

Full Length Research Article

Measuring knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty A case study of non-political office holder and political office holders in Ibadan metropolis

***Solomon Ojo Ph.D**

Department of sociology, psychology and environmental management, Lead city university, Ibadan, Oyo state, Nigeria *Corresponding author: solojoe2004@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study was set to examine knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty. The study was actually targeted at political-office holders and non-political officers, in order to possibly investigate any difference in their knowledge of the relationship between corruption and poverty. This study was informed on the revelation of the increasing like Nigeria while at the same time, corruption and other forms of economic and financial crimes have been on the increase. Basically, this study was a survey, which adopted ex-post facto design. A total number of 292 of participants (i.e. both the political office holders and non-political office holders) took part in the study. The participants generally were made up 133(45.2%) males and 161(54.8%) females, with a mean age of 43.39(509.80) collection. Both the Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed for data analysis. The results revealed that non-political office holders reported significantly higher on overall knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty ($t(292) = -3.04, p < .01$). However the results showed that there was no significant difference between political office holder and non-political office holders on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by diverting resources and benefits towards the rich and away from the poor ($t(292) = 14, p > .05$); that corruption disturbs the patterns of public spending and investment by encouraging large capital intensive project to maximize bride receipt ($t(292) = -.08, p > .05$); that corruption reduces tax revenues to government and thus a reduction in public services that benefit the poor ($t(292) = -1.08, p > .05$); that corruption undermines social and political stability with consequences that leave poor people more insecure ($t(292) = .09, p > .05$); that corruption reduces economic growth and thereby the opportunities for the poor to escape from poverty ($t(292) = .79, p > .05$); that corruption perpetuates social exclusion and prevents the poor from acquiring the capacity to challenge inequality of resources ($t(292) = .20, p > .05$). the results showed further that non-political office holders reported significantly higher on knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty by imposing an additional unofficial tax, which the poor are least able to pay ($t(292) = -3.81, p < .01$); and by depriving the poor of their legal rights and entitlement ($t(292) = -3.51, p < .01$). The results of the study were adequately discussed, in relation to the relevant related studies. It was then emphasized that the issue of conception is real and is even endemic in the country and as such all efforts should be geared towards eradicating all forms of corruption. And also, political office holders should be made to know the negative implications of every form of corruption practices they are involved in.

Key words: Knowledge, Corruption, Poverty, Political office holders, Non-political office holders.

INTRODUCTION

One particular ill that has been much recognized in Nigeria and other countries of the world is corruption. Corruption has been identified in every facet of the society in the country. Essentially, it is observed that there are many unresolved problems in Nigeria, but the issue of the upsurge of corruption is troubling. And the damages it has done to the policy are astronomical. The menace of corruption leads to slow movement of files in offices, police extortion tollgates and slow traffics on the highways, port congestion, queues at passport offices and gas stations, ghost workers syndrome, election irregularities, among others (Dike, 2005). Dike notes further that corruption is the bane of Nigeria and that even the mad people on the street recognize the havoc caused by corruption, in which the funds allocated for their welfare disappear into the air. Corruption is said to cut across faiths, religious,

denominations and political systems and affects both young and kid, man and woman alike. Corruption is found in democratic and dictatorial politics, feudal, capitalist and socialist economies. Christians, Muslims, Hindu, and Buddhist cultures are equally bedevilled by corruption. And corrupt practices did not begin today; the history is as old as the world. Ancient civilizations have traces of widespread illegality and corruption. Thus corruption has been ubiquitous in complex societies from ancient Egypt, Israel, and Rome, Greece down to the present (Lipset and Lenz, 2000 cited in Dike, 2005). Very clearly, it is established that since corruption is not new, and since it is a global phenomenon, then it is not peculiar to Nigeria (and in many other African and Asian nations); the leaders as well as the followers are corrupt. Consequently, it has defied all the necessary medicine (Dike, 2005). A number of definitions have been adduced to corruption. For example, a widely accepted definition of corruption

as used by the World Bank and the international Monetary Funds is the abuse of public roles or resources for privates' benefit. More narrowly construed, corruption for any services rendered whether such services are directed towards achieving a business advantages or personal gain. Demanding bribes in exchanges for tax incentives or to obtain government contracts are included in this definition of corruption. (http://articles.directory/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-800123.html). Sen (1999 cited in Dike, 2005) sees corruption or corrupt behaviours as the violation of established rules for personal gain and profit. Similarly, Lipset and Lenz (2000 cited in Dike, 2005) see corruption as efforts to secure wealth of power through illegal means for private gain at public expenses or a misuse of public power for private benefit. This particular definition provided by Lipset and Lenz is very much related to the focus of this study, which is meant to understand knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty among ordinary citizens and politicians. This is observed since where there is securing of wealth for private gains at the public expense, then the public or masses would be made to pay for it by way of poverty, or better still, poverty growth among the public. However, another definition has also been noted. This is taken from the view of Nye (1967 cited in Dike, 2005).

