Investigative Journalism, Corruption Disclosure, and Accountability Mechanisms in Nigeria: An Analytical Review

Musa Adamu Labaran[a]*
[a]Department of Mass Communication, Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria
*Corresponding email: malabaran.mac@buk.edu.ng

Abstract
Corruption remains a persistent and deeply rooted challenge in Nigeria, undermining democratic governance, economic development, and public trust in institutions. Despite various anti-corruption initiatives and the establishment of oversight bodies, accountability often remains elusive, particularly in high-level cases involving political and economic elites. Within this context, investigative journalism has emerged as a powerful tool for uncovering corruption, amplifying public scrutiny, and prompting institutional responses. Drawing on secondary data from existing literature, the paper examines how investigative journalism enhances public awareness, triggers institutional action, and stimulates legal or administrative measures against corrupt practices. The paper highlights that, although investigative journalism has significantly contributed to exposing high-profile corruption cases and pressuring authorities into action, its effectiveness is frequently weakened by political interference, inadequate judicial follow-through, and threats to press freedom. It further The argues that strengthening legal protections for journalists, fostering independent media institutions, and enhancing collaboration with civil society are essential for advancing investigative reporting and governance reform. It underscores the indispensable role of a vibrant investigative press in deepening democratic accountability and promoting transparency within Nigeria's public sector. The paper concludes that by exposing corruption, raising public awareness, and in some cases triggering administrative or judicial action, investigative journalism fulfils a vital watchdog function in Nigeria.

Keywords: Accountability, Corruption, Disclosure, Impact, Investigative, and Journalism

Introduction

Investigative journalism has become one of the most effective instruments, especially in emerging democracies where accountability frameworks are brittle and institutions are frequently inadequate. Corruption continues to be a major problem in Nigeria, threatening democracy, economic development, and public confidence in government agencies. Investigative journalists are essential in revealing unethical behaviour, bringing secret facts to light, and exerting pressure on state actors to maintain accountability. Investigative journalism enhances democratic oversight mechanisms and provides citizens with knowledge by closely examining the activities of public officials, private sector actors, and political leaders. The ability of the media to identify and report misconduct becomes a crucial component of government reform in environments where corruption thrives on secrecy and impunity (Suleiman, 2017).

Investigative journalism has made important contributions, but because of institutional, political, and professional limitations, its influence on accountability outcomes in Nigeria has been unequal. The degree to which investigative work results in real policy change or judicial action is

constrained by the intimidation, lack of access to official information, and insufficient legal protections that frequently surround media practitioners (Aondover et al., 2024). However, historic exposes on Nigeria's major corruption scandals have shown how investigative media can shape anti-corruption frameworks, force government reactions, and spark public debate. In this context, it is crucial to evaluate how investigative journalism affects Nigeria's systems for accountability and corruption exposure in order to identify both its advantages and disadvantages.

There is growing evidence both anecdotal and documented of investigations precipitating tangible accountability outcomes. *Premium Times'* exposé on then-Finance Minister Kemi Adeosun's falsified National Youth Service Corps exemption certificate is a canonical case: the reporting triggered public outcry, elite scrutiny, and ultimately her resignation in September 2018, signifying a rare, high-level administrative sanction linked directly to journalistic revelations (Lasisi et al., 2023). Similar cycles, albeit with varied legal end-points are visible in procurement abuses, constituency projects, and local service delivery, where media–civic-tech collaborations have catalyzed project completion, budget re-allocations, or disciplinary probes. Yet systematic, cross-case evaluation remains thin, and scholars still debate how often investigations lead to prosecutions or asset recovery compared to "softer" outcomes such as resignations, policy memos, or audit queries (Okon, 2017).

These dynamics frame the central problem of this study in a context of persistent corruption risks, evolving information-access jurisprudence, and uneven press protections, how and under what conditions does investigative journalism move beyond disclosure to activate accountability mechanisms in Nigeria? By focusing on the linkages between media revelations and institutional responses across EFCC/ICPC actions, audit queries, legislative hearings, disciplinary sanctions, prosecutions, and project completions, and by incorporating the role of FOI litigation and the 2016–2024 whistleblower policies as accelerators, the study provides an empirically grounded assessment of investigative journalism. The goal is not simply to examine stories, but to map causal chains from evidence to enforcement, identifying what works, where, and why in Nigeria's accountability landscape.

Theoretical Framework

The paper adopted the media–accountability theory, which synthesizes insights from normative media theory, political economy, and institutional accountability studies to explain how mass media, and investigative journalism in particular translate information into mechanisms of public oversight (Edmond & Wilson, 2018). At its core the literature treats media as an information intermediary that reduces information asymmetries between principals (citizens, legislatures, donors) and agents (public officials, bureaucrats, contractors), thereby altering incentives, reputational costs, and the likelihood that oversight actors will act (McQuail, 2003). Classical normative foundations locate this function within the "public sphere" and "watchdog" traditions: free, pluralistic publicity supplies the facts and forums needed for public deliberation and collective sanctioning, and a robust press thereby contributes to democratically legitimate.

