

Review of: "Why Corruption in Nigeria? Experts' Accounts on the Occurrences and Persistence"

Simon Norton¹

¹ Cardiff University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract.

The abstract needs to be rewritten. It succeeds in identifying the core issues to be addressed, particularly the reasons for corruption in Nigeria, but it also briefly mentions methodology- interviews- which should not be included here. The abstract should 'delve deeper', for example by indicating that corruption as a phenomenon common to developing countries will be discussed, and then contextualised for Nigeria. At present the abstract, whilst good in places, tends to wander and lack focus.

Introduction.

The introduction contains excellent information regarding Nigeria and there are useful statistics provided. But this information should be provided in a separate section dedicated to Nigeria and the nature of the problem. This information does not belong here.

The research questions need to be revisited. One of these is 'Why corruption in Nigeria?'. This is not a question and does not make sense. The author needs to place Nigerian corruption in the wider context of the phenomenon in developing countries generally. What are the similarities, what are the differences, and what are the remedial measures which are being implemented by the government? There also need to be more citations in the introduction- at present they are not enough.

Literature review.

This is good and helps develop a sense of direction. There are useful citations, but they are out of date- there is considerably more updated material available which a Google Scholar search will reveal. The discussion of the colonial background is good, but again should be relocated to a section on Nigeria, and the historical context and how this has affected the rise of corruption. Instead, use this to discuss the wider literature regarding corruption in developing countries, including its different forms, sources, and destination of illegal proceeds. There is no discussion of this wider context- it must be included in depth.

Methodology.

This is acceptable but move information from the abstract to this location. Also, there needs to be citations in support of

the chosen methodology. This section is presently too brief.

Data analysis.

This should be preceded by a section on the specific Nigerian context, including history, governance, and how the political structure of the country affects the propensity for corrupt practices. There is a very limited sense of history in this paper, and it is weakened by this. This paper is about corruption in Nigeria, but there is no in-depth discussion of the applicable laws, or critique of these. This is a material omission from the paper.

Figure 0 should be figure 1: it is well presented and useful. The discussion of each theme which follows is excellent: this is your original contribution (remember, you need to identify the gap in the literature much earlier in your paper).

Your use of quotes in this part of the paper is excellent: good, original qualitative data.

Subsequent figures are excellent: original and well -presented. Again, your discussion in the form of addressing each theme is excellent.

Conclusion. This is too short. It does not adequately revisit and answer the research questions. There is no reference to the literature. There are no recommendations of depth here. No contextualising of Nigerian corruption within the wider literature. This part of your paper needs to be at least three times the length.