
LEADERSHIP AND SUBSTANCES OF DEMOCRACY IN
NIGERIA: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECT

— — — — —
¹Deborah Adetoro Ogunjimi &

²Alicia Adenike Ogundeji

¹The College of Education, Lanlate

²Osun State College of Education, Ila

Abstract

The paper examined the leadership and substances of democracy in Nigeria: problems and prospect. Place of elections in Nigeria democratic process needs not to be under emphasised. However, the wide acceptance of any electoral process would mostly be determined by the quantity of elections in that society. The near absence of democratic leadership and by extension good governance at the grassroots level in Nigeria could be linked to undue interference by the State government. Grassroots administration in Nigeria has been reduced to an area office, the various governments at the State level, irrespective of party politics ideology have been consistently abused by the third tier of government. Election and administration of local communities should be left to the people to determine, it was curious to discover that democratic leadership at local government administration fared better under the military government than the present civilian government. Corruption and ethno-religious politics is another factor, as the major problems of leadership in Nigerian polity. The study propose possible way forward; that Nigeria should put in

place a programme of developing and educating the youths, as potential leaders of the future, on the values of true democracy; good governance; and national transformation.

Keywords: Leadership, Substances, Democracy, Democratic Development, Electoral Problems

Introduction

Substances of democracy is a form of democracy in which the outcome of elections is representative of the people and functions in the interest of the governed. This type of democracy can also be referred to as a functional democracy. Democratic governance has the potentials to enhance development in a society. However, development has also been achieved under non-democratic contexts. All societies of the world strive to achieve development which is interpreted to mean improvement in the living standard of the people in the society (Shaapera & Ayatse, 2018). Ogbogu (2012) observed that democratic governance is an entitlement conferred upon all citizens by law, implying that there is no legal exclusion of women from governance in Nigeria; other barriers still impede their full participation. The increased involvement of women in the democratic process is essential to broadening and deepening the Nigerian government's commitment to democratic governance which by definition allows for diversity and participation of different groups.

Many leaders in the positions of authority have remained uninterested to the plight of the poor, unemployed and the hungry; they are infatuated with siphoning the fortunes of the country, hence social injustice, corruption, poverty and insecurity have brought untold hardship to the people. The greatest threat to Nigerian democracy and good governance is poor leadership, which breeds hostile political environment for national development. Since the return of democratic governance in 1999, Nigeria has been experiencing deepening political crises as a result of the defects of the democratization process and the apparent ineptitude of the political leadership (Odo, 2015).

Leadership has been a major problem that continue to effort the genuine democratization through exclusion of some segments of the political elite from effective participation in the politics of the country. According to Fayemi (2009), the long years of political misrule and bad governance exemplified by civilian administrations and military dictatorships since the country's political independence has left the nation politically de-mobilized, humanly underdeveloped and economically sterile with an ample population ravaged by poverty. Thus, with the return to democratic rule in the country in 1999, Nigerians had expected that the new wave of political leadership and democratic governance would accelerate the tide of development in the nation. The political leadership was expected to grapple with the socio-economic and political problems of the country, which border on poverty, corruption, lack of good governance, corrupt electoral system, unemployment, and insecurity, among others (Orji, 2014).

Some of these problems are not only getting worse, but appear to defy solutions. Nigerians have become deeply frustrated and disappointed over unfulfilled hopes of solving persistent economic crises, social tensions and political instability. The emergent political corruption and deceit have created widespread national disaffection, which has been hijacked by some interest groups for their own parochial purposes. Thus, despite size and natural endowment in both human and material resources, Nigeria lingers in the doldrums, perpetually a country of the future. This is contrary to the dreams of Nigeria's founding fathers that saw the country at independence as a beacon of hope and a bastion of democratic government in Africa (Oronsaye, 2006).

The problem of leadership has continued to abort efforts at genuine democratization through exclusion of some segments of the political elite from effective participation in the politics of the country. Still the level of substances of democracy in the country is deceptively weak and characterized by pervasion, indiscretions, electoral malpractices, rigging, lack of stable and credible political party system, electoral violence, etc. The problem antique of this paper fulcrums on reasons why has Nigeria's democracy in projecting good leadership remained unachieved.

