



LEADERSHIP CRISIS AND NATION BUILDING IN NIGERIA: A SYMPTOM OF GOVERNANCE FAILURE

¹AGBOOLA Theophilus Olumuyiwa (Ph.D), ²LAMIDI Kazeem Oyedele & ³SHIYANBADE Bolanle Waliu

^{1&3}Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administration
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

²Department of Local Government Studies, Faculty of Administration
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria

Abstract

In the wealth of literature on state failure, surprisingly little attention has been paid to the question of what constitutes state success and what enables a state to succeed. This paper examines the strategies and tactics of government bureaucrats, political leaders and civil society groups, to build or rebuild public institutions before they reach the point of failure: to make the state work. In Nigeria, the public sector has become an epitome of all that is corrupt, fraudulent and self-egoistic. Self-egoistic is preferred to national interest and leadership crisis prevalent at all levels of decision-making has further deepened the imbroglio. The paper adopts personal interview technique method leading to the generation of primary data and further adopts desk research method; mainly from secondary source and also adopts analytical research in arriving at findings. A mini interaction with few randomly selected academicians, civil organisation, politicians, market men and women were sought to elicit information on leadership crisis and national development in Nigeria. The findings revealed that Nigeria has lost traction in its attempt to achieve nation's development because of politics, ethnicity, socio-economic inequalities, building institutions for democracy and development, appropriate constitutional settlement and corrupted process of recruitment of leaders, among other factors. It is against this backdrop that the paper examines the developmental topics, the role of public sector in Nigeria, the primacy of Political leadership in nation building and the challenges facing leadership and nation building in Nigeria as fundamental obstacles on the path to nation building in Nigeria, hence the need to surmount them. Nations are built by men and women who have the will and vision to accomplish greatness, not for themselves only, their immediate families and friends, but for their country.

Keywords: Leadership, Nation building, Governance, Crisis, Development Administration.

Introduction

The interplay of leadership, crisis, governance, nation building and development administration is intricate and inseparable. This is so because the context of leadership, both theoretically and practically, the impacts of governance reflects on national development processes. Warren Bennis, a leading authority on leadership, once stated that 'leadership is like beauty: it's hard to define, but you know it when you see it.' That could not be further from the truth. The paper is concerned with the relationship between development administrations (or the management of national development) on the one hand and administrative development on the other. It attempts to explore the concepts of public administration and management in the national development context, leadership role, leadership culture in Nigeria context and challenges of leadership in contemporary Nigeria by a close analysis of the institution of political leadership.

According to Abdulsalam (2007) he described the interests of Riggs and Pye in the relationship between national development administration and the environmental forces, especially those who represented by the private sector stakeholders and the cultural values respectively, Katz draw attention to the technical requirements for effective development administration, such as finance, manpower, information, logistics, and other related variables. Obiozor (2015) opines that Nigeria is a nation born in optimism in 1960 at independence but has its 57 year lived in a state of doubt and uncertainty. Within those years too, all kinds of analysis and conclusions have been assembled on critical issues responsible for what has become a Nigerian dilemma over nation building and national development. This is because all countries compared to Nigeria in 1960 have made astronomical progress, developed relatively stable political and economic systems. When compared with 3rd world countries in the 1960s, such as countries in Asia like Singapore, Taiwan, Indonesia, Malaysia, South Korea. In an interval of thirty years, the latter became the Asian Tigers.

He explained further that while the former are immersed in perennial violent wars, armed conflicts and small scale insurgencies, cross-border terrorism, unrelenting economic crises, financial corruption, famine, diseases and

poverty, political instability, to name a few, which have become emblems of the African continent. What made the difference? In the light of the conundrum, this paper attempts to look at how leadership and governance have interacted and the implications of their interactions on nation building within the Nigerian context (Obiozor, 2015). There is no doubt that there are crisis in the country, they include all the crisis of political, social and economic development identified by Olugbade (1987) in Lucan Pye. Efforts at resolving the crisis have been utter failure because the issues have not been addressed rather we have been busy chasing the shadow. One of Nigeria's fault lines was for long time attributed to leadership failures and others were defective political and economic structures. Ele (2013) opines that there is frequently assumed the collapse of state structures, whether through defeat by an external power or as a result of internal chaos, leads to a vacuum of political power. This is rarely the case. The mechanisms through which political power are exercised may be less formalised or consistent, but basic questions of how best to ensure the physical and economic security of oneself and one's dependants do not simply disappear when the institutions of the state break down. Non-state actors in such situations may exercise varying degrees of political power over local populations, at times providing basic social services from education to medical care. Even where non-state actors exist as parasites on local populations, political life goes on.

They explained further that how to engage in such an environment is a particular problem for policymakers in intergovernmental organizations and donor governments. But it poses far greater difficulties for the embattled state institutions and the populations of such territories. Making states work examines how these various actors have responded to crises in the legitimacy and viability of state institutions, with a particular emphasis on those situations in which the state has been salvaged or at least kept afloat.

