

Fragility of Ministry of Defense, Abuja: The Imperative of Ethics and Accountability

Michael Josephine Tani¹, Iloanya Kenneth²

¹Department of Business Management, (Public Administration option), Faculty of Management and Social Sciences, Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu, Nigeria

²Department of Public Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka Nigeria

Abstract: *This study examined the fragility of Ministry of Defence, Abuja and the imperative of ethics and accountability. Public services in Nigeria generally have underlying organizational problems which tend to impair their ability to perform their public functions to the satisfaction of the citizenry. The study adopted a descriptive survey design and reviewed related literature on the topic. The study had a population size of 4,887 while the sample size was 390. The data for the research were collected by means of documentary instruments and the use of structured questionnaire, using Likert 5-point scale. Interview and focus group discussion guide. Data collected were presented and analyzed with simple percentages and Mean score of 3.00 to give scientifically verifiable answers to the problems and objectives of the study. The findings revealed that unethical behavior and weak accountability exist in the Ministry, and many factors were responsible for the anomaly; the multiplicity of the control mechanisms with the resultant overlap functions have rather made matters worse; and the measures adopted to ensure that they are duly observed are weak. The study concluded that unethical behavior and weak accountability are still prevalent among the civil servants in the Ministry. It, therefore, recommended that factors that create opportunities for unethical behavior and weak accountability in the Ministry should be addressed; that all the institutional control mechanisms should be enhanced to perform more efficiently; and that systems and procedures should be simplified in order to remove the unnecessary blockages in organizational systems, which create opportunities for bribe to be extracted from members of the public.*

Keywords: Ethical question, accountability, system procedure, organization.

1.1 Introduction

Ethics refers to a set of moral principles, especially ones relating to or affirming a specified group, field, or form of conduct. It is defined as a moral philosophy or code of morals practiced by a person or group of people. Ethics is based on well-founded standards of right and wrong that prescribe what humans ought to do, usually in terms of rights, obligations, benefits to society, fairness, or specific virtues. Ethics affects how people make decisions and lead their lives.

The word ethics is derived from the Greek ethos, meaning custom or habit. Ethics differs from morals and morality in that ethics denotes the theory of right action and the greater good, while morals indicate their practice. Ethics is not limited to specific acts and defined moral codes, but encompasses the whole of moral ideals and endeavors, a person's philosophy of life. It asks questions like how should people behave? (Normative or prescriptive ethics), what do people think is right? (Descriptive ethics), how do we take moral knowledge and put it into practice? (Applied ethics), and what does right mean? (Meta-ethics).

Ethics covers the dilemma of how to live a good life, our rights and responsibilities, the language of right and wrong as well as moral decisions. Its subjects consist of the fundamental issues of practical decision-making, and its major concerns include the nature of ultimate value and the standards by which human actions can be justified and judged as right or wrong.

Thompson (1985) defined administrative ethics as involving the application of moral principles to the conduct of official responsibilities and duties. On the other hand, Chapman (1988) defined civil service ethics as the application of moral standards in the course of official works.

Recent assessment of poor performance by the government has highlighted the importance of being ethical in the delivery of public services. Evidence of the decline in public trust resulting from decline in ethics and accountability can be seen in decline in voter turnout at elections, and increased negative perception of public sector agencies. Unethical behaviours in the Nigerian civil service have persisted, such as bribery and corruption, nepotism, conflict of interest, favours to relations and friends, lateness to work, partiality, absenteeism, leaking official information, and participating in unauthorized activities. All these have led to deterioration of accountability arising from weak institutions of enforcement.

There have been cases of gross indiscipline, lack of accountability and transparency, unethical behaviours, and corrupt practices, to the extent that one may speak of a crisis of ethics and accountability in Nigerian civil service. Ethical deficit and the problem of accountability feature noticeably in the action of the civil servants. This development has made it necessary to urgently address the issue of ethics and accountability in the Nigerian civil service, with particular focus on the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja. This is what this research project has set out to investigate.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

1. Investigate the factors that account for unethical behaviours and weak accountability in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja;
2. Determine the extent institutional mechanisms for enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability affect Ministry of Defence, Abuja.
3. To determine the efficiency of the measures adopted to ensure that ethics and accountability in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja, are adequate and effective.

1.3 Research Questions

1. What are the factors that account for the unethical behaviours and weak accountability in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja?
2. What are the extant institutional mechanisms for enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja?; and
3. How adequate are the measures adopted to ensure ethics and accountability?

2.0 Review of Related Literature

2.1 The Concept and Meaning of Ethics

Ethics is a set of moral principles that define right or wrong actions of a person or an organization. Ethics is the study of what is morally right or wrong. Bortoff (1997) describes ethics as a body of principles or standards of human conduct that govern the behaviour of individuals or groups. Pollitt (2003) defines ethics as rules of conduct and behavior which relate to the questions of right or wrong, good or evil. Hornby (2000) defined ethics as a system of moral principles that govern or influence the behaviour of individuals or groups. A synthesis of the definitions given will view ethics as moral codes of behaviour that are established by a society, organizations, individuals, groups or a country to protect their values.

In public administration and organizations, ethics is the code of behaviour written down to protect public values such as public interest, accountability, justice, impartiality, neutrality, and responsiveness. In the public service, ethics focuses on the fundamental premise of the civil or public servant's duty as a steward to the public.

2.2 The Concept and Meaning of Accountability

Accountability is the natural consequence of stewardship in which one is given a responsibility and required to report back. In this context, public officers who manage public resources allocated to numerous programmes have the obligation to render a full account of their activities to the public.

Normanlon (1966) defined accountability as a check of performance against authorization and duly expected to be performed by all responsible civil servants. In principle, accountability is a call on office holders to render account of their stewardship (Mustafa, 1997).

