

JOURNAL OF TAXATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The Official Journal of the Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria
ISSN 1118-6017 VOLUME 21, ISSUE 1, MARCH 2022



TAX REVENUE AND INFRASTRUCTURE EXPECTATION GAP IN SELECTED
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES

OLUGBENGA DANIEL-ADEBAYO, RUFUS ISHOLA AKINTOYE,
FESTUS FOLAJIMI ADEGBIE AND OLOTU AYOO LUWA AJAYI-OWOEYE

FISCAL POLICY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA
AYODEJI BABATOPE ADEYEMI AND ADEFISAYO AWOGBADE

PERFORMANCE AUDIT EFFECTIVENESS IN THE NIGERIA PUBLIC SECTOR:
A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

FELIX OGBEIYULU UMANHONLEN,
REBECCA IMADE UMANHONLEN AND KILLIAN OSIKHENA OGIEDU

FORENSIC AUDIT AND FRAUD PREVENTION IN THE NIGERIAN
DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS

GODWIN EMMANUEL OYEDOKUN AND OLUWATOBILOBA OREOLUWA DUROWAIYE

DIGITAL TAXATION IN NIGERIA: ISSUES, CHALLENGES
AND THE WAY FORWARD

JAMES ODIA AND SARAH AKONOAFUA



Vision

To be one of the foremost
professional associations
in Africa and beyond

Mission

To build an Institute which
will be a citadel for the
advancement of taxation
in all its ramifications

Motto

Integrity and Service

Core Values

Service
Teamwork
Excellence
Professionalism

Journal of Taxation and Economic Development (JTED)
A publication of the Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria
(Academic and Professional Researchers)
ISSN: 1118-6017

Published By:

The Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria
Tax Professionals' House
Plot 16, Otunba Jobi Fele way, Central Business District, Alausa Ikeja
P.O. Box 1087, Ebute-Metta, Lagos State, Nigeria.
Tel: 09080888815
E-mail: editor.jtax@citn.org
Website: www.citn.org

ABUJA LIASON OFFICE

David Ajibola Olorunleke's House
Block 26 (27), Abidjan Street, Wuse Zone 3,
Abuja, FCT, Nigeria
Tel: (234) 09-2918349

© Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria

All rights reserved. Reproduction of the Journal of Taxation and Economic Development in any form or by any means without the written permission of the Institute is prohibited.

Views expressed by the authors do not represent the opinion of the Institute.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

Professor Rafiu Oyesola Salawu
Department of Management & Accounting, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria

Managing Editor

Professor Godwin Emmanuel Oyedokun
Department of Management & Accounting, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria

Editorial Board Secretary

Ayodeji Adeyemi
Manager, Research and Professional Standard, Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria

Editorial Board Members

Professor Chinedum Nathaniel Nwezeaku
Federal University of Technology, Owerri Nigeria

Professor John Adeoti
Nigeria Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER), Ibadan, Nigeria

Professor Uche Jack-Osimiri
Faculty of Law, River State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Professor Aruwa Suleiman Akwu-Odo Salihu
Department of Accounting and Finance, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria

Dr. Eiya Ofiafoh Ofiafoh (Associate Professor)
Department of Accounting, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria

Dr. Stephen Chukwuemeka Mark Abani
MCSA Worldwide Projects Limited, Abuja, Nigeria

Dr. Kenny Adedapo Soyemi
Department of Accounting, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago Iwoye, Nigeria

Professor Joseph Uchenna Uwaleke
Department of Banking & Finance, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria

Barrister Chukwuemeka Eze
Faculty of Law, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria

Mr. Simon Nwanmaghyi Kato
Federal Inland Revenue Service, Chairman's Office, Abuja, Nigeria

Professor Tankiso Moloi
Department of Accounting, University of Johannesburg, South Africa

Professor Taiwo Asaolu
Department of Accounting, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile – Ife, Nigeria

Professor Ishola Rufus Akintoye
Department of Accounting, Babcock University, Illishan - Remo, Nigeria.

Professor Kabiru Isa Dandago
Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria

Professor Micheal Nwidobie
Department of Accounting, Caleb University, Lagos, Nigeria

Professor Abdulmumini Bala Ahmed
Department of Private and Commercial Law, Ado Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria

Professor Zainab Dabo
Department of Business Administration, Kaduna State University, Kaduna, Nigeria

Dr. Justina Okoror
Managing Partner HMAO Professional Services, Nigeria

Dr. Hauwa Lamino Abubakar
Department of Business Administration, Nile University, Abuja, Nigeria

Professor Lawrence Ogechukwu Obokor
Department of Cost and Management Accounting, University of Technology, Cape Town,
South Africa

Dr. Musenze Ibrahim Abaasi
Faculty of Management Sciences, Busitema University, Tororo, Uganda

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Professor Aminu Mikailu, FCTI
Usman Danfodio University, Sokoto, Sokoto State, Nigeria.

Professor Mainoma Muhammad Akaro, FCTI
Nasarawa State University, Lafia, Nassarawa State, Nigeria.

Professor Muhammed Taofeeq Abdulrazaq, FCTI
Faculty of Law, Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos State, Nigeria.

Professor Ishola Rufus Akintoye, FCTI
CITN Professorial Chair in Taxation, Babcock University, Babcock University,
Illishan - Remo, Nigeria.

Professor Kabiru Isa Dandago, FCTI
Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria.

Professor Eugene Okoye Nwadiolor, FCTI
Godfrey Okoye University, Ugwuomu-Nike, Enugu, Nigeria.

Professor John Obiora Anyaduba, FCTI
University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.

Professor Olateju Abiola Somorin, FCTI
Caleb University, Lagos State, Nigeria.

Professor Muhammad Tanko, FCTI
Kaduna State University, Kaduna, Nigeria.

Professor Ofuan James Ilaboya, FCTI
University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.

Professor Jude Jirinwayo Odinkonigbo, FCTI
University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria.

Professor Amari Omaka, FCTI
Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State, Nigeria.

Professor Prince Famous Izedonmi, FCTI
University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.

EDITOR'S NOTE

It gives me great joy to present to you the Journal of Taxation and Economic Development (JTED). Volume 21, Issue 1. This is the official Journal of the Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria. The journal is a high-impact journal indexed in IDEAS and ECONPAPERS. The Journal is assigned an ISSN code number. All articles are peer-reviewed. Articles are outcomes of rigorous and in-depth research.

This edition contains articles in the areas of Taxation, Fiscal Policy, Economic Growth, and Development.

I expressed my profound gratitude for your immense contribution to this edition of the journal and request your articles for the next edition of the journal. Manuscript should be typed as prescribed in the call for papers.

Thanks.

Professor Salawu Rafiu Oyesola

Editor-in-Chief

March 31, 2022

NOTE ON CONTRIBUTORS

Olugbenga DANIEL-ADEBAYO is of the Department of Accounting, School of Management Sciences, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Nigeria.

Rufus Ishola AKINTOYE is a Professor of Accounting and Strategic Financial Management in the Department of Accounting, School of Management Sciences, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Nigeria.

Festus Folajimi ADEGBIE is a Professor of Accounting and Taxation, Department of Accounting, School of Management Sciences, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Nigeria.

Olotu Ayooluwa AJAYI-OWOEYE is a lecturer at the Department of Accounting, School of Management Sciences, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Nigeria.

Ayodeji Babatope ADEYEMI is a Research Manager at the Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria and PhD student of Economics, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria.

Adefisayo AWOGBADE is the Registrar/Chief Executive at the Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria and PhD student of Accounting, Caleb University, Imota, Lagos Nigeria.

Felix Ogbeiyulu UMANHONLEN is of the Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin, Nigeria.

Rebecca Imade UMANHONLEN is of the Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin, Nigeria.

Killian Osikhena OGIEDU is of the Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin, Nigeria.

Godwin Emmanuel OYEDOKUN is a Professor of Management and Accounting in the Faculty of Management and Social Sciences, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Oluwatobiloba Oreoluwa DUROWAIYE is of Taxation Department, Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, Nigeria.

James ODIA is a Professor in the Department of Accounting, University of Benin, Nigeria.

Sarah AKONOAFUA is of Department of Accounting, University of Benin, Nigeria.

Journal of Taxation and Economic Development (JTED)
A publication of the Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria
(Academic and Professional Researchers)

Call for Papers

The Institute

The Institute is charged with the duty, amongst others, to encourage, promote and coordinate research for the advancement of taxation in Nigeria and to regulate the taxation profession in all its ramifications. The Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria Act LFN 2004 is recognized as part of the tax laws in the country by the Federal Government Tax Policy.

The Publication: Journal of Taxation and Economic Development (JTED)

The Journal of Taxation and Economic Development (JTED) is the official Journal of the Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria (CITN). JTED is devoted to the study of taxation and its role in economic development. The journal's specific areas of interest include the theoretical and empirical analysis of taxation and its implication for fiscal performance; tax laws and policies; accounting and tax administration; and social factors determining the effectiveness of tax regimes especially in developing economies. Articles in these areas should keep in view the nexus between tax-related factors and economic development as a major deciding criterion of their contribution to the mission of JTED.

Articles submitted to JTED are peer-reviewed and are expected to promote scholarly interactions among taxation professionals, academics, policy makers, development partners, and other development stakeholders in Nigeria and abroad.

Guidelines for the submission of articles

1. Submission of an article for publication in JTED presupposes that it is original research; has never been previously published and is not being concurrently submitted for publication elsewhere.
2. All articles must be well researched on contemporary issues in keeping with the JTED's mission outlined above. These can be under any of the following categories:
 - a. Original research - These must report studies and explain the purpose, methodology, sample, results and implications of the findings. A variety of research designs are welcomed but manuscripts should not exceed 7,500 words typed in Times New Romans 12 font and double-spaced.
 - b. Best practice – analytical reports of specific, successful documented efforts that improved, or provide evidence-based guidelines that can be used to improve, taxation administration, policy, etc. Whether entirely innovative or a variation of a tried and true approach, the best practice described must offer evidence as to how the subject matter was or could be

counterpoint columns on a controversial topic. Insight papers are intended to stimulate thought and prompt open dialogue about taxation administration and social effect as well contribute to new lines of study. Such insight papers should not exceed 2,500 words typed in Times New Romans 12 font and double-spaced.

