were used, which follows randomization principle. This was to allow every member of the population equal chance of being selected. The sources of data for this work consist of two sources, namely, primary and secondary sources. The primary source of data consists of questionnaires, while the secondary

sources of data collection were documentation such as textbooks, journals, reports, internet publication and unpublished materials. Data were analyzed using tables of descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, percentages, mean, standard deviations and hypotheses were tested using simple linear regression analysis.

Discussion

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM1	367	1.00	5.00	2.2480	1.61485
ITEM2	367	1.00	5.00	3.3215	.94386
ITEM3	367	1.00	5.00	3.4877	1.05801
ITEM4	368	1.00	5.00	3.7201	.87061
ITEM5	367	1.00	5.00	3.4905	.82601
ITEM6	367	1.00	5.00	3.5450	.94234
Valid (listwise)	N 367				

The descriptive statistics present respondents' perceptions of poor accountability and governance/development outcomes based on six questionnaire items, with 367 respondents. All items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale. The descriptive results show mixed responses, with mean scores ranging from 2.25 to 3.72. This indicates that Some respondents disagree on certain accountability issues, most respondents agree that accountability is weak, Governance and development outcomes are affected etc. Since most mean values are above the benchmark of 3.00, except ITEM1, it implies that respondents generally agree that poor accountability exists and affects governance and development outcomes in the Commission. However, the relatively low score in ITEM1 suggests some inconsistency in perception across respondents.

Table 2: Effect of Poor Accountability on Governance and Development Outcomes in Anambra State Civil Service Commission

Predictor	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	B	Std. Error β	t	F	p-value	Decision	
Poor Accountability (PA)	.206	.042	.040	.161	.040	.206	4.012	16.094	< .001	Reject H ₀
Model								16.094	< .001	Significant

Interpretation

The regression analysis indicates a weak positive relationship between poor accountability and governance and development outcomes in the Anambra State Civil Service Commission ($R = .206$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .042$) shows that poor accountability explains 4.2% of the variation in governance and development outcomes, while the remaining 95.8% is attributable to other factors not included in the model. The model is statistically significant, $F(1, 365) = 16.094$, $p < .001$. The regression coefficient further indicates that poor accountability has a positive and statistically significant effect on governance and development outcomes ($B = .161$, $\beta = .206$, $t = 4.012$, $p < .001$). Therefore, the null hypothesis, “Poor accountability has no significant impact on governance and development outcomes in Anambra State Civil Service Commission,” is rejected.

1.5 Findings of the Study

Poor accountability has a statistically significant effect on governance and development outcomes in the Commission. Although the relatively low R^2 suggests that its explanatory power is limited and that other institutional, administrative, political, and socioeconomic factors also contribute substantially to governance and development outcomes.

1.6 Conclusion

The study concludes that accountability is an important factor in determining governance and development outcomes in the Anambra State Civil Service Commission. The statistically significant relationship established by the study demonstrates that weaknesses in accountability mechanisms are relevant to the governance and developmental performance of the Commission. Although the explanatory power of poor accountability is relatively modest, its statistical significance indicates that accountability-related practices cannot be ignored in

efforts to improve public service performance. The finding further suggests that governance and development outcomes are multidimensional and cannot be explained by accountability deficits alone. Since poor accountability accounted for only 4.2% of the variation in the dependent variable, other institutional, administrative, financial, political, and organizational factors are likely to influence governance and development outcomes within the Commission. Nevertheless, strengthening accountability remains necessary for improving transparency, responsible resource management, institutional effectiveness, and public service delivery.

1.7 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion, the study recommends that:

1. The Anambra State Civil Service Commission should strengthen internal accountability mechanisms. Regular monitoring, auditing, performance assessment, and financial reporting should be institutionalized to ensure that officials are answerable for their decisions, actions, and use of public resources.
2. Transparency in the management of public resources should be enhanced. The Commission should ensure that relevant financial, procurement, and administrative information is properly documented and made available to authorized oversight institutions to reduce opportunities for corruption and misuse of resources.
3. The capacity of internal audit and monitoring units should be strengthened. Adequate personnel, resources, training, and operational independence should be provided to enable these units to identify irregularities and report them promptly to the appropriate authorities.