Accountability is a concept deeply rooted in political power and democracy. It is the bridge linking the people with the Executives to whom enormous powers have been entrusted. In fact, the evidence of bad government is the absence of accountability (Mustafa, 1997).

In ethics and governance, accountability is answerability, liability, and the expectation of account-giving (Ejiofor, 1987). According to Anger (2002), in leadership roles, accountability is the acknowledgement and assumption of responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies including administration, governance, and implementation within the scope of the role or employment position and encompasses the obligation to report, explain and be answerable for the resulting consequences.

From the foregoing, it is therefore clear that accountability is basically a feature of democratic governance characterized by answerability and openness.

2.3 Mechanisms for Enforcing and Monitoring Ethics and Accountability in the Nigeria Public Service

In Nigeria, some institutions and agencies have been set up to fight corrupt and unethical behaviours among civil servants and private individuals. These include the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC), the Independent Corrupt Practices and Offences Commission (ICPC), Code of Conduct Bureau (CCB), Budget Monitoring and Price Intelligence Unit (BMPIU), Public Complaint Commission (PCC), and Public Accounts Committee (PAC).

The Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) is an agency for enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability in the Nigeria Civil Service. The Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) is an institution set in accordance with Nigerian law to curb the menace of corruption; protect national and foreign investments in the country; imbue the spirit of hard work; identify illegally acquired wealth and confiscate it; build an upright workforce in both public and private sectors of the economy; and contribute to the global war against financial crime. It is a Nigerian law enforcement agency that investigates financial crimes.

Another agency for enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability in the Nigeria Civil Service is the Independent Corrupt Practices and Offences Commission (ICPC). The Independent Corrupt Practices and Offences Commission (ICPC) was set up by President Olusegun Obasanjo through a legislative act of the national assembly. The main duty of the Commission is to receive complaints, investigate and prosecute offenders. Other duties of the commission include education and enlightenment of the public about and against bribery, corruption and related offences. The Commission also has the task of reviewing and modifying the activities of public bodies, where such practices may aid corruption. Section 6 of the Independent Corrupt Practices and Offences Commission (ICPC) Act 2000 sets out the duties of the commission as follows:

- i. to receive and investigate complaints from members of the public on allegations of corrupt practices and in appropriate cases, prosecute the offenders;
- ii. to examine the practices, systems and procedures of public bodies and where such systems aid corruption, to direct and supervise their reviews;
- iii. to instruct, advice, and assist any officer, agency, or parastatal on ways by which fraud or corruption may be eliminated by them;
- iv. to advise heads of public bodies of changes in practice, systems and procedures compatible with the effective discharge of the duties of public bodies to reduce the likelihood or incidence of bribery, corruption and related offences;
- v. to educate and enlighten the public about and against bribery, corruption and related offences; and
- vi. to enlist and foster public support in combating corruption

The Code of Conduct Bureau (CCB) is an anti-corruption agency in Nigeria. It was established in 1979 after thirteen years of military rule during the second republic of Nigeria. Its aim is to battle corruption in Nigerian public service. It was established alongside the Code of Conduct Tribunal which serves as a court under the jurisdiction of the Federal High Court used to prosecute public servants that are found guilty of public funds embezzlement among other crimes.

In 1990, the National Assembly of Nigeria enacted a law that supports the Bureau in carrying out its functions. It was empowered to establish, maintain and sustain public morality in the conduct of government organizations and to make sure that the behavior of public officers also comply with the highest quality of public morality and accountability.

Another agency for enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability in the Nigeria Civil Service is the Budget Monitoring and Price Intelligence Unit (BMPIU). It was established in 2003 as part of the government reform agenda to enforce ethical standards in government activities to ensure transparency in the implementation of public policies, programmes and projects. This agency of government is also known as Due Process Unit (DPU). The main goals of the Budget Monitoring and Price Intelligence Unit (BMPIU) include ensuring strict compliance with laid down rules and procedures.

The Public Complaints Commission (PCC) is also an agency for enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability in the Nigeria Civil Service. It was established in 1975 and charged with investigation of all complaints in respect of all administrative actions by officers of public agencies considered by the citizens as contrary to the law, arbitrary, unfair, oppressive or improper.

Finally, the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) helps in enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability in the Nigeria Civil Service. The Committee was given broad power under the 1979 and 1989 Constitutions to prevent and expose corruption. The Committee examines the accounts and reports of ministries and departments of the government of the Federation. The Committee has power to require any person to produce any books, documents or records as it may deem necessary and desirable.

Iji (2005) opines that the problem of these agencies in enforcing ethics and accountability is the value system of the Nigerian citizens, which is the get rich-quick syndrome. Because of this value system, these anti-corruption agencies are occupied by people with different personal values from those of the agencies.

Joseph (1987) observed that the current level of corruption in Nigeria started from minor unethical practices in the civil service, such as laziness, to full blown corruption such as embezzlement. The inability of the agencies to contain the unethical practices led

to coziness, collusion, and lack of accountability in the Nigeria Civil Service. These institutions suffer from jurisdictional problems and functional overlaps.

Without an organizational framework to coordinate and harmonize the activities of these agencies, each of them tries to register its presence in every case established. They see themselves as rivals instead of being coordinate. In so doing, they end up collecting their own share of the loots from corrupt officials in the civil service. In most cases, the corrupt officials go free since no agency may be prepared to pursue any case of corruption to its logical conclusion.

In other words, the establishment of the various anti-corruption institutions appears to be an expansion of the conduit pipes of corruption. This is because each institution has staff members whose values are different from those of the institution they serve.