Conceptual Review

The five concepts that are central to this paper are leadership, Crisis, governance, development administration and nation building. What constitute the meanings of each of the concepts, both theoretically and practically, are enmeshed in definitional welter. It is not within the scope of this piece to contribute to the welter of existing definitions, but to extract perspectives that will be analytically useful for the paper.

Leadership

Leadership is the exercise of power or influence in social collectivities such as groups, organisations, communities or nation. Olugbade (1987) sees leadership is both a research area and a practical skill encompassing the ability of an individual or organization to "lead" or guide other individuals, teams, or entire organisations. Leadership can either be understood as a pattern of behavior or a personal quality. As a pattern of behavior, leadership is the influence exerted by an individual or group over a large body to organise or direct its efforts towards the achievement of desired goals. As a personal attitude, leadership refers to the character traits which enable the leader to exert influence over others. Leadership is thus equated with charisma which is the personal charm or power to lead.

He sees democratic political leaders therefore have to be mindful of the side effects of their leadership style on the people they lead least the undesirable effects derail democratic process. Bad leadership lead to undesired outcome like it concentrates power and can thus lead to corruption and tyranny, hence the democratic demand that leadership be checked by accountability; it creates a situation of subservience and difference which may discourage people from participating in issues that concern them and thus lead to failure to take responsibility for their own destiny.

Schmidt (1933:283) says, the relation of leadership arises only where a group follows an individual from free choice and not under command or coercion and, secondly, not in response to blind drives but on positive and more or less national grounds. The concept of leadership should be understood as encompassing a wide range of activities. It applies to the running of social groups and the governing of nations. It may concern the relatively diffuse process of influence in establishing norms of style or opinion; or it may involve specific orders in a chain of command. It includes supervision and statesmanship, routine administration and organisation building.

Nation Building

Nation-building means enhancing the capacity of state institutions, building state-society relations and also external interventions. Nation-building is constructing or structuring a national identity using the power of the state, it can be called "Nation formation" that is the broad process through which nations come into being. Nation-building aims at the unification of the people within the state so that it remains politically stable and viable in the long run. Nation builders are those members of state who take the initiative to develop the national community through government programmes, including military conscription and national content and mass schooling also nation-building can involve the use of propaganda or major infrastructure development to foster social harmony and economic growth (James, 1996).

In the modern era, nation-building referred to the efforts of newly independent nations, notably the nations of Africa to redefine the populace of territories that had been carved out by colonial powers or empires without regard to ethnic, religious, or other boundaries. These reformed states would then become viable and coherent national entities. Nation-building includes the creation of national paraphernalia such as flags, anthems, national days,

national stadium, national theaters, national airlines, national languages, and national myths At a deeper level, national identity needed to be deliberately constructed by molding different ethnic groups into a nation, especially since in many newly established states colonial practices of divide and rule had resulted in ethnically heterogeneous populations (Wikipedia, 2015).

However, many new states were plagued by tribalism; that is, rivalry between ethnic groups within the nation. This sometimes resulted in their near-disintegration, such as the attempt by Biafra to secede from Nigeria in 1970.

Governance

The concept of “governance” in a generic sense involves the task of running a government or any other appropriate entity, such as a nation. It encompasses a set of values, policies and institutions through which the society manages economic, political as well as social processes at different levels, on the basis of interaction among the government, civil society and private sector. Governance straddles the exercise of power, exertion of influence and management of social and economic resources to achieve development. Governance has social, political, and economic dimensions (Sahni, 2003:1-2).

To Oladoyin (2010), governance is the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented or not implemented. Since decisions made can be good or bad, the analysis of the process by which can arrive at decisions is important in governance. This also requires that one can understand who the actors are in governance. These actors include government and depending on the level of government under discussion, other actors such as political parties, the military, the police, farmers, religious leaders, NGOs, the media, lobbyist and many others, All the other actors apart from government and the military, are called civil society.

Omotosho (2013) agreed that governance involves political management with emphasis on developing network of reciprocity and exchange, in order to increase the possibilities of accomplishing more while spending less. Governance is about goals and the process by which decisions are implemented or not implemented. Governance provides essential link between the civil society and state and means of giving a shape to the way decisions are made for serving public interest. It broadly means ‘the capacity to establish and sustain workable relations between individual actors in order to promote collective goals.

Governance and power are intertwined. World Bank (1989:60) defines governance as “the exercise of political power to manage a nation’s affairs.” In a more precise governance is the way those with power, use the power. Governance, in essence, indicates the capacity to entrench the authority of the central state and to regularize its relations with society. In other words, it entails ‘a process of organizing and managing legitimate power structures, entrusted by the people, to provide law and order, protect fundamental human rights, ensure rule of law and due process of law, provide for the basic needs and welfare of the people and the pursuit of their happiness. Thus, the quality of governance is reflected in the quality of relationships between the government and citizens whom it serves and protects.

