

Leadership in the Nigeria State and the Burden of Integrity¹

Professor Benedict Tanimu Michael Umaru

Department of Arts Education

Faculty of Education

University of Abuja.

benumar66@yahoo.com

08035980415, 09071575085

Introduction

The post-independence Nigeria continues to grapple with the monster of bad leadership and governance which according to Oni and Excellence-Oluye (2019) have been the bane of political instability and poor state of development in the country. Blessed with diverse mineral and human resources, it is not far-fetched to expect Nigeria to soar high in consonance with the economic giants of the world. Paradoxically, Nigeria – the so called giant of Africa wallows in socio-economic, political and infrastructural decadence in all her services.

The inability of Nigeria's leadership to harness the nation's vast resources and reserves towards socio-economic development continuously calls to question the composition of the fabric of the nation's leadership and governance. Oni et al (2019) states that because of this, there seems to be a total collapse of ethical governance with the abuse of every moral norm of administration and a loss of conscience towards 'rightness' and objectivity in polity. To this end, it becomes a wonder if Nigeria can never rise out of decadence and her impoverished state if those that are meant to drive the steering towards the nation's emancipation lack the morality and sanity to do so.

The essence of government in every society is the creation of necessary enabling environment for the facilitation of good life and

¹ Being a Key Note Address, presented at the 2019 Annual Conference of the National Association for Christian Studies (NACS), under the theme: Religion, Politics and Integrity, which held from 4th – 7th Nov, 2019, at DRACC Conference Centre, AMAC/ACO Estate, New Lugbe, Abuja. Hosted by Department of Christian Religious Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Abuja, Abuja.

universal acceptance of democracy as the best system of governance is incontestable (Mato, 2005:105; Leke, 2010:32). The need to protect and ensure life and survivability brought about the state. The social contract theory of the state clearly explains why man in the first place decided to surrender some essential components of his liberty and freedom to a committee of persons for the purpose of defence of life and security (Thomas Hobbes's state of nature).

The essence of modern governance has transcended the desire for security against physical or military aggression to defence against basic social and economic insecurity. The right to choose who leads in any society is a principal ingredient in what is today referred to as democracy (Mato, 2005:105).

The Nigeria state has witnessed increasing buildup of authoritarian structure and institutions as well as human right abuses. The resultant unstable political atmosphere has continued with poor social infrastructure to frighten off local and foreign investors (Lekem 2010:32).

As Frantz Fanon has aptly observed, there is nothing but a fancy dress parade and the blare of trumpet. There is nothing except a few reforms at the top while at the bottom the masses are still endlessly marking time (Fanon, 1965:65). The above analysis by Fanon can be likened to Nigerian situation.

It is sad that despite Nigeria being a sovereign state for 57 years, with an abundance of natural resources at the country's disposal, the lives of the Nigerian populace has not been transformed as a result of bad and inept leadership that have always been at the helm of affairs. Some scholars even predicted that if the leadership remains the same "Nigeria would be a failed state by the year 2020". Although it is not within the scope of this paper to give the parameters of a failed state, it is however pertinent to say that Nigeria exhibits the characteristics of a failed state.

Leadership: A Definition

In the words of Adamson et al (2018), leadership is distinct a concept from rulership. The former connotes showing the way. In other words, leadership constitutes a guide, an indication, a direction, just as it provides the led with the desirables in, and of, charting a course and new direction. Stodgill (1981:7) observes that many of the attempts to define leadership are "confusing, varied, disorganized, idiosyncratic, muddled,

and according to conventional wisdom quite unrewarding”. However, we can build our explanation on the concept of leadership around the etymological interpretation, which sees the leader as that individual who directs by going in front (quoted in Yagboyaju, 2004:148).

Simply put, the leader is someone who lays an example for others to follow. In this way, leadership implies a purposeful direction of the affairs of those led. Put differently, a leader is a true representative of the people, consciously and conscientiously chosen by the led, (without undue influence or coercion) and given the necessary political power and authority (Olanipekun, 2004). Therefore, a leader, like magnet, radiates aura which attracts the people. The relationship between the duo, that is, the leader and the led, attract each other.

Contrary wise, a ruler, therefore, radiates heat or fire which consumes his subjects over whom he dominates, a relationship or scenario which favourably and justifiably cannot attract each other.