2.4 Factors Responsible for Weak Accountability and Unethical Behaviour in Nigeria Civil Service

Unethical behavior in the civil service includes bribery and corruption, patronage, nepotism, conflict of interest, influence peddling, seeking pleasure by using one's official position, showing favour to relatives and friends, moonlighting, divided loyalty, slowness in discharging official duties, lateness, partiality, partisanship, absenteeism, insubordination, improper handling of government property, leaking or misusing official information and engaging in unauthorized activities.

Akinbuli (2013) identified four broad categories of the factors responsible for weak accountability and unethical behavior in the Nigeria Civil Service. These include economic, political, socio-cultural and institutional factors.

The economic factors include the high incidence of poverty, which has caused many civil servants to seek bribe. The emergence of economic crisis and the decline in real wage arising from certain economic reform measures, are among such economic factors.

The political factors that account for increase in unethical behavior among civil servants include lack of purposeful political leadership, excessive bureaucratization, as well as the politicization of the civil service. Certain socio-cultural considerations cited as potentially detrimental to ethical conduct in the civil service include tribalism and ethnic tendencies, which compete with loyalty to the nation. It is no longer news that, sometimes, relatives and friends put pressure on a civil servant to give preference to them in contravention of the existing rules and regulations guiding the civil service. Ineffective mechanisms for administrative control and monitoring of the daily performance and behavior of the civil servants also lead to increase in unethical behaviour and weak accountability. Besides, the multiplicity of control mechanisms, with the resultant overlap of functions, also lead to inefficiency. There is also the problem of inadequate funding of the agencies to effectively discharge their responsibilities (Ezeani, 2006).

Other institutional factors leading to weakness in accountability and increase in unethical behavior include over politicization of the civil service and other forms of interference (Ezeani, 2006). There is also the issue of lack of cooperation of the government agencies and officials expected to provide relevant information on the conduct of investigation.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research design adopted in this study is survey research design. This is the type of research design that studies the sampling of individual units from a population through the technique of survey data collection. Specifically, descriptive typology of survey research was adopted. This research design was adopted with a view to making statistical inferences about the population studied and the answers provided in the questionnaire.

3.2 Population of the Study

The population of this study consists of the entire staff of the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja. The total strength of the Ministry is 14, 887, made up of 10,073 senior staff and 4, 814 junior staff. (Min. of Defence, Abuja Nominal roll, 2018).

Table 1: Population Distribution

Category of staff	Number	Percentage
Senior	10,073	68%
Junior	4,814	32%

Total	14,887	100%
-------	--------	------

Source: Field survey 2020

3.3 Sample Size selection.

The population was too large to be used for analysis. Therefore, Taro Yamane formula was applied to get the sample size. Thus:

$$n = N / 1 + N(e)^2$$

where:

n= Sample size

N = Population size

e= significant level

1 = constant level for the purpose of the study.

Hence,

$$e = 5\%$$

$$= 5/100 = (0.05)^2$$

$$n = N / 1 + N(e)^2$$

$$= 14,887 / 1 + 14,887 (0.05)^2$$

$$= 14,887 / 1 + 14,887 (0.0025)$$

$$= 14,887 / 1 + 37.2175$$

$$= 14,887 / 38.2175$$

$$= 390$$

Therefore, the sample size is 390. Thus, the sample size for the study became 390 members of the population. This number was considered sufficient for the study since it was a random exercise on the entire population.

Table 2: Sample Size Distribution

Status of Staff	Number	Percentage
Senior	290	74%
Junior	100	26%
Total	390	100%

Source: Field Survey 2020 **3.6 Sampling Technique**

This study adopted purposive sampling technique in selecting the sample from the population. The Researcher interacted with the staff of the Ministry, to minimize sampling error. This proved effective as the respondents responded positively.

3.4 Sources of Data

The study depended on two major sources of data. They were primary and secondary data sources. The primary sources of data used in this study were data collected through the questionnaire, oral interview, focus group discussion guide.

The secondary sources of data used in this study included journals, text books, and internet materials sources.

3.5 Method of Data Collection

Data were collected using questionnaire. Structured questionnaire was used to collect data for the study. A list of questions that aided the research work was constructed and distributed to the selected respondents from the population, which they completed and returned to the researcher for collation and analysis. The questionnaire was specifically designed to guarantee easy analysis or assessment of the respondents.

3.6 Method of Data Analysis

The responses from the questionnaire were presented in tabular form and analyzed with simple percentages and Mean scores. Every questionnaire statement whose Mean score was 3.0 and above was accepted; otherwise, it was rejected. The formula for calculating Mean scores is as follows:

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

The returned copies of the questionnaire were organized, arranged and presented in tables to show absolute numbers and worked to the nearest decimal points as are shown in Chapter Four.

4.0 Data Analysis

4.1 Factors That Account For Unethical Behavior and Weak Accountability

Questionnaire statements 1 to 6 were designed to get responses on this issue from the respondents. Tables 9 – 14 below show the responses by the respondents on the matter.

Questionnaire Statement 1: Lack of effective monitoring of the staff leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability.

Table 4.1: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 1

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	59	18	295
2	A	118	36	472
3	N	79	24	327
4	D	46	14	92
5	SD	26	8	26
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1212$

Source: Field Survey, 2020.

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1212}{328} = 3.7$$

The above table shows that a total of 59 respondents (representing 18%) strongly agreed and another 118 respondents representing 36%, all together 54%, also agreed that lack of effective monitoring of the staff leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability. Only 72 respondents, representing 22%, disagreed. Since the mean score on this statement is more than 3.0 (3.7 precisely), the statement is accepted as true. This means that lack of effective monitoring of the staff leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability.