The theoretical literature like Plaisance (2002) elaborates several interlocking mechanisms by which media produce accountability. First, information provision: by uncovering, verifying, and publicizing previously hidden facts, media reduce informational deficits that shield abuse, and they create observable signals that oversight institutions can use to prioritize investigations. Second, agenda-setting and framing: through selection and narrative framing, media shape what issues enter the public and institutional agenda, influence the salience of corruption claims, and determine which aspects of wrongdoing attract sustained scrutiny. Third, reputational and electoral mechanisms: media exposure increases reputational costs for implicated actors and can mobilize

voter or donor sanctions, which in turn raise the expected cost of corrupt behavior and strengthen incentives for internal or external corrective action. Fourth, catalytic coalition-building: investigative revelations often operate through intermediaries, civil-society organizations, civic-tech platforms, legislative committees, and donors that amplify findings, translate them into formal complaints or litigation, and sustain pressure on enforcement agencies (Eberwein et al., 2011).

Empirical studies like Eberwein et al., (2019) assess these mechanisms at varying levels of aggregation and with mixed results. Cross-national political-economy studies find systematic associations between media development and certain accountability outcomes, for example, more competitive media markets correlate with greater corruption detection and, in some models, improved public-good provision, but the strength and causal direction of these relationships depend on institutional contexts, media independence, and audience incentives. Programmatic and case-based literature from investigative-practice domains demonstrates that high-quality, evidence-rich reporting can precipitate concrete administrative responses resignations, audits, or policy reforms though prosecutions and asset recovery are less consistently observed, reflecting bottlenecks in enforcement capacity and political will (Fengler, 2012).

Scholars therefore emphasize conditionality: media-induced disclosure is necessary but not sufficient for durable accountability. The transmission from exposure to sanction depends on institutional receptivity (strength and independence of anti-corruption agencies, judiciary, and legislative oversight), legal and normative protections for whistleblowers and journalists (which affect source flows and reporter willingness), and the broader political economy (patterns of media ownership, state advertising, and risks of capture) (Bana, 2019). Research on media capture and ownership concentration documents how clientelistic advertising, political ownership, or covert influence weaken editorial independence and produce selective disclosure that favors certain actors or narratives, thereby blunting the media's corrective force (Bolarinwa et al., 2023).

Methodological literature in the media–accountability calls for mixed-methods designs that combine large-N statistical inference with within-case process tracing. Quantitative approaches (content-coding of investigative outputs, time-series analysis of institutional actions, and matched comparisons across jurisdictions) help estimate average effects and identify macro-level correlates, while qualitative process tracing and elite interviews uncover causal mechanisms, sequence, and attrition points in the disclosure-to-action pipeline (Akinkugbe, 2018). Measurement strategies recommended include disaggregating media inputs (verification depth, documentary evidence, cross-platform reach), proximate outputs (public attention, social-media diffusion), and distal institutional outcomes (audit initiations, prosecutions, policy change), and then tracing the mediators (civil-society mobilization, legislative attention) and moderators (press freedom indices, FOI compliance rates, enforcement capacity) that condition effects.

Critical and normative critiques temper optimistic conceptions of media-driven accountability. First, selective visibility and sensationalism can generate "spotlight" effects that encourage episodic rather than structural correction, producing high-visibility scandals without systemic reform. Second, the media themselves may be instruments of political actors, engaging in targeted exposures that serve partisan ends rather than public accountability, which complicates causal attributions and raises ethical concerns. Third, the contemporary information ecosystem fragmented audiences, algorithmic amplification, and the economics of click-driven content can distort attention cycles and incentivize short-form, rapid reporting that is poorly suited to the verification-intensive work investigative accountability demands (McQuail, 2003).

A growing body of scholarship therefore focuses on institutional complements and safeguards that enhance the media's accountability potential. These include robust FOI regimes

and whistleblower protections to improve evidence flows; legal protections and defence funds to lower the risks of investigative work; civic-tech intermediaries that translate disclosures into participatory monitoring; and diversified funding models, non-profit investigative hubs, endowments, and donor support that reduce commercial pressures and enable sustained inquiry (Plaisance, 2000). Evaluations of such interventions emphasize that coupling investigative outputs with organized pathways to enforcement (forensic audits, legislative referrals, coordinated CSO campaigns) substantially increases the probability that disclosure leads to meaningful institutional action.