We believe that leadership is a better institution notion than rulership. The exercise of leadership is pursued vigorously and according to its tenets and goals, should ensure the attainment of Jeremy Bentham’s dictum which recommended for any modern government, “greatest happiness for the greatest number of people”.

From the foregoing analysis on leadership and rulership, it can be gleaned that leadership is arguably a better and preferred institution which aspires to achieve greatness. Nigeria continues to be bedeviled by the problem of leadership; hence fifty seven years after independence, Nigeria is still being ingloriously ranked among the poorest nations of the world. No thanks to inept, visionless, rumbustious leadership.

Achebe (1983:1) graphically captures the problem of Nigeria in the following memorable words:

It is total false to suggest, as we are apt to do, that Nigerians are fundamentally different from any other people in the world. Nigerians are corrupt because the system under which they live today makes corruption easy and profitable; they will cease to be corrupt when corruption is made difficult and inconvenient ...the trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely a failure of leadership. There is nothing basically wrong with the Nigerian land or climate or water or air or anything else.

The Nigerian problem is the unwillingness or inability of its leaders to rise to the responsibility to the challenge of personal example which is the hallmark of true leadership...

These lines are as true of Nigeria today as they were written some thirty-two years ago. Olanipekin (2004) observes that, the absence or total lack of leadership in the country has consistently resulted in growing state of insecurity, absence of requisite basic social infrastructure, unemployment, corruption, grave economic predicament and uncertainty (which has made Nigeria a debtor and a beggar nation), inadequacy of food at reasonable and affordable prices, inflation of unimaginable proportion, health services that are in shambles, hospitals that have been reduced to mere consulting clinics, etc. It is an irony that most of those who have only succeeded in running the country aground are now consciously or unconsciously being recycled or “sanitized” to continually lord it over us in one capacity or other and this explains why we are not making much progress.

Leadership Theories

Allah Nawaz and Irfan Ullah Khan gave the following theories of leadership:

- a. **Great-man theory:** The effort toward exploration for common traits of leadership is protracted over centuries as most cultures need heroes to define their successes and to justify their failures. In 1847, Thomas Carlyle stated in the best interests of the heroes that “universal history, the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is at the bottom of the history of the great man who have worked here”. Carlyle claimed in his “great man theory” that leaders are born and that only those men who are endowed with heroic potentials could ever become the leaders. He opined that great men were born, not made. An American philosopher, Sidney Hook, further expanded Carlyle perspective highlighting the impact which could be made by the eventful man vs. the event-making man (Dobbins & Platz, 1986).

He proposed that the eventful man remained complex in a historic situation, but did not really determine its course. On the other hand, he

maintained that the actions of the event-making man influenced the course of events, which could have been much different, had he not been involved in the process. The event-making man's role based on "the consequences of outstanding capacities of intelligence, will and character rather than the actions of distinction". However, subsequent events unfolded that this concept of leadership was morally flawed, as was the case with Hitler, Napoleon, and the like, thereby challenging the credibility of the great man theory. These great men became irrelevant and consequently growth of the organizations, stifled (MacGregor, 2003). "The passing years have given the coup de grace to another force the great man who with brilliance and farsightedness could preside with dictatorial powers as the head of a growing organization but in the process retarded democratization". Leadership theory then progressed from dogma that leaders are born or are destined by nature to be in their role at a particular time to a reflection of certain traits that envisage a potential for leadership.

b. **Trait theory:** The early theorists opined that born leaders were endowed with certain physical traits and personality characteristics which distinguished them from non-leaders. Trait theories ignored the assumptions about whether leadership traits were genetic or acquired. Jenkins identified two traits; emergent traits (those which are heavily dependent upon heredity) as height, intelligence, attractiveness and self-confidence and effectiveness traits (based on experience or learning), including charisma, as fundamental component of leadership (Ekvall & Arvonen, 1991).

Max Weber termed charisma as "the greatest revolutionary force, capable of producing a completely new orientation through followers and complete personal devotion to leaders they perceived as endowed with almost magical supernatural, superhuman qualities and powers". This initial focus on intellectual, physical and personality traits that distinguished non-leaders from leaders portended a research that maintained that only minor variances exist between followers and leaders (Burns, 2003). The failure in detecting the traits which every single effective leader had in common, resulted in development of trait theory, as an inaccessible component, falling into disfavour. In the late 1940s, scholars studied the traits of military and non-military leaders

respectively and exposed the significance of certain traits developing at certain times.

c. **Contingency theories (situational):** The theories of contingency recommends that no leadership style is precise as a stand-alone as the leadership style used is reliant upon the factors such as the quality, situation of the followers or a number of other variables. “According to this theory, there is no single right way to lead because the internal and external dimensions of the environment require the leader to adapt to that particular situation”. In most cases, leaders do not change only the dynamics and environment, employees within the organization change. In a common sense, the theories of contingency are a category of behavioural theory that challenges that there is no one finest way of leading/organizing and that the style of leadership that is operative in some circumstances may not be effective in others (Greenlead, 1977).