Questionnaire Statement 2: Weak institutional arrangement for enforcing ethical and accountability standards leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff

Table 4.2: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 2.

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	105	32	525

2	A	125	38	500
3	N	54	16	162
4	D	40	12	80
5	SD	4	2	2
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1269$

Source: Field survey 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1269}{328}$$

$$= 3.9$$

The table above shows that a total of 230 respondents (representing 70%) responded in the affirmative, while only 44 respondents (representing 14 %) responded in the negative. Since the Mean score on this statement is 3.9, which is above 3.00, we accept the statement that weak institutional arrangement for enforcing ethical and accountability standards leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff

Questionnaire Statement 3: Ignorance of the rules of conduct of the Civil Service leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff of the Ministry

Table 4.3: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 3.

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	26	8	130
2	A	33	10	132
3	N	112	34	336
4	D	9228	184	
5	SD	65	20	65
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=847$

Source: Field Survey, 2020.

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{847}{328}$$

$$= 2.6$$

Table 11 above shows that majority of the respondents, specifically 157 of them (representing 48%) did not accept that ignorance of the rules of conduct of the Civil Service leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff of the Ministry. Since the mean score on this statement is only 2.6, which is below 3.00, we reject the statement. In other words, ignorance of the rules of conduct of the Civil Service is not the reason for high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff of the Ministry. This suggests that many of them are not ignorant of the rules; yet they fail to comply.

Questionnaire Statement 4: Poor working conditions can lead to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff

Table 4.4: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 4.

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	72	22	360
2	A	112	34	448
3	N	65	20	195
4	D	46	14	92
5	SD	33	10	33
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1128$

Source: Field Survey, 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1128}{328}$$

$$= 3.4$$

Table 12 above shows that 72 respondents (representing 22%) strongly agreed, in addition to another 112 respondents (representing 34%) who equally agree, making a total of 56%, who acknowledged that poor working conditions can lead to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff. Only 79 respondents (representing 24%) disagreed with the view. Since the mean score on the statement is 3.4, which is above 3.00, the statement is accepted as true. This means that poor working conditions can lead to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff.

Questionnaire Statement 5: Lack of adequate training in ethical behavior and practice also leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among staff members

Table 4.5: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 5.

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	73	22.3	365
2	A	39	12	156
3	N	92	28	276
4	D	66	20	132
5	SD	58	17.7	58
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=987$

Source: Field Survey, 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{987}{328}$$

$$= 3.0$$

As shown in the table above, 112 respondents agreed with the statement that lack of adequate training in ethical behavior and practice also leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among staff members. Based on the fact that the mean score on the statement is 3.0, the statement is accepted. This implies that lack of adequate training in ethical behavior and practice also leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among staff members.

Questionnaire Statement 6: Miserable pay of the staff in view of the steep decline in real wages due to inflation leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among them.

Table 4.6: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 6.

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	112	34	560
2	A	151	46	604
3	N	33	10	99
4	D	6212		
5	SD	26 8	26	
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1310$

Source: Field Survey, 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1301}{328}$$

$$= 4.0$$

The table above shows that out of the 328 respondents used in the study, 253 of them (representing 80 %) accepted that miserable pay of the staff in view of the steep decline in real wages due to inflation leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among them. The mean score on the statement is 4.0, which is above 3.00. Therefore, the statement is accepted by the researcher to be true. This means that miserable pay of the staff in view of the steep decline in real wages due to inflation leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among them.

Table 4.7: Summary of calculated Mean Scores for Statements on Research Question One

S/N	Statement on Research Question One	$\sum f$	$\sum fx$	Mean score	Decision
1	Lack of effective monitoring of the staff leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability	328	1212	3.7	Accepted
2	Weak institutional arrangement for enforcing ethical and accountability standards leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff	328	1269	3.9	Accepted
3	Ignorance of the rules of conduct the civil service leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff of the Ministry	328	847	2.6	Rejected
4	Poor working conditions can lead to high rate of ethical violation and weak	328	1128	3.4	Accepted

	accountability among the staff				
5	Lack of adequate training in ethical behaviour and practice also leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among staff members	328	987	3.0	Accepted
6	Miserable pay of the staff in view of the steep decline in real wages due to inflation leads to high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among them	328	1301	4.0	Accepted

Source: Field Survey, 2020

From the pattern of responses calculated in mean scores and analyzed in Tables 9 to 14 of the foregoing, it is very clear that many factors account for unethical behavior and weak accountability in the civil service, with particular reference to the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja. Ignorance of the rules of conduct of the civil service is not an excuse for the high rate of ethical violation and weak accountability among the staff of the Ministry. Weak institutional arrangements for enforcing ethical and accountability standards, lack of effective monitoring of the staff, poor working conditions, and lack of adequate training in ethical behavior and accountability are strong factors that lead to the anomaly. Besides, the high rate of inflation and the steep decline in real wages of the staff equally lead to ethical violation and weak accountability among the civil servants, with particular reference to the staff members of the Ministry of Defence, Abuja.

4.2 Institutional Mechanisms for Enforcing and Monitoring Ethics and Accountability in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja

Questionnaire statements 7 to 12 were designed to get responses on this issue from the respondents. Tables 16 – 21 below show the responses by the respondents on the matter.

Questionnaire Statement 7: There are anti-graft institutions set up to fight corrupt behavior among civil servants in Nigeria

Table 4.8: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 7.