- d. Reviews – these are a synopsis of worthwhile reading, viewing, and direct experience in taxation related research and practice. Such review papers should not exceed 1,000 words typed in Times New Romans 12 font and double-spaced.
3. Articles submitted should have a covering letter that contains the following information:
 - a. Category submitted as outlined in 2 above
 - b. Title of Article
 - c. Name of Author(s)
 - d. Brief bio-data of the Author(s) at the bottom of the first page e.g. XXX is a Professor at ...University; or xxx, Tax Manager, Training Manager, Managing Partner, Partner XYZ Associates/& Co. (not exceeding 100 words)
 - e. Email address(es)
 - f. Text references should be cited in the body of the paper as follows: Author's last name and publication year (E.g., Ogundipe, 2020)
4. Full references using the Current edition of the American Psychological Association (APA) styled should be listed at the end of the paper as follows: Last, F. M. (Year Published) Book. City, State: Publisher.
5. Footnotes should be avoided apart from the Author's bio-data on page one.
6. Manuscripts: The manuscript must be submitted in soft copy as a Microsoft Word document. Other file formats, including PDF documents, are not accepted for the main (text) document. The manuscript should contain no clues as to author identity, such as acknowledgements, institutional information, and mention of a specific city – these should all be in the covering letter. Thus, information that might identify the author(s) should be omitted or highlighted in black. The first page of the manuscript should include only the title of the manuscript and date of submission. All manuscripts must include an abstract of 150–200 words and three to six keywords. Line numbers should be embedded in the left margin to facilitate the review process.
7. Where tables and figures are necessary, they should not duplicate the text. Tables must be formatted using Microsoft Word's table building functions (using spaces or tabs in your tables may create problems when typesetting and may result in an error). Check tables and figures (rows, columns and totals) properly. Tables should be single-spaced and include a brief title. Explanatory paragraphs should be as near as possible to the relevant tables and figures, which should be appropriately numbered. The size and complexity of a table should be determined with consideration for its legibility and ability to fit the printed page.
8. Plagiarism is a serious offence. Authors should ensure appropriate citation of documents used in their articles and avoid copying from already published

materials.

9. Final Revisions: Authors of accepted manuscripts must obtain and provide the managing editor all necessary permissions for reproduced figures, pictures, or other copyrighted work prior to publication. The authors also will need to complete and sign the copyright agreement.
10. Desk Rejection Policy: Before the full review, submissions are examined at the editorial level. If the editor and an editorial board member believe the submission has extensive flaws or is inconsistent with the mission and focus of the journal, the manuscript may receive a desk reject decision.

Submission and correspondence:

Manuscripts should be submitted electronically to editor.jtax@citn.org.

For further enquiries, please contact:

The Editor-in-Chief

Journal of Taxation and Economic Development (JTED)

Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria

Tax Professionals' House

Plot 16, Otunba Jobi Fele Way

Central Business District Alausa- Ikeja

P.O.Box 1087, Ebute Metta

Lagos State.

editor.jtax@citn.org

www.citn.org

CONTENTS

VISION, MISSION, MOTTO	i
PUBLISHER'S AND COPYRIGHT INFORMATION.....	ii
EDITORIAL BOARD	iii
EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.....	v
EDITORS NOTE.....	vi
NOTE ON CONTRIBUTORS.....	vii
CALL FOR PAPERS.....	viii
TAX REVENUE AND INFRASTRUCTURE EXPECTATION GAP IN SELECTED SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.....	1-19
Olugbenga DANIEL-ADEBAYO, Rufus Ishola AKINTOYE, Festus Folajimi Adegbe and Olotu Ayooluwa AJAYI-OWOEYE	
FISCAL POLICY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA.....	20-35
Ayodeji Babatope ADEYEMI and Adefisayo AWOGBADE	
PERFORMANCE AUDIT EFFECTIVENESS IN THE NIGERIA PUBLIC SECTOR: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	36-65
Felix Ogbeiyulu UMANHONLEN, Rebecca Imade UMANHONLEN and Killian Osikheni OGIEDU	
FORENSIC AUDIT AND FRAUD PREVENTION IN THE NIGERIAN DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS.....	66-74
Godwin Emmanuel OYEDOKUN and Oluwatobiloba Oreoluwa DUROWAIYE	
DIGITAL TAXATION IN NIGERIA: ISSUES, CHALLENGES AND THE WAY FORWARD.....	75-92
James ODIA and Sarah AKONOAFUA	

PERFORMANCE AUDIT EFFECTIVENESS IN THE NIGERIA PUBLIC SECTOR: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Umanhonlen Ogbeiyulu Felix

Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin,
Nigeria

E-mail: ogbeiyulu4real@yahoo.com

Umanhonlen Imade Rebecca

Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin,
Nigeria

Email: lawreb@yahoo.com

Ogiedu Osikhena Killian

Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin,
Nigeria,

Email: koogiedu@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Performance audit, which is also known as “value for money” audits, have become increasingly common in the public sector over the past few decades. This paper examined performance audit effectiveness in the Nigerian public sector. Specifically, the study reviewed extant literature on the subject, and examined Nigeria’s public sector and its governance as well as the concepts of performance audit, the effectiveness of performance audit, and public sector. The paper adopted the library research approach, such as journal articles, textbooks, online publications, magazines, and so on. It was observed that prior literature on the effectiveness of performance audits was done in other countries. Studies from Nigeria focused on accountability, its measures, the role of the Supreme Audit Institution, performance audit, and public sector budgetary efficiency, as an effective tool for fighting corruption. Also, this paper found out that effective performance audit in Nigeria’s public sector is bedeviled by certain factors which have made their effectiveness questionable. It, therefore, concludes that audit has gone beyond the examination of expenditure and now beginning to look into the processes and procedures that influence the decision on expenditure. However, recommended that the Auditor General of the Federation should ensure that adequate and competent staff which can help it develop the right performance audit team matrix are employed.

Keywords: Performance Audit, Public Sector, Value for Money Audit, Supreme Audit Institution,

JEL Classification: G351, H11

1.0. INTRODUCTION

Performance audits in the public sector are carried out by the relevant supreme audit institutions of a country together with the internal audit of the various public sector

organizations. Internal auditors incorporate performance audit into their audit plans to assist in the audit evaluation of organizational performance management and accountability processes (Gheorghiu, 2012; Yan & Li, 1997). Performance audit is conventionally focused on the economy, effectiveness and efficiency, referred to as the 'three Es' (Gildenhuis & Jense, 2017). Since performance audit focuses on assessing the economical acquisition, together with the effective and efficient utilization of resources, it has the potential to contribute towards providing the requisite public sector performance measurement. It provides parliament with an assessment of the performance of government activities with information, observations, and recommendations designed to promote accountability in government and ensure ethical and effective public service, good governance, and sustainable development (Odia, 2014; Waring & Morgan, 2007).

The public sector, on the other hand, is considered to be that part of the economy which is traditionally managed and controlled by the government on behalf of the citizenry (Nirmala, Karen & Alan, 2005; Shim & Seigal, 1995). Therefore, governments decide on the use of resources and are responsible for the welfare, policies, and consumption of public sector resources. The role of the public sector is to improve citizens' welfare by delivering goods and services that may not be provided by the private sector at a price affordable and accessible to all (Herlok, 1989). To have a good understanding of the public sector, there is a need to ensure audit effectiveness and efficiency in order to enable citizens to get optimal satisfaction. It is of interest therefore that those saddle with the responsibilities or entrusted with the confidence of the management of public sectors adhere strictly to compliance, and services are adequately distributed without any shortcomings. However, a performance audit is considered to be one of the most effective means for improving performance and governance (Dalia & Irena, 2008).

In Nigeria, there have been increasing public outcries and concern about the government's insensitivity over citizens' welfare, high level of corruption, high recurrent expenditures, wastage of public spending, high costs of governance, capital freight by the local council, state government as well as the federal government (i.e capital transfers by government personnel abroad). The increasing ministerial scandals around public agitations about the inability of the executive arm of government to turn things around gave rise to the demand for greater public accountability and performance audit in the public sector (Green & Singleton, 2009; Manaf, 2010).

Nigeria has been identified internationally for poor governance and lack of transparency and accountability in tendering public funds. It has been rated as a failed state by Fund for Peace for the consecutive time from 94.4 indexes in 2006 (out of 178 countries) to 97.27, ranked 15 positions out of 177 Nations, growing at an average annual of -1.25% in 2006 and 0.23% in 2020 respectively based on twelve indicators of vulnerability. Four are for social, two for economic, and six for political (Fragile States Index [FSI], 2020). Transparency International [TI], (2021) on global coalition against corruption under corruption perception index (CPI) in 2020 rated Nigeria as the most corrupt Nation. In addition, Nigeria in sub-Saharan Africa in January 28th 2021 was ranked 149 in 180 countries and score 25/100, a score changed -2 since 2012 due to poor governance, infrastructural deficit, and decay institutions among other factors. The world bank group has considered corruption as a major challenge to its twin goal of ending extreme poverty by 2030 and boosting shared prosperity for the

poorest forty percent of people in developing countries (World Bank Group, 2020).

It, therefore, follows as aforementioned that since the adoption of performance audit in Nigeria in 1960, it has been a subject of debate whether or not it has met its objectives. There have also been mixed reactions regarding whether or not since its inception those responsible for government business, tending public policies, institutions, and agencies have measured to expectations (Nkwagu & Nwamgbebu, 2019; Steward & Walsh, 1994; Udel & Nwadiolor, 2016). Against this backdrop, observers have argued that performance audit has lots more shortcomings and there is much still needed to be done in ensuring its audit effectiveness (Yodit, 2016). Extant literature has blamed the failure and deficiency on weak supreme audit institutions and the non-existence of law backing it framework and operations, happenings and challenges overwhelming the public sector and incessant pervasive cases of corruption through cohesion as well as decaying failing institutions (FSI, 2020; Odia, 2014; Ogiedu, & Izedonmi, 2013; TI, 2021), including missing trail records of financial impropriety which usually uncover aftermath of performance audit engagement and lot more.

It has also been speculated in some quarters despite the opposing views that performance audit has been effective (Agbo & Aruomoaghe, 2014; Dalia & Irena, 2008; Udeh & Elom, 2016; Etvert, 2002; Regassa, 2016), emphasizing value for money audit strength on the desired impact derived within the confer of extant public service rules, efficiency and economy. Thus, ensuring that those saddled with the responsibilities of handling government business are transparent, prudent, and accountable (Adzor, Clement & Mike, 2016; Dalia & Irena, 2008; Yodit, 2016). Suffice it to say in the viewpoint of the above assertions that performance audit effectiveness in the Nigerian public sector has both sides left for debate and dialogue in Nigeria's geographical climate. Hence, informs the belief that these challenges may have emanated from noncompliance, which may have led to the weak and failing institutions as well as encouraged cohesion and corruption among public servants, government, and government officials alike.

Against this backdrop, prior literature on the effectiveness of performance audit has either focused on the principle of effectiveness of performance audit, and factors affecting it in other countries (Luiz & Mury 2020; Yodit, 2016) or looked at the impact of performance audit in the public sector a case of other countries (Albrecht 2012, Njanike & Dube, 2009). Studies from Nigeria focused on accountability and transparency in the public sector through performance auditing and the role of the Supreme Audit Institution (Ejere, 2012; Odia, 2014; Reichborn-Kjennerud, 2013). Also, other studies from Nigeria focused on performance audit and public sector budgetary efficiency (Olaoye & Adedeji, 2019), the effect of performance auditing on project implementation (Adzor, Clement & Mike, 2016), effect of value for money auditing on local government service delivery (Nkwagu & Nwamgbebu, 2019). But Agbo and Aruomoaghe (2014); Olaoye and Adedeji (2019); Reichborn-Kjennerud (2013) stated that performance audit could be an effective tool for fighting corruption.