In this context, media–accountability theory provides a multi-layered framework for understanding how information intermediaries can produce governance outcomes: it situates investigative journalism as a mechanism that generates signals, shapes public agendas, imposes reputational costs, and catalyzes intermediary action, but it also makes clear that institutional capacity, legal protections, media independence, and political context fundamentally condition whether disclosure becomes durable accountability. For empirical research on contexts such as Nigeria, the literature argues for careful operationalization of media quality and diffusion, systematic tracing of causal chains from exposure to sanction, and evaluation of the institutional complements that are required to translate reporting into enforceable remedies.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, literature-based approach, relying on secondary data drawn from existing scholarly works, policy documents, and landmark investigative journalism reports in Nigeria. The research design follows a narrative review approach with elements of case study analysis**,** focusing on selected high-profile investigations that exposed corruption and influenced institutional reforms. The process of data gathering involved a systemic search of peer-reviewed journals, books, and grey literature using academic databases such as Google Scholar, Scopus, and ResearchGate, as well as reputable media archives. Selection criteria were guided by relevance, credibility, and significance: only studies and reports that addressed investigative journalism's role in shaping public awareness, prompting institutional accountability, or triggering legal and administrative action were included. By triangulating insights from academic literature with concrete case studies of investigative journalism, the study ensures both conceptual depth and empirical grounding. This combined methodological orientation, narrative review and case study analysis, provides a structured yet flexible framework to examine the broader influence of investigative journalism while situating it in specific socio-political contexts.

Investigative Journalism as a Watchdog Function

Investigative journalism's identity as a democratic watchdog is deeply rooted in normative theories of the press that conceive journalism as an independent monitor of power, obligated to verify claims, serve the public interest, and provide a forum for public criticism. Seminal statements of journalistic purpose emphasize verification, independence, and the duty to act as an independent monitor of power, articulating the normative core of the watchdog idea and the practical disciplines, documentary evidence, source protection, and long-form inquiry, that underpin it. Empirical and conceptual treatments alike stress that watchdog journalism is not merely adversarial reporting but a disciplined epistemic practice whose legitimacy rests on rigorous standards of evidence and ethical restraint (Karadimitriou et al., 2022).

Scholars have operationalized the watchdog function along three interlocking activities: investigation (systematic fact-finding into suspected wrongdoing), verification (triangulating documentary and testimonial evidence), and publicization (framing findings so they can enter policymaking and civic processes). This tripartite model explains how discrete acts of reporting

are meant to translate latent information asymmetries into public knowledge that can activate other institutions. Investigative practice literature highlights techniques, data analysis, FOI requests, cross-border collaboration, and prolonged source cultivation that are uniquely suited to uncovering complex financial and administrative corruption, and it underscores how these techniques differ from routine beat reporting in scope, cost, and risk.

Theoretical treatments of the media–accountability nexus explore the mechanisms by which disclosure produces (or fails to produce) institutional accountability. Watchdog scholarship persuasively argues that disclosure is necessary but not sufficient for accountability: the pathway from exposure to sanction depends on institutional receptivity (judiciary, anti-corruption agencies, legislative oversight), civic mobilization (public pressure, advocacy groups), and enabling legal frameworks (freedom of information, whistleblower protections). Comparative and interdisciplinary reviews emphasize that the media's capacity to "trigger" accountability is contingent on these mediating variables, making impact context-dependent rather than intrinsic to journalistic outputs (Wang & Li, 2024).

Empirical literature from multiple regions offers mixed but instructive evidence on outcomes. High-profile historical cases (often cited in comparative work) show that rigorous investigations can precipitate resignations, prosecutions, and policy reforms; at the same time, systematic studies reveal frequent "soft" outcomes, public awareness and policy debate—without commensurate legal sanctions. Recent reviews of investigative journalism in Africa underline both the sector's expansion and the variability of downstream effects: strong reporting can set the agenda and feed reform cycles, but the institutional follow-through that converts disclosure into punitive or corrective action is uneven. These global and regional findings shape expectations for national cases like Nigeria, where documented instances of reporting producing administrative resignations sit alongside many investigations that do not culminate in formal sanctions.

Agbo and Chukwuma (2017) maintained that Nigeria-focused studies and case reports illuminate how the watchdog function plays out in practice under specific political and institutional constraints. Longitudinal and doctoral research tracking investigative and corruption coverage in Nigeria (1999–2012) identifies patterns of episodic investigative surges around major scandals and structural limits, resource constraints, low specialist capacity, and commercial pressures, that reduce sustained investigative output. Field studies of FOI usage among Nigerian journalists show modest uptake and persistent implementation challenges, meaning that legal access to records often fails to translate into reliable documentary sources for investigations (Aondover & Abba, 2017). At the same time, high-visibility episodes, such as reporting that led to the resignation of a sitting minister over document falsification, demonstrate that rigorous local investigation can produce decisive administrative outcomes when combined with public pressure and receptive institutions.

Research on the enabling and constraining environment in Nigeria highlights how structural factors mediate the effectiveness of watchdog journalism. Studies and press-freedom reporting document legal instruments, including criminal and cyber-security statutes, that have been used to intimidate or prosecute reporters; physical and legal insecurity therefore operates as a chilling factor that raises the costs of long-term investigations and narrows the pool of willing reporters. Capacity constraints (budgetary, technical, and skills gaps) and newsroom economics further limit investigative output. Conversely, the emergence of civic-tech groups and donor-funded investigative hubs has augmented capacity by providing data tools, cross-organisational collaborations, and legal support, factors that empirical case studies identify as critical enablers of disclosure-to-action pathways (Waisbord, 2001).