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	144	44	720
2	A	126	38	504
3	N	33	10	99
4	D	19	6	38
5	SD	6	2	6
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1,367$

Source: Field Survey, 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1,367}{328}$$

$$= 4.2$$

Table 16 above shows that only 25 respondents (representing 8 %) out of the 328 sampled population did not agree that there are anti-graft institutions set up to fight corrupt behavior among civil servants in Nigeria. A total of 270 respondents (representing 82%) confirmed that the statement is true. Since the mean score on the statement is 4.2, the statement is accepted as true, because

the score is above 3.00. In other words, there are anti-graft institutions set up to fight corrupt behavior among civil servants in Nigeria

Questionnaire Statement 8: Multiplicity of control mechanisms with resultant overlap functions leads to increased unethical practices among civil servants in Nigeria

Table 4.9: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 8.

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	138	42	552
2	A	11836		472
3	N	3912117		
4	D	2	8	52
5	SD	727		
	TOTAL	$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1,200$

Source: Field Survey, 2020.

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1200}{328}$$

$$= 3.7$$

$$= 3.7$$

In table 17, a total of 256 respondents (representing 78 %) are of the opinion that multiplicity of control mechanisms with resultant overlap functions lead to increased unethical practices among civil servants in Nigeria. The mean score on the statement is 3.7. Therefore, we accept the statement as true. This implies that multiplicity of control mechanisms with resultant overlap functions leads to increased unethical practices among civil servants in Nigeria.

Questionnaire Statement 9: Lack of sufficient autonomy from the executive organ of the government to be able to carry out their duties independently is a challenge facing anti-graft institutions in Nigeria

Table 4.10: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 9.

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	125	38	625
2	A	131	40	524
3	N	4614	138	
4	D	26	8	52
5	SD	00	0	
	TOTAL	$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1,339$

Source: Field Survey, 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1,339}{328}$$

$$= 4.1$$

As shown in the table above, only 26 respondents (representing 8 %) out of the 328 respondents used in the study did not accept that lack of sufficient autonomy from the executive organ of the government to be able to carry out their duties independently is a challenge facing anti-graft institutions in Nigeria. But 256 respondents (representing 78 %) affirmed that the statement is true. The mean score on the statement is 4.1, which is above 3.00. Therefore, the researcher accepted the statement as true. This means that lack of sufficient autonomy from the executive organ of the government to be able to carry out their duties independently is a challenge facing anti-graft institutions in Nigeria.

Questionnaire Statement 10: Lack of cooperation from government agencies and officials that are expected to provide information in the conduct of investigation militate against the efficiency of anti-graft institutions in Nigeria.

Table 4.11: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 10.

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	0	0	0
2	A	20680		
3	N	46	14	138
4	D	26	8	52
5	SD	23672	236	
	TOTAL	$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=506$

Source: Field Survey, 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{506}{328}$$

$$= 1.5$$

The table above shows that only 20 respondents (constituting 6 %) are of the opinion that lack of cooperation from government agencies and officials that are expected to provide information in the conduct of investigation does not militate against the efficiency of anti-graft institutions in Nigeria. A total of 262 respondents (representing 80 %) disagreed, and said that lack of cooperation from government agencies and officials that are expected to provide information in the conduct of investigation does not militate against the efficiency of anti-graft institutions in Nigeria. The mean score on the statement is only 1.5, far below 3.00. Therefore, the researcher rejected the statement. This means that lack of cooperation from government agencies and officials that are expected to provide information in the conduct of investigation has not militated against the efficiency of anti-graft institutions in Nigeria. In other words, even when necessary information is provided by relevant agencies, the efficiency of the agencies is not guaranteed.

Questionnaire Statement 11: There is lack of organizational framework to coordinate and harmonize the activities of the anti-graft institutions in Nigeria.

Table 4.12: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 11.

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Fx
-----	------------------------	---------------	----------------	----

1	SA	157	48	785
2	A	116	34	464
3	N	26	8	78
4	D	0	0	0
5	SD	29	10	29
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1,356$

Source: Field Survey, 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1,356}{328}$$

$$= 4.1$$

In table 20, a total of 273 respondents (representing 82 %) agreed with the statement that there is lack of organizational framework to coordinate and harmonize the activities of the anti-graft institutions in Nigeria. The mean score is 4.1, which is above 3.00. We, therefore, accept the statement as true, implying that there is lack of organizational framework to coordinate and harmonize the activities of the anti-graft institutions in Nigeria.

Questionnaire Statement 12: There is lack of commitment to sustain the institutions created in Nigeria for monitoring and enforcement of ethics and accountability in the civil service

Table 4.13: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 12

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	0	0	0
2	A	20	6	80
3	N	46	14	138
4	D	26	8	52
5	SD	236	72	236
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=506$

Source: Field Survey, 2020.

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{506}{328}$$

$$= 1.5$$

The table above shows that only 20 respondents (constituting 6 %) are of the opinion that there is lack of commitment to sustain the institutions created in Nigeria for monitoring and enforcement of ethics and accountability in the civil service. A total of 262 respondents (representing 80 %) disagreed, and said that there is no lack of commitment to sustain the institutions created in Nigeria for monitoring and enforcement of ethics and accountability in the civil service. The mean score on the statement is only

1.5, far below 3.00. Therefore, the researcher rejected the statement. This means that there is no lack of commitment to sustain the institutions created in Nigeria for monitoring and enforcement of ethics and accountability in the civil service. In other words, even when there is commitment to sustain the institutions created in Nigeria for monitoring and enforcement of ethics and accountability in the civil service, the efficiency of the agencies is still illusive.