Contingency theorists assumed that the leader was the focus of leader-subordinate relationship; situational theorists opined that the subordinates played a pivotal role in defining the relationship. Though, the situational leadership stays to emphasis mostly upon the leader, it creates the significance of the focus into group dynamic. “These studies of the relationships between groups and their leaders have led to some of our modern theories of group dynamics and leadership”. The theory of situational leadership proposes that style of leadership should be accorded with the maturity of the subordinates (Bass, 1997). “The situational leadership model, first introduced in 1969, theorized that there was no unsurpassed way to led and those leaders to be effective must be able to adapt to the situation and transform their leadership style between task-oriented and relationship-oriented”.

d. **Style and behaviour theory:** The style theory acknowledges the significance of certain necessary leadership skills that serve as enabler for a leader who performs an act while drawing its parallel with previous capacity of the leader, prior to that particular act while suggesting that each individual has a distinct style of leadership with which he/she feels most contented. Like one that does not fit all heads, similarly one style cannot be effective in all situations. Yukl (1989) introduced three different leadership

styles. The employees serving with democratic leaders displayed high degree of satisfaction, creativity, and motivation; working with great enthusiasm and energy irrespective of the presence or absence of the leader; maintaining better connections with the leader, in terms of productivity whereas, autocratic leaders mainly focused on greater quantity of output.

Laissez faire leadership was only considered relevant while leading a team of highly skilled and motivated people who excellent track-record, in the past. Feidler & House (1994) identified two additional leadership styles focusing effectiveness of the leadership. These researchers opined that consideration (concern for production and task behaviours) were very vital variables. The consideration is referred to the amount of confidence and rapport, a leader engenders in his subordinates. Whereas, initiating structure, on the other hand, reflects the extent, to which the leader structures, directs and defines his/her own and the subordinates' roles as they have the participatory role toward organizational performance, profit and accomplishment of the mission. Different researchers proposed that three types of leaders, they were; autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire. Without involving subordinates, the autocratic leader makes decisions, laissez-faire leader lets subordinates make the decision and hence takes no real leadership role other than assuming the position and the democratic leader accesses his subordinates then takes his decision. "He further assumed that all leaders could fit into one of these three categories".

e. **Process leadership:** Theory additional leadership theories with a process focus include servant leadership, learning organisations, principal centered leadership and charismatic leadership with others emerging every year. Greenleaf introduced servant leadership in the early 1970s. A resurgence of the discussion of servant leadership was noted in the early 1990s.

Servant leaders were encouraged to be focused to the anxieties of the followers and the leader should sympathize with them take-care of and nurture them. The leadership was imparted on a person who was by nature a servant. "The servant leader focuses on the needs of the follower and helps them to become more autonomous freer and knowledgeable". The servant leader is also more concerned with the "have-nots" and recognizes them as equal (Greenleaf, 1996). The leaders in leading

organizations are to be the steward (servant) of the vision of the organization and not a servant of the people within the organization. Leaders in learning organizations clarify and nurture the vision and consider it to be greater than one-self. The leader aligns themselves or their vision with others in the organization or community at large.

These process leadership theories and others that have emerged often suggest that the work of leaders is to contribute to the well-being of others with a focus on some form of social responsibility. There appears to be a clear evolution in the study of leadership. Leadership theory has moved from birth traits and rights to acquired traits and styles, to situational and relationship types of leadership, to the function of groups and group processes and currently to the interaction of the group members with an emphasis on personal and organizational moral improvements (Yammarino, 1999).

f. **Transactional theory:** The leadership theories, by the late 1970s and early 1980s, activated to diverge from the specific perspectives of the leader, leadership context and the follower and toward practices that concentrated further on the exchanges between the followers and leaders. The transactional leadership was described as that in which leader-follower associations were grounded upon a series of agreements between followers and leaders (House & Shamir, 1993). The transactional theory was “based on reciprocity where leaders not only influence followers but are under the influence as well”. Some studies revealed that transactional leadership show a discrepancy with regard to the level of leaders’ action and the nature of the relations with the followers.