The concept of democracy varies in many culture and social structure around the world. Democracy has won for itself a household name across the globe. It has gained popularity because it is believed to be a sine-qua-non for growth and development. What then is democracy? There is no generally accepted definition of democracy because over the years, different forms of democracy have emerged. According to Erunke (2012), democracy is a fluid concept that has received many definitions by scholars either in the classical political studies or in the contemporary world of scholarship. According to Almond, Powell, Strom and Dalton (2004), democracy is a political system in which citizens enjoy a number of basic civil and political rights and in which their most important political leaders are elected in free and fair elections and accountable under the rule of law.

Democracy is a political system which supplies regular constitutional opportunities for changing the governing officials and a social mechanism which permits the larger possible part of the population to influence major decisions by choosing among contenders for political office. Dada, Udoaka and Dada (2013) reviews that democracy as a political method or type of institutional arrangement for arriving at political, legislative and administrative decisions. According to him, it is a method by means of competitive struggle for the peoples' vote and this competition for votes is the distinguishing character of the democratic method. Democracy is "a system of elected representative government operated under the rule of law, where the most significant groups in the population participate in the political process and have access to effective representation in the practice of making governmental decisions, that is, of allocation of scarce resources" (Erunke, 2012).

Consolidation as avoiding democratic break down and consolidation as transformation from a diminished sub-type of democracy to a consolidated liberal democracy. The former has to do with the process of stabilizing and maintaining the new democracies while the latter focused on the process of deepening, completing or organizing democracies (Shedler, 1998; Odo, 2015). Consolidation is achieved when a strong public opinion, privileges, democratic procedures and institution as the only

appropriate means of governing. Constitutionally, in consolidated democracies, both government and non-state actors and social forces in the state become subjected to and abide by laws, procedure and sanctioned institutions for conflict resolution.

Democratic consolidation is one concept that has attracted the attention of scholars and policy makers since the advent of the third wave of democratization. To Jega (2006), democratic consolidation is “an omnibus concept, a garbage-can concept, a catch-all concept, lacking a core meaning that would unite all modes of usage”. In the literature, there are two ways of viewing the concept of consolidation.

According to Odo (2015), democratic consolidation represents a state whereby institutions, rules and constraints of democracy becomes the sole legitimate means for the acquisition and exercise of political power. Democratic consolidation is a term which describes the vital political goal for a transiting democracy with intermittent fop by authoritarian rule (Erunke, 2012). It consists of overlapping behavioural, attitudinal and constitutional dimensions through which democracy becomes routinised and deeply internalised in social, institutional and even psychological life as well as political calculation for achieving success. Democratic consolidation as an identifiable phase in the process of transition from authoritarian to democratic system that are critical to the establishment of a stable, institutional and lasting democracy (Ademola, 2011). Mohammed (2013) states that democratic consolidation as the challenge of making new democracies secure and extending their life expectancy beyond the short term of making them immune against the threat of authoritarian repression and of building dams against eventual reverse waves. Democratic consolidation refers to “a firm establishment and successful completion of the process of political democratization” (Frimpong-Mansoh, 2012).

According to Ogundiya (2009), democratic consolidation is about regime maintenance and about regarding the key political institution as the only legitimate framework for political contestation and adherence to the democratic rules of the game. Democratic consolidation as the acceptance by all political actors that

democratic procedure dictate government renewal. Democratic consolidation entails widespread acceptance of rules that generate political participation and competition (Michels, 2011). Democracy becomes the only game in town in a consolidated democracy and offer a framework surrounding behaviour and attitudinal and constitutional means of determining democratic consolidation. There are no significant socio-economic, political, institutional or national actors trying to achieve their aims through unconstitutional means, violence or in attempt to secede from the state (Michels, 2011).

There are severe problems of governance, and widespread dissatisfaction of the ruling government, the public and the elites uphold the belief and commitment to constitutional means as the only legitimate way to change a government. Esu, (2010), on his part, postulates a “two- turnover” thesis as an indicator of democratic consolidation. He argues that democracy becomes consolidated when an entrenched regime delivers free, fair and competitive election by which the party that wins power at the initial elections during the transition phase loses in subsequent elections and hands over power to the winning party and when the winning party also in turn hands over power peacefully to another party at subsequent elections. The paper therefore examined the leadership and substances of democracy in Nigeria with reference to problems and prospect.