Hyden (1992:7) views governance as a management function that encompasses ‘the conscious management of regime structures with a view to enhancing the legitimacy of public realm’. Hyden’s effort to operationalize “governance” inevitably associates good governance with democratic values and procedures. Put differently, governance may be legitimate or illegitimate. Although Hyde’s concept of a governance realm is applicable to all political systems, it can be used to extrapolate governance across the African continent, where breakdown of democratic leadership values and governance has been an institutional challenge.

Development Administration

Ademola (2000) defines development administration as the administration of policies, programmes and projects that contribute to the development of a nation and have significant sociopolitical and socioeconomic impact on the countries involved. It is performed by bureaucrats who are talented and highly experienced. Development administration models are driven by the desire for change. Most development functions have specific objectives, and planning for both resources and time is crucial to the model.

Ekong (1977) in “The Management Study Guide” indicates that development administration is conducted in two categories: administrative development and administration of development. Administration of development involves the management of scarce resources with objectives that include innovation through the planning process, development at a grassroots level, human capital growth and a combination of politics and administration to facilitate changes in the society. Administrative development involves building the capacity for effective decision making within project committees, developing skills and competencies to handle complex issues in personnel management, personnel training to build capacity and create accountability, and eradication of corruption through transparency. In order to achieve development goals, it is crucial that proper planning is done and resources are utilized optimally. The projects must embrace innovation through technology and transparency in all the processes, which can be accomplished through effective development administration.

Olaleye (1997) sees development administration is about projects, programs, policies and ideas which are focused at development of a nation, with the point of view of socio-economic and socio-political development of society in general, carried out by talented and skilled bureaucrats. He explained further that a model of Development Administration must contain the following points.

- It should reject status quo and be directed towards change and more so towards results. It is result oriented at its core and every development function should have a defined objective.
- Planning is essential to decide the framework of resources and time to be allotted for a development function.
- Innovation. It is dynamic in approach and encourages new and better ways to achieve objectives.
- It should focus on planning for the people as well as with the people. It is people-centered, must empower society as a whole and not product or profit-centered.

Ekong (1977) agrees that the concept of Development Administration should be understood using two concepts Administration of Development and administrative Development.

Administration of development underpin that resources are scarce, material or human thus the need to make optimum utilization of available resources and making new means for development gather importance. So administration of development involves following objectives:

- Innovation at all levels of planning.
- Importance to the development at grassroots level.
- Development of human capital as a resource.
- Politics and administration must go hand in hand to establish rapid change in society and bring about just and distinct social order.
- Freedom of administrative machinery to express ideas, views for the most effective and efficient use of natural resources.

Administrative Development is for effective Development Administration the structure of Administration itself must be empowered, large and capable enough to sustain the pressures by the developmental activities. In simpler words it means to develop administrative health by rationalizing and institution building and bringing about a radical change in the administrative framework, from the traditionalist approach, to handle and create socio-economic and political development and social change. In essence the objective of Administrative development can be summarized as:

- Building decision making capabilities.
- Development of skill and specialization to tackle complex issues in the personnel.
- Giving importance to training, effective use of technology to bring about change in Administrative approach.
- Increasing administrative capacity, capabilities, removing corruption and bringing in more accountability.
- Creating leaders out of bureaucrats for promotion of development initiatives.

To achieve development goals it is necessary to that there is proper planning, optimum utilization of resources, skilled personnel, accountability in actions and words, self-reliance and emphasis on technology. At the same time we need to develop the bureaucracy, innovativeness, build capabilities, integrity and decentralized decision making So, administrative development and administration of development both are important for the effective development of Society (Ekong, 1977).

Crisis

Omotosho (2013) says that crisis is often linked to the concept of stress. In general crisis is the situation of a complex system (family, economy, society, political, social) when the system functions poorly, an immediate decision is necessary, but the causes of the dysfunction are not immediately identified situation of a complex system simple systems do not enter crises. He speaks about a crisis of moral values, an economic or political crisis, but not a motor crisis. The system still functions, but does not break down for instant, an immediate decision is necessary to stop the further disintegration of the system or the causes are so many, or unknown, that it is impossible to take a rational, informed decision to reverse the situation.

Crisis has several defining characteristics. Seeger, Sellnow, and Ulmer (1998) say that crises have four defining characteristics that are "specific, unexpected, and non-routine events or series of events that (create) high levels of uncertainty and threat or perceived threat to an organization's high priority goals." Thus the first three characteristics are that the event is

1. Unexpected (i.e., a surprise)
2. Creates uncertainty
3. Is seen as a threat to important goals

Venette (2003) argues that "crisis is a process of transformation where the old system can no longer be maintained." Therefore the fourth defining quality is the need for change. If change is not needed, the event could more accurately be described as a failure. Apart from natural crises that are inherently unpredictable (volcanic eruptions, tsunami etc.) most of the crises that we face are created by man. Hence the requirement of their being 'unexpected' depends upon man failing to note the onset of crisis conditions. Some of our inability to recognise crises before they become dangerous is due to denial and other psychological responses that provide succour and protection for our emotions.