Bass and Avolio (1994) observed transactional leadership “as a type of contingent-reward leadership that had active and positive exchange between leaders and followers whereby followers were rewarded or recognized for accomplishing agreed upon objectives”. From the leader, these rewards might implicate gratitude for merit increases, bonuses and work achievement. For good work, positive support could be exchanged, merit for promotions, increased performance and cooperation for collegiality. The leaders could instead focus on errors, avoid responses and delay decisions. This attitude is stated as the “management-by-exception” and could be categorized as passive or

active transactions. The difference between these two types of transactions is predicated on the timing of the leaders' involvement. In the active form, the leader continuously monitors performance and attempts to intervene proactively (Avolio & Bass, 1997).

g. **Transformational theory:** Transformational leadership distinguishes itself from the rest of the previous and contemporary theories, on the basis of its alignment to a greater good as it entails involvement of the followers in processes or activities related to personal factor towards the organization and a course that will yield certain superior social dividend. The transformational leaders raise the motivation and morality of both the follower and the leader (House & Shamir, 1993). It is considered that the transformational leaders “engage in interactions with followers based on common values, beliefs and goals”. This impacts the performance leading to the attainment of goal. As per Bass, transformational leader, “attempts to induce followers to reorder their needs by transcending self-interests and strive for higher order needs”. This theory conform the Maslow (1954) higher order needs theory. Transformational leadership is a course that changes and approach targets on beliefs, values and attitudes that enlighten leaders' practices and the capacity to lead change.

The literature suggests that followers and leaders set aside personal interests for the benefit of the group. The leader is then asked to focus on followers' needs and input in order to transform everyone into a leader by empowering and motivating them (House & Aditya, 1997). Emphasis from the previously defined leadership theories, the ethical extents of leadership further differentiates the transformational leadership. The transformational leaders are considered by their capability to identify the need for change, gain the agreement and commitment of others, create a vision that guides change and embed the change (MacGregor Bums, 2003). These types of leaders treat subordinates individually and pursue to develop their consciousness, morals and skills by providing significance to their work and challenge. These leaders produce an appearance of convincing and encouraged vision of the future. They are “visionary leaders who seek to appeal to their followers' better nature and move them toward higher and more universal needs and purposes” (Mac-Gregor Bums, 2003).

Leadership Styles

- a. **Transactional leadership:** Style transactional leadership style comprises three components; contingent reward, management-by-exception (active) and management-by-exception (passive). A transactional leader follows the scheme of contingent rewards to explain performance expectation to the followers and appreciates good performance. Transactional leaders believe in contractual agreements as principal motivators (Bass, 1985) and use extrinsic rewards toward enhancing followers' motivation. The literature revealed that the "transactional style retards creativity and can adversely influence employees job satisfaction. Management-by-exception explains leaders' behaviour with regards apt detection of deviations from expected followers' behaviour.

The application of both styles varies from situation to situation and context to context. The situations entailing high degree of precision, technical expertise, time-constraints, particularly in technological intensive environment, we shall prefer transactional leadership whereas, in human-intensive environment, where focus is on influencing the followers through motivation and respecting their emotions on the basis of common goals, beliefs and values, preferable option is transformational leadership style (MacGregor Burns, 2003).

Contingent reward: Contingent reward leadership focuses on achieving results. As humans appreciate concrete, tangible, material rewards in exchange of their efforts, thus, this behaviour surfaced. "Where transformational leadership acknowledges individual talents and builds enthusiasm through emotional appeals, values and beliefs systems, transactional leadership engenders compliance by appealing to the wants and needs of individuals" (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Manager leaders who use contingent reward are expected to show direction to the employees so the job gets done. In nutshell, key indicators of contingent reward encompass performance-based material rewards, direction-setting, reciprocity and confidence-building in the team.

Management by exception (active): Management by exception (active) is not the relinquishment of leadership, characterized by a laissez-faire leadership. Leaders who follow management by exception (active) have an inherent trust in their workers to end the job to a satisfactory standard,

and avoid rocking the boat. “This type of leadership does not inspire workers to achieve beyond expected outcomes, however, if target is achieved, that means the system has worked, everyone is satisfied, and the business continues as usual”, (Bass & Avolio, 2004). There is a little sense of adventure or risk-taking, new perspectives or white water strategies in case of management by exception leaders. It correspond need-driven change culture. To sum it up, management by exception (active) includes trust in workers, poor communication, maintenance of the status quo, and lack of confidence.