Leadership within Nigerian Democracy

Different scholars has review the definitions of leadership revolve around the ability to organize individuals for the achievement of a common goal. A focus is the trait theory of leadership, which projects the idea that leadership is based on individual attributes. Plato’s quiz of the constituent quality of a leader is another review of leadership context. Unable to subsist the attendant ‘leaders are born’ versus ‘leaders are made’ debate, the trait theory is, over the era, competed with alternate theories. Prominent scheme of the post-trait theories is to present vigorously a situational leadership philosophy. Leadership roles and dispositions vary with given situations. Leadership variation is as natural as existential situations

and leaders, whether substantial or developed, are situational emergentists (Nweke, 2015).

Certain existential circumstances turn out concomitant leadership features. Within the political setting, leadership tends to strongly equate rulership. Any political setting guided by laws presupposes rulership. Pendergrass (2013) stated nine leadership traits one of which is the democratic (participatory) leadership philosophy. A leader who practices this leadership philosophy offers guidance to organization members while still being a part of the group. This type of leadership is democratic, considerate, participative, and consultative. It focuses on creating and maintaining good working relationships that are supportive and interactive. Followers are encouraged to participate and engage with the decision making process and their input is considered.

This kind of leadership is supposedly the vision of Locke, Rousseau and Mill's theories of democracy. Leadership in the democratic system of government remains the exercise of political powers within the frame of constitutional provisions duly legislated for common good. Smith's (2014) view leadership as a personal leadership philosophy, which makes such person a manager; your people will decide if you are a leader. Leadership is not the job of putting greatness into people, but rather the recognition that greatness already exists. The role of a leader is to provide the grand challenge, create the environment and invest in the individual to inspire that greatness to emerge. Leadership is about inspiring a group of individuals to achieve extraordinary things.

Good leader include integrity which is a principles-based leader, and will always say what I mean, and mean what I say. In the end, my words and my actions should be synonymous. Humility: Mankind has many gifts, and I do not view myself as one of them. I seek to learn from others, treat every success and failure as a learning opportunity, and strive to be a better version of myself each and every day. Also, teamwork that a player that makes the team great is far more valuable than simply a great player. A team plays for a cause greater than itself or any individual, and believes that only together can we create outcomes that will echo an eternity.

The Federal Republic of Nigeria's embrace of democracy in 1999 saw the transition of political power from the grip of the military to civilian rule. The country adopted a model of democracy that is basically representative with three tiers and arms of government. Thus the exercise of political power resides mainly within the confines of three arms of government viz; the executive, the legislature and the judiciary both at the federal, states and local governments. At the federal level, Nigeria runs a bicameral legislature of the Senate and House of Representatives. The Senate is constituted of 109 members, three of which are elected from each of the thirty-six existing States of the Federation. The House of Representatives have 360 seats drawn from federal constituencies across the country. Leadership within Nigerian democracy as in every other democracy is either by election or executive appointment. Hence, seekers of political offices either contest election or lobby for appointments.

From the inception of the Nigerian democratic dispensation of the fourth republic headed by Olusegun Obasanjo, to the present, Nigerian political leadership has witnessed three civilian to civilian transitions. Of course, the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria stipulated leadership tenures for mainly key political leadership positions occupied through elections. After the general election of 2007, Obasanjo handed over power to Late Umar Musa Yar'Adua whose administration was short-circuited by his demise in 2009. The 2011 general election propped up Jonathan Goodluck, who was vice president in Yar'Adua's time but sworn-in as president and completed that tenure.

Despite the laudability of current sustenance of democracy in Nigeria, the question remains as to the extent Nigerian democratic leaders have justified the essence of democratic leadership. If Nigerians' clamour for democracy was propelled by the quest for good governance aimed ultimately at enhanced national development, then Nigerians must have clamoured for the assurances of the general benefits of democracy. This definitely includes visions for real democratic governance. It simply entails that Nigerian democratic leaders must be disposed to lead the citizenry on the parts of rule of law, protection of human rights and

freedom, enhanced public participation as well as integral and sustainable development. So far, the benefits of democratic governance are evident in Nigeria. The current rating of Nigeria as Africa's greatest economy is owed to democracy. A relative advancement in Nigerian politics rests in the actuality of successful civilian to civilian transitions within fifteen years of uninterrupted democracy. On the minimum, Nigerians could presently boast of quasi satisfaction as regards, the replacement of civility of governance against the preceding military dictatorship. Aside these and more, some leadership challenges within the democratic setting are discernible.