Accordingly, Nye sees corruption as a behaviour which deviates from the formal duties of a public role, because of private (gains) regarding personal, close family, private clique, pecuniary or status gains. It is a behaviour which violates rules against the exercise of certain types of (duties) for private (gains) regarding influences. In a sense, this definition includes such behaviour as bribery (use of a person in a position of trust), nepotism (bestowal of patronage by reason of inscriptive relationship rather than merit), and misappropriation (illegal appropriation of public resources for private uses (Banfield, 1961 cited in Dike, 2005)). And in line with this definition, Osoba (1996 cited in Dike, 2005) notes that corruption is an anti social behaviour conferring improper benefits contrary to legal and moral norms, and which undermine the authorities to improve the living condition of the people. A widely accepted definition of corruption as used by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund is the abuse of public roles or resources for private benefit. More narrowly construed, corruption is the bribery of government officials for any service rendered whether such services are directed towards activities a business advantages or personal gain. Demanding bribes in exchanges for tax incentive or to obtain government contracts are included in this definition of corruption

(http://articles.directory/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-800123.html). Very essentially, corruption has been variously linked with poverty. It is noted that despite a considerable increase in economic growth in developing countries, presently 1.3 billion people live on less than \$1 a day. Many reasons can account for the discrepancy in economic growth and the reduction of poverty. In line with thus, corruption impedes economic

growth by creating income inequality, perpetuating unfair asserts distribution, deterring private investment and foreign direct investment, and resulting in poor allocation of government expenditures (http://articles.directory/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-800123.html). Based on the link between corruption and income inequality, the research conducted by the IMF, provides the earliest evidence of the correlation between high rates of corruption and income inequality. According, the study reveals that an increase in the corruption index is tied to a substantial increase in income inequality. Specifically, the study shows that a worsening in the corruption index in one country by the standard deviation of 2.25 points is associated with an increase in the Gini coefficient by 4.4 points. Furthermore, the study concludes that corruption causes income inequality and not the other way round

(http://articles.directory/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-800123.html). Similarly, based on the link between corruption and asset distribution, studies also reveal that unequal asset distribution perpetuates income inequality and exacerbates poverty by decreasing economic growth. Birdsall and Lonono (cited in http://articles.directory/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-800123.html) argue that unequal asset distribution is a significant cause of poverty. When assets are concentrated with a small group of well connected elite members, these wealthy asset owners lobby the government for preferential treatment with respect to favourable trade policies, tax breaks, exchange rates and government spending. These policies will yield high returns for wealthy owners and minimal returns for the less well connected thereby increasing income inequality (http://articles.directory/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-800123.html). In the same vein, studies reveal that corruption increases unequal asset distribution. Furthermore, in a society where corruption is low, a multitude of other factors including the increased transparency of government action and market forces affect the direction of government policies. Evidence also suggests that efforts to alleviate poverty will be significantly more effective in societies that have equal asset distribution patterns.

In a clearer term, unequal asset distribution limits the poor in their ability to borrow money and increase their life time income (http://articles.directory/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-800123.html). In another vein, corruption has also been linked up with poor allocation of government expenditure (public investment). In line with this, it is observed that corruption impedes economic growth by distorting government expenditure and the allocation of government resources. Very clearly, corruption tends to divert public funds to areas that are not related to social welfare. Accordingly, ranking projects based on social values differ from ranking projects based on corrupt payments and as such, under the latter circumstances, only the government officials and the recipient of the funds will benefit from these expenditures. However, evidence

also suggests that lower rates of corruption will lead to higher public investment in projects relating to social welfare