Management by exception (passive): “It is the style of transactional leadership in which the leaders avoid specifying agreement, and fail to provide goals and standards to be achieved by staff. Sometimes, a leader waits for things to go wrong before taking action” (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

b. **Transformational leadership style**: Transformational leadership links with positive outcomes on individual as well as organizational levels. Transformational leaders emboldens followers to attain high-order needs like self-actualization, self-esteem (Bass, 1985), and are influential in surging followers’ motivation in the direction of “self-sacrifice and achievement of organizational goals over personal interests” (Bass, 1995). Leaders with idealized influence demonstrate heightened concerns and cognizance of followers’ needs and generate a sense of shared risk-taking” (Jung et al, 2008).

Inspirational motivation affords a cradle of encouragement and challenges followers to achieve the set goals, whereas, intellectual stimulation inspires followers to be more creative and innovative in their problem-solving skills. Transformational leaders grade their relationships with followers very high in priority and demonstrate individualized consideration in meeting their needs for empowerment, achievement, enhanced self-efficacy and personal growth. Leadership styles, however, do not embrace all of the factors that influence innovation. As per Cummings, Midodzi, Wong and Estabrooks (2010), “leadership style alone could not be linked to patient mortality”. Instead, the researchers examined that when the organization has associated and consistent organizational culture, patient mortality was on downward trajectory. Cummings et al (2010) observed that regardless of style, “leaders who

practiced relational transformational styles had better quality outcomes than those who demonstrated autocracy”.

Idealized influence: It is the attribute of a leader which inspires followers to take their leader as a role model. Charisma is an alternate term which replaces idealized influence, creates values that inspire, establish sense, and engender a sense of purpose among people. Idealized influence is inspirational in nature. It builds attitudes about what is significant in life. Idealized influence is related with charismatic leadership (Yuk, 1999; Shamir et al., 1993). Charismatic leaders instill self-confidence onto others. It is their demonstration of confidence in a follower’s preparedness to make self-sacrifices and an aptitude to undertake exceptional goals which is an influential rousing force of idealized influence and role-modelling behaviour (House and Shamir, 1993). Leaders with confidence in their employers can secure great accomplishments. Leaders with idealized influence are endowed with a constructive sense of self-determination. Shamir (1993) showed that maintaining self-esteem is a powerful and pervasive social need. These leaders are high in the conviction, transform their followers through regular communication, presenting themselves as role model, and encouraging them toward “achieving the mission and goals of the company”. They have requisite degree of emotional stability and control. “These leaders go beyond inner conflicts and direct their capacities to be masters of their own fate”. As per Jhon Marshall (CEO, Solaris Power), transformational leaders role of mentoring followers and learning about key responsibilities of leaders in the context of idealized behaviour. Such leaders are learning leaders. In short, fundamental pointers of idealized influence are role-modelling, articulation and values-creation, providing sense of purpose, meaning, self-esteem, self-determination, emotional control and confidence in followers.

Inspirational motivation: Developing the consciousness of followers, aligning them towards the organizational mission and vision and motivating others in understanding and pledging to the vision is a key dimension of the transformational leadership style of inspirational motivation; “inspirational motivation targets at the principle of organizational existence, instead of personality of the leader” (Bass and Avolio, 2004). Instead of suffocating employees, a leader with this style, encourages the employees in the organizational pursuit drawing best out

of them. The prevention of “experimentation and hampering creativity only frustrate employees who want to positively and productively contribute to the organization”. Leaders equipped with this style encourage the employees rendering them more autonomy to make decisions without supervision and providing them the tools to make these decisions. The leaders using this behaviour set high standard for followers besides communicating their vision in unambiguous ways, and encouraging them to develop beyond the normal situations for their own and organizational growth (House and Shamir, 1993). The successful executives are always active with their people by inspiring, rewarding and correcting them and by replacing them, if they fail, thereby, creating opportunities for others. In short, leaders with inspirational motivation behaviour create vision, establish communication and manage challenging workers by encouraging, working with them and giving them autonomy.