The Challenges of Leadership in Nigeria

It is worrisome to note that Nigeria's political independence had not brought substantial change in the economic conditions and people's general development. Fayemi (2009) observed, the standard of living in Nigeria is deteriorating on a daily basis as high unemployment, inflation, civil strife, poverty, corruption, disease, malnutrition, illiteracy, insecurity of lives and property, among others appeared to be the only legacy the state is capable of passing from one generation to the other.

The emergent political leadership of the post-independence Nigeria has shown a disappointing incapacity to manage the affairs of the country. The citizens are feeling thoroughly embarrassed and disappointed by the turn of events because of unfulfilled expectations and dashed hopes (Okau, 2014). The people are facing economic hardship of the highest order despite the enormous national resources with which the country has been endowed. The most critical question that any patriotic Nigerian might be asking today is why has the country not developed or is not developing as fast as it should? Okau (2014) noted while answers to this question may vary from group to group and individual to individual, some answers are so strong that they are rarely controvertible. In this respect, the problem of leadership is a good example.

Nigeria's celebrated economic growth has not translated into better economic and social welfare for Nigerians. Thus, poverty reduction and job creation have not kept pace with the population

growth, which implies social distress for an increasing number of the people.

Poor leadership has succeeded in putting Nigeria and its over 160 million people into political and economic impasse. It is rather unbelievable that since the return of democracy in 1999, the country could not consolidate the democratization process to achieve good governance and usher Nigerians into the land of goodies. In most parts of the country today, millions of human inhabitants share water from the same source with animals; water infested with bacteria and viruses (Odu, 2015).

According to Achebe (2010), the country's embarrassing stunted growth despite its enormous human and material resources is the product of the failure of leadership. The thesis that determined and focused leaders, elected or non-elected, make their society is well grounded with the facts of history. The people or followers feed on the energy of their leaders to rise to their individual potentials; the full flowering of which fuel national development. Leaders are the engines of national development. This shows the critical role of leadership.

Major Failure of Leadership in Nigeria

Nigeria has failed to internalize true democratic culture; good governance; and development, in terms of the general well-being of the larger majority of its population 15 years (1999-2014) after an uninterrupted civilian rule is bad leadership. Ekpu (2010) noted that with our vast resources, men and material and our unspeakable enthusiasm, we would circle the globe. However, 50 years (now 54) later, we are like a false pregnancy; every symptom is there but no baby. Indeed, Nigerians are unanimous on the verdict that the country has not fulfilled its potentials despite her enormous natural endowment in both human and material resources, hence the people's realities are far from their ideals; and all the accusing fingers for this paradox point to the quality of leadership. This makes the search for the underlying causes of the phenomenon of leadership failure in Nigeria a compelling endeavour. The causes of leadership failure in Nigeria include the following:

Constitutional Provision: The 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria in Section 131 provides four qualifications for the office of the President as follows:

- He must be a citizen of Nigeria by birth;
- He must attain the age of 40 years;
- He must be a member of a political party and is sponsored by that political party; and
- He must be educated up to at least school certificate level or its equivalent.

The issues of citizenship and political party affiliation are not debatable but certainly age and educational qualifications are. As Nigeria searches for a leader, what should count are people with a gift of the head and gift of the heart; brilliant and hardworking people with uncommon traits of selflessness and sacrificial service to humanity. These qualities have nothing to do with age.

The constitution provides for school certificate level education for an aspirant to the high office of President. At this time of great complexity in world affairs, if our entry qualification for the most important office in the land is this low, how can we expect a high level achievement from the occupant since higher education is part of the preparations for a high office. According to Ekpu (2010), no school certificate holder today can be the managing director of a bank or the manager of a high grade restaurant in Nigeria, or driver at national Agency for the control of AIDs. Yet we have school certificate as the qualification for the most important office in the land at a time of great complexity, in world affairs.