A study examined the measure of the effectiveness of performance audits and stated that measuring the effectiveness of performance audits is important in order to analyze its usefulness to the public sector and raise its future contribution (Etverk, 2002). Audit institutions have been forced to justify their own activities and demonstrate their results and achievements. Therefore, the ways of assessing the effectiveness of performance audit have

gained more importance and attention as well as the Supreme Audit Institutions and performance audits in general. But, left other researchers to see the need for extensive literature on the effectiveness of performance audits in the public sector because she attempted to address the measure of the effectiveness of performance audits.

This paper reviewed the literature on the effectiveness of performance audits in Nigeria's public sector by using a library research approach. Therefore, the study is not limited to only performance audit, its processes, Nigeria's public sector, and its audit, but goes on to evaluate performance audits and public sector transparency and accountability, performance audit effectiveness and public sector as well as the challenges of effective performance audit in Nigeria public sector and made some recommendations. However, this paper reviewed the literature on performance audit effectiveness in the Nigerian public sector to decipher these claims. The remaining sections have been divided into three. The first section deals with the concepts of public sector and performance audit, while the second section examines the challenges of effective performance audit in the Nigeria public sector; the third section is the conclusion.

2.0. OVERVIEW OF NIGERIA PUBLIC SECTOR, REFORMS AND GOVERNANCE

The public sector is that portion of the economy whose activities are under the control and direction of either the federal or state or local government council. The public sector typically creates and sustains independent public institutions of accountability that are empowered to oversee government actions, and activities and demand explanations (Oladipupo, 2005). The public sector is the government sector whose affairs or services are made known to the public (People in General) in aggregate and detail reflecting all transactions involving the receipts, transfer, and disposition of its fund and properties (Kayode, 2010). The sector varies in terms of compositions, demographic, economic welfare, programmes, and projections. Anyafo (2002) refers to the public sector as that sector of the economy, established and operated by the government or its agencies, distinguishable from the private sector, and organized on behalf of the whole citizens. The public sector in Nigeria comprises an expanding ring of organizations with the core government at the center, followed by agencies and public enterprises. However, public sector organizations comprise of organizations whose control lies in the hand of the public and whose objectives and services are not for profit making.

Accordingly, the public sector of any economy is the biggest spender and it is the sector that set the tone of activities for the private sector. Udeh and Nwadiakor (2016) stated that in developing countries like Nigeria, the public sector represents the most dominant economic force due to the fact that government constitutes the largest single business entity and her pattern of expenditure through its various ministries, agencies, and departments stimulate a lot of economic activities. However, the public sector set the economic agenda for the nation. It is a widely held opinion by financial experts that the public sector in Nigeria controls about sixty percent (60%) of the asset base of the country. On the other hand, public sector entities are organizations that are owned and financed by the government. They provide services such that non-taxpayers cannot be excluded from their benefits. Adams (2006) noted the public sector as all organizations which are not privately owned and operated but

established, run, and funded by the government on behalf of the public. The primary aim of government is to ensure that the publicly owned enterprises are adequately secured, welfare equitably distributed, services adequately rendered, and protection of Government corporations for the interest of the public.

Public sector entities include: government business enterprises, ministries, department, and agencies (MDAs), parastatals, commissions etc. Their services comprise the military, police, public transits, rails, roads, airports, healthcare, schools, free education, bridges, rail tracks, other social amenities such as pipe bone water, telephone, provision of markets, public toilets, public schools, skill acquisition centre, clearing of drainages and so on. These enterprises are managed by the government through representatives or selected workforce with laydown processes and procedures amongst the citizens, except where the services of expatriate are required and are not in the first instance available. Consequently, in order for the government to perform these businesses on behalf of the citizens, the government ensures that there is no loophole, leakages are blocked, laws and orders are maintained, absolute absence of corruption, equitable distribution of income, transparency, probity, and accountability (Dimant & Guglielmo, 2017).

The Nigerian public sector was the result of the colonial masters, and its formation dated to the late 19th Century when the colonial masters were in charge of governance in the country. In 1898, the system of state enterprise first began in the black coast, present day Nigeria, when the British colonial master's administration undertook major public sector interventions. Amongst the first venture by the colonial administration was the railway transport project, which was provided at *Dido* to the other axes. The project took off from *Dido*, Lagos capital centre city area to the hinterland as franked by the British colonial masters (Esu & Ingang, 2009). Udeh and Nwadiolor (2016) noted that one of the inherited legacies of Nigeria from the British colonial masters was an extensive public sector. Hence, Mr Fitzgerald contracts in the colliery business lay the foundation for the establishment of a public corporation in Nigeria.

The colonial master administration in its inception provided several other public corporations to commensurate development and ameliorates the sufferings of lots of people of the then slave coasts. As a result of these, Nigeria gained electricity corporations, railway coal corporations, ports authority, water board, telecommunication, local mill, and post offices to mention but a few. People were engaged from time to time to work in these corporations (public sector) which in the present day are called the public or civil servants. All these enterprises were established primarily as administrative organs and were to facilitate trade and commercial activities of the country as well as the colonial government (Babatude, 2013). Moreso, the corporations provided essential services that met government aspirations at different levels. The corporations applied internal checks on the utilization of funds in such a way that public assurance was maintained through the instrumentality of the constitution, and hence, through the Finance Control Management Act of 1958, and Audit Act of 1956.

Udeh and Nwadiolor (2016) have noted that as years rolled by, the effectiveness of these corporations dwindled in terms of services rendered. Many people then saw them as a mere conduit pipes for siphoning scarce public funds and consequently clamored for their privatization. This later led to some corporations being privatized, and commercialized

while others collapse and fizzled away. The public sector in Nigeria now consists of government MDAs with public service rules, financial regulations, procurement Act and other aiding services, extant laws, rules, and regulation guiding the public servants. Despite this, corruption and high level of highhandedness, nepotism, tribalism, religious related mysteries, and mediocrity now characterized the present-day public sector system.

Against this backdrop, the government in order to enhance welfare for its citizens and eliminate bottlenecks, inefficiency, nepotism, and corruption from the system initiated some reforms to encourage citizens as well as revamp the public sector. Such reforms include the introduction of the Government e-Collection and e-Payment System, Integrated Personal Payroll Information System (IPPIS), Government Integrated Financial and Management Information System (GIFMIS), National Chart of Accounts (NCOA), Treasury Single Account (TSA), International Public Sector Accounting Standard (IPSAs), Consolidated Salaries Structure (CSSC), Contributory Pension Scheme (CPS) to mention but a few. To ensure that these government enterprises strive, citizens advocate the need for government to promote efficiency, effectiveness, prudence, accountability, and due process in budget dealings as well as programme implementations.

In as so much, countries with good governance, citizens respect the government because among other reasons those in authority manage public resources effectively. According to Agbo and Aruomoaghe (2014), governance is the manner in which public officials and institutions acquire and exercise authority to shape public policy and provide goods and services that enhances the welfare of the public. Governance is the norms, traditions, and institutions by which power and authority in a country are exercised (Dereje, 2012). Meanwhile, the mobilization and utilization of financial resources for the public good is an essential area of governance. Where governance systems are weak or seem not working effectively or are devoid of transparency and accountability mechanisms, corruption, nepotism, and mismanagement of public resources often submerge increasingly problems to the governed.

2.1. Public Sector Audit

The audit process in the public sector is to review the financial statements of public entities and other information such as non-financial performance information that the entity is required to have audited. Udeh and Elom (2016) stated that the examination of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness to bring to light examples of wasteful, extravagant unrewarding expenditures and failure to maximize financial arrangements or receipts detrimental to the exchequer and weakness leading to them has raised issues on public sector accountability in the global economy, especially within the developing countries. Thus, as the public and citizens become more conscious and aware of the need to ascertain the actual utilization of resources, the concept of performance auditing starts to emerge in the year 1960. Public sector executives respond by enforcing internal accountability measures and by reporting to the citizens on how public money is being spent and on the success and or failure of public programmes.

Messier (2000) refers to auditing as a systematic process of objectively obtaining and evaluating evidence regarding assertions about economic actions and events to ascertain the degree of correspondence between those assertions and established criteria and

communicate the results to interested users (Saidu, 2011). Auditing standard 2 and 7 defines auditing as an independent examination of, and the expression of opinion on accounts of companies as presented by management, by a duly appointed auditor, in pursuance of that appointment and in keeping with the relevant legislation and other requirements when in his opinion that the account shows a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the company, and that the accounts have been properly prepared in accordance with the provision of the Company and Allied Matters Act (CAMA) of 1990. In view of the above public sector, audit is required to entail an independent examination of, legislation bound, expressing of opinion, duly appointed auditor and true and fair view.

Adebisi (2011) stated that public sector audit has wide scope as to reviewing, regularity, probity, and value for money with which public services are rendered. He noted that in order to achieve the above issues, public sector audit covers the audit of books and records of the federal ministries, extra-ministerial offices, other arms of the government, federation account and revenue audit of all government institutions as well as the pre and post auditing of the payment of pensions and gratuities of the retiring military and civilian personnel. It also includes: vetting, commenting, and certifying audited accounts of all parastatals, deliberation, verifying, and reporting on reported cases of loss of funds, stores, plants, and equipment as stipulated in the relevant financial regulation as well as auditing of Accountant-General annual financial statements and government statutory corporations, in accordance with the constitution of the federation. However, statutory and private audits are undertaken by an independent auditor called an external auditor. Statutory audits are conducted under the statutory framework. The scope of the audit is determined under statute and no restriction is expected to be placed.

2.2. Scope of the Supreme Audit Institutions Mandate

The scope of a supreme audit institution mandate refers to the subject of audit which is usually determined by the audit act, constitution or law of a given country (Roberts, 1996). One of such public institutions that monitors and manages public sector accountability is the supreme audit institution (SAIs) which is known as the Office of the Auditor-Generals (OAG) in Nigeria, the National Audit Office (NAO) in the United Kingdom (UK), and the Comptroller-General (CG) in the United State of America (USA). Udeh and Elom (2016) opined that one of the functions of the Office of the Auditor-Generals is to conduct and carry out audit service which ranges from performance audit which is value for money audit, financial audit, regulatory audit, and management audit. Ogiedu and Izedonmi (2013) said that supreme audit institutions are created to audit the legality, efficiency, and effectiveness of the spending behavior of government officials. Odia (2014) added that supreme audit institutions serve as an assurance to the parliament or legislature on programme and issues of management by public utilities.

The audit act of 1956 covers areas of auditing and accounting in the public sector. It deals with the duties of the Auditor-General for the Federation and spells out the account, which the Accountant-General of the Federation should prepare and present for audit. The act also spelled out the power of the Auditor-General for the Federation. According to Kayode (2010), Robert, O. Ejenavi, former Auditor-General for the Federation, at a conference for federal and state Auditors in Abuja in August 2008, stated that Nigeria has no Audit Act and the colonial Act of 1956 was superseded by the limited provisions in the 1979 constitution,

which were also transferred to the 1999 constitution. Furthermore, efforts were made to have a modern Audit Act to strengthen the Auditors-General, with an Audit bill passed by the two houses of the national assembly but has not been signed into law. And as a matter of fact, the LFN 2004 (Laws of the Federation of Nigeria) excludes the Audit Act 1956, which means that it is no longer a law in Nigeria.