Starkman (2014) observed that methodological discussions in the literature point to recurring measurement problems in assessing watchdog impact. Many studies rely on output measures (number of investigations, stories published) or selective case studies of high-profile outcomes, which risk overstating visibility while understating processual change (e.g., audit follow-ups, legislative inquiries, or administrative corrections). Recent program evaluations argue for impact frameworks that trace causal chains, from source development and evidence collection, through publicization and civic uptake, to formal institutional responses, so that scholars can differentiate between immediate disclosure effects and longer-term accountability outcomes. This approach requires mixed methods: process tracing, stakeholder interviews, and institutional data (e.g., prosecution records, audit reports) to capture the multi-step nature of accountability.

The literature converges investigative journalism to be necessary but not a sufficient condition for accountability. Its watchdog strength depends on methodological rigor, institutional receptiveness, civic uptake, legal protections, and the broader political economy of news production. For contexts such as Nigeria, the evidence base calls for research designs that move beyond counts of exposés to mapping impact pathways and identifying specific bottlenecks, legal, technical, or political, that determine whether disclosures translate into meaningful corrective action. Filling these empirical and methodological gaps would advance both theory and practice by clarifying when and how the watchdog function yields accountability in fragile or partially accountable polities (Woldeamanuel, 2012).

Corruption Disclosure as Transparency Mechanism

Corruption disclosure functions as a central transparency mechanism by converting concealed or tacit information about public-sector malfeasance into verifiable public knowledge that can be acted upon by citizens, civil society, and formal institutions. The literature frames disclosure as both an informational intervention, reducing information asymmetries that shield corrupt exchange, and a political one, shaping agenda-setting, social norms, and the incentives of oversight actors. Empirical and theoretical studies argue that disclosure lowers the transaction and search costs that enable corrupt deals, increases reputational and political risks for corrupt actors, and signals to oversight institutions that intervention is warranted, yet these effects are conditional on the quality, credibility, and diffusion of the disclosed information (Eder & Preisinger, 2024).

A substantial strand of the literature links statutory transparency tools, most notably Freedom of Information (FOI) laws, and incentive mechanisms such as whistleblower policies to the potency of disclosure as a governance lever. FOI regimes provide a procedural route for journalists, watchdogs, and citizens to request documentary evidence, while whistleblowing arrangements can surface insider evidence otherwise unavailable to public scrutiny. However, cross-national and Nigeria-focused studies highlight an "implementation gap": legal entitlements alone rarely guarantee timely or usable access to records, and whistleblower initiatives often suffer from weak protection, limited uptake, and political capture. For Nigeria specifically, scholarship and policy analyses document the FOI Act's potential to improve oversight while also cataloguing persistent barriers, bureaucratic noncompliance, poor records management, and limited journalist familiarity or use, that blunt the mechanism's practical effect on corruption exposure and follow-up. These weaknesses reduce the reliability of disclosure as a trigger for formal accountability absent complementary reforms in administrative culture and record systems (Chen & Ganapati, 2023).

Ghazwani et al., (2024) observed that empirical work assessing the downstream consequences of disclosure differentiates between immediate informational effects (public awareness, media attention) and institutional outcomes (audits, hearings, disciplinary actions,

prosecutions, asset recovery). Comparative analyses find that disclosure tends to produce more consistent "soft" outcomes, agenda-setting, reputational damage, and administrative adjustments, than consistent legal sanctions; the translation of publicized wrongdoing into formal judicial or enforcement outcomes depends heavily on institutional capacity, political will, and civil-society pressure. Studies on transparency interventions further suggest heterogeneous returns: in some contexts, increased transparency measurably reduces corruption indicators, but in others it provokes strategic adaptation by elites or simply relocates corrupt practices into less-visible channels. These nuanced findings caution against assuming a direct or linear relationship between disclosure and durable reductions in corruption without attention to the institutional and political mediators.

Bauhr and Grimes (2017) point out that Nigeria-focused reviews and case studies provide rich, context-specific insights into how disclosure operates in practice. Research on anti-corruption institutions and public accountability demonstrates that while high-profile disclosures have occasionally precipitated administrative resignations or audits, many investigations stall at the stage of public exposure due to weak prosecutorial follow-through, politicized enforcement, and informal networks that shield elite actors. The literature also records examples where disclosure coupled with civic mobilization or donor-supported oversight initiatives produced corrective actions, illustrating that disclosure is most effective when embedded within coalitions that translate revelations into sustained institutional pressure. At the same time, scholars have documented a "dark side" of transparency: selective disclosure or poorly framed revelations can be weaponized for political ends, and increased openness in one domain can push corrupt activity into opaque informal practices unless transparency is paired with enforcement capacity and governance reforms. These dynamics emphasize the contingent and politically mediated nature of disclosure's effectiveness in Nigeria.