(http://articles.directorym/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-&800123.html). Further, corruption has been linked with biased tax system. With this, finding show that corruption leads to poor tax administration and biased tax system. Tax exemptions are regularly extended to the well connected and wealthy sector of the population who can pay bribes in exchanges for tax benefits. Preferential tax exemptions are not based on any other factors and are arbitrarily provided to people based solely on the level of connection recipient has to the government and on the bribe the recipient is able to pay. This results in the loss of progressivity in the tax system which increases income inequality because the poor will pay a higher portion of their income in taxes than the wealthier individuals. In line with this, studies show that high rates of corruption lead to a lower tax revenue and reduces available government funds to provide for public services including education and health services

(http://articles.directorym/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-&800123.html). The role of corruption on unequal distribution of risk has also been emphasized. It is emphasized that where regulations are unclear and bias towards the well-connected, corruption can impose greater risks on the poor with respect to their investment in any of their resources such as human, land, capital or physical. Accordingly, studies reveal that, in societies where corruption is high, the poor alone experience a heightened risk associated with any investment. These risks discriminate against the poor and are not anticipated by the well connected who can expect to enjoy high returns on their investment. This phenomenon perpetuates income inequality because the poor are discouraged from investing in any resources (http://articles.directorym/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-&800123.html). In another vein, corruption has also been linked with destroying elements necessary for economic growth; deterring foreign direct investment decreasing private investments, etc (http://articles.directorym/Does_Corruption_Cause_Poverty-&800123.html).

The most unfortunate aspect of corruption for Nigeria is that it has taught Nigerians a dangerous and wrong lesson that is does not pay to be honest, hardworking and law abiding. Through corrupt means, many political office holders acquire wealth and properties in and outside Nigeria, and many display their wealth (which is beyond the means), but the society does not blink. This has made politics a big business in Nigeria, because anything spent to secure a political office is regarded as an investment, which matures immediately one gets into office (The Guardian, July 14, 2002 cited in Dike, 2005). Corruption wastes skills as precious time is often wasted to set up unending committee to fight corruption, and to monitor public projects. It also leads to aid forgone. Some foreign donors do not give out to corrupt nations, for instance, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) has withdrawn development

support from some nations that are notoriously corrupt. And the World Bank has introduced tougher anti-corruption countries. Similarly, other organizations such as the Council of European and the Organization of American states are taking tough measures against international corruption (OECD, December, 1997 cited in Dike, 2005). In any case, this study has shown a number of issues raised by scholars as regards to corruption. In essence, corruption is real, particularly here in Nigeria. However the major aim of this study was to examine levels of understanding of knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty among non political office holders and political office holders. It is hoped that this study will empirically reveal extent of knowledge of the relationship between corruption and poverty. This study was really informed on the need to know if there would be significant difference between non-political office holders and political office holders on knowledge of the relationship between corruption and poverty in Nigeria. It is expected that the findings of this study would contribute empirically based findings in relation to the knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty among politicians and non-politicians. It is therefore hypothesized that there would be significant difference between political office holders and non political office holders on overall knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty. It was also hypothesized that there would be significant difference between political office holders and non political office holders on different specific knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty.

METHOD

Design

The study was a survey, which was made, to adopt ex-post facto design. The major independent variable was category of individual, which was a categorized into non political office holders and political office holders. The other independent variables considered in the study were gender and age. The Dependent variable was knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty.

Setting

The study was conducted within Ibadan metropolis. Certain areas within Ibadan metropolis were identified for data collection. These locations were Ibadan North West Local Government Area; Ibadan North East Local Government Area; Ibadan South West Local Government; Ibadan South East Local Area and Ibadan North Local Government Area. In all five, (5) Local Government Areas within Ibadan metropolis were approached and used for the study. The participants (ordinary citizens and political office holders) were drawn randomly across the selected local government areas.

Participants

The study participants for the study were drawn randomly selected from five (5) Local Government

Areas within Ibadan metropolis. A total number of 294 participants took part in the study. The socio-demographic characteristics of the participant are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants

Variable:	N	%
Gender		
Male	133	45.2%
Female	161	54.8%
Marital status:		
Never married	75	25.5%
Married	181	61.6%
Separated	23	7.8%
Divorced	15	5.1%
Education:		
Less than SSCE	49	16.7%
SSCE	74	25.2%
Diploma / NCE	100	34.0%
Graduate	44	15.0%
Masters Degree	18	6.1%
P.h.D	9	3.1%
Religion:		
Christianity	139	47.3%
Islam	121	41.2%
Traditional	26	8.8%
Others	8	2.7%