Supreme audit institutions contribute toward effectiveness, accountability, and improvement in the public sector information through their emphasis on economy, efficiency, effectiveness, equity, and ethics. In that regard, Nigeria's supreme audit institutions derive their origin from Westminster which is also known as Anglo Saxon or monocratic or parliamentary model. This model by Westminster is called Uninominal Supreme Audit Institution headed by a single authority called the Auditor-General (Santiso, 2007); this means that all rights, powers, and responsibilities are vested in the Auditor-General rather than SAI as an institution. Hence, under the Westminster system according to Ogiedu and Izedonmi (2013), the financial cycle starts with the National Assembly through budget presentations for an anticipated estimates of annual expenditure for a cycle of a year by the government and various MDAs through budgeting processes. While the process is duly observed, the budget is subjected to appropriate committees, and on the account of this expenditure framework are issued and the budget is passed. All government MDAs produce annual accounts including those from outstations as audited by the Office of the Auditor-General. Moreover, the office of the Auditor-General submits the Audit reports to the National Assembly for review, while the review is carried out by the public accounts committee (PAC) of the National Assembly which therefore issues its report as well as recommendation to which the executive or president is expected to respond to.

Instead of this, the various committees of the National Assemblies undertake oversight functions according to the provision of the constitution to ensure budgeting provisions are strictly adhered to. The National Assembly maintains an active Public Account Committee which works closely with the Office of the Auditor-General and is chaired by a member of the opposition party. Because of the audit bill that has been domiciled with the Nigeria National Assembly, subject to the provisions of the constitution, there is an established office known as the office of the Auditor-General for the Federation (The Office). The office shall be headed by the Auditor-General for the Federation. Subject to the constitution, the Auditor-General in exercising his powers or performing functions under this bill, shall not be under the direction or control of any authority or person (Federal Audit Service Commission Bill, 2016). Though, the bill has been duly passed in 2018 through bill passage processes by the two houses (Senate and House of Representatives) of the National Assembly and has been sent in January 2019 for the president assent. These are provisions or ways by which the supreme SAI could have been strengthened to ensure economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of performance audit if the bill was assented to by the Nigerian president.

Considerably, the Nigerian Supreme Audit Institution at the Federal level is divided into four main categories of operational departments: the ministerial department which deals with the audit of accounts of members and other agencies of government and all financial statements; the extra ministerial department is responsible for vetting the audited account of government companies, corporations, agencies, commissions, and other authorized departments; the project monitoring and evaluation Department which is to conduct a value for money and performance audits. Moreso, this department engages in examining and reporting on the

on of the economy, and the efficiency and effectiveness of government projects and programmes; the revenue Audit department involves in auditing revenue accrued to the government (Anyanwu, 2001).

Performance Audit

Performance audit has been defined differently by various academics and scholars worldwide. Performance audit has its own set of nomenclature, although different countries and academics use different terms to describe it which include value for money audit, comprehensive audit, efficiency audit, and operational audit (Yodit, 2016). The different terms do not entail different concepts, as most of them encapsulate auditing of a similar nature (Nurul Athirah Abd Manaf, 2010). Khan (2006) defined a performance audit as an audit of the activities of an organization to observe if the resources are being managed in a manner that regard for economy, efficiency, and effectiveness and if accountability requirements are being met reasonably. Odia (2014) submitted that a performance audit is a systematic, purposeful, organized, and objective examination of government activities. International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) Code of Ethics (1998), Regassa (2016:1) defined a performance audit as “an audit of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness with which the audited entity uses its resources in carrying out its responsibilities”. However, companies have better performance through an effective audit that can enable various business partners such as shareholders, personnel, and state institutions to obtain certainty about the quality and reliability of the information provided by the company (Achmad, Iman, & Melinda, 2020).

Performance audit examines the matters of efficiency and effectiveness, waste, probity, and compliance with a statutory obligation, financial prudence, or any combination of these (Udeh, 2016; Auditor General, 2009). It contributes toward effectiveness in the public sector through its emphasis on economy, efficiency, effectiveness, equity, and ethics (Matherly and Parker (1988) noted that a performance audit is an independent examination and evaluation of the economy and efficiency of an entity's operations as well as the effectiveness of its programmes. The above assertion showed that performance audit is a duty and obligation to express opinion ensuring correctness, compliance, and due diligence followed to the later amongst hierarchical structure of the public sector and those associated with the disbursement of public funds (Udeh, & Nwadiakor, 2016).

Performance audit examines the economy, the efficiency of operation (programmes and projects), and the effectiveness entail reliability of financial and operational information, safeguarding of assets, and compliance with rules and regulations designed to help an organization to achieve its objective. Dalia and Irena (2008) considered performance audits as one of the most effective means for improving performance and governance. They stated that the improvement system model allows for a wide concept of effective auditing and that the application of theory to practice is a frequent object of scientific research debate. In the independent profession, performance audit plays a significant role in the management of organizations and states' policies, programmes, and projects.

Performance audits are those procedures designed to assist management to establish necessary controls to ensure that the desired objective is met at the desired level of efficiency and effectiveness (Van & Williams, 2002). Oladipupo (2005) stated that performance auditing may be applied to private and public enterprises, but it is particularly more relevant in the public sector. It, therefore, followed that performance auditing is a term used to assess whether or not an organization has obtained the maximum benefit from the goods and services it acquires and provides within the resources available to it (Udeh & Elom, 2016). Furthermore, Adeniji (2010) stated that the objective of the performance audit or value for money audit is to investigate a system or activity in the organization, judging whether the objectives of the system are being achieved or the resources of the organization are being judiciously utilized or system is being operated economically or whether there is overspending. In Nigeria, there is that uncertainty about whether or not value for money audit has exacerbated clear relevant objectives in the public sector due to ineffectiveness, high level of corruption, lasciviousness, and inefficiency being reported in the sector (Udeh & Elom, 2016).

Hence, the success story of performance audits will be tailored to help management. The Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria (ICAN) Professional Examination Study Pack (2009) noted that performance auditing is a concept that seeks the examination the use of scarce resources for the welfare of the public by ensuring that activities and programmes are carried out at low cost and high standard. Performance audit is anchored on three pillars referred to as the 3Es; Economy, Efficiency, and Effectiveness. In view of the foregoing, it is obvious that performance audit in the public sector takes place in an environment where it is the responsibility of the management of government MDAs to institute measures to; acquire resources of the right quantity in the right quality at the right time and at the lowest possible cost (economy); achieving the optimal relationship between the output of service and the resources used to produce them (efficiency) and achieving policy objectives, operational goals and other intended effects (effectiveness).

2.3.1. Historical Antecedent of Performance Audit

Historically, the literature reviewed on performance auditing was limited to the United States (US), the United Kingdom (UK), Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The choice of audit performance antidote was limited to these countries due to the fact that all other countries are based on the Westminster system of governance, and have an Auditor-General (AG) who audits government expenditure and revenue, except for the US, which is said to have been considered as the most developed practice of performance auditing in the public sector context (Parker, 1990). However, the emergence of performance audits has provided literature on an evaluation of performance audits and identified eight (8) possible social, political, and economic themes that have influenced the emergence and practice of performance audits in the Anglo-American Public Sector. The theme includes: Auditor-General influences; Central and Local Governments; Government Fiscal Policies; Pressure from Lobby groups; Review Committees; Statutes and Legislation; The Public Sector Accounting Profession; and the Organization of the Audit Office/General Accounting Office.

The scope of the public sector audit now exceeds the expectation that the auditor only checks for regulatory and procedural compliance. It is now expected that auditors enhance

ability in the management of public sector resources. The perceived objective which performance auditing; economy, efficiency, and effectiveness emerge as a strong one which seems to comply with these more modern expectations of performance (Karen & Alan, 2005). Though Nigeria has its historical antecedent, these were not literature. Public accounts audit in Nigeria dates back to the beginning of the era (Ukura, 2016). Before 1910, these audits were performed by the Colonial Office and the Exchequer and Audit Department established in 1866. The Colonial Audit is responsible to the Secretary of State of the Colonies and was established in 1910. Year heads of audit of Southern and Northern protectorates were appointed. In Nigeria was first created through the amalgamation of the Northern and Southern Protectorates, and at this stage, an audit section was established as part of the Central Office in Lagos.

Officers of Audit were responsible to the Governor but were also "under the general control of the Director-General of the Overseas Audit Service (Audit Ordinance, 1956). According to Aguolu (2002), the concept of performance auditing in Nigeria became very popular because of the economic depression experienced during the 1980s. Generally, the practice of performance auditing was overlooked, but it is now gaining increasing importance due to the emphasis on performance improvement and accountability in the public sector (Odia, 2014). However, due to time relevance, Green and Singleton (2009) stated that Nigeria's performance audit was introduced in the 1960s to provide assurance and accountability concerns in the public sector.

With the emergence of new public management (NPM) and good government ideas, there have been rapid changes in the approach to public sector auditing. The focus has shifted from traditional compliance and financial auditing to issues of performance and results. This is the public sector reform by transferring private sector management principles to the public sector. The reform simplifies bureaucracy, forces innovation, and improves public sector efficiency and effectiveness. This however meant that organization performance assessment is needed both in the NPM and public sector reform (Nusrat, 2012). Performance audit works with the same performance management concepts used by public managers and their principals to plan, monitor, and evaluate how public resources are used to achieve public policy objectives. The concepts of inputs, processes, outputs, and impact, as well as their correlation with the above goals of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, are common tools for public managers and public performance assessment (Dalia and Irena, 2008).

In this vein, performance auditing in the Australian and Canadian Public sectors has shown that the Auditor-General has a significant personal and professional influence on the conduct of performance audits (Morin, 2001). Homburger (1989) showed that the development of performance audit at the Australian National Audit Office was greatly influenced by the professional and personal attitudes and competence of the Auditor-General over a span of fifteen years. The study outlines how each of the Auditor-Generals has contributed to the development of public sector auditing from

sector resources. This influenced the practice and development of performance audit through extensive levels of reporting on public sector resources management and the use of appropriate funds (Radeliffe, 1998).

Moreso, New Zealand in the 1970s experienced public sector growth with a consequent increase in government spending. Hence, the Account Office took it upon itself to comment on government expenditures that it thought were wasteful or extravagant. By providing the government with reports on how departments and entities are being run, and which used the resources in a wasteful and extravagant manner. However, the Account Office appeared to be signaling to the government to cut back on the fund and other resources allocated to such departments. There were suggestions according to Pallot (2003) that the New Zealand government took a major step to cut back budgetary allocations to such government departmental. Wherefore, in the late 1980s, there was a reduction in the size of the public sector. In another development, in the UK, the local government authorities influenced the emergence of performance audits by undertaking a review of the 1972 Local Government Financial Act in 1982 (Grimwood & Tomkins, 1986). The 1982 review provided the Accountant-General with the mandate to undertake performance audits in the local government municipalities.