Ethnicity: has been observed a major obstacle to the development of effective leadership in Nigeria. Nigeria is bedeviled by crisis of governance, which include the conduct of governance within an ethnic framework. Ethnic politics in the country has reduced faith in the unity of the Nigerian state to protect all citizens. Ruling parties are tailored to serve tribal and ethnic cleavages with either the dominant tribal group or an acceptable tribal group used as a balance (Eke, 2008). The natural consequence is intensified tribal

and ethnic rivalries based on deep-seated suspicion of the opposing ethnic groups. The ethnic minorities in Nigeria offer lucid examples. The political class in Nigeria sacrifices national economic objectives on the altar of ethnicity. These are at variance with the fundamental objective and directive principles of state policy.

Accidental Political Leaders: It is argued that no elected President of Nigeria since independence was ever prepared for the job. Hence, many of them hadn't the faintest idea about the nature and essence of political leadership because they were without exemption ill-prepared. This is the bane of the country's progress. According to Ekpu (2010), no elected President of Nigeria was ever prepared for the job. Abubakar Tafawa Balewa was not ready but was pushed by Ahmadu Bello to come to Lagos while he tended the shop in Kaduna. Shehu Shagari wanted to go for the Senate but the National Party of Nigeria's Kingmakers diverted him to Dodan Barracks. Olusegun Obasanjo was still in prison when godfathers pulled him out of the dungeon and put the crown on his head amidst a mild protest, "what did I forget there?" Umar Musa Yar'adua was heading to Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria for a teaching job when Obasanjo halted and wheeled him to Aso Rock. Goodluck Jonathan was just adjusting his seat as the Governor of Bayelsa state when Obasanjo called him to higher duties as Vice-President to Yar'Adua. As Yar'Adua's health failed, luck smiled on Jonathan and he became what he was not ready for; president.

With reference, no one among the presidents spent years dreaming, studying, working, researching and networking in readiness for the post of Nigeria's president. It is thus not surprising if none of them turned out to be a peak performer. Thus, Nigeria has over the years since the country's political independence, been saddled with leaders who were neither properly equipped nor even ready for the job.

Personalization of Public Office: One of the greatest un-doing of the Nigerian leadership is the tendency to personalize public projects. They initiate a vision and leave office with it, which is detrimental to national development. The challenge of leadership also creates the problem of policy summersault whereby policies

are not allowed to mature as they are changed and countered arbitrarily. An example of this, according to Mark (2014), was when Obasanjo sold refineries in Nigeria to Chinese investors, which was upturned a year later by Yar'Adua. It is evident in Nigeria that every new administration comes in with its own programmes and completely jettisons whatever was on the ground notwithstanding the status of such programmes. It is worst when the new government belongs to a different political party. This accounts for the numerous abandoned projects that littered the entire landscape of the country.

Corruption: Nigeria is a nation favoured by providence. The vast human and material wealth with which she is endowed bestows on her a role in Africa and the world, which no one else can assume or fulfill. However, successive leaders in the country have regrettably betrayed irretrievably the country's high destiny. Achebe (1983) lamented over this situation when he said the countless billions that a generous providence poured into our national coffers in the last ten years (1979-82) would have been enough to launch this nation into the middle-rank of developed nations and transformed the lives of our poor and needy. However, because the country lacked the right leadership to manage such resources for the general good of the people, they were simply looted and stolen including squandering on uncontrolled importation of all kinds of useless consumer goods; inflated contracts to an increasing army of party loyalists who had neither the desire nor the competence to execute such contracts; as well as escalating salaries of grossly over-staffed and un-productive public service.

Nigeria lacks the leadership that would institute policies by which to engender the development of the nation. The people live in want of functional hospitals, roads, electricity, affordable shelter, schools, etc. Igwe (2010) observed that funds meant for public welfare have been hijacked by the leadership and are sitting in Swiss Banks denying the poor the chance to escape poverty and forcing the best Nigerian brains (emphasis mine) to seek greener pastures abroad. Millions of others die from starvation, hunger, malnutrition, polio, measles, tuberculosis and other killer diseases. The crime of those who die and those who continued to suffer and

who are denied opportunity to escape poverty is that they happened to have come under corrupt and incompetent leaders.