Category of Participants:

Political office holders	59	20.1%
Non political office holders	235	79.9%

Belief in democracy:

No	64	21.8%
Yes	230	78.2%
N = 294, x age= 43.39yrs SD age= 9.80		

Instrument

Questionnaire format was utilized for data collection in the study. The questionnaire was made to have only two sections: Section A and Section B. The section A was designed to elicit information on socio demographic characteristics of the study participants. The characteristics measured included, gender, age, marital status, educational status, religion, category of participants, etc. The section B of the questionnaire was designed to assess knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty. The items for the scale were generated based on review of literature (see <http://www.u//no/helpdesk/faqs/faqs/cfm>). The scale is a 8-item scale, which has a response format of "Yes" (2) or "No" (1). High scores in the scale indicate more knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty while low scores indicate less knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty. A Cronbach's alpha of 0.89 and a Guttman Split-half reliability coefficient of 0.78 were reported for the scale.

Procedure

The study was purely a survey, which reached out to a number of political office holders and non political office holders. The political office holders were individuals approached at state secretariat, Agodi and at the selected five Local Government Council Secretariats within Ibadan metropolis. The non political office holders were approached at different settings, which included educational institutions, banking organizations, market locations, insurance organizations, and numerous business organizations. The political office holders sampled for the study included Local Government chairmen, ward councillors, commissioners, and some other politicians who were occupying some positions, either by appointment or election as at the time this study was conducted. A total of seventy-five political office holders were initially identified for selection across the five identified Local Government Council Areas within Ibadan metropolis. However, only fifty nine (59) political office holders were available and even ready to fill the study questionnaires.

Essentially, Fifteen (15) political office holders were identified for selection from each of the Five (5) Local Government Areas. Further, the non-political office holders selected for the study were individuals from different organizational settings. They included teachers, lecturers, civil servants, bankers, insurance personnel, students, market men and women and some other private business operators. A total of three hundred and fifty (350) participants were identified for selection, with Seventy (70) participants from each identified Local Government Area. In all, four hundred and twenty five (425) questionnaires were designed and distributed to both the political office holders (75) and non political office holders (350), but only 294 copies were retrieved from the study participant, with 59 copies from the political office holders while 235 copies were drawn from the non political office holders. The study participants were informed individually before filling the questionnaires that sincere and honest responses were expected from them and that their responses would be subjected to almost confidentiality. The study was made possible with the assistance of five research assistants, who approached the selected Local Government Areas within Ibadan metropolis. The selected Local Government Areas were Ibadan North Local Government Area; Ibadan North East Local Government Area; Ibadan North West Local Government Area; Ibadan South West Local Government Area Ibadan South Local Government Area.

Statistical Analysis

The collected data for the study were analyzed by both the descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics was meant to obtain mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentage for some data while the inferential statistics was employed to test the stated hypothesis. Specifically t-test for independent measures employed to test the only stated hypothesis.

RESULTS

The results of the study are presented below. The results in Table 2 reflected descriptive statistics of responses to measures of knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty among the study participant. It was clearly shown that 177(60.2%) of the study participant indicated that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by diverting resources and benefits towards the rich and away from the poor while 117 (39.8%) indicated that it was not.

The results also revealed that 96 (32.7%) of the study participant indicated that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by disturbing the pattern of public spending and investment by encouraging large capital intensive project to maximize bribe receipts while 198 (67.3%) indicated it was not. Similarly, the results showed the 69 (23.5%) expressed that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by imposing an additional unofficial tax which the poor are least able to pay while 225 (76.5%) indicated it was not. The results on table 2 also revealed that 148 (50.3%) of the study participants indicated that corruption perpetuates and

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of responses to measures of knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty among the study participants