At the Central government level, the national audit Act 1983 was revised which provides the Accountant-General with the mandate for a performance audit. Broadbent and Guthrie (1992) included that the government at the Central was changing the organizational form of traditional governments to that of statutory bodies whereby the statutory bodies had to operate accounting to the rules of a commercial entity that is being focused on outputs. It however follows that performance audit has been the grand norm at which government has it various public services priorities aligned. In the case of USA, Flesher and Zarzeski (2002) admitted that congress had requested the General Accounting Office (GAO) after World War 11 to undertake management audits for government-owned companies for control purposes. Though congress initiated a performance audit, the nature, scope, objective, and to an extent development of a framework, practice, and structure of performance audit. However, changes in the leadership and staffing need at the general accounting office from the period of 1960 to 1980 facilitated as well as enhanced the emergence of performance audits in the USA.

2.3.2. Benefits of Performance Audit

Performance audit reinforces the accountability of ministers and public sector managers for their performance as well as recognize and advise parliament of management initiatives and achievements (Udeh and Elom, 2016). Also, it assists in holding the implementers of government programmes accountable for the economic, efficient, and effective discharge of budgeted programmes. According to Yodit (2016), a performance audit is an important building block with which to improve accountable and responsive governance of public resources. However, it is a management tool that provides information and feedback for organizational improvement.

Oladipupo (2005) on his part, noted that the benefits of a performance audit include: informing the management and public whether value for money is being received from the public expenditure; It demonstrating general direction for improvement; It is a source of

independent and reliable information for the legislation and top management; It sharpens the process of accountability in public administration; It creates awareness among public managers towards efficiency and effectiveness. Adzor, Clement, and Mike (2016) admitted that performance audit help ministries, departments, and agencies improve their operations. Also, it can be seen as an investment that should lead to better functioning public entities. It identifies important problems; analyses the causes and effects and presents recommendations for using resources in a better way.


2.3.3. Performance Audit Processes and Procedures

The process of performance audit differs. Performance audit is an essential element of the accountability process in all public jurisdictions. Performance audit is a learning process. Obtaining the required knowledge is a continuous and cumulative process of gathering and assessing information at all stages of the audit. The auditor must weigh the costs of obtaining information against the additional values of the information to the audit. Performance audit works with the same performance management process, procedures, and concepts used by program managers and their principals to plan monitor, and evaluate how public resources are used to achieve public policy objectives (Dalia & Irena, 2008).

Ordinarily, the process of performance audit in Nigeria starts with the office of the Auditor-General with detailed programmes and procedures as contained in the relevant documents. The office of the Auditor-General of Nigeria is configured to carry out both financial and performance audits which involve examining and reporting on the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of government projects and programmes (Anyanwu, 2001). Consequent to this, efforts are made to ensure that revenue collected from all sources is properly accounted for through the process of value for money and performance audit engagements. Though the Auditor-General has no powers to publicize audit reports, he has to refer them to the legislature which holds the government to account. The Supreme Audit Institution is saddled with the responsibility to give information to the legislature and they are required to do so effectively where objectivity comes to fusion without any downplay.

The audit procedures also include: tests of controls on the systems used to generate performance information; performing an analytical review to evaluate trends and measure the consistency of the programme information; interacting with management teams and those responsible for the reporting process; review of minutes of meetings where performance information programmes have been deliberated upon; sample base test to confirmed performance information to source documentation; and reconciliation of qualitative information or programme measure. Hence, the audit working paper must contain a summary of findings and conclusions on the procedures that have been performed.

Similarly, International Standard of Supreme Audit Institution (ISSAI) 3200 highlighted performance audit processes and procedures to include the following components as shown in the diagram below:



Sources: Adopted from ISSAI 3200 – Performance Auditing Process

2.3.3.1 Planning: - It contains the requirements and guidelines for planning the audit. The requirement is aimed at establishing the overall approach to the audit. It also involves selecting the audit topics and designing the audit (Itelsinki, 2007).

2.3.3.2 Conducting: - INTOSAI (2007) noted the requirement and guidelines for conducting performance audits. The requirement is aimed at establishing the overall approach for the auditor to apply when conducting a performance audit and it is also associated with obtaining sufficient and appropriate audit evidence and using this evidence to answer the audit objective and audit questions. Also, it entails carrying out the audit work in order to obtain sufficient and appropriate evidence to support the auditor's findings and conclusions.

2.3.3.3 Reporting: - According to Itelsinki (2007), the format of the report, the report contents, and the purpose of the report are to provide the audit's distribution frameworks for communicating the results of the performance audit.

2.3.3.4 Follow-Up: - It is an important tool to strengthen the impact of the audit and improve future audit work. Follow-up will provide feedback to the SAI, the legislature, and the government on performance audit effectiveness and the improvements made by the audited entity. According to ISSAI 3000 (136), the auditor shall follow up, as appropriate, on previous audit findings and recommendations and the SAI shall report to the legislature, if possible, on the conclusions and impacts of all relevant corrective actions. Accordingly, follow-up of previous findings and recommendations in performance audit reports is to identify and document the impact of the audit and the progress made in the problems.

Khan and Chowdry (2008) added that the process of performance audit includes determining whether or not the value of the projects executed by each Ministry/Extra Ministerial Department and Agency (MDAs) in relation to the money spent on the project meets the stated plans and objectives in accordance with the provisions of extant law and rule of engagement; ensuring that whatever money spent on the implementation of projects and provision to the members of the public commensurate with the value of such projects so that the purpose of the expenditure does not defect and public funds are not misappropriated or diverted; ascertaining the compliance of the ministries to government appropriation bill and budget follows due process and to the later; determine exactly what was done and what values members of the public have derived from the set targets by way of acceptability, accountability through evaluation report and feedbacks.

According to Yodit (2016), performance auditing is carried out in three phases: planning, fieldwork, and reporting. The planning stages deal with the establishment of guidelines and providing guidance on the methods and processes of implementing performance audits in an organized manner. Fieldwork sets out the required tasks and maps out processes for each aspect of fieldwork. It involves the process of evidence gathering, analyzing, and evaluating that evidence as directed by the approved audit procedures and when the exact steps to be followed are specific to each audit as determined in the fieldwork plan. Thus, some data collection considerations are common to all audits (Waring & Morgan, 2007). Performance audit objectives of fieldwork are often developed after the audit begins based on an assessment of the risks and vulnerabilities associated with the activity being audited or initiated at the request of parliamentarians or ministers. Reporting has to come from each

the audit team would have to determine the means of reporting audit findings at the end of the fieldwork. The medium for reporting process should be thought out and the audit organization's relevant auditing standards including the end user's needs.

organizations around the world use a different methods to carry out the various environmental team work is conducive to the conduct of performance audits, as the different perspectives and experiences can enhance the value of the product. Megbelube stated that the process of a performance audit is usually made up of economy, efficiency, and efficiency as well as program audits. Agbo and Aruomoaghe (2014) added that economy and efficiency audits determine whether the entity is following sound management practices, acquiring appropriate types of resources, properly protecting and managing resources, avoiding duplication of effort by employees, avoiding idleness and using efficient operating procedures, using optimum amounts of resources, complying with requirements of laws and regulations that can affect the acquisition, management, and use of resources which has an adequate management control system.

Measure of Performance audit Effectiveness

In measuring performance audit effectiveness, auditors tend to equate the success of the performance audit with whether or not their recommendations have been followed. By so doing, performance audit has to start with an understanding of the entity to ensure that the auditor has knowledge of the predetermined performance measures; evaluation of the systems and controls used to derive and capture the performance programmes, as well as performing the audit procedures on the reported measures are achieved. The performance auditor must understand the purpose behind the measures. Hence, to properly assess the effectiveness of the objectives of the public sector organization and the usefulness of the services being provided. According to Etverk (2002) recommendations accepted by the entity can be a good way of measuring the effectiveness of a performance audit. The main advantage of this measure is that it identifies the achievement as well as the influencing factors and analyzes why one audit was better than another.

Measuring the effectiveness of performance audits is important to analyze their impact on the public sector and raise its future contribution. Morin (2003) noted that one of the aspects of the extension of performance audit mandates to include a review of efficiency, and indeed the general outcome focus, was that it raised the issue of whether the audit should be focused on controlling public sector performance or on improving it (Morin, & Schmitz, 2019). Pollitt and Summa (1997) cited in Etverk, (2002) that the proportion of recommendations in performance audit reports accepted by the entity is the most common measure used by three renowned SAIs: the UK National Audit Office, Swedish Audit office, and Dutch Algemene Rekenkamer.

Financial savings achieved is another measurement parameter for performance audit effectiveness. The main advantage of financial measure is that it is easy to read and understand and more credible than non-financial argumentation. The financial savings

which includes auditees' perceptions and reaction which has to do with how the auditee feels about the audit, the impact on the audited organization which involves whether it has a negative or positive impact, and the contribution to the public debate which has to do with the added value it has brought to public debate. However, difficulties of measurement are inherent in the nature of performance in the public sector, because performance can never be finally defined. Hence, it can never be adequately measured (Stewart & Walsh, 1994).

2.5. Performance Audits and Public Sector Transparency and Accountability

The primary stakeholder in an accountability scheme are the people, they ensure public officeholders are accountable for the management of revenue collected for public use from public coffers as well as ensuring that public debt and expenditure on public programmes meet stated objectives (Ukura, 2016). The increasing public demands for transparency in governance and the global outcry against corruption in recent times have now made accountability of intense concern among nations (Ozuomba, 2019). Therefore, public officers are held accountable for effective management systems of funds, compliance with laws and government policies and initiatives, and the delivery of an acceptable level of services to the citizens. Accountability for the spending of public money is at the heart of public sector management. Accountability, therefore, relates to the obligations of the managers to give adequate reports or information about their performance and the manner in which they have used the powers or resources given to them (Laxmikanth, 2006).

INTOSAI (1998) added that public accountability will be more effectively promoted when SAIs perform performance audits and holds the government accountable to the legislature and public for their stewardship of public funds. According to Ozuomba (2019) accountability deals largely with resource input and with the expectation of the output which could be human or capital input. Park (2020) conducted a study on enhancing the transparency and accountability of state-owned enterprises in Asian and other economies. Hence, found that the majority of the countries do not publish aggregate ownership reports, which could potentially limit accountability and restrict the public from overseeing state-owned enterprise performance, and recommends the establishment of comprehensive legal and regulatory frameworks for public disclosure of financial and non-financial information about the activities of state-owned entities is critical.

Ogundana and Okere (2017) stated that accountability is the process whereby public sector entities, and the individuals within them, are responsible for their decisions and actions, including their stewardship of public funds and all aspects of performance, and submit themselves to appropriate external scrutiny. A public sector financial statement is the means by which information about government activities is made known to the public hence audit report is needed to access the performance of those entrusted with public sector resources and this, therefore, implies that proper audit plays a significant role in promoting accountability and transparency. Performance audit is mainly used to evaluate the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of an entity's operations to assure that strategic board targets are done and whether they can be enhanced (Ozuomba, 2019). A performance audit is an examination rather made on a non-recurring basis that controls selected issues at a given point in time, therefore, resembles evaluation, but is placed in an institutional control of accountability (Roness & Rubecken, 2006).