Table 4.14: Summary of calculated Mean Scores for Statements on Research Question Two

S/N	Statement on Research Question Two	Σf	Σfx	Mean score	Decision
7	There are anti-graft institutions setup to fight corrupt behavior among civil servant in Nigeria	328	1367	4.2	Accepted
8	Multiplicity of control mechanisms with resultant overlap functions leads to increased unethical practices among civil servants in Nigeria	328	1200	3.7	Accepted
9	Lack of sufficient autonomy from the executive organ of government to be able to carry out their duties independently is a challenge facing anti-graft institutions in Nigeria	328	1339	4.1	Accepted
10	Lack of cooperation from government agencies and officials that are expected to provide information in the conduct of investigation militate against the efficiency of anti-graft institutions in Nigeria	328	506	1.5	Rejected
11	There is lack of organizational framework to coordinate and harmonize the activities of anti-graft institutions in Nigeria	328	1356	4.1	Accepted
12	There is lack of commitment to sustain the institutions created in Nigeria for monitoring and enforcement of ethics and accountability in the civil service	328	506	1.5	Rejected

Source: Field Survey, 2020

From the pattern of responses calculated in mean scores and analyzed in Tables 15 to 20 in the foregoing, it is very clear that there are many institutional mechanisms for enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability in the Nigeria civil service. However, the multiplicity of the institutions has led to overlap functions, paving way for increased unethical practices among the civil servants. Lack of sufficient autonomy from the executive arm of the government, and lack of organizational framework to coordinate and harmonize their activities constitute cogs in the wheel of progress. Furthermore, the findings from the respondents suggested that there is no lack of commitment to sustain the institutions. There is equally no lack of cooperation from government agencies and officials expected to provide information in the conduct of investigation.

4.3 Measures adopted to ensure ethics and accountability are duly observed in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja.

Questionnaire statements 13 to 18 are designed to get responses on this issue from the respondents. Tables 23 – 28 below contain the responses by the respondents on the matter.

Questionnaire Statement 13: To ensure accountability among public servants, regulatory mechanisms such as the Constitution and Public Service Rules have been put in place in Nigeria.

Table 4.15: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 13

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	151	46	755
2	A	125	38	500
3	N	39	12	117
4	D	13	4	26
5	SD	0	0	0
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1398$

Source: Field Survey 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1398}{328}$$

$$= 4.3$$

Table 23 above shows that 276 respondents (representing 84 %) confirmed that, to ensure accountability among public servants, regulatory mechanisms such as the Constitution and Public Service Rules, have been put in place in Nigeria. Since the mean score of the statement is 4.3, we accept the statement as true. This means that, to ensure accountability among public servants, regulatory mechanisms such as the Constitution and Public Service Rules have been put in place in Nigeria.

Questionnaire Statement 14: As a foundation of public accountability, the civil servants in Nigeria are aware of the basic ethical principles and standards they are expected to apply to their work

Table 4.16: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 14

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	184	56	920
2	A	98	30	392
3	N	46	14	138
4	D	0	0	0
5	SD	0	0	0
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1450$

Source: Field Survey 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1450}{328}$$

$$= 4.4$$

In table 24 above, a total of 282 respondents (signifying 86 %) believe that, as a foundation of public accountability, the civil servants in Nigeria are aware of the basic ethical principles and standards they are expected to apply to their work. Going by the mean score on the statement, which is 4.4, we accept the statement as true. This means that, as a foundation of public accountability, the civil servants in Nigeria are aware of the basic ethical principles and standards they are expected to apply to their work.

Questionnaire Statement 15: Anti-graft institutions and agencies in Nigeria have been set up to fight unethical and corrupt behavior among public servants

Table 4.17: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 15

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	151	46	755
2	A	157	48	628
3	N	0	0	0
4	D	13	4	26
5	SD	7	2	7
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1416$

Source: Field Survey 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1416}{328}$$

$$= 4.3$$

The data displayed in table 25 above reveals that 308 respondents (signifying 94 %) believe that anti-graft institutions and agencies in Nigeria have been set up to fight unethical and corrupt behavior among public servants. Based on the mean score of the statement, which is 4.3, the statement is accepted as true. This implies that anti-graft institutions and agencies in Nigeria have been set up to fight unethical and corrupt behavior among public servants.

Questionnaire Statement 16: Stiff penalties have been imposed on those found to be involved in unethical behavior and weak accountability among public servants in Nigeria

Table 4.18: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 16

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	177	54	885
2	A	125	38	500
3	N	7	2	21
4	D	19	6	38
5	SD	0	0	0
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1444$

Source: Field Survey, 2020

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1444}{328}$$

= 4.4

Based on the data displayed in table 26 above, only 19 respondents (representing 6 %) did not believe that stiff penalties have been imposed on those found to be involved in unethical behavior and weak accountability among public servants in Nigeria. But 302 respondents (constituting 92 %) believed so. Since the means score on the statement is 4.4, we accept the statement as true, meaning that stiff penalties have been imposed on those found to be involved in unethical behavior and weak accountability among public servants in Nigeria.

Questionnaire Statement 17: The Code of Conduct Bureau is empowered to scrutinize the declaration of assets by public officials, and examine the declarations in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Conduct Law

Table 4.19: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 17

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Fx
1	SA	13842	552	
2	A	118	36472	
3	N	3912		117
4	D	26	8	52
5	SD	72	7	
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	100	$\sum fx=1200$

Source: Field Survey, 2020.

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1200}{328}$$

$$= 3.7$$

In table 27, a total of 256 respondents (representing 78 %) are of the opinion that the Code of Conduct Bureau is empowered to scrutinize the declaration of assets by public officials, and examine the declarations in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Conduct Law. The mean score on the statement is 3.7. Therefore, we accept the statement as true. This implies that the Code of Conduct Bureau is empowered to scrutinize the declaration of assets by public officials, and examine the declarations in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Conduct Law.