Vian (2020) maintains that methodological debates in the literature stress the need for more rigorous, mixed-methods designs to trace disclosure's causal pathways. Many existing studies rely on output measures (counts of disclosures or media stories) or illustrative case studies, which are valuable but insufficient for attributing downstream accountability outcomes to disclosure per se. Scholars therefore recommend process-tracing, matched case comparisons, and the integration of institutional records (audit reports, prosecution files, FOI request logs) with qualitative stakeholder interviews to map how disclosed evidence moves through oversight channels, stalls, or triggers corrective action. Measurement frameworks that separate disclosure quality (depth, verifiability), diffusion (reach, resonance), and enabling conditions (legal protections, institutional capacity, civic mobilization) would allow researchers to identify the precise bottlenecks and facilitators of disclosure-driven accountability. This research agenda is especially urgent for Nigeria, where the combination of formal transparency laws and weak implementation makes fine-grained causal analysis necessary to inform reform strategies.

The literature converges on a qualified endorsement of corruption disclosure as a vital transparency mechanism: it is necessary for enabling accountability but not sufficient on its own. Its impact depends on the credibility and usability of the disclosed information, the responsiveness and capacity of oversight institutions, protective and enabling legal frameworks (FOI and whistleblower protections), and the presence of civic and media coalitions that sustain pressure beyond initial revelations. For policy and research, this implies prioritizing the strengthening of implementation processes (records management, FOI compliance, whistleblower protections), bolstering institutional follow-through, and designing impact studies that unpack the conditional pathways from disclosure to durable accountability outcomes in Nigeria (Sekalala et al., 2020).

Whistleblowing and Information Access

Whistleblowing and information access are intimately connected in the literature on transparency and anti-corruption: whistleblowing supplies insider leads that reduce information asymmetries and create actionable evidence, while legal and administrative access mechanisms determine whether those leads can be verified, publicized, and acted upon (Owens-Ibie & Aondover, 2025). Two complementary strands dominate scholarship and policy reports. The first treats whistleblowing as an incentive-based disclosure mechanism, often framed in terms of rewards, confidentiality guarantees, and legal protections, that can surface hidden malfeasance and catalyze investigations. The second emphasizes the institutional infrastructure for converting whistle tips into public knowledge and formal redress: dedicated reporting portals, protection laws, Freedom of Information (FOI) regimes, and the records-management practices of public bodies. Empirical work shows that when whistleblowing systems are well designed and coupled with reliable information-access channels, they can generate high-value leads for journalists, auditors, and enforcement agencies; conversely, when protections and access are weak, whistleblowers face retaliation, and tips too frequently wither without institutional follow-through (Chen & Neshkova, 2020).

In Nigeria the formal experiment with incentive-driven whistleblowing began with the Federal Government's 2016 Whistleblowing Policy and the online reporting portal administered by the Ministry of Finance, which attracted a large volume of tips and contributed to several recovery claims in its early phase. Policy analyses and government reporting document that the 2016 policy produced thousands of tips and helped open multiple investigations, demonstrating the potential of a centralized tip line to surface hidden fiscal irregularities and to channel information to enforcement agencies (Aondover et al., 2025). However, legal commentators and civil-society monitors concurrently highlight a fundamental institutional lacuna: Nigeria still lacks comprehensive statutory whistleblower protection that would guarantee confidentiality, bar retaliatory measures, and provide effective redress and anonymity safeguards that modern whistleblower regimes normally ensure. As a result, the policy's technical successes coexist with systemic vulnerabilities that limit uptake and endanger informants (Vian, 2020).

Waisbord (2021) emphasizes that protection (legal and practical) is the linchpin of effective whistleblowing. Comparative studies show that reward-oriented models increase reporting when claimants expect secure anonymization and legal insulation from recriminatory employment or criminal sanctions; absent those protections, whistleblowers are less likely to come forward, and when they do they often encounter victimization, prosecution, or social ostracism. In Nigeria contemporary reporting and NGO analyses document numerous instances where whistleblowers or sources faced reprisals, including prosecution or chilling threats—because statutory protections remain partial and unevenly enforced. This body of evidence suggests that policy design must prioritize enforceable protection mechanisms (statutory and procedural) and independent intake procedures to reduce the personal costs of disclosure and maximize the information flow into public oversight channels.

Information access interacts with whistleblowing at two critical points: verification and amplification. Verification requires access to public records, procurement files, and audit reports, materials that allow investigators and journalists to corroborate insider allegations (Yar'Adua & Aondover, 2023). Amplification depends on the media, civil society, or oversight bodies' ability to translate verified tips into publicly resonant narratives and formal complaints. In Nigeria the FOI Act (2011) is the principal statutory tool for verification, but empirical studies show persistent implementation problems, limited institutional compliance, poor records management, and delays

that blunt FOI's utility for time-sensitive corroboration. Recent judicial developments that clarify FOI's scope (including post-2024 jurisprudence extending obligations across tiers of government) are encouraging from an access perspective, but scholarly assessments maintain that without administrative reforms to records management and FOI enforcement, whistleblower leads will remain difficult to substantiate and act upon at scale. Thus, strengthening both whistleblower protection and FOI implementation is required to close the verification-to-action loop (Agbo & Chukwuma, 2017).