Supreme Audit Institution performs an essential role in strengthening accountability and ensuring good governance in various governments MDAs, parastatals, and improves performance, enhance transparency, ensure accountability, fights corruption, promotes public trust, and fosters the efficient and effective receipt and use of public resources of their country (Odia, 2014). Ogundana and Okere (2017) study on the impact of public sector auditing in promoting accountability and transparency in Nigeria found that lack of transparency and accountability in the public sector presents a major risk to the efficiency of capital markets, financial stability, long-term economic sustainability, economic growth, development. Public accountability mechanisms are needed to prevent the misuse of funds; therefore, the role of external control institutions is rarely questioned (Udeh & Etom, 2016). The principles of transparency are related to the openness of a public sector entity to its constituents (Institute of Internal Auditors, 2012). The public sector's decisions, actions, and transactions need to be conducted openly to enable relevant stakeholders to access accurate facts and information on the performance and operations of the public sector.

Transparency is a necessary part of accountability but it is not the same as accountability (Ogundana & Okere, 2017). The government is charged to discharge its responsibility in a manner by which they have effectively and efficiently used the resources at its disposal and to ensure a well transparent financial reporting which enhances accountability it is not sufficient to determine whether or not the activities of the government have been in the interest of the public. Park (2020) stated that internationally recognized good practices call for the establishment of a comprehensive policy framework to ensure accountability and transparency in government-owned entities. Glynn (1985) submits that accountability in the public sector occurs when both politicians and the public at large respect and are assured that public funds are being spent efficiently, economically, and on effective programmes. He noted that the introduction of value-for-money auditing in Canada was accompanied by a number of institutional innovations, hence, all of which were designed to increase the accountability of public sector organizations.

Effectiveness of Performance Audit and Public Sector

Effectiveness can be defined as the achievement of the desired results in the medium and long term. Luiz and Mury (2020) submitted that effectiveness is the relationship between the results of a program, in terms of effects on the targeted population (observed impacts), and the intended objectives (expected impacts). Udeh and Elom (2016) opined that effectiveness is a measure of achieving policy objectives, operational goals, and other intended effects. Efficiency is closely linked to effectiveness because it is an important factor in determining the least-cost method of achieving desired outcomes (INTOSAI, 1995). Failures in effectiveness arise when an entity does not produce the expected outputs, results, or outcomes and the audit of effectiveness will therefore concentrate on outputs, results, or outcomes (Dalia & Irena, 2008). Effectiveness focuses on the relationship between outputs and the intended objectives of an entity. With regard to effectiveness, performance auditors focus on the results of an entity and evaluate how the outputs have contributed to the achievement of its intended objectives. On the other hand, efficiency focuses on the relationship between the inputs and the outputs of an entity. Efficiency focuses on the relationship between the inputs and the outputs of an entity. Efficiency focuses on the relationship between the inputs and the outputs of an entity.

According to Yodit (2016), a performance audit is only effective in so far as it has convinced the decision makers of the units inspected of the rightness of its case and persuaded them of the effects of the necessary changes. In the public sector, a performance audit assists the government to demonstrate to the public whether it has fulfilled its responsibility with regard to the accountability of resources or not. A performance audit is aimed at evaluating a public entity's performance by assessing its dispositions and the results it has achieved. It examines whether programs implemented have achieved their goals economically, efficiently, and effectively (Olaoye & Adedeji, 2019). Effectiveness according to Hatherly and Parker (1988) is an end oriented rather than a means-oriented concept that has been defined as the degree to which predetermined entity objectives for a particular activity or programme are achieved. They admitted that monitoring effectiveness identifies major operational objectives of the auditee by ensuring their consistency with legislature/ministerial directives and higher level objectives and assessing the adequacy of the auditee mechanisms in place for monitoring the achievement of operational objectives.

It, therefore, follows as aforementioned above that effectiveness measures the relationship between the output and outcomes in terms of the output level, quantity, timeliness, quality, price cost, customer satisfaction, mission and objectives accomplishment, money in terms of its saving advantage, and cost adequacy (Waring & Morgan, 2007). It measures the extent to which the policies and programs of the public sector have affected society. Also, it focuses on how the policies and programs of the public sector are being distributed among the geopolitical regions or the targeted population or audience and examine whether there has been fairness in the utilization and rendering of stewardship of the resources at the disposal of all the public sector. The effectiveness of a program can be assessed by evaluating and reviewing some basic issues including the degree to which the programme's objectives are being met; the relative cost-effectiveness of the present method of delivering the programme; the degree to which the programme continues to make sense and addresses a continuing need; and the assessment of the programmes intended or unintended impact and effects (McRoberts & Hudson, 1985). Hence, it ensures that the output delivered the desired outcome.

Performance audit effectiveness in relation to the achievement of the objectiveness of the audited entity reviewed the actual impact of activities compared with the intended impact (Regassa, 2016). It concerns the better achievement of objectives by changing the nature of output or improved targets; better identification and justification of needs; introducing better sub-objectives and targets as well as clarifying objectives and policies. The approach also considers whether systems in place produce relevant, reliable, and timely information on the development of human, financial and other resources (output), the carrying out of activities (processes), and the delivery of the outputs, compared with operational objectives by way of performance indicators. This helps to examine discrepancies when it arises and to take appropriate and timely actions. Effectiveness is considered with the consideration of the success of, or the extent to which outputs achieve the intended outcome or desired goals of a public sector entity (Nirmala *et al.*, 2005). Audit effectiveness as regards achieving the audit's objective is by gathering sufficient and appropriate audit evidence in order to express a reasonable opinion regarding the financial statement's compliance with generally acceptance accounting principles (Shoommuangpak & Ussahawanitchakit, 2009).

In auditing the effectiveness of an operation, an effort is made to determine the extent to

targets for programmes or activities are achieved (Oshisami, 1992). Hence, the scope of deficiencies are corrected following the audited process (Mizrahi & man, 2007). This involves an inquiry into the results of benefits achieved and the or activities to determine their achievement of established objectives (Nkwagu oebu, 2019). Performance audit searches out problems by analyzing the problem, on of its roles, and the nature of institutional legitimacy. The successful on of the problem streams lead to finding answers to the problem depending on ctors, resources, culture, power differentiation, styles of coalition building, and efore, performance audit reports provide an independent assessment of an area of or activity. It seeks to improve resource management and add value to an agency ecommendation for improving operations and procedures (Dalia & Irena, 2008). ts of the outcomes or impacts on citizens will be a reduction in corruption; services; government personnel being more aware of external security and more responsive to public needs; promotion of reform in processes and as well as more credible public dissemination of government programmes; tation of activities between state auditor and civil society thereby expanding d improving quality of reviewed accountabilities (Morn, 2001).

Challenges of Effective Performance Audit in the Nigeria Public Sector

Performance audit in Nigeria's public sector is faced with numerous challenges and the following:

The Issue of Loophole in the Legislative Framework

ive framework has numerous loopholes in the 1999 Constitution of Nigeria and Finance Management Act (2004) as repealed does not give the office of the eral of the federation any sanctioning powers to compel MDA and public comply with the treasury instructions. There is a lack of political will of the d the legislature to implement the reports of performance audits carried out by f the Auditor General in the country and the non-assent of the Federal Audit mission Bill 2016 by the president is worthy of note.

Auditor's Independence Threat

ne Auditor General has no independence from the executive or political office e discharge of their duties. The executives have the power to appoint the Auditor rmine the nature of their tenure, and determine their financial autonomy as well ng needs (Udeh & Elom, 2016). This, therefore, indicates that the platform with ditor Generals in Nigeria determine how well the resources are managed with s is weak owing to the enormous undue control challenges. This impliedly tcome of the Auditor General's report weak since they are under the control of as or executives that appoints them. The non-assent by the president of the

2.7.3. Unsatisfactory Performance of Public Account Committee

Performance audit is an essential element of accountability in public jurisdiction. The legislature through Public Account Committee (PAC) is the centre of accountability in the public sector as championed by the Auditor General's office using performance audits. The Auditor-General office faces the challenge of lack of sufficient authority to ensure that audit findings and recommendations are acted upon or fully implemented by the executives. PAC has the responsibility to ensure that public officers are accountable by complying and enforcing the implementation of performance audit reports but this is not the case as corruption and mismanagement of public resources are given the free opportunity to blossom (Odia, 2014; Udeh & Elom, 2016).

2.7.4. Unavailability of Professional Competence to Conduct Effective Performance Audit

Performance audit needs well-trained and competent professionals because it involves the judgment of the auditor. According to Nusrat (2012), the subjective nature of a performance audit means that this audit must be meticulously carried out and the people involved should be fully trained. An audit procedure that needs the exercise of judgment beyond the ability of the person expected to make the judgment will likely fail. Yodit (2016) observed that the lack of adequate and competent staff extends a noticeable influence on performance audit effectiveness and that the influence could be attributed to the lack of manpower planning and failure to attract and retain adequate professionals.

2.7.5. Lack of Post-Audit Follow Up

The effectiveness of a performance audit is undermined if no post-audit follow-up is conducted. Nirmala (2011) stated that if the Auditor-General submits reports to the legislature and these are not read, understood, and acted upon, the system breaks down. In such cases, the legislators may not detect or understand important audit findings, or may not follow up on the implementation of audit recommendations by the executive.

2.7.6. Difficulty in Identity and Measure Outputs and Outcomes

It is difficult to identify and measure the extent to which public welfare is maximized importantly when national plans may not be linked to strategic plans from MDAs. Consequently, outputs and outcomes are difficult to identify and measure in the short run. Udeh and Elom (2016) study on challenges of performance auditing in public sector accountability in Nigeria; a case of the office of auditor general with the use of documentary and content analysis approach observed that the Constitution of Nigeria and other Financial/Audit Acts do not give Office of Auditor-General any sanctioning powers to compel MDAs to comply and enforce the reports of performance audit.

3.0. THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING

The theory of performance audit considered relevant to this paper has been in existence over decades, propounded and developed by the most notable school of thought among whom are

and Meckling (1976) and others. However, notable among the theories of performance audit effectiveness in the public sector analysis links the theories of credibility, confidence, and agency. These theories help to resolve the relationship between the public servant who is handling government concern for the citizens and the one who is ensuring that government gets value for his money on behalf of the citizenry. Credibility theory states that the credibility of the information sources influences judgments and decisions (Eagly & Chaiké, 1993). This is seen in the performance reports on public sector engagement. For a performance audit to come up with a report on public sector effectiveness, efficiency, economic, transparency, and accountability, it must have been influenced by source and quality evidence, the level of competence and skill of the performance audit expert opinion, and evaluator assessment of any shortcoming noticed on performance.