Adefarasin (2015) have a different set of reasons for failing to notice the onset of crises is that we allow ourselves to be 'tricked' into believing that we are doing something for reasons that are false. In other words, we are

doing the wrong things for the right reasons. For example, we might believe that we are combating corruption in Nigeria through EFCC and ICPC, insurgencies of Boko Haram, Fulani cattle rearing and famers solving the threats of all sort of criminality by engaging in economic trading activity that has no real impact on the governance. The effect of our inability to attend to the likely results of our actions can result in crisis.

From this perspective we might usefully learn that failing to understand the real causes of our difficulties is likely to lead to repeated downstream 'blowback' where states are concerned. Okotoni (2017) in his inaugural lecture on "Governance Crisis and State Failure in Nigeria: Are we all Guilty?" Suggested that a different way of defining crisis as conditions are perceptions held by the highest level decision-makers of the actor concerned, threat to basic values, with a simultaneous or subsequent, high probability of involvement in military in politics, and the awareness of finite time for response to the external value threat.

Methodology

The paper adopts personal interview technique method leading to the generation of primary data and further adopts desk research method; mainly from secondary source and also adopts analytical research in arriving at findings. A mini interaction with few randomly selected academicians, civil organisations, politicians, market men and women were sought to elicit information on leadership crisis and nation building in Nigeria.

The Primacy of Leadership in Nation Building

Nigeria has had a long history of democratic experiment but never getting it right. Authoritarian role by an institutionalised oligarchy set of people that constituted the main structural obstacle to actualising democratic leadership in Nigeria. Also corruption, tribalism, ethnicity, mismanagement, embezzlement and nepotism are direct negations of law and order, good governance, economic justice and democracy.

Adefarasin (2015) asserts that Nigeria is blessed with both human and natural resources; yet, it quite evident today that political independence has failed to match with economic independence. Nigeria has refused to develop and join comity of Nations, simply because of lack of effective leadership. It is gratifying to note that the majority of the leaders that have emerged in Nigeria after independence have exhibited bad leadership quality. The leaders are not concerned about the development of our country, as corruption, bad democratic principles and mediocrity have become the norms and direct negations of law and order, good governance, economic justice and democracy.

He explained further that despite her enormous resources and huge potentialities, Nigeria remains underdeveloped, embellished in abject poverty, unemployment with the majority unified; high crime rate and insecurity with its attendant terrorism as well as the nagging issues of favouritism and ethnicity in resource distribution. Despite of all these vices the leaders undermined the development of the nation despite the fact that Nigeria is blessed with natural resources and rich in human resource.

In 2017, in his inaugural lecture of Professor Okotoni, he cited corruption as a vice that risked gravely harming millions in Nigeria and it is the major cause of poverty and conflicts. Corruption in Nigeria takes place in many forms, corruption in Nigeria has grown at an alarming rate due to poverty, which is rampant and miserable salaries often cannot suffice to cater for a big and extended family force many people to opt for bribes to meet the needs. Most Nigerian leaders have used their political position to embezzle economic resources that is a process that often involved the mass pauperization of the "subjects" and the deepening of their dependence on the patrimonial favours of the "ruler".

Obiozor (2015) opines that Nigeria is a nation born in optimism in 1960 at independence but has its 57 year lived in a state of doubt and uncertainty. Within those years too, all kinds of analysis and conclusions have been assembled on critical issues responsible for what has become a Nigerian dilemma over nation building and national development. This is because all countries compared to Nigeria in 1960 have made astronomical progress, developed relatively stable political and economic systems. When compared with 3rd world countries in the 1960s, such as countries in Asia like Singapore, Taiwan, Indonesia, Malaysia, South Korea. In an interval of thirty years, the latter became the Asian Tigers.

He explained further that while the former are immersed in perennial violent wars, armed conflicts and small scale insurgencies, cross-border terrorism, unrelenting economic crises, financial corruption, famine, diseases and poverty, political instability, to name a few, which have become emblems of the African continent. What made the difference? In the light of the conundrum, this paper attempts to look at how leadership and governance have interacted and the implications of their interactions on nation building within the Nigerian context (Obiozor, 2015). Chimakonam & Ogar (2015) asserted that in Nigeria, however, there are some people who resent our national importance by calling us the "Giant of Africa". This is an ascriptive perspective. We are seen as giants not necessarily because of the quality of our national institutions and values, but simply by virtue of our large population and oil wealth. But in reality, the greatness of a nation has to be earned and is not determined just by the size of its population or abundance of its natural resources. For instance, China and India have the largest population in the world, but they are only now rising as important global players, on the other hand Japan has few natural resources, but has long managed to run itself in the global economic powerhouse.