A growing methodological literature calls for mixed-method impact assessments that explicitly trace the pathway from tip to outcome. Process tracing, matched case comparisons, and integrated institutional data (whistleblower portal logs, FOI request records, audit findings, prosecution files) combined with interviews of whistleblowers, journalists, and enforcement officials provide the necessary granularity to adjudicate whether tips caused investigations, whether investigations led to administrative or judicial sanctions, and where attrition occurs. Existing Nigerian studies and program evaluations suggest substantial early promise, tips generating investigations and asset recoveries in some cases, but they also reveal high attrition rates and frequent political interference. Consequently, the research agenda emphasizes (a) rigorous measurement of attrition at each pipeline stage, (b) analysis of the role of intermediaries (journalists, CSOs, donor projects) in protecting and converting tips, and (c) evaluation of whether reward structures produce perverse incentives (e.g., low-quality tips, politicized allegations) that must be managed by intake filters and evidentiary thresholds.

Woldeamanuel (2012) is of the view that policy and practice implications are clear in the literature: to harness whistleblowing as a reliable anti-corruption instrument Nigeria needs enforceable statutory protections, secure and independent intake mechanisms, transparent reward and payment procedures, and robust FOI and records-management reforms that enable rapid verification. Complementary measures include legal assistance and psychosocial support for whistleblowers, oversight of intake and reward decisions to prevent politicization, and strengthened coordination between whistleblower units, investigative journalists, auditors, and anti-corruption agencies so that high-value tips move quickly into investigatory channels. Absent these reforms, whistleblowing will continue to generate episodic wins but will fall short of producing systematic improvements in accountability. Future empirical work should therefore prioritize high-resolution pipeline data and comparative designs that can distinguish program design effects from political-institutional constraints.

Press Freedom and Structural Constraints

Press freedom and structural constraints interact as both cause and consequence: a shrinking space for independent reporting is shaped by legal instruments, economic pressures, and security threats, while those constraints in turn weaken the press's capacity to investigate, verify, and sustain long-form exposure of corruption. Normative literature positions press freedom as a precondition for the democratic watchdog role, free access to information, editorial independence, and physical and legal safety are required if journalists are to perform prolonged investigations that reduce information asymmetries (Eder & Preisinger, 2024). Empirical research reframes this normative claim as a conditional one, demonstrating that formal guarantees mean little where enforcement is weak, where commercial concentration and fragile business models erode editorial autonomy, or where criminal law and policing create incentives for self-censorship. Recent global assessments have made these relationships more visible by documenting how economic fragility, legal harassment, and physical threats together produce a "difficult" environment for press freedom in many countries.

Country-specific work on Nigeria shows how structural constraints operate across multiple, interacting domains. Legal instruments intended to regulate online harms, most notably the Cybercrimes Act and its amendments, have been repeatedly invoked in prosecutions or detentions of journalists reporting on corruption, producing chilling effects that reduce investigative risk-taking (Ghazwani et al., 2024). Human-rights monitors and investigative outlets document a pattern in which arrests, protracted detentions, and criminal charges are used as blunt instruments to deter scrutiny rather than to vindicate clear legal norms; these state actions are reinforced by inconsistent rule-of-law practices such as delays in arraignment and restricted access to counsel. At the same time, formal improvements in law (e.g., amendment debates) have not reliably translated into safer practice on the ground, which underscores the distinction between de jure reform and de facto enforcement in media freedom studies.

Karadimitriou et al., (2022) observed that economic and ownership structures form a second major axis of constraint. Media organizations operating in weak advertising markets, high inflationary environments, and under concentrated ownership face reduced capacity for long-term, resource-intensive investigations. Scholars and industry reports argue that economic precarity reshapes newsroom priorities: short, high-turnover items that drive traffic and advertising revenue are prioritized over slow-burn investigative projects that require legal backing and secure funding (RSF analysis; Reuters Institute reviews). In Nigeria, this dynamic is exacerbated by clientelistic advertising (state and corporate ad spend tied to political patronage), which heightens the conflict of interest between editorial independence and revenue survival, conditions that incentivize self-censorship or selective coverage of politically sensitive corruption stories.

Institutional capacity and professional norms within newsrooms also mediate the effect of external constraints. Investigative journalism requires sustained skills (data analysis, legal literacy, source protection), institutional resources (legal funds, secure communications), and organizational commitments (editorial protection, ethical standards). The literature points to an uneven picture in Nigeria: pockets of robust investigative practice have emerged, often within nonprofit or donor-supported centers, but these coexist with a wider ecosystem where few legacy outlets can absorb the reputational, legal, and financial risks of major probes (Bauhr & Grimes, 2017). Capacity-building interventions thus show promise, but their impact is limited when structural threats, criminalization, economic coercion, and violent intimidation, remain unresolved.