Majority of Nigerian leaders since independence, short of rhetorics, have variously shown they have no interest in the future of the country. All Nigeria has to live with are leaders who by some illegal means or the other acquired power, emptied the nation's coffers and restart the same process by working towards re-election and where this is not possible, transfer power to their cronies who venture to do worse than their predecessors. They recycled themselves within the corridors of power. Thus, to all intents and purposes, Nigeria is a country of failed political leadership, which has betrayed its citizens. According to Okau (2014), one major characteristic of African Political leaders including Nigeria has to do with "Kleptocracy", which he explained thus:

The Greek roots of this word are "thief" and "rule" i.e. rule by thievery. It was coined by an observer of a Latin American dictator who pilfered on a grand scale. In Africa, the description was regularly applied to the government of President Mobutu of Zaire. Mobutu treated the national treasury as his personal account, drawing cash whenever he decided to buy another villa in Europe or to fly with the national airline to France for a haircut.

The situation in Zaire during Mobutu's era has a lot of similarities with the events in Nigeria since the country's political independence. For instance, late General Sani Abacha had during his presidency, 1993-1998, stolen N 78 billion, stashed in banks around the world. According to Leslie Caldwell, US Assistant Attorney General quoted by Reuters (2014), rather than serve his country, General Abacha used his public office in Nigeria to loot millions of dollars, engaging in brazen acts of kleptocracy. The most critical challenge of the Nigerian nation today therefore, is bad leadership. Arising from such monumental corruption and decay occasioned by the absence of good leadership, Achebe (1983) decried Nigeria's loss of the 20th century and wondered if the 21st century would be allowed to follow suit.

The Role of Followership: There are no leaders without followers. In both theory and practice in a democracy, leaders lead

with the consent of their followers, which is obtained through the instrumentality of the ballot paper. It follows therefore, that the followers deserve the leaders they get because they are or supposed to be instrumental to the emergence of the leaders. It is however, tempting to hold a leader entirely responsible when things go wrong but such temptation needs to be moderated by the fact that the followership have critical role to play in the success or failure of their leader. One of the critical roles the followership play is the right to act as the watch dog of the leadership. The followership abdicates that role by its uncritical acceptance of whatever the leader does.

A critical followership is alive to its watch dog responsibility, which creates an atmosphere that prevents a democratic leader from turning himself into an autocratic leader and even an autocratic from turning himself into a god. Docile followership, on the other hand, is passive and has no stomach to question the leadership or hold him accountable for his deeds. Docile followership is a fertile ground for poor and failed leadership (Agbese, 2010).

Generally, enlightened societies have critical followership, hence on the average; have better and more committed leadership. However, unenlightened societies such as Nigeria have docile followership and tend on the average to have poor leadership. Nigeria has therefore, continued to face the constant challenge of good leadership. The education of the citizenry is the sure road to critical followership. This is because education exposes the followership to their rights and responsibilities including the rights and obligation of the leadership to the people (Agbese, 2010).

Poverty and illiteracy, on the other hand, foster the culture of dependence, which in turn fosters the culture of benevolence. The culture of benevolence is anathema to the culture of accountability because in such a culture, people do not feel it is their right to question the behaviour of the benefactors or the source of their generosity. Confront their leaders but eulogize and collaborate with those who visit bad leadership on them. Nigeria is unfortunately saddled with the twin burden of illiteracy and abject poverty, which have created fertile ground for poor leadership. This is because under

conditions of mass illiteracy and dehumanizing poverty, the ability of Nigerians to demand accountability from their leaders are seriously weakened if not entirely denied (Odo, 2015).

Conclusion

The place of elections in Nigeria democratic process needs not to be underemphasised. However, the wide acceptance of any electoral process would mostly be determined by the quantity of elections in that society. The near absence of democratic leadership and by extension good governance at the grassroots level in Nigeria could be linked to undue interference by the State government. Grassroots administration in Nigeria has been reduced to an area office, the various governments at the State level, irrespective of party politics ideology have been consistently abused the third tier of government. Election and administration of local communities be left to the people to determine, it was curious to discover that democratic leadership at local government administration fared better under the military government than the present civilian government. Corruption and ethno-religious politics is another factor, as the major problems of leadership in Nigerian polity. The nature and various leadership concepts present leaders as situational emergentists. With a thriving and stable Nigerian democracy, service driven leadership critical thinking orientation is philosophically prescribed.