S/N	MEASURES	Yes	No	X	SD	N
1.	Corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty in a variety of ways including:	177	117			
	Diverting resources and benefits towards the rich and away from the poor	(60.2%)	(39.8%)	1.60	.49	294
2.	Disturbing the pattern of public spending and investment by encouraging large capital intensive project to maximize bribe receipts	96	198	1.33	.47	294
		(32.7%)	(67.3%)			
3.	Imposing an additional unofficial tax which the poor are least able to pay.	69	225	1.23	.42	294
		(23.5%)	(76.5%)			
4.	Reducing tax revenue to government and thus a reduction in public services that benefit the	148	146	1.50	.50	294
		(50.3%)	(49.7%)			
5.	Undermining social and political stability with consequences that leave poor people more insecure.	158	136	1.54	.50	294
		(53.7%)	(46.3%)			
6.	Reducing economic growth and thereby reducing opportunity for the poor to escape from poverty.	158	136	1.54	.50	294
		(53.7%)	(46.9%)			
7.	Perpetuating social exclusion and preventing the poor from acquiring the capacity to challenge inequalities of resources	156	138	1.53	.50	294
		(53.1%)	(46.9%)			
8.	Depriving the poor of their legal rights and enticements	168	126	1.57	.50	264
		(57.1%)	(42.9%)			

Table 3. Summary table of t- test for independent measures showing the difference between non political office holders and political office holders on overall knowledge, and specific knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty.

Dependent variable	Category of Participants	N	X	SD	Df	t	P
Overall knowledge that Corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty	Political office holders	59	11.37	1.41	292	-3.04	<.01
	Non political office holders	235	11.96	1.31			
Corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by diverting resources and benefit towards the rich and away from the poor.	Political office holders	59	1.61	.49	292	.14	>.05
	Non political office holders	235	1.60	.49			
Corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by disturbing the patterns of public spending and investment by encouraging large capital intensive project to maximize bribe receipt	Political office holders	59	1.32	.47	292	-.08	>.05
	Non political office holders	235	1.33	.47			
Corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by imposing an additional unofficial tax which the poor are least able to pay.	Political office holders	59	1.05	.22	292	3.81	<.01
	Non political office holders	235	1.28	.45			
Corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by reducing tax revenues to government and thus a reduction in public services that benefit the poor	Political office holders	59	1.44	.50	292	-1.08	>.01
	Non political office holders	235	1.52	.50			
Corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by undermining social and political stability with consequences that leave poor people more insecure	Political office holders	59	1.54	.50	292	.09	>.05
	Non political office holders	235	1.54	.50			
Corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by reducing economic growth and thereby the opportunities for the poor to escape from poverty	Political office holders	59	1.49	.50	292	.79	>.05
	Non political office holders	235	1.55	.50			
Corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by perpetuating social exclusion and preventing the poor from acquiring the capacity to challenge inequality of resources	Political office holders	59	1.54	.50	292	.20	>.05
	Non political office holders	235	1.52	.50			
Corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by depriving the poor of their legal rights and entitlement	Political office holders	59	1.37	.49	292	3.51	<.01
	Non political office holders	25	1.62	.49			

government and thus a reduction in public service that benefit the poor while 146 (49.7%) indicated it was not. Further, the results revealed that 158 (53.7%) of the study participant expressed that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by undermining social and political stability with consequences that leave poor people more insecure while 136 (46.3%) expressed that it was not. Also, the results showed that 158 (53.7%) of the study participant expressed that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by reducing economic growth and thereby reducing the opportunity for the poor to escape from poverty while 136 (46.3%) expressed that it was not. In the same vein, the result showed that 156 (53.1%) of the study participants expressed that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by perpetuation social exclusion and preventing the poor from acquiring the capacity to challenge inequality of resources while 138 (46.9%) expressed that it was not. On the last note, the result revealed that 168 (57.1%) of the study participants indicated that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by depriving the poor of their legal rights and entitlement while 126 (42.9) expressed that it was not. The results in Table 3 reflected the difference between political office holders and non political office holders on overall knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty and also specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty in a number of ways.

The result showed clearly that political office holders and non political office holders were significantly different on overall knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty in which non-political office holders reported significantly higher than political office holders ($t(292) = -3.04, P < .01$). The result showed further that political office holders and non-political were not significantly different on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by diverting resources and benefits towards the rich and away from the poor ($t(292) = .14, P > .05$). The result showed also that political office holders and non political office holders were not significantly different on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty and investment by encouraging large capital intensive project to maximize bribe receipt ($t(292) = -.08, P > .05$). The results revealed further that political office holders and non political office holders were significantly different on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by imposing an additional unofficial tax which the poor are least able to pay, in which non political office holders reported significantly higher political office holder ($t(292) = -3.81, P < .01$). The result showed also that political office holders and non political office holders were not significantly different on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by reducing tax revenues to governments and thus a reduction in public services that benefit the poor ($t(292) = -1.08, P > .05$). In the same vein, the results on table 3 revealed also that there was no significant difference between political office holders and non-political office