A third strand emphasizes the interaction between media constraints and the wider political economy of accountability. Disclosure alone is insufficient to trigger institutional correction when oversight bodies are captured, when judicial independence is weak, or when civic mobilization is constrained. Press freedom scholars therefore situate media constraints within a broader governance framework: attacks on journalists both reflect and reinforce elite impunity by blocking channels that convert evidence into public pressure and formal investigation (Sekalala et al., 2020). Analyses of Nigeria's recent press environment illustrate a feedback loop in which legal harassment and detentions depress reporting on corruption, which reduces the flow of public evidence that could otherwise empower auditors, legislators, and enforcement agencies, thereby perpetuating weak accountability and further diminishing the political space for independent media. International watchdogs and local coalitions have highlighted this dynamic in policy briefs and incident-tracking, arguing that simultaneous reforms across legal, economic, and institutional axes are required to break the cycle.

Chen and Neshkova (2020) critique in the literature call for multi-layered research designs to capture how structural constraints attenuate the press's watchdog function. Single-case

narratives of journalist arrests or high-profile censures are powerful but risk overstating either the resiliency or the collapse of journalistic ecosystems. Instead, scholars recommend mixed-method strategies that combine longitudinal content analysis, newsroom ethnography, legal-case tracking, and institutional outcome measures (e.g., prosecution follow-ups, FOI request success rates) to map how legal actions, economic shock, and security incidents affect both the supply of investigative reporting and its downstream accountability effects. Such approaches have been applied in comparative studies and are increasingly used by program evaluators to assess interventions (capacity support, legal defence funds, and donor-backed investigative hubs), offering nuanced evidence on what mitigates structural constraints and where reforms remain most urgent.

The literature frames press freedom not as a single variable but as a compound of legal, economic, professional, and security conditions that jointly determine the press's capacity to serve as a watchdog. For Nigeria, contemporary evidence points to a constrained environment shaped by recurrent use of criminal statutes against reporters, an economically precarious media market, and uneven institutional protections, conditions that collectively depress investigative output and limit the conversion of disclosure into formal accountability. Addressing these structural constraints therefore requires coordinated legal reform, stronger enforcement of protections, sustainable funding models for investigative work, and investments in newsroom capacities so that journalists can safely pursue, verify, and publicize corruption revelations that matter for democratic accountability.

From the literature reviewed, investigative journalism in Nigeria plays an important but limited role as a watchdog. Rather than consistently producing hard accountability outcomes like prosecutions or sanctions, investigative journalism frequently produces soft outcomes like agenda-setting, civic mobilization, and reputational costs for corrupt actors. While mechanisms such as the FOI Act, whistleblowing initiatives, and donor-supported investigative hubs have expanded journalistic capacity, their impact is weakened by structural constraints including legal intimidation, economic precarity, and weak institutional follow-through. These dynamics are demonstrated by specific examples: the 2016 whistleblowing policy produced high-profile asset recoveries but failed because of insufficient statutory protections and political interference, while the exposé that forced the resignation of a Nigerian minister over falsified documents shows the potential of thorough investigations to prompt administrative action. These cases highlight the main conclusion that, in Nigeria, investigative journalism is essential for exposing corruption but, in the absence of more robust institutional, legal, and civic support mechanisms, is insufficient to guarantee accountability.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that by exposing corruption, increasing public awareness, and perhaps triggering administrative or judicial action, investigative media serves a significant watchdog function in Nigeria. In the context of the existing literature, disclosure has varying effects even if it is essential for transparency. While investigations frequently succeed in generating public discussion and harming a company's reputation, they are less likely to lead to prosecutions or long-lasting changes. Journalists are limited in their ability to transform revelations into accountability outcomes by structural constraints, such as inadequate institutional follow-through, inadequate implementation of FOI legislation, economic fragility in the media industry, and threats to press freedom.

The results have significant ramifications for improving Nigeria's accountability frameworks. Improving institutional responsiveness is necessary for effective reforms, especially

in the court and anti-corruption institutions, to ensure that revelations are not ignored. Enhancing the caliber and dependability of the evidence that investigators have access to also depends on protecting whistleblowers and making sure the FOI Act is followed. Protecting journalistic freedom by enforcing laws against intimidation, strengthening existing protections, and repealing laws that punish reporting are equally critical. Furthermore, long-term reporting that holds people accountable will be made possible by economic reforms and steady funding for investigative media.

Therefore, practical measures should concentrate on forming alliances between journalists, public figures, and oversight organizations as well as establishing more secure and well-equipped investigative environments. Breaking the cycle of unpunished exposure requires independent review of law enforcement activities against journalists, statutory whistleblower laws, and press protections. In the absence of these modifications, investigative journalism will continue to be a vital but insufficient force for accountability.

References

Agbo, B. O., & Chukwuma, O. (2017). Influence of the new media on the watchdog role of the press in Nigeria. *European scientific journal*, *13*(2), 126-140.

Akinkugbe, O. D. (2018). Informal networks of corruption: assessing the challenges for public sector whistleblowing in Nigeria. *Jindal Global Law Review*, *9*(1), 11-28.

Aondover, E. M., Aondover, P. O., Adewale, O. C., Falobi, F., & Maiwada, A. A. (2024). Contextual Issues Surrounding Investigative Journalism in Nigeria. *Polit Journal Scientific Journal of Politics*, *4*(4), 226-239.