Intellectual stimulation: Leaders with characteristics of intellectual stimulation are those who “intellectually stimulate followers, engender creativity and accept challenges as part of their job”. They maintain their emotional balance, and rationally deal with complex problems. They cultivate the similar skills in their workers as well. They develop problem solving techniques in the followers for making complex decisions, reflecting a mutual consensus between leaders and employees. “The intellectual stimulation leadership approach projects in large measure the mentoring, coaching, morale-building strengths of individualized consideration”. Both leadership approaches build organizational skills as well as character, similar to caring leadership behaviours that coach and challenge (House and Shamir, 1993). “In other words, leaders with this leadership approach require first to unravel the complexities of the challenge, develop sense of direction towards what it means for them and their workers prior to promoting worker involvement in the challenge”. There are different levels of intellects and encouragement to work actively. It is an ability to intellectually stimulate the workers and a propensity to get involved actively in the work. “In nutshell, the key indicators of the intellectual stimulation are rationality, creativity, consensus decision making, coaching, supporting, challenging and involvement”.

Individualized consideration: Individualized consideration is concerned with the basic transformational leadership behaviours of regarding individuals as fundamental contributors to the work place. Such leaders display concern for their workers' needs, and are equipped to boost and coach the development of desired work-place behaviour. Their role alternates from participatory to autocratic style. In short, "fundamental elements of individualized consideration consist of reassurance, caring for and coaching of individuals and an open and consultative approach".

Integrity: An Essential Component of Servant Leadership

According to Stallard (2014), the word "integrity" comes from the Latin "integritas," meaning wholeness and soundness. The integrity of servant leaders is one reason people see them as being sound and grounded human beings. Their integrity is like a rock-solid foundation of a building. Conversely, a leader who lacks integrity is not perceived to be solid, dependable or reliable.

Integrity can be defined as always interacting with others ethically and honourably. People with integrity aspire to the highest ethical standards and expect the same behaviour of others. They conduct themselves honourably in any situation that may arise. They treat every person with respect and fairness. They are straightforward and forthright, expressing themselves with clarity so that others always understand what is being communicated. They approach their work with honesty and having made a commitment, keep their word.

Leaders with integrity declare and explain their values. This requires a great deal of courage, but if you act honestly and faithfully in this regard, you will not be second-guessed".

Why is integrity important to a servant leader's performance? Effective leaders build trust with the people they lead. Trust is strengthened when a servant leader demonstrates integrity by saying what he/she believes and feels. When a leader has integrity, people aren't left to guess the leader's true intention, which often creates ambiguity, uncertainty and anxiety. Trust is also strengthened when a servant leader does what he/she declared would be done. Thus builds the servant leader's reputation for reliability.

Integrity is related to the core element of voice in a connection culture. People with integrity strengthen voice in culture because they

Speak up and say what they believe rather than withhold their thoughts or lie because they want to say what others want to hear. When they express themselves, it is done in a way that reflects human value. In sharing their thoughts and feelings in a manner that safeguards relational connections, leaders with integrity also demonstrate the character strength of social intelligence. People with integrity are not naysayers because in addition to integrity, they also possess the character strength of hope (which includes optimism). When they speak, their comments are sincere, constructive and intended to advance their team's work, rather than to impede it.

Five actions you can take to develop integrity as a Leader

Stallard (2014) has suggested the following ways to develop integrity:

1. **Be a model for your team.** It is critical for you to be consistent and clear about your ethical standards. Strive to provide facts, not smokescreens, speak up even when it may be risky to do so, and challenge any system that encourages or rewards dishonesty and unethical behaviour.
2. **Be a model for ethical behaviour.** Ensure you are consistent, open and clear with your ethical standards and expectations. Encourage your team to express concerns about questionable practices and take the time to review any ethical concerns and your team will provide open, candid feedback.
3. **Don't be a political animal.** Being competent in your job is the most effective method of achieving success. Avoid being political by increasing your own awareness of political behaviour. Start by listing the tactics you are aware of and ensure you are not exhibiting these behaviours. Then ensure you always share recognition, be a team player, acknowledge people for their unique knowledge and talents, and set SMART objectives to help with unbiased measurements of performance.
4. **Be a risk taker and stand up for what you believe in.** There is a direct correlation between risk, success and excellence. These are key components in maintaining a competitive advantage. When standing up for what you believe in, approach any adversity with a positive attitude and always work to gain support and

- cooperation from key people in your immediate or broader team. Be sure to encourage others to speak up and voice their viewpoints.
5. **Be a role model for living your organization's values.** If you demonstrate that you are a proud member of your organization and live its values, and explicitly articulate to your team why you are proud and why these things are important, they will soon follow. Walk the talk, be an example of what you want your employees to be and ensure your performance reflects the standards you expect from your team.