Salgman (1968: 107) says that only effective leadership can furnish integrative direction and action as a cure for the stalemated pluralism endemic to western democratic systems. The pathology of political pluralism, as we

have in Nigeria, is immobilism. Under such conditions, only strong executive leadership can furnish decisive national purpose. But leadership role varies with situation and conditions. Leadership is a nexus of need fulfillments that binds situational demands and group membership. Thus during crisis situations, as Nigeria has been since our flag independence, groups are likely to select leaders who diagnose problems quickly and act decisively. But unfortunately, Nigeria has not been blessed with that type of leadership despite the fact that she has been in one crisis or the other.

Olugbade (1977) says that no matter how important effective the leader may be, the qualities that ender him to his people may soon fade away if he operate in an ideological vacuum, even if he manages to cope, as most charismatic leaders do, things would surely be difficult for his successors. This is why the issue of ideology is linked with leadership.

Chikendu (1987) agreed that leadership is important in any political community because the electorate is generally atomised and inert. The mass is able to act as a single unit only when it is integrated from outside by the leader. Leadership can transform the mass from an aggregation of isolated units into a solid unified group. The great leader of the masses has noted that the workers themselves never transcend their mileux to see the distinction bread riots and total revolution.

He explained further that the goal attainment functions are the functions of the political system. The political system, as the system that allocates to the values of the society authoritatively, bestrides the other functional sub-systems of the society. Political leaders operate in the political system and through the government. Therefore, they are the authoritative decision-making agents of the society. All the resources of the society are ultimately mobilised and manipulated by the political leaders, how well and hoe wise they do this will, to a very large extent, determine the progress and development of the society. A few examples in history may suffice to buttress the point author are making. Nigeria is a nation born in optimism in 1960 at independence but has its 57 year lived in a state of doubt and uncertainty. Within those years too, all kinds of analysis and conclusions have been assembled on critical issues responsible for what has become a Nigerian dilemma over nation building and national development. This is because all countries compared to Nigeria in 1960 have made astronomical progress, developed relatively stable political and economic systems. When compared with 3rd world countries in the 1960s, such as countries in Asia like Singapore, Taiwan, Indonesia, Malaysia, South Korea. In an interval of thirty years, the latter became the Asian Tigers.

Agbor (2012) asserts that the United States of America which today ranks as one of the world's most developed nations in terms of technology and standard of living of her people, did not become a great nation overnight and by accident. She has been tended and nurtured into greatness by her political leaders ranging from George Washington, through Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln to John Kennedy. The history of Russia offers yet another example of the importance of political leadership in nation building before 1917 the Russians could not manufacture a bicycle. Her citizens were famished lot, see thing under the autocratic misrule of the Czars but today, the Russian is vying strongly with the United States for the first position s the most powerful and most developed nation in the world. Thanks to the able leadership of Lenin and Stalin, without Lenin, the great Bolshevick revolution of 1917 which was destined to transform the Russia into a superpower, would not have come to fruition. He explained further that turning to the developing countries of the third world, Cuba is another example of the role of leadership in lifting a people from the quagmire of poverty, ignorance and disease into a haven of affluence and contentment. Cuba lacked the right type of political leadership that could have put her on the path of development and national greatness. She was to await the arrival of Fidel Castro, who in 1959 brought down the corrupt and inefficient regime of Fulgencio Batista and mounted a progressive type of political leadership. Today Cuba, under the leadership of Fidel Castro has been transformed politically, socially and economically and his government has vastly expanded educational opportunities and institution. These are but a few examples of the role of political leadership in building a nation, virtually all the nations of the world that have made it, did so primarily because of good leadership (Chikendu, 1987).

The Role of Public Sector in Nation Building in the 4th Democratic Dispensation

Abah (2015) agreed that the role of public administration in governance is a continuing issue of discussion and debate in the contemporary world. As with other developing economies and recognized member of the international community, Nigeria is required to subscribe to a system of values, policies and institutions for managing our economic, social and political affairs. It is also becoming increasingly imperative for government to address calls from among civil society, private sector and other groups for greater effectiveness and accountability for management of human and material resources. The only authentic means of doing this is through public sector/public administration institutions as the mechanisms by which government actors are implemented.

Okotoni (2017) opines that the adoption of democratic governance in 1999 as a moral imperative and a continuous process of political practice had enabled Nigeria to overcome past challenges of military junta's administration, regain legitimacy and muster the capacity for development and delivery. The implementation of the Constitution had established the basis for the rule of law, assert a balance of power among the three branches of government, and affirm the dignity, basic human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Nigerian people. It had restored the people's sovereignty, sanction democratic principles and allow popular participation in policy and

decision making. Furthermore, it had provides for the formation of a transparent government accountable to the people and open up the space for competitive politics, independent media and autonomous civic associations. In a nutshell, democratic governance had been the path to national renewal, state construction and economic revival.