Questionnaire Statement 18: Lack of sufficient autonomy from the executive organ of the government to be able to carry out their duties independently is a challenge facing anti-graft institutions in Nigeria

Table 4.20: Calculation of Mean scores for questionnaire Statement 18

S/N	Level of Agreement (x)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	fx
1	SA	12538625		
2	A	13140524		
3	N	4614	138	
4	D	26	852	

5	SD	00	0
TOTAL		$\sum f=328$	$\sum fx=1,339$

Source: Field Survey, 2020.

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$$

$$= \frac{1,339}{328}$$

$$= 4.1$$

As shown in the table above, only 26 respondents (representing 8 %) out of the 328 respondents used in the study did not accept that the Code of Conduct Bureau is empowered to scrutinize the declaration of assets by public officials, and examine the declarations in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Conduct Law. But 256 respondents (representing 78 %) affirmed that the statement is true. The mean score on the statement is 4.1, which is above 3.00. Therefore, the researcher accepted the statement as true. This means that the Code of Conduct Bureau is empowered to scrutinize the declaration of assets by public officials, and examine the declarations in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Conduct Law.

Table 4.21: Summary of calculated Mean Scores for Statements on Research Question Three

S/N	Statement on Research Question Three	$\sum f$	$\sum fx$	Mean score	Decision
13	To ensure accountability among public servants, regulatory mechanisms such as Constitution and Public Service Rules have been put in place in Nigeria	328	1398	4.3	Accepted
14	As a foundation of public accountability, the civil servants in Nigeria are aware of the basic ethical principles and standards they are expected to apply to their work	328	1450	4.4	Accepted
15	Anti-graft institutions and agencies in Nigeria have been set up to fight unethical and corrupt behaviour among public servants	328	1416	4.3	Accepted
16	Stiff penalties have been imposed on those found to be involved in unethical behaviour and weak accountability among public servants in Nigeria	328	1444	4.4	Accepted
17	The Code of Conduct Bureau is empowered to scrutinize the declaration of assets by public officials, and examine the declarations in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Conduct Law	328	1200	3.7	Accepted
18	The Budget Monitoring and Price Intelligence Unit, otherwise known as “Due Process Unit”, has been established to enforce ethical standards in government activities to ensure transparency and	328	1339	4.1	Accepted

	proper scrutiny of government expenditure to avoid wastage	
--	--	--

Source: Field Survey, 2020

From the pattern of responses calculated in mean scores and analyzed in Tables 23 to 28 in the foregoing, it is very clear that measures have been put in place to ensure that ethics and accountability are duly observed in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja, and, by extension, in the Nigerian Civil Service generally. These include such regulatory mechanisms such as the National Constitution and the Public Service Rules. The civil servants are aware of these basic ethical principles and standards which they are expected to apply to their works. In addition, the anti-graft agencies have been established to fight unethical and corrupt behavior among the staff. Furthermore, stiff penalties have been imposed on those found to be involved in unethical behavior and weak accountability among civil servants in Nigeria.

5.1 Findings

1. There were cases of unethical behaviour and weak accountability in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja. The study discovered that many factors account for this anomaly, among which are: ignorance of the rules of conduct of the civil service, weak institutional arrangements for enforcing ethical and accountability standards, lack of effective monitoring of the staff, lack of adequate training in ethical behavior and practice, among others.
2. The study revealed that there were institutional mechanisms for enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja. There anti-graft institutions EFCC, CCB, BMPIU, PCC, PAC, among others. But it was discovered that the multiplicity of control mechanisms with resultant overlap functions have led to increased unethical practices and weak accountability among the staff. Besides, lack of sufficient autonomy from the executive organ of government to enable them to carry out their duties independently has hindered their effectiveness. Above all, there is lack of organizational framework to coordinate and harmonize their activities.
3. Finally, the study revealed that several measures have been adopted to ensure that ethics and accountability are duly observed in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja. These include such regulatory mechanisms such as the National Constitution and the Public Service Rules. Civil servants are aware of these basic ethical principles and standards which they are expected to apply to their works. In addition, the anti-graft agencies have been established to fight unethical and corrupt practices among the staff. Furthermore, stiff penalties have been imposed on those found to be involved in unethical practices and weak accountability among civil servants in Nigeria.

5.2 Conclusion

Based on the above findings of the study, the researcher concluded that, in spite of the institutional mechanisms for enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja, and despite the measures adopted to ensure that ethics and accountability are duly observed in the Ministry, unethical behavior and weak accountability are still prevalent among the civil servants in the Ministry. The problem is not based on the ignorance of the rules of conduct of the civil service, poor working conditions, the wages and salaries paid to the staff. In fact, establishing more institutions to fight corruption and unethical behavior will not even be able to arrest the situation. The problem is the value system of the average Nigerian, which is to get rich quickly. These anti-graft agencies are also occupied by people whose values are different from those of the institutions.

5.3 Recommendations

1. Factors that create opportunities for unethical behavior and weak accountability should be addressed in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja. There should be regular and adequate training of all categories of the staff in ethical behavior and practice. There should also be effective monitoring of the staff as well as improvement in the institutional arrangements for enforcing ethics and accountability standards in the Ministry.
2. All the institutional mechanisms for enforcing and monitoring ethics and accountability in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja, should be enhanced to perform more efficiently. The multiplicity of control mechanisms with the resultant overlap functions should be reviewed. The institutions should be given sufficient autonomy to carry out their duties independently without undue interference from the executive organ of government. Above all, necessary organizational framework to coordinate and harmonize the activities of the anti-graft agencies should be put in place.
3. Finally, Government should ensure that effective measures are adopted so that ethics and accountability should be duly observed in the Federal Ministry of Defence, Abuja. Administrative procedures that cause delay and frustrations in obtaining decisions and services on time, which partially encourages bribery and corruption at the point of service delivery, should be eliminated. Similarly, systems and procedures should be simplified in order to remove the unnecessary blockages in organizational systems that create opportunities for bribes to be extracted from members of the public.