Way Forward

1. Nigeria should in addition to tackling the underlying causes of leadership failure in the country, put in place a programme of developing and educating the youths, as potential leaders of the future, on the values of true democracy; good governance; and national transformation.
2. Other nations whose levels of material poverty were similar to ours at independence and which are less endowed in resources have made greater strides because they were better led politically.
3. Positive leadership represents Nigeria's oasis of hope for greatness in a desert of mediocrities, purposeless, corrupt and

visionless men and women masquerading as leaders at all levels of governance in the country.

4. Various underlying causes of leadership failure in Nigeria, which have remained obstacles to the country's quest for true democracy; good governance; and national development, must be addressed with the seriousness and urgency they deserve. This will allow for the emergence of a positive leadership that would not compromise the national quest for improved welfare for the citizens; social infrastructures, human development; and technological breakthrough, which are the dividends of democracy and good governance.

References

- Achebe, C. (2012). *There was a country: A personal history of Biafra.*, London: Penguin Books.
- Ademola, A. (2011). Endangering good governance for sustainable democracy: The continuing struggle against corruption in Nigeria. *Journal of Research on Peace, Gender and Development*. 1(11). 307-314.
- Almond, G.A.; Powell, G.B.; Strom, K. & Dalton, R.J. (2000). *Comparative Politics Today: A World View*. Singapore: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dada, J. A., Udoaka, E. E. & Dada, E. O. (2013). The Imperative of good governance for sustainable democracy in Nigeria. *African Journal of Social Sciences*. 3(2): 45-60
- Erunke, C. E (2012). Reconsolidating democratic governance in Nigeria: Analysis and suggestions. *African Journal of Social Sciences*. 2(2): 67-73.
- Esu, A. E. O. (2010). *Functionality of Curriculum in Nigeria*. A paper presented at a seminar of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction, Enugu Chapter held at the University of Nigeria Nsukka in October 2009.
- Fayemi, A. K. (2009). "A Philosophical Appraisal of Leadership and Development in Nigeria" in Edoh, T. et al (eds). *OpCit*.

- Frinpong-Mansoh, Y. A. (2102). Democratic consolidation in Ghana: The role of the news media. Africa Media and Democracy Conference, Accra, Ghana. Pp. 1-36.
- Michels, A. (2011). Innovations in democratic governance: How does citizens' participation contribute to a better democracy? *International Review of Administrative Science*, 77(2), 275-293
- Mohammed, U (2013). Nigeria's elected system: A change to sustainable democracy in the fourth republic. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development* Pp. 567- 581.
- Nweke, C.C. (2015). Democracy, Leadership and Nation Building in Nigeria. *Ogicrisi: A New Journal of African Studies*. vol 11
- Nweke, C.C. (2015). Democracy, Leadership and Nation Building in Nigeria. *Journal of African Studies*. 11
- Odo, L. U. (2015). Democracy, Good Governance and Development in Nigeria: The Challenges of Leadership. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 20(6): 01-09
- Ogbogu, C. O. (2012). The Role of Women in Politics and in the Sustenance of Democracy in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 3(18): 182-192
- Okau, A. (2014). A Keynote Address Delivered at a National Conference on Nigeria since the 1914 Amalgamation held at IBBUniversity, Lapai, Niger State from 4-7 May.
- Orji, T. (2014). Democracy Thrives only in atmosphere of Peace” in the Eagle-Eye, March 24 – April, 6.
- Oronsaye, A. O. (2006). From Military to Democracy: The Challenges of Government and Development in Nigeria in the 21stCentury: A Prognosis. *International Journal of Governance and Development*. 2(1).
- Pendergrass, K. (2013). Leadership Philosophies. <https://www.udemy.com/blog/leadership-philosophy/>, Accessed on 10/02/2020
- Pendergrass, K. (2013). Leadership Philosophies. Retrieved from <https://www.udemy.com/blog/leadership-philosophy/>,

Plato, Republic. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/democracy/>
Accessed on 11/08/2019

Shaapera, S. A. & Ayatse, F. H. (2018). Democratic Governance and Development in Benue

State of Nigeria: A Political Economy Perspective. FUDMA Economic and Development Review (FEDER), Vol. 2(1).

Shedler, A (1998). What is democratic consolidation? *Journal of Democracy*, 9(2), 91-107.

Smith, B. (2014). Leadership Philosophy. <http://www.academyleadership.com/Leadership Philosophy/philosophy001.asp>, Accessed on 11/08/2019