Abdulsalam (2007) agrees that it has been recognised that Nigerians live in an “Executive Centred era” in which the effectiveness of government depends substantially upon executive leadership, both in policy formulation in policy execution. The suspension of extant laws and absence of new laws to guide emerging issues has resulted in anomalies in Nigerian public sector. To the extent that this observation is valid and irrespective of the burden of the management of governmental affairs rests on the public service that is executive instrument in Nigeria. Championing legal reforms and transforming their organisations into models of legal compliance becomes an immediate objective for public services/administrators, even as the Nigerian judiciary works to address weakness, slowness and inconsistency, public officials must take highest standards of ethics and performance within their organisations.

He explained further that the civil service in Nigeria is expected to play a leading role in the socio-economic transformation through innovation and social engineering. It also expected to be a leader in promoting national unity and integration, because governments in developing countries have accepted responsibility for including promoting, directing and managing national socio-economic and political development, it becomes imperative that large scale of government bureaucracy is established, charged with the task of implementing development programmes and projects in a variety of fields. The need for administrative development has arisen, that is, the need for appropriate action to be taken to design, build and sustain effective and efficient administrative machinery capable and ready to play its expected role in national development and nation building (Abdulsalam, 2007).

Animashaun (2009) addresses public administration and governance as it is worth recalling that from the time of independence in 1960s the practice of public administration has been dominated by western models, but admittedly, when countries have attempted to depart from such models they have not too successful either, since various such statist models were also predicated on narrow interests and agendas. The question that arises is whether the organisational, institutional and procedural forms that have characterised public administration so far are adequate to address the developmental needs of Nigeria especially with respect to the need for strategic policy formulation, coherence and comprehensiveness of policies, and participatory and consultative processes of policy formulation and implementation.

He explained further that if Nigeria’s plight requires proactive state policies carried out in collaboration with the private sector, civil society and community agencies, do we have the appropriate state apparatus, and is such an apparatus adequately embedded in society to accomplish the needed task? It may be noted that Nigerian governments, just like their colonial counterparts have been dedicated to nurturing the enclave formal economy and polity which, although accounting for the greater part of gross domestic product, only accounts for a small proportion of total employment, and thus only services the needs of a minority in most countries.

Ele (2013) asserts that modern formations in Nigeria, whose needs the state and the public sector finds itself compelled to address are relative enclaves providing livelihoods to minority of the population while the majority of the populace lives and works in relative poverty and, marginalisation and exclusion in the non-formal sectors where traditional and various survivalist and adaptive livelihoods and modes of governance are dominant even if under great pressure from various external factors. Thus the question still stands as to what kind of state would be needed to promote inclusive economic participation, sustainable human development and nation building in a manner that uplifts the poorest of the poor in its wake. That is the grand problematic of public administration and governance.

Achebe (1983) has opined that “Nigeria is less than fortunate in its leadership” according to him Nigerian leaders have a tendency to pious materialist wooliness and self-centred pedestrianism. He drew our attention to the statements made by Nigerians best known leaders, Chief Obafemi Awolowo and Dr. Nnamdi Azikwe, in their autobiographies, which could be construed to be the underlying principles of their leadership behavior in Nigeria politics.

Agbor (2012) called the Nigerian leaders of this period wind-sowers rather than nation-building, their error of omission and commission were the wind the sowed. Political leaders such as ministers, commissioners, party leaders, heads of various parastatals, chairmen of local council, etc. used their positions o accumulate wealth, buy properties of various kinds, or enter into partnership with foreign exploiters to set up local branch factories of the multi-national corporations, etc. On the whole there is a great need for the evolution of a new political culture which sees leadership as a collective endeavour in which all attempts should be directed towards the transformation of the society. Successful leaders should be honoured and deferred, while unsuccessful ones should be disgraced.

Challenges Facing Leadership and Nation-Building in Nigeria

There is no denying the problem of leadership as one of the problem in Nigeria, if not in the entire developing states. Nigeria have capacity to end poverty, what really then is lacking is the will to do so and that will is largely locked in the hands of those who call themselves leaders, business or political. And there is only cul-de-sac organised use people numbers to create civil society that hold leadership accountable.

It is suffice to say that the major problem facing the development of the Nigerian state is the crisis of leadership, politicians, scholars, students, social critics, labour leaders and seasoned bureaucrats even clergymen

have consistently attributed it to be the major problem facing nation-building, integration and national development. An analysis of the plethora of leaders on Nigeria's political landscape revealed corruption, nepotism, selfish, ethnicity, mediocre, tribal leaders and opportunistic small minded people masquerading as leaders. From Tafawa Balewa to Buhari, the crisis of leadership remains the same. Absence of pragmatic charismatic and selfless leadership to steer the ship of the nation remains a mirage (Ayodele & Olu-Adeyemi, 2013).