Credibility is rooted in a biased source, expertise, and reviewer point of view (Birnbbaum & Perloff, 1979). The literature explains that credibility is made up of expertise and trustworthiness (McGinnies & Ward 1980; Perloff, 1993). This theory regards the primary purpose of auditing to be the addition of credibility to the financial statements. Audited financial statements are used by management which is the agent in order to enhance the faith in the agent's stewardship and reduce the information asymmetry. This theory states that audited information does not form the primary basis for investors' investment decisions (Porter, 1990). However, trustworthiness in this concept is twin to ethics which is the human aspect that affects performance audit accountability, transparency, and reporting. Expertise is a specialized skill and knowledge embedded in the audit suggesting that a performance audit report will be more credible than a financial audit report in matters of the audit engagement.

In the backdrop, the theory of inspired confidence posits that the role of an auditor is to enhance inspiring confidence in the users of financial statements. The theory states that the auditor in his ability makes available sufficient information by ensuring his competence and objectivity are up to the performance. This implies that as a result of the trust placed in the auditors as being independent in the auditing techniques used, the trust in the credibility to financial statements which then leads to higher audit quality (Jensen & Adebisi, 2013). Consequently, agency theory explains the relationship that exists between the principal and the agent. Jensen and Meckling (1976) portray that information asymmetry is understood when the contractual arrangement is connected to the agents (agents) purposely or inadvertently keeping information available to the principals (Principals).

Agency theory is the recognition that the inclination of agents (Directors or Managers) of an organization is for the general well-being of the owners (shareholders), employers, and the public rather than in their interests (Millichamp & Taylor, 2008). An agency relationship is a contract under which one or more persons, the principal, engages another person to perform some services on their behalf which involves delegating some authority to the agent (Jensen & Meckling, 1976).

reduced by monitoring the opportunistic attitudes of managers. Millichamp and Taylor (2008) added that the agent is the name given to the practice by which productive resources owned by one person or group are managed by another person or group of persons. Agency theory, on the other hand, is the recognition that the inclination of agents, in this case, the public servant (director or manager) of the enterprise (Business) is to act rather than move in their interests than those of their employers (Government) or the citizens (shareholders). Wang (2017) stresses that information asymmetry is a situation whereby the firm's management has more private information than existing shareholders or potential investors. Therefore, if shareholders and creditors do not observe companies' risk management activities directly, they will tend to institute monitoring systems to increase the flow of information about these activities. And to reduce uncertainty and in the absence of such a monitoring mechanism, managers seem more likely to perform opportunistically by withholding relevant information or by manipulating reporting to their advantage by making misleading disclosures (Latham & Jacobs, 2000). Hence, agency theory is built around the key ideals of self-interest, adverse selection moral hazard, signaling, incentives, information asymmetry, and the contract (Macintosh, 1994).

4.01 REVIEW OF PRIOR STUDIES

Prior studies relating to the effectiveness of performance audits and the public sector were reviewed in this section. Luiz and Mury (2020) conducted a study on performance audit applying the principle of effectiveness in a case study in Brazil using regression analysis based on the difference in differences with a sample of primary schools of the target municipality, before and after the adoption of the private textbooks. The study showed that there was a negative impact hence the principle of effectiveness in performance audit was not achieved. Njanike and Dube (2009) carried out a study on the impact of performance audits in the public sector using descriptive and content analysis research approaches in Mozambique and Ghana. Univariate and multivariate tests were performed using statistical mean, standard deviation, t-test, and spearman rank order correlation. The study found that government auditors pay much attention to the internal control systems put in place in the government MDAs rather than the outcome of the government policies and programmes on the citizens which is the basic yardstick for measuring the value of policies and programmes. Yodit (2016) carried out a study on factors affecting performance audit effectiveness in the case of office of federal auditor general of Ethiopia. The study covered a period from 2009-2015 and used survey questionnaire analysis. Data was analyzed on quantitative basis using Pearson's correlation, linear regression analysis and descriptive statistics. The study found that there is strongly significant positive relationship among adequate and competent professionals, post audit follow up and performance audit effectiveness. Nkwagu and Nwamgbebu (2019) conducted a study to ascertain the effects of value-for-money auditing on local government service delivery in Ebonyi State. The study adopted a structured and cross-sectional survey design with 136 senior staff in the account, internal audit, and five other departments in the nine selected local government area in Ebonyi State. The paper employed multiple regression of the ordinary least square in analyzing data. It was revealed that the economic principle in procurement and the effectiveness principle in budget implementation has no significant effect, while the efficiency principle in resource utilization has a positive significant effect on local government service delivery. This means

COLLISION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COLLISION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COLLISION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

effective tool in curbing corruption and this agrees with Agbo and Aruomoaghe (2014).

5.0. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Performance audit is a management tool that is becoming more sophisticated to accommodate different communities' needs and levels of government over services ranging from public safety and public works to economic development. Globalization and liberalization changes which enhance the access to information and the rising societal and country's expectations for change in all aspects of life including the public sector management systems have become imminent and audit is not lagging in this reform. The audit has gone beyond the examination of expenditure and now beginning to look into the processes and procedures that influence the decision on expenditure. Auditors look at management processes and systems to determine the cost-effectiveness of public expenditure. Emphasis on performance and results is important to overcome the inefficiencies of procedure-driven bottlenecks in Nigeria. Using a library research approach, this paper examined performance audit effectiveness in the Nigeria public sector and observed that the institutional control by the executive and the legislative arm of government, unavailability of professional competence and lack of post-audit follow-up, difficulty to identify and measure output and outcomes constitutes a serious threat in ensuring performance audit effectiveness in the Nigeria public sector.

Against this backdrop, however, prior literature on the effectiveness of performance audit has either focused on the principle of effectiveness of performance audit, factors affecting it in other countries, or looking at the impact of performance audit in the public sector as a case of other countries. Studies from Nigeria focused on accountability and transparency in the public sector through performance auditing and the role of the Supreme Audit Institution.

Moreso, this paper reviewed the literature on the effectiveness of performance audits in Nigeria's public sector by using a library research approach. The study is not limited to only performance audit, its processes, Nigeria's public sector, and its audit, but goes on to evaluate performance audits and public sector transparency and accountability, performance audit effectiveness and public sector as well as the challenges of effective performance audit in Nigeria public sector. The study also summarized some recommendations in order to improve the performance audit effectiveness in the Nigerian public sector. Hence, the following points are of importance and to be considered. There should be an amendment to the Nigeria Constitution (1999) and the Public Finance Management Act (2004) and the passage of the Federal Audit Service Commission bill 2016 to ensure that the office of the Auditor General of the Federation is independent of undue interference of the government and also given the statutory power and audit mandate to carry out a performance audit.

The Auditor General of the Federation should ensure that adequate and competent staff which can help it develop the right performance audit team matrix are employed. There is a need to enhance the awareness of performance audit effectiveness in MDAs and parastatals in Nigeria. There is a need to establish and fund a public sector audit training centre where performance auditors could be trained to boost their skills and become enlightened with global best practices. Public account committee (PAC) should wake up to their functions that would enhance the confidence and credibility citizens bestowed on them in relation to accountability. The office of the Auditor General of the Federation should oversee that

recommendations stated on performance audit reports are implemented by undertaking post-audit follow up, and performance audit reports should be made public in Nigeria to enable citizen's access their public officers' performance in line with the resources available to them to manage.

REFERENCES

- Adedokun, D. D., Iman, H., & Melinda, C. R. (2020). Internal audit functions and audit outcomes: Evidence from Indonesia, *Cogent Business and Management*, 7(1), 1-21.
- Adegoke, R. A. (2006). Public sector accounting and finance made simple (Revised edition). Lagos: Corporate publishers.
- Adegoke, R. A. (2010). Auditing and assurance services. Lagos: El. Toda Ventures Limited.
- Adegoke, R. A. (2011). Public sector accounting and finance. Ilorin: Rajah Dynamic publication.
- Adegoke, R. A., Clement, O., & Mike, S. (2016). The effect of performance audit on the implementation of fadama II project in federal capital territory Abuja. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 7(23), 34-35.
- Adegoke, R. A., & Aruomoaghe, J. A. (2014). Performance audit: A tool for fighting corruption in Nigeria's public sector administration. *International Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 3(6): 374-383.
- Adegoke, R. A. (2002). Fundamentals of auditing. Enugu: Meridia Associates page 518.
- Adegoke, R. A., & P. (2012). Ethical dilemmas in accountancy practice; Australian accountant. *International Journal of Business Ethics*, 14(2) 97-104.
- Adegoke, R. A. M. O. (2002). Public sector accounting. Enugu: G. D. P. R. O Foundation publishers.
- Adegoke, R. A., & F. N. (2001). Audit profile: Office of the Auditor General for the Federation, *International Journal of Government Accounting* April, 1-5.
- Ordinance (1956: 7). Audit Act 1956, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, 1990, CAP 119.
- International standard 2, 7 definition
- Adegoke, R. A. (2013). Stakeholder perception on the effectiveness of internal control system on financial accountability in Nigeria public sector. *International Journal of Business and Management* Invention, 2(1), 16-33.
- Adegoke, R. A., M. H., & Stegner, S. E. (1979). Source credibility in social judgment: Expertise and the Judge's point of view. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(1), 48-74.
- Adegoke, R. A., J., & Guthrie, J. (1992). Changes in the public sector. A review of recent alternatives in accounting research. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 2(1), 3-31.
- Companies Act (1990). Company and Allied Matters Act 1990. Lagos: Landlord Publishers.
- Adegoke, R. A., & Irena, M. (2008). Development of performance audit in public sector. *International Scientific Business and Management Conference* (5th ed.), 16-17 May, 2008. Vilnius, Lithuania.
- Adegoke, R. A. (2012). Role of performance audit in fighting corruption: Evidences from EFRE

- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Fort worth, Fx: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich college publishers.
- Ejere, (2012). Promoting accountability in public sector management in today's democratic Nigeria through value for money audit. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 4(8), 106-113.
- Esu, B. B., & Iyang, B. J. (2009). A case for performance management in the public sector in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(4), 98-105.
- Etverk, J. (2002). *Measuring performance audit effectiveness the case of Estonia* (Master Thesis). University of Taru.
- Federal Audit Service Commission Bill (2016). Review of relevant Information on Nigeria's Democracy. Policy and legal Advocacy Centre (PLAC), Fact Sheet, 1(1), 1-20.
- Flesher, D. L., & Zarzeski, M. T. (2002). The roots of value for money auditing in English speaking countries. *Accounting and Business Research*, 32(2), 93-104.
- FGN (1999). *The 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and Fundamental Rights (Enforcement Procedures) rules 2008*. Abuja: Federal Government of Nigeria.
- Fragile State Index. (2020). Fund for Peace assessment Ranked Nigeria 15 out of 177 Nations as failed State with 97.27% growing at an average annual of 0.23% based on twelve indicators of vulnerability Four Social, Two Economic and Six Political. Washington DC, Foreign Policy Magazine Publishers. Retrieved from www.fragilestateindex.org
- Gheorghiu, A. (2012). Performance auditing - A complex concept. *Hyperion International Journal of Econophysics and New Economy*, 5(1), 159-176.
- Gildenhuis, C. E., & Jense Van Rensbury, J. O. (2017). The fourth E of performance auditing. *Southern African Journal of Accountability and Auditing Research*, 19(1), 117-127.
- Green, D., & Singleton, J. (2009). *The watchdog: New Zealand's Audit Office*. Dunedin: Otago University Press.
- Grimwood, M., & Tomkins, C. (1986). Value for money auditing: Towards incorporating a mutualistic approach. *Financial accountability and management*, 2(4), 251-272.
- Glynn, J. J. (1987). The Development of performance auditing in Australia: Paper Presented at the Annual Research Lecture in Government Accounting. Australian Society of Accountants.
- Homburger, P. (1989). Efficiency auditing by the Australian audit office: Reform and reaction under three Auditors General. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 2(3), 13-21.
- Hatherly, D. J., & Parker, L. D. (1988). Performance auditing outcome: A comparative study. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 4(1), 21-41.
- Hereck, A. (1989). Australian International Development Assistance Bureau. In B. Craia (Ed.) *Public Sector Financial Management Series*. Centre for Pacific Development and Training. Australia, Parliamentary Research Service.
- Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria [ICAN] (2009). *Advance audit and assurance; professional examination 1*. Lagos: VI Publishers.
- Institute of Internal Auditors. (2012). *Supplemental guidance: The role of auditing in public sector governance*.
- INTOSAI (1995). *Implementing guidelines for the INTOSAI auditing standards*. INTOSAI Framework of Professional Pronouncements (IFPP). SAIs of the European Union Ad hoc group on auditing standards, 33, 103-141, European.
- INTOSAI (1998). *Code of ethics and auditing standards*. Issued by the Auditing Standards Committee at the XVIth Congress of INTOSAI in Montevideo, Uruguay.