Conclusion

In concluding this paper, the observations and suggestions noted by Adamson et al (2018) indicate that governance as a process has impacted negatively on the Nigerian populace. This is as a result of the dreaded disease that seems to always inflict its leadership. This disease is called corruption, combined with primitive accumulation of wealth. The conclusion drawn from this paper is that a general reconstruction is required. There is a need to rebuild the bridges between the state and the people who are being governed by the state, empower the people and strengthen the state.

Presently, the Nigerian state is in a flux because the dominant class is in factional crisis and is unable to organize itself to be united with a common ideology needed to plan for development, as a result, the Nigerian society is thrown into a condition, making everybody to run helter skelter for survival, which is gradually turning the Nigerian state into the Hobbesian state of nature (Fadakinle, 2015). And the situation is like that because Nigeria as a state has a very weak institution. Based on the above, how does the Nigerian government plan for development, good governance and organized leadership for its teeming citizens, when a sizeable portion of its budget is channeled to defence, to enable its secure political stability so as to be able to maintain social control.

Nigeria's governance agenda must strive from the start not only to install good governance but also to develop democratic governance. Democratic governance requires that governed citizens themselves become governors determining their own future and not simply be beneficiaries of goods and services provided by governments. The preparation of citizens for decision making and the crafting of governance

institutions that repose governance authority in a knowledgeable citizenry are the hallmarks of a democratic society. This require going beyond the strengthening of parliaments and electoral processes and other democratic institutions at the level of the central government. Democratic governance requires removing governance constraints that create sub-citizen jurisdictions for rural people, women and minorities.

In achieving these, a starting point should be the country's infrastructures which are lamentably in disarray. First is the political infrastructure both in terms of the bureaucracy, the arrangement of political institutions and ideology of governance. Second, is the social infrastructure? Nigeria is 57 years old, but its educational institutions are poorly equipped, its teachers are demoralized, there is no Nigerian university ranked among the first 1000 in the world. At a time when most universities in other parts of the world are in the computer age, using computer technology in teaching; our own universities are still using moribund equipment.

Third, is the economic infrastructure? We live in the age of economics. The 21st century is bound to be even more challenging with the reality of globalization, international finance and statelessness of capital. Nigeria must be part of the future, and not remain bogged down by the limitation of the past.

Positive leadership translates to honesty, accountability, respect for the rule of the land, selfless service to the people at all levels of governance. There is equally the need to stem the role of corruption at all levels of governance which has been perceive as one of the greatest impediments to good governance and to enable sustainable development. While this paper encouraged the present administration to continue on its fight against corruption, the paper also recommends that good governance structures that are rooted in constitutional law be created, good governance structures that truly devolve governance authority, including the authority to mobilize and dispense resources to local communities.

References

- Achebe, C. (1983). *The Trouble with Nigeria*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Adamson, D.G.; Halima, A. Godowoli; Lawal, J.O. (2018). *Governance, Good Governance, Organised Leadership and Meaningful Development: The Nigerian Experience*. <http://jpa.macrothink.org>.
- Dauda, S.; & Liman, A. (2005)(ed): *Issues in Nigeria's Political and Economic Development*. Abuja: Zumunta Publishers.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *The Wretched of the Earth*. N.Y: Grove.
- Leke, O. (2018). *Democracy and Governance in Nigeria's Fourth Republic*. *African Research Review: An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal*. Ethiopia 4(39).
- Mato, K. (2005). *Developing Variable Democratic Culture through the Electoral Process* in Dauda, S. & Liman, A. (ed) *Issues in Nigeria's Political and Economic Development*. Abuja: Zumunta Publishers.
- Olanipekun, W. (2004). *The Search for Good Leadership*. The Guardian, Tuesday, June 4.
- Stallard, M.L. (2014). *Definition of Integrity*: <https://www.michaelstallard.com/leading-with-character-integrity>.
- Stodgil, R.M. (1981). *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social Research (third Edition)*. Melbourne: Macmillan Educational Press. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-20901-5>.