



## Comparative Analysis of Leadership Styles and Its Implication for Governance In Nigeria (1999-2015)

<sup>1</sup>Adebogun, O.B. <sup>2</sup>Ogbonna, S. PhD & <sup>3</sup>Nnabuihe E. Onyekachi. PhD

<sup>1</sup>Department of Political Science/ International Relations,

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mass Communication

<sup>3</sup>Department of Criminology, Security, Peace and Conflict Studies

Caleb University, Imota, Lagos State, Nigeria

oyesun@yahoo.com

### ABSTRACT

This study examined the comparative analysis of leadership styles and its implication for governance covering three administrations in Nigeria- 1999-2015. The objectives of the study were: to comparatively analyze leadership styles of three administrations in Nigeria; to examine the nature of governance since 1999-2015; and to identify the effect of leadership styles on governance in Nigeria. The study used secondary data in gathering information from books, newspapers, magazines and the internet sources. The contingency theory of leadership was adopted in this study. Findings show that the state of underdevelopment and lack of progress made in every sector of Nigeria economy, its backward level of economic growth and development is as a result of the leadership style adopted by various past Nigerian leaders during their administration. The study also reveals that there has been inadequate utilization of resources by such past leaders. The resultant effect of this has manifested on unemployment, poverty, low standard of living, insecurity, irregular power supply, lack of infrastructural development which have had tremendous implications on the economy. Thus, the study recommends that any leadership policy to be implemented should be geared towards engendering infrastructural development in the country and that the country's leaders should be more transparent in discharging their duties and responsibilities.

**Keywords:** Leadership, Governance, Contingency theory, Development

---

### ISTEAMS Cross-Border Conference Proceedings Paper Citation Format

Adebogun, O.B. Ogbonna, S. & Nnabuihe E. Onyekachi. (2017): Comparative Analysis of Leadership Styles and Its Implication for Governance In Nigeria (1999-2015). Proceedings of the 9th iSTEAMS Multidisciplinary Conference, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra Ghana. Pp 383-394

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Whatever development or state of underdevelopment in Nigeria, depend on the leadership style adopted by various past Nigerian leaders during their respective administration. According to figures and information from the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), Nigeria's population is currently projected to be over 163 million people based on the 2006 census of 140.3 million. She is currently the tenth largest producer of crude oil in the world based on 2011 estimates. Yet, 69 per cent or 112.5 million of her citizens live in relative poverty, while 60.9 per cent or 99.3 million live in absolute poverty, and 61.2 per cent live on less than a dollar a day (National Bureau of Statistics, 2012). However, these factors are traceable to the styles of leadership adopted by its leaders and this has a tremendous impact on governance in Nigeria.

Nigeria has been encountering development challenges occasioned by leadership styles adopted by its leaders and this is as a result of the way and manner past Nigerian leaders governed the citizens. In the word of a world renowned leadership expert, John C. Maxwell: "Everything rises and falls on leadership". By implication, governance and development in any society rises and falls according to the prevailing leadership style. It is a common belief that many of the chronic ills bedeviling Nigeria is not unconnected with the leadership styles adopted by its leaders which had



resulted in bad leadership manifesting in bad governance. Bad leadership and bad governance is a major contribution to poor service delivery and the prevailing underdevelopment in Nigeria.

An obvious illustration of this is the tendency for the leadership at all levels to rule without some notion of governance as social contract which is implicit in the mandate freely given during elections to deliver on goals of sustainable socio-economic and political development (Egwu & Jibril, 2006: 1-2). Apparently, the level of service delivery and accountability in the management of public affairs in Nigeria has consistently declined since independence. This is in spite of various legal and political instruments, reforms, watch dogs and institutions established to regulate and monitor the ethical conducts of public officials. The central argument here is that, the pattern of consolidation of power embarked upon by past leaders in Nigeria was a major underlying factor in the deterioration of ethical standards in the public service. (Enejo, 2008: 9). Reacting to this phenomenon,

Apam (2011:33) argued that governance should be an exercise of power by these various levels of government in a manner that is effective, equitable, transparent and accountable. Governance in his view should ensure the absence of abuse, accountability and the existence of the rule of law. However, the reverse has been the case as exemplified by past leaders. Consequently, manifesting in such large scale issues of embezzlement of public funds, excessive display of materialism, mismanagement of the national economy, corruption and lack of accountability; which contributed to the challenges of development experienced in Nigeria. Past leaders like presidents Olusegun Aremu Obasanjo, Goodluck Ebele Jonathan and Umaru Musa Yar'Adua, despite the immense human and material resources at their disposal were unable to improve the living standard of the average Nigerian citizen (Tukur, 2004).

Government exists to serve the needs of the public, and good governance exists to ensure that those needs are served efficiently, effectively, and fairly (Deloitte Global Series, 2012). This means that governance has a lot to do with how authority is exercised in institutions and the traditions of government, which includes the process of bringing government into being and holding it accountable. Davis (2011) and Oyedele (2012) posited that the success or failure of a leader or government is measured by the level and nature of the infrastructural development embarked upon by the leaders or government and how well it meets the needs and aspirations of the people in democratic governance. Good and effective governance helps to strengthen democracy, promote economic prosperity and social cohesion, and reduce poverty (United Nations: 2007). Furthermore, social scientists and opinion holders conceive of democracy as the platform for development of nations, Nigeria has had sixteen years of democracy from 1999 -2015, development within the frame of analysis has continued to elude her. What could be responsible? What have been the roles of successive governments or leadership in the development of the country? Is Nigeria a case of leadership failure or is it the citizens that have failed themselves? This paper attempts to seek answers to these questions with a comparative analysis of leadership styles and its implications for governance in Nigeria from 1999 to 2015.

## **2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK/ LITERATURE REVIEW**

Contingency theories of leadership focus on particular variables related to the environment that might determine which style of leadership is best suited for a particular work situation. According to this theory, no single leadership style is appropriate in all situations. Success depends upon a number of variables, including leadership style, qualities of followers and situational features (Charry: 2012). A contingency factor is thus any condition in any relevant environment to be considered when designing an organization or one of its elements (Naylor, 1999). Contingency theory states that effective leadership depends on the degree of fit between a leader's qualities and leadership style and that demanded by a specific situation (Lamb, 2013). For a leader to be effective there must be an appropriate fit between the leader's behavior and style, and the followers and the situation. The contingency or situational school is a refinement of the situational viewpoint and focuses on identifying the situational variables which best predict the most appropriate or effective leadership style to fit the particular circumstance.



Researchers however conclude that there is not one leadership style that works for every leader under one circumstance. Instead, contingency-situational theories were developed to indicate that the style to be used is contingent upon such factors as the situation, the people, the task, the organization, and the other environmental variables. The contingency leadership theory attempts to explain the appropriate leadership style based on the leader, followers, and situation. Different individuals and group prefer different leadership styles. Leaders display a range of behavior in different situation, because leadership is largely faced by contextual factors. The contingency theory is relevant to this study because it focuses on the leadership styles and its implication for governance. As the theory describes that there is not a single leadership style adopted by a leader, a leader could be democratic towards an issue and at the same time be autocratic probably in enforcing rules or laws. The leadership styles that would have been adopted by past leaders in Nigeria since 1999-2015 should have been based on the situation, people, followers, the task, and the styles of that situation.

For instance in Nigeria at the inception of democratic dispensation in 1999-2015, there are still some attributes of authoritarianism, and other undemocratic forms, which of course tells us that Nigerian leaders adopted different leadership styles at different levels and situations. An instance is the Odi invasion and massacre during the administration of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo.

## 2.1 Conceptualization of Leadership

To many, leaders are not born, but made. It is increasingly accepted, however, that in order to be a good leader, one must have the experience, knowledge, commitment, patience, and most importantly the skill to negotiate and work with others to achieve goals. Good leaders are thus made, not born. Good leadership is developed through a never ending process of self-study, education, training, and the accumulation of relevant experience (Bass & Bass, 2008). According to Boulding (1956) in his book *"The Image: Knowledge in Life and Society"*, outlined the general trans-disciplinary theory of knowledge and human social and organizational behaviour. He stated that the basis of a good leadership is strong character and selfless devotion to an organization. From the perspective of employees, leadership is comprised of everything a leader does that affects the achievement of objectives and the well-being of employees and the organization (Abbasialiya, 2010). Trustworthiness is often key to positions of leadership as trust is fundamental to all manner of organized human groups, whether in education, business, the military, religion, government, or international organizations (Lamb & McKee, 2004; Ivancevich, Konopaske, & Matteson, 2007).

Leadership involves a type of responsibility aimed at achieving particular ends by applying the available resources (human and material) and ensuring a cohesive and coherent organization in the process (Ololube, 2013; Northouse 2007 and Rowe 2007) described leadership as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal. This paper contends that effective leadership is crucial to the proper operation and very survival of any organization or government. Leadership is arguably one of the most observed, yet least understood phenomena on earth (Burns, cited in Abbasialiya, 2010). Over time, researchers have proposed many different styles of leadership as there is no particular style of leadership that can be considered universal. Despite the many diverse styles of leadership, a good or effective leader inspires, motivates, and directs activities to help achieve group or organizational goals. Conversely, an ineffective leader does not contribute to organizational progress and can, in fact, detract from organizational goal accomplishment. According to Naylor (1999), effective leadership is a product of the heart and an effective leader must be visionary, passionate, creative, flexible, inspiring, innovative, courageous, imaginative, experimental, and initiates change.

The concept of leadership has been written about and researched more than any other concept in social science literature (Eneanya, 2010). Leadership is often regarded as the important modifier of organization behavior. Throughout history, it has been recognized that leadership determines the failure or success of any organization or institutions. It is the exercise of authority, whether formal or informal, in directing and coordinating the work of others. Leadership can also be seen as "the exercise of authority, whether formal or informal, in directing and coordinating the work of others".



According to Eneanya, “the best leaders are those who can simultaneously exercise both kinds of leadership: the formal, based on the authority of rank or office, and the informal, based on the willingness of others to give service to a person whose special qualities of authority they admire” (Shafritz et al 2011: 372). Leadership has become essentially topical in recent years as our country and indeed the world cries out for better and more purposeful and effective leadership, in business, in government, and in public (Ajumogba, 2011). It is argued that in this changing global environment, leadership holds the key not only to the success of individual and organizations, but also, to sectors, regions, and nations. Yet, there is no widely accepted definition of leadership. One of the most popular attempts at defining leadership is by one time American President, Dwight Eisenhower, who defines leadership as the act of getting someone else to do something you want done because he wants to do it (Dickson, 2008).

## **2.2 LEADERSHIP STYLES**

### **2.2.1 Autocratic Leadership**

According to Naidu (2011), the way in which the leader behaves and influences the activities of his followers is known as leadership style. To him, there are basically three types of leadership styles and this include: Autocratic, Democratic, and Laissez-faire. In the autocratic or authoritarian style of leadership, the leader makes decision alone as power is centralized in one person. The leader assumes full authority and responsibility. He assigns specific work task to each individual worker and determine the techniques of work. Subordinates do as they are told. He gives orders to them and demand strict obedience and loyalty from them. If the authority of the autocratic leader becomes oppressive, subordinates may become insecure and afraid of the leader’s authority and behaviours. He is personal in praise and criticism of group work. He tends to remain aloof from group participation.

### **2.2.2 Democratic Leadership Style**

This type of leadership is also known as participatory leadership. The democratic leader involves the entire group in discussion of all policies. Decisions relating to goal-setting and the activities to achieve the set goals arrived at through such group discussions. The leader can suggest alternatives. However, suggestions are made in both directions. Communications flows freely. The leader tends to be a member of group. This tendency enables the leader and the subordinates to act as a social unit. Members are free to work with companions they chose. Praise and criticism are both used. The leader is objective in his praise and criticism.

### **2.2.3 Laissez-Faire Leadership**

Laissez-faire leadership may be the best or the worst of leadership styles (Goodnight, 2011). Laissez-faire, a French phrase for “let it be,” when applied to leadership describes leaders who allow people to work on their own. Laissez-faire leaders abdicate responsibilities and avoid making decisions, they may give team’s complete freedom to do their work and set their own deadlines. Laissez-faire leaders usually allow their