Olugbade (1987) asked this question why has the task of nation-building been so difficult in Nigeria, and the fruits so patchy, despite our enormous human and natural resources? The author suggested that the Nigerian people should look for the answer in three critical areas: (1) threats and challenges posed by the environment for nation-building; (2) the quality of leadership that has confronted these challenges; and (3) the fragility of political and development institutions. Nigerians need to understand the environment for nation-building in Nigeria, so we can clearly identify our strengths, weaknesses, and core challenges. The electorates also need to evolve a system of leadership selection and accountability which produces the sort of leaders that will confront the challenges of the environment in a way that is beneficial for nation-building. The states are a product of the human will and imagination and the institutions that sustain their collective efforts. Therefore, people must find these resources in ourselves if we are to succeed in building our nation.

Adefarasin (2015) opines that the post-colonial state is an alien implantation on Nigeria soil. It is encumbered by its European origins and the weight of its colonial legacy. Its problems are compounded by palpable failures in nation building, and development. Weak governments in fragile states pursue the politics of repression, exclusion and marginalisation. This provokes discontent at the centre and resistance and civil wars on the periphery Biafra in 1967. The resultant insecurity and instability perpetuate underdevelopment, worsen poverty, corruption, and hamper the fight against pandemic diseases. The consequences of climate change aggravate an already precarious human condition. The state is unable to deliver and redress the situation.

Chikendu (1987) emphasises the fact that nations just don't happen by historical accident, rather they are built by men and women with vision and resolve. Nation-building is therefore the product of conscious state management not happenstance. Nation-building is always a work-in-progress; a dynamic process in constant need of nurturing and re-invention. Nation-building never stops and true nation-builder never rest because all nations are constantly facing up to new challenges.

Insecurity in hardly can anyone deny the severity of the security challenges this country faces today, characterised by the new enterprise in town called kidnapping. The challenges of armed robbery and boko haram which has been with us as part of the harvest of the civil war would not go away. Assassinations and cultism are the latter-day headaches in the country called Nigeria (The Guardian, 2017).

Findings

The major findings in the paper revealed that Nigeria has lost traction in its attempt to achieve nation's development because of politics of live and other live, various factors or challenges as been responsible for this abysmal state of affairs and which Nigerian political and bureaucratic leaders have been battling with. The paper examines some of these challenges which among others include: the elusiveness of a national leaders, corruption and mismanagement, lack of proper accountability on the part of Nigerian leaders, Niger Delta environmental crisis, religious crisis, ethnicity, socio-economic inequalities, Boko Haram, building institutions for democracy and development, appropriate constitutional settlement and corrupted process of recruitment of leaders, among other factors. The implication of the totality of all these factors has the effect of partly contributing to Nigeria perambulating at the same spot or even dancing backward rather than progressing, thereby making stability, true nation building and development elusive to the Nigerian nation. The finding revealed that political leaders are self-seeking and not oriented to the interest of all the people and the nation at large.

Conclusion

The study concluded that nations are built by men and women who have the will and vision to accomplish greatness, not for themselves only, their immediate families and friends, but for their country. There is a need to investigate the nature of leadership in Nigeria with a view to informing in how good leadership can be nurtured, promoted and supported to spearhead democratic and developmental strategic agendas through a proactive role of the state in partnership with the private sector and civil society.

This is not to say that there have not been few exceptions in the leadership cadre in Nigeria worthy of emulation, Chief Obafemi Awolowo's achievement in the old Western region remained unequalled in the history of productive leadership. Late Prof. Dora Akinyuli, NAFDAC Director-General remains a symbol of pride to the feminine gender in leadership just as Late Commadore Samson Emeka Omerua, former Minister for Sport who refunded public fund in 1988 World cup tournament and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) is performing wonderfully well in Nigeria's revered anti-corruption machinery under the leadership of Ibrahim Magu.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are forwarded by the author based on the above discussions.

How do we solve the problem of leadership in Nigeria? Providing solution to the problem of leadership in Nigeria remains very difficult but not impossible. Since leaders played great roles in nation building and promote socio-economic development, pragmatic solution to the problem of leadership can be offered as an antidote, this can be achieved through:

Every individual, particularly, leaders are required to be committed to their words to discharge their responsibilities as a leader and as an individual; commitment is the foundation for all other responsibilities; Leaders are required to “walk their talk”; they are required to do practically what they have said by their mouth; Readiness to accept change is another key element in ensuring Good Governance; so that the current leaders and the emerging future leaders should have to be ready to accept change and go accordingly.

To promote civil patriotism over local or ethnic nationalism is important, the encouragement of an ethnlial rebirth that lays emphasis on integrity and transparency, the promotion of social goods for commonwealth over selfish consideration.