holders on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by undermining social and political stability with consequence that leave poor people more insecure ($t(292) = .09, P > .05$). The results also showed that there was no significant difference between political holders on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by reducing economic growth and thereby the opportunity for the poor to escape from poverty ($t(292) = -.79, P > .05$). The results revealed further that there was no significant different between political office holders and non political holder on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by perpetuating social exclusion and preventing the poor from acquiring the capacity to challenge inequality of resources ($t(292) = .20, P > .5$). However, the results revealed clearly that political office holders and non political office holders were significantly different on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by depriving the poor of their legal right and entitlement, in which the non political officer were found to report significantly higher than political office holders ($t(292) = -3.51, P < .01$). Therefore, it can be expressed that the tested hypothesis was partially supported by the study results.

DISCUSSION

The issue of corruption has been well addressed all over the world by scholars in educational institutions, Government officials in Governmental institutions, stakeholders and even religious leaders in some religious settings e.t.c. Very importantly, the major reason why corruption is well addressed in developing countries like Nigeria might be as a result of its negative consequences on the people, particularly poor people. In clearer terms, corruption has been well linked with poverty, indicating that where corruption thrives, then poverty is usually on the increase. This has actually been what the study is all about. In actual fact, the study was designed to measure knowledge of the relationship between corruption poverty among political office holders and non political office holders. A number of political office holders and non political office holders were actually approached for the study. The results of the study showed clearly (as shown in Table 2) that the study participants were somehow differed on knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty. For example, still based on the results on the Table 2, it was revealed clearly that 60.2% of the study participants agreed that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by diverting resources and benefit towards the rich and away from the poor, while 39.8% did not agree with this. Similarly, while 23.5% of the study participants agreed that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by imposing an additional unofficial tax which the poor are least able to pay, 72.5% of the study participant did not agree with this. In this same vein, the results as revealed on Table 2 showed that 53.7% of the study participant agreed that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by undermining social and political stability with consequences that leave poor people more insecure

while 46.3% of the study participant did not agree with this. The results also showed that 57.1% of the study participant agreed that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by depriving the poor of their legal rights and entitlement while 42.9% of the study participant did not agree with this. This is therefore a good picture that a larger number of the study participants seemed to have more knowledge of the relationship between corruption and poverty. Further, in order to know if the political office holders and non political office holders would be significantly different on knowledge of relationship between corruption and poverty (both overall knowledge, and specific knowledge), t-test for independent measures was computed. The results (as shown in table 3) revealed in the first place, that non political office holders reported significantly higher on overall knowledge of the relationship between corruption and poverty than political office holders. This particular finding portrayed that non-political office holders know much more about the role of corruption in promoting poverty than political office holders. Now can we now say the political office holders do not really know the harm caused by corruption on the populace? In a real sense of it, they may know, may be they just feel they should not be bothered about it. After all, what is the big deal.

Very importantly, this finding corroborates the findings of helpdesk (i.e. <http://www.no/helpdesk/faq/faqs/.cfm>) that corruption is much related to poverty. However, the results on table 3 revealed that political office holders and non political office holders were not significantly different on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by diverting resources and benefits towards the rich and away from the poor. The result also revealed that there was no significant difference between political office holders and non political office holders on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by disturbing the pattern of public spending and investment by encouraging large capital intensive projects to maximize bribe receipts. The results showed, however, that there was significant difference between political office holders and non-political office holders on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates and exacerbates poverty by imposing an additional unofficial tax which the poor are least able to pay, in which non political office holders were found to report significantly higher than political office holders.