- 013). Overview of Concept Notes and Cross-cutting Issues. INTOSAI
ment Initiative Supporting Effective, Accountable and Inclusive.
tability for Development. The International Standards of Supreme Audit
ons, Performance Audit guidelines: ISSAI 3000 –3100. Retrieved from
tosai.org
- Standards of Supreme Audit Institution [ISSAI], (2007). Guidelines for the
ance auditing process. Retrieved from <http://www.Intosai.org>
- 007). Performance audit manual. Finland: Edita Prima LTD.
- Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behaviour, Agency
d ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305-360.
- 008). How effective are performance audits? A multiple case study within the
udit Office of Rotterdam, 5th International Conference on Accounting,
and Management in Public Sector Reforms.
- 6). The role of Audit in the Fight against Corruption. Being a paper prepared
oc group meeting of ethics, integrity, and accountability in the Public Sector:
ing Public Trust in Government through the Implementation of the UN
ion against Corruption. 26-27 September 2006. St. Petersburg, Russia and
Asian Pacific Journal of Administration, 30(1): 15 - 28.
- Chowdry, N. (2008). Public accountability in differencing governance
S: Challenges and options. *Asian pacific Journal of Administration*, 30(1): 15
- 2010). Public sector accounting and finance manual. Jos: Larigraphics press
- , & Jacobs, F. A. (2000). Mandating and incentive effects influencing
g disclosures. *Journal of Management Issues*, 12(2), 169-187.
- I. (2006: 201). Public administration. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill
g Company Limited.
- ry, M. (2020). Performance Audit: Applying the principle of effectiveness in
dy. *Applied Finance and Accounting*, 6(1), 40-45.
- 1994). Management accounting and control systems. An organizational
rior approach, New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- (2010). The impact of performance audit: The New Zealand experience.
esis, Victoria University, Wellington.
- & Ward, C. (1980). Personality and social psychology. *Journal of Personality*
Psychology, 16(1), 332-346.
- A., & Hudson, J. (1985). Auditing program evaluations. *The Canadian Case*.
g Organizations and Society 10(4), 493-502
- (2010). Performance audit in Nigeria. A seminar paper presented at
University, Okada on 2nd December, 2010, 1-15.
- 000). Auditing and assurance services. A systematic approach. New York:
Hill Companies, Inc.
- H., & Taylor, J. R., (2008 9ed). Auditing, book power: Croatia, South
Cengage Learning Publishers.
- ess Weisman, J. (2007). Financial statement audits: The 33rd annual

- value for money auditors please stand up? *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 18(1), 19-30.
- Nirmala, D. N. (2011). Public sector performance auditing and accountability: A Fijian case study (Thesis, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/10289/5364>.
- Nirmala, N., Karen, V. P., & Alan, L. (2005). Public sector performance auditing: Emergence, purpose and meaning. A working paper Series, Department of Accounting, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Njanike, J., & Dube, M. (2009: 251). Accounting and accountability. Ibadan: Ibadan University press.
- Nkwagu, L. C., & Nwamgbebu, O. P. (2019). Value for money auditing and Local Government services delivery in Ebonyi State: A study of selected Local Government areas. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal*, 23(5), 1-21.
- Nusrat, F. (2012). Challenges of performance audit in the implementation phase: Bangladesh perspective. North South University, Bangladesh.
- Odia, J. O. (2014). Performance auditing and public sector accountability in Nigeria: The role of Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs). *Asian Journal of Management Sciences and Education*, 3(2), 102-109.
- Office of the Auditor General (OAG). (2009). Performance audit reports. Retrieved from <http://www.oag.govt.nz/reports/reports/by-type/performance-audits>.
- Ogiedu, K.O., & Izedonmi, F. I. O. (2013). Topology of audit agency/audit techniques and the effectiveness of the Nigerian supreme audit institution. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 4(6), 193-203.
- Ogundana, O. M., & Okere, W. (2017). Impact of public sector auditing in promoting accountability and transparency in Nigeria. *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, 1.22(3), 1-8.
- Oladipupo, A. O. (2005). Auditing and investigation theory and practice. Benin City, Nigeria: Mindex publishers.
- Olaoye, F. O., & Adedeji, A. Q. (2019). Performance audit and public sector budgetary efficiency in southwest Nigeria. *Journal of Accounting, Business and Finance Research*, 5(1), 2521-3830.
- Olowookere, J. K., & Adebiyi, W. K. (2013). Mandatory audit firm rotation and audit firm quality in Nigeria deposit money banks. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 2(9), 63-69.
- Oshisami, K. (1992). Government accounting and financial control. Ibadan, Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Ozuomba, N. T (2019). Performance audit and accountability of public sector in Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Finance and Economics Research*, 7(2), 1-9.
- Park, C. (2020). Enhancing the transparency and accountability of state-owned enterprises. ADBI working paper 1070. Tokyo: Asian Development Bank Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.adb.org/publications/enhancing-transparency-accountability-state-owned-enterprises>
- Pallot, J. (2003). A wider accountability? The audit office and New Zealand's bureaucratic revolution. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 1(14), 133-155.
- Parker, L. D. (1990). Towards value for money audit policy. In J. Guthrie, L. D. Parker, & Shand, D.(Eds), *The Public Sector Contemporary Readings in Accounting and Auditing*, 292-306. Australia: Harcourt Brace Jovahovich publishers.
- Parker, L., Jacobs, K., & Schmitz, J. (2019). New public management and the rise of public sector performance audit: Evidence from the Australian case. *Accounting, Auditing*

- and Accountability Journal, 32(1), 280-306.
- Perloff, R. M. (1993). *The Dynamics of persuasion*. Cleveland State University, New Jersey Hoveand London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pollitt, C. H. & Summa, H. (1997). Performance audit and public sector reform. University of Vermont, 1997, 206 (4).
- Porter, M. (1990). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Radcliffe, V. S. (1998). Efficiency audit: An assembly of rationalities and programs. *Accounting Organizations and Society*, 23(4), 377-410.
- Regassa, B. (2016). The Role of performance audit on performance improvement and accountability in the audited public sectors of Oromia National Regional State. Addis Ababa University, College of Business Economics Department of Accounting and Finance, page 1-69.
- Reichborn-Kjennerud, K. (2013). Political accountability and performance audit: The case of the auditor general in Norway. *Public Administration*, 91(3), 680-695.
- Robert, J. (1996). From Discipline to Dialogued: Individualizing and socializing forms of accountability. In Munro, R. & Mouritsen (Eds), *Accountability. Power, Ethos and the Technologies of Managing* (40-61). U.K: International Thomson business press
- Roness, T., & Rubecken, D. (2016). Could auditing standards based on society's values? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 6(1), 86 – 104.
- Saidu, A. L. (2011). *Auditing, investigation, assurance services and money laundering and forensic audit*. Jos: Lecaps Consults
- Santiso, C. (2007). Eyes wide shot? The politics of autonomous audit agencies in emerges documents: De Trabajo CIPPEC. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ex_tfin_ancialmgmt/Resources/313217-1196229169083/4441154-1196273114377/4444384-11996273135391/santiso2007_Eyes_WideShut_Working_Paper.pdf.
- Shim, J., & Siegal, J. G. (1995). *Dictionary of economics*. New York: Wiley & Company, Inc.
- Shoommuangpack, P., & Ussahawanitchakit, P. (2009). Audit strategy of CPAs in Thailand: How does it affect audit effectiveness and stakeholders' acceptance? *International of Business Strategy*, 9(2), 136-157.
- Steward, J., & Walsh, K. (1994). Performance measurement: When performance can never be finally defined. *Public Money and Management*, 14(2), 45-49.
- Transparency International (2020, 2021). *Corruptions perception index for sub-Saharan African* (Nigeria Scored 25/100, Ranked 149/180, Score Changes -2, Since 2012. The global Coalition against Corruption.
- Udeh, S. N., & Elom, O. J. (2016). Challenges of performance auditing in public sector accountability in Nigeria: A Study of the Office of Auditor General. *ESUT Journal of Accountancy* 7(1), 204-216.
- Udeh, S. N., & Nwadiolor, E. O. (2016). Evaluation of effectiveness of internal audit in the Nigerian public sector. *European Journal of Business, Economics and Accountancy*, 4(3), 44-58.
- Ukura, S. T. (2016). *An introduction and history of Nigeria audit*. Abuja, Office of the Auditor-General for the federation.
- Umanhonlen, O. F., Otakefe, J. P., & Ogiedu, K. O. (2020). Combating Economic and Financial Crimes in Nigeria: The role of the Forensic Accountant. *Journal of Management and Science*, 10(4), 16-32.

- Van, T. S., & Williams, T. (2002). The performance paradox in the public sector, public performance review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 25(3), 267-281.
- Wang, M. (2017). The Relationship between firm characteristics and the disclosure of sustainability reporting. *Sustainability*, 9(424), 1-14.
- Waring, C. & Morgan, S. (2007). Performance accountability and combating Corruption. Washington D.C: The World Bank
- World Bank Group (2020). Report Fraud or Corruption. Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/immersive-story/2018/08/03/investigating-people-to-build-human-capital>
- Yan, J. & Li, D. (1997). Performance audit in the service of internal audit. *Managerial Accounting Journal*, 12(4/5), 192-195.
- Yodit, B. (2016). Factors affecting performance audit effectiveness: In case of the Office of Federal Auditor General of Ethiopia. Department of Accounting and Finance College of Business & Economics, Addis Ababa University.