References

- Abhuere, H. U. (2000). Governance and Accountability in Nigeria, Ibadan: Daily Graphics (Nigeria) Limited.
- Abdullahi, M. (2013). Ethics and Accountability in Nigeria Public Service: Its Collapse and the Way Forward. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 3(7), 258-264.
- Akinbuli, S.F. (2013). An Assessment of Accountability in the Public Sector in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 14(21): 181-186.
- Anger, B. (2002). Ethical Problems in Nigeria's Democratic Experiment: A Critical Analysis: *African Journal of Economy and Society*. (4) 2. 47-59.
- Adebayo, A.O. (2014). Ethical Issues in Public Service: *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity*, (4) 5. 321-330.
- Bass B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance*. N.Y.: Free Press Ltd.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to share the vision, *Organizational Dynamics*, (8) 5. 19-32.
- Boddy, D., 2008. *Management: An Introduction* (4th Ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education Limited.
- Bottomorff, J.A. (1997). *Ethics for Life: An Interdisciplinary and Multicultural Introduction*. California. May Field Publishing Company.
- Burn, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Broad, C B. (1971). *Governing Nigeria: History, Problems and Prospects*. Lagos Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Chapman, A.O. (1988). Public Sector and Corruption in Nigeria: An Ethical and Institutional Framework of Analysis Research. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 12(2): 181-186.
- Ede, M.S. (2007). Public Service Ethics and the Fight Against Corruption in Nigeria: A Critical Analysis. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management*. Vol.6, P. 134-141.
- Emmanuel, S. S. (2017). Ethical Leadership in South Africa and Botswana. *BAR*, Rio de Janeiro, (14) 2.
- Ezeani, F.N. (2006). *Fundamentals of Public Administration*, Enugu: Snap Press Ltd.
- Ejiofor, P.N.O. (1987). *Management in Nigeria: Theory and Issues*. Benin: Africana- Fep Publishers Ltd.
- Edozien (2009). Governing Nigeria: Problems and Challenges. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 14(3): 111-119.
- Encyclopedia Britannica (2002). New York. Harper and Row.
- Encarta World English Dictionary (1999). New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Eagle Wood Cliffs.
- Gazalic, D.E. (2008). Ethical Issues and Nigeria's Quest for Development. *Journal of Poverty, Investment and Development: Journal of Social Sciences*. 14(1): 81-86.
- Goodnight, R. (2011). *Encyclopedia of Leadership*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Hornby, W. S. (2000). Responsible Leadership and Accountability in Africa, (IJRAOB), 2(2), pp. 734 – 751.
- Iji, E.P. (2005). Ethics and Accountability in Nigerian Civil Service: Problems and Prospects. *NAPSS Journal of Politics and International Relations* (1) 4.
- Immanuel Kant (1788). *Deontological Ethics*. New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Eagle Wood Cliffs.
- Joseph, R.A. (1987). *Democracy and Prebendal Politics in Nigeria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mullin, A.P.(1999). Transparency and Good Governance under the 1999 Constitution. A Paper Presented at the National Conference on Issues in the 1999 Constitution held at Abuja 26th -28th October.
- Normanlon, C.E. (1966). *Path to Nigerian Development*, New Delhi: Standard Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Mutafa, R.C. (1997). Prebendalism as the Albatross to Democratic Practice and National Development in Nigeria A Critical Discourse. *Journal of Policy and Development Studies* (9) 4, p 18.
- Obasi, I.N. (1999). *Research Methodology in Political Science*, Ibadan: Daily Graphics (Nigeria) Limited.
- Odigbo, P.C. (2015). *Accountability in Nigerian Public Service: A Societal Responsibility Perspective*: Lagos, Global Academic Publishers Ltd. Okigbo, C.N. (2000). *Research and Statistics in Education, Management and Social Sciences*, Owerri: Mason Printers and Publishers.
- Olaopa, B. (2000). *Transparency, Accountability and Good Governance*, Tokyo: McGraw – Hill Kogakusha Ltd.
- Okafor, N. (2005). *Challenges in Ethics and Accountability in Nigerian Civil Service*, Ibadan: Daily Graphics (Nigeria) Limited.
- Paretomode, V.F. (2012). *Theories of Management: Implications for Public Administration in Nigeria*. Benin City: Justice Jeco Printing & Publishing Global.
- Pollitt, C. (2003). *The Essential Public Manager: Public Policy and Management*. UK: Open University Press, MacGraw –Hill Education.

- Oyido, R.G. (2008). Ethics and Accountability in Governance. Tokyo: McGraw – Hill Kogakusha Ltd. Pepple, M.B. (2008). Ethics and Accountability in Public Service in Nigeria: The Obligation Theory Perspective. IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (19) 3, p37-51.
- Rohr, T.J. (1976). Philosophy, Democracy and Responsible Governance in Africa, London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Tijjani, R.W. (2000). Practical and Theoretical Problems in Emergence of Responsible Government in Africa, Kaduna: Salmora Ventures Ltd.
- Yamani, T. (1964). Statistics: An Introductory Analysis, New York: Harper and Row Publishers. Thompson, T.O. (1985). Understanding Public Policy. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc. Wey, V.F.(1971). Administration and Public Affairs. New Jersey: Engel Wood Cliff.
- Whiting, G.N. (2002); Contemporary Public Administration. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Webster's Dictionary (2011) New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Eagle Wood Cliffs.
- Yayale, D.(2007). The Trouble with Nigeria. Tokyo: McGraw – Hill Kogakusha Ltd.