This indicates clearly that non political office holders know that corruption gives room for imposition of an additional unofficial tax which the poor are least able to pay, since they are part of the populace that, in most cases, usually made to pay the unofficial tax. This finding also corroborates the findings of helpdesk(i.e. <http://www.no/helpdesk/faq/faqs/.cfm>) that corruption imposes an additional unofficial 'tax' which the poor are least able to pay. The results revealed further that there was no significant difference between political office holders and non political office holders on specific knowledge that corruption reduces tax revenues to government and thus a reduction in public services

that benefit the poor. In a similar vein, it was revealed that there was no significant difference between political office holders and non political office holders on specific knowledge that corruption undermines social and political stability with consequences that leave poor people more insecure. Along this line also, there was no significant difference between political office knowledge and non political office holders on specific knowledge that corruption reduces economic growth and thereby the opportunities for the poor to escape from poverty. The result also revealed that political office holders and non political office holders were not significantly different on specific knowledge that corruption perpetuates social exclusion and prevents the poor acquiring the capacity to challenge inequality of resources. However, the results, still on Table 3, revealed that non political holders reported significantly higher on specific knowledge that corruption deprives the poor of their legal rights and entitlement than political office holders. This connotes that political office holders know and it was by the study results that corruption deprived the poor of their legal rights and entitlements. In actuality fact, corruption has been linked with this. Very clearly, this particular findings is supported by the findings of helpdesk (i.e. <http://www.no/helpdesk/faq/faqs/.cfm>) that corruption on usually deprives the poor of their legal rights and enhancement than political office holders.

Implications/ Recommendations

This study has established, to some extent, the relationship between corruption and poverty. This connotes that, empirically, corruption has been associated with poverty. Essentially, it is revealed, somehow, by the study findings that the study participant still disagreed, to some extent, on the statements depicting relationship between corruption and poverty. However, the issue is that corruption is a real cankerworm and it has been much linked up with poverty. Very importantly, it seems political office holders did not really know the danger inherent in corruption, as it appears, based on the study result, that non political office holders were more knowledgeable of the relationship between corruption and poverty than political office holders. In any case, this is a serious dilemma, if those who lead us do not know the havoc caused by corruption or by their corrupt attitudes and behaviours, and then it is purely an unfortunate situation. Serving political office holders must be made to know what and what corruption is all about. Even, would be political office holders must also be made to know how dangerous corruption is. The different characteristic features and shape of corruption must be exposed to any serving or would be political office holders. This can really go a long way by organising enlightenment programme in form of seminars and workshops for the serving and would be political office holders. However, the campaign of anti-corruption crusade must be made adequately all-round in the country. Anti-corruption crusade must be institutionalised in the three tiers of government. In this case, the efforts of Independent Corrupt Practices and Other related Offences Commission (ICPC) must be

given adequate publicity across the country. This can possibly be achieved by established Local office, of ICPC across the existing Local Government Areas in the country. This will make cases of corruption or corrupt practises reportable at any point in time. Further, it is expected that any serving or would be political office holders must really be made to face the music if indicted and even convicted of corrupt practices. In actual fact, indicted political office holder must be given wide media publicity. This would make them practically known to every one in the country and as such, limiting their future plans of involvement in any form of corruption in Nigeria, or even desiring to take-up any elective position or appointment. These efforts must be taken seriously since corruption is endemic in the country and the unfortunate ones (i.e. the poor masses) are being made to pay for it. This is bad indeed! Efforts should be institutionalised to stampede corruption or eliminate corruption completely.

REFERENCES

- Banfield, E. (1961). *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society* (Chicago: Free Press, 1958)
- Birdsall, and Lonono-- In: Does corruption cause Poverty? Retrieved 17th September, 2007 from http://articles.directorym.com/Does_corruption_Cause_Poverty_a800123.html
- Does Corruption Cause Poverty? Retrieved 17th September, 2007 from http://articles.directorym.com/Does_corruption_Cause_Poverty_a800123.html
- Dike, V.E. (2005). Corruption in Nigeria: A new paradigm for effective control. Retrieved 14th August 2007 from <http://www.africaeconomicanalysis.org/articles/gen/corruptiondikehtm.html>
- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQS): Cause and Consequences of Corruption. Retrieved August 9th, 2007, from <http://www.uit.no/helpdesk/faqs/faqs/cfm>
- Lipset, S. M. and Lenz, G.S.(2000).Corruption, Culture, and Markets, in Culture Matters, Lawrence E. Harrison, and Samuel P. Huntington, eds., (New York: Basic Books, 2000), p.112.
- Nye, J. S. (1967). Corruption and Political Development: A Case-Benefit Analysis. The American Political Science Review, 1967, pp. 417-427
- Osoba, S.O. (1996). Corruption in Nigeria: Historical Perspectives. Review of African Political Economy, Vol. 23, no. 69, p. 371.
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom (New York: Anchor Books, 1999), p.275
- The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD): see The OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions, December 1997
- The Guardian Online, January 2, 1999