References

- Abada, I. M., & Onyia, F. O. (2020). Nepotism, cronyism and prebendalism: An exploration of the mores that reinforce corruption in Nigeria's political system. *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration*, 8(3), 1-13.
- Abubakar J (2007). EFCC: The Politics, the Report Card. Daily Trust Newspaper, Wednesday, August 15.
- Achebe, C. (1960). No longer at ease. London: *Heinemann Educational*. ActionAid Nigeria (2015). Corruption and poverty in Nigeria: A report published by ActionAid Nigeria.



- Adamaagashi I, Awakessien C, Awakessien S. (2024) Corruption and governance: Examining the impact on political stability in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Science and Management Research*.; 10(2):19. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.56201/ijssmr.v10.no2.2024.pg1.19>
- Adamu BJ (2007). Method of Tackling Corruption in Nigeria, file:///E;retrieved 04/02/2011
- Adebanwi, W. (2012). Authority stealing: Anti-corruption war and democratic politics in post-military Nigeria. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Adebayo, A.A. (2013). The nexus of Corruption and Poverty in the Quest for sustainable Development in Nigeria, *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 15(7):225-235.
- Adejuwon, K. D. (2012). The dilemma of accountability and good governance for improved public service delivery in Nigeria. *Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review*, 1(3), 25–45.
- Adeniran, A., & Mohammed, K. (2023). Corruption and operational efficiency in Nigerian ports: A case study of Port Harcourt complex. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 45(3), 112-128.
- Aderoju T.(2023) The impact of corruption on the rule of law and the effective administration of justice using Nigeria as a case study. *International Bar Association*. <https://www.ibanet.org/impact-of-corruption-on-rule-of-law-Nigeria>
- Adewale, S. B. (2011). The crowding-out effects of corruption in Nigeria. An empirical study. *E3 journal of Business Management and Economics* 2: 59-68.
- Adeyemi, O. (2012) “Corruption and Local Government Administration in Nigeria. A Discourse of Core Issues”, *European Journal of Sustainable Development*. Vol.,pp.183-198
- Adeyemi, S. L. (2015). Corruption and service delivery in Nigeria’s public sector. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 5(1), 1–12.
- Aina OB, Shamsuddin B. (2023) Corruption: An impediment to public service delivery in Africa. 18(4):104- 110. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10049652#32>



- Aiyede, R.E. (2006). The Role of INEC, ICPC and EFCC in Combating Political Corruption in Money, Politics. *16 Zamfara Journal of Politics and Development* | Vol. 3 No. 3 | December 2022
- Ajao, O. S., Dada, S. O., & Olaoye, S.A. (2013). Application of forensic accounting technique in effective investigation and detection of embezzlement to combat corruption in Nigeria. *Unique Journal of Business Management Research*, 1(4), 065-070.
- Akinlabi AO, Hamed B, Awoniyi MA. (2011) Corruption, foreign direct investment and economic growth in Nigeria: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Research in International Business Management.*; 1(9):278-292.
- Akinsanya, A. A. (2018). *Corruption in the Nigerian public sector: An overview*. Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research, 10(2), 15–23.
- Akosile, Abimbola. (2011). Nigeria drops 9 Steps in 2011 corruption index. This Day Live. <http://www.thisdaylive.com/articles/nigeria-drops-9-steps-in-2011-corruption-index/104108/>.
- Alabi, S., & Efeurhobo, D. O. (2026). The impact of corruption, transparency and accountability on effective public service delivery in Nigeria (2011–2023). *British American University Journal of Social and Contemporary Issues*, 2(1), 82–102.
- Alemika, E.E.O. (2012). Corruption and insecurity in Nigeria. *Lead presentation at the International Conference National Security, Integration and Sustainable Development in Nigeria* organized by Ahmadu Bello University (ABU), Zaria.
- Alemika, E.E.O. (2017). Corruption and insecurity in Nigeria. Lead presentation at the International Conference National Security, Integration and Sustainable Development in Nigeria organized by Ahmadu Bello University (ABU), Zaria
- Ibietan, J. I. (2023). Public accountability and national development: The role of Nigeria's federal public service. *Public Administration and Regional Studies*, 16(1), 55–79.
- Nkwede, V., Udoikah, J. M., & Ogbu, M. (2023). Whistle blowing policy and accountability in the Nigerian public service: An assessment. *South East Political Science Review*, 8(1).
- World Bank. (2024). *Nigeria: Country Partnership Framework and governance/service delivery initiatives*.
- World Bank. (2025). *Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) 2024: Nigeria*.