The import of leadership is more synonymous with national development. It is a critical element that makes nation building and development realisable. There is no doubt that productive leadership has eluded Nigeria for decades, its consequences are therefore grave for sustainable development.

References

- Abah, J. (2015) Public Administrators as Agents of Change. National Conference, Nigeria. *Institute of Public Administration*, Pp.18-23.
- Abdulsalam, I. (2007) The Role of Public Administration in National Development Strategy: Challenges and Prospects, 2006 *Management Conference in Nigeria*, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 28-34.
- Achebe, C. (1983) *The Trouble with Nigeria*, Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers. Pp. 11.
- Adefarasin, V.O. (2015) Effective Leadership as the basis for Nigeria’s Quest for Development. In Y.K. Salami, J.O. Famakinde & G. Fasikun (eds) *Nationalism and Economic Justice in Nigeria*, Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press. Pp.730-746.
- Ademola, T. (2000) *Fundamentals of Development Administration*, Lagos: Eagles Might Venture. Pp. 33-42.
- Agbor, U. I. (2012). Leadership Attitude, Development paradigms and Africa’s Development: The Necessity of the Confucian Ethics. *EBSU Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(2), Pp. 90- 103 Aldoory,
- Animashaun, M.A. (2009) State Failure, Crisis of Governance and Disengagement from State in Africa, *Africa Development*, Vol. XXXIV, Nos. 3&4, pp.47-63.
- Ayodele, B. & Olu-Adeyemi, L. (2015) Leadership Crisis and Africa’s Development Dilemma: The Case of Nigeria, *LUNARPAGES.COM’S CAVEAT EMPTOR- A story of Technical Incompetence – October*, 14. Pp. 45-59.
- Chikendu, P.N. (1987) Political Leadership and Nation Building in Nigeria. In S.O. Olugbemi (eds) *Alternative Political Future for Nigeria*, Lagos: NPSA Publisher. Pp. 249-258.
- Chimakonam, J.O. & Ogar, J.N. (2015) Democratic Leadership in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic: A Loss of the ideals of Nationalism. In Y.K. Salami, J.O. Famakinde & G. Fasikun (eds) *Nationalism and Economic Justice in Nigeria*, Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press. Pp. 78-98.
- Ekong, E.E. (1977) *Evaluating Development: The Case of Western Nigeria*, Ilesa: Ilesanmi Press and Sons Ltd. Pp. 5-12.
- Ele, S. (2013) Nigeria and the Challenges of Nation Building in the 21st Century, *International Journal of Advance Legal Studies and Governance*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp.32-42.
- Hyden, G. (1992) “Governance and the Study of Politics” in G. Hyden and M. Bratton (eds) *Governance and Politics in Africa*, Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers. Pp. 1-26.
- James, P. (1996) *Nation Formation: Towards a Theory of Abstract Community*, London: Sage Publications. Pp. 12-17.
- Obiozor, G. (2015) Nigerian Politics, Leadership and Nation-Building, *A Seminar Paper Presented Leadership Forum*, Abuja, October 8, 2015. Pp. 1-25.
- Okotoni, M.O. (2017) Governance Crisis and State Failure in Nigeria: Are we all Guilty? *Inaugural Lecture Series 299*, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife. Pp. 1-3
- Oladoyin, A. M. (2010), “The Role of Public Managers in Governance”, paper presented in the *Institute of Public Management*, Lagos October 9. Pp. 1-17.
- Olaleye, A.O. (1997) *Introduction to Development Administration*, Akure: Alabi-Eyo & Co. Ltd. Pp. 22-27.
- Olubgade, K. (1987) Leadership and the Problem of Ideology in Nigeria, in S. O. Olubgemi, *Alternative Political Futures for Nigeria*, Lagos: NPSA. Pp. 239-241.
- Sahni, P. (2003) *Governance for Development: Issues and Strategies*, New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited. Pp. 1-10.
- Salgman, L.G. (1968) The Study of Political Leadership: *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 44, No. 4. Pp. 56-71
- Schmidt, R. (1972) *Leadership in Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, New York: Macmillan Company, Vol. 9.
- Seeger, M. W., Sellnow, T. L., Ulmer, R. R. (1998). Communication, Organisation and Crisis. *Communication Yearbook*. 21: 231–275.
- The Guardian*, (2017) Insecurity: Where do we go from here? www.guardian.org. March, 30th pp.17

Venette, S. J. (2003) Risk Communication in a High Reliability Organization: APHIS PPQ's inclusion of Risk in Decision Making. Ann Arbor, MI: *UMI Proquest Information and Learning*.

Wikipedia, (2015) Nation Building, www.onlineretrieved March 18, 2015.

World Bank, (1989) *Governance and Development*, Washington DC: World Bank. Pp. 23-25.