Aondover, E. M., Mohammed, I., Akin-Odukoya, O. O., & Ogunbola, O. (2025). Press Coverage of Corruption Scandal in Nigeria. *Indian Journal of Mass Communication and Journalism (IJMCJ)*, *4*(3), 34-42.

Aondover, E.M. & Abba, A. A. (2017). *Understanding Safety and Protection in Nigeria's Journalism*. Ahmadu Bello University Press.

Bana, J. O. (2019). Impact of forensic accounting investigation on public sector financial crimes in Nigeria. *Bingham University Journal of Accounting and Business*, *5*(7), 261-268.

Bauhr, M., & Grimes, M. (2017). Transparency to curb corruption? Concepts, measures and empirical merit. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, *68*(4), 431-458.

Bolarinwa, I. S., Olola, T., Awofadeju, M., & Fonkem, B. (2023). The Death of Whistleblowing Policies in Nigeria and How It Entrenches Corruption and Financial Misappropriation. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*, *7*(6), 376-389.

Chen, C., & Ganapati, S. (2023). Do transparency mechanisms reduce government corruption? A meta-analysis. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *89*(1), 257-272.

Chen, C., & Neshkova, M. I. (2020). The effect of fiscal transparency on corruption: A panel cross- country analysis. *Public Administration*, *98*(1), 226-243.

Eberwein, T., Fengler, S., & Karmasin, M. (2019). Theory and practice of media accountability in Europe: An introductory overview. *Media accountability in the era of post-truth politics*, 3-17.

Eberwein, T., Fengler, S., Lauk, E., & Leppik-Bork, T. (2011). *Mapping media accountability-in Europe and beyond*. Köln: Herbert von Halem Verlag.

Eder, M., & Preisinger, I. (2024). Watchdogs on a leash: Austrian journalists and their obstacles to investigative reporting. *International Journal of media & cultural politics*, *20*(2), 203-224.

Edmond, L., & Wilson, F. (2018). An assessment of media coverage of anti-corruption campaigns by the Buhari administration in 2016: A study of the nation and daily trust newspaper. *Journal of Mass Communication and Journalism*, *8*(4), 1-16.

Fengler, S. (2012). From media self-regulation to 'crowd-criticism': Media accountability in the digital age. *Central European Journal of Communication*, *5*(09), 175-189.

Ghazwani, M., Alamir, I., Salem, R. I. A., & Sawan, N. (2024). Anti-corruption disclosure and corporate governance mechanisms: insights from FTSE 100. *International Journal of Accounting & Information Management*, *32*(2), 279-307.

Karadimitriou, A., von Krogh, T., Ruggiero, C., Biancalana, C., & Bomba, M. (2022). Investigative journalism and the watchdog role of news media: Between acute challenges and exceptional counterbalances. In *Success and failure in news media performance: Comparative analysis in the Media for Democracy Monitor 2021* (pp. 101-125). Nordicom, University of Gothenburg.

Lasisi, M. I., Ajetunmobi, U. O., & Adeitan, M. A. (2023). Which is Impactful in Nigeria? Investigative or Social Justice Journalism Practice: Evidence from Fisayo Soyombo's Journalism Practice. *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, *12*(1).

McQuail, D. (2003). *Media accountability and freedom of publication*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Okon, P. E. (2017). Partnering with EFCC: Investigative journalism in the service of the Nigerian public. *Global Scholastic Research Journal of Multidisciplinary*, *3*(3), 37-49.

Owens-Ibie, N., & Aondover, E. M. (2025). *Issues in Contemporary Journalism Education and Practice in Nigeria: Volume 1*. Vernon Press.

Plaisance, P. L. (2000). The concept of media accountability reconsidered. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, *15*(4), 257-268.

Sekalala, S., Masud, H., & Bosco, R. T. (2020). Human rights mechanisms for anti-corruption, transparency and accountability: enabling the right to health. *Global health action*, *13*(sup1), 1699343.

Starkman, D. (2014). *The watchdog that didn't bark: The financial crisis and the disappearance of investigative journalism*. Columbia University Press.

Suleiman, S. A. (2017). *Investigative reporting and press coverage of corruption in Nigeria (1999-2012)* (Doctoral dissertation, University of East Anglia).

Vian, T. (2020). Anti-corruption, transparency and accountability in health: concepts, frameworks, and approaches. *Global health action*, *13*(sup1), 1694744.

Waisbord, S. (2001). The challenges of investigative journalism. *U. Miami L. Rev.*, *56*, 377.

Wang, H., & Li, A. (2024). A watchdog that no longer barks: Role performance of investigative journalism in China in the digital age. *Journalism Practice*, *18*(9), 2240-2257.

Woldeamanuel, B. (2012). *The watchdog role of journalism: A study on the perception of Ethiopian journalists* (Doctoral dissertation, Addis Ababa University Addis Ababa, Ethiopia).

Yar'Adua, S. M., & Aondover, E.M. (2023). Peace journalism and development: An appraisal of Boko Haram insurgency in the North-East of Nigeria. *International Journal of Health, Safety and Environment (IJHSE)* 6(7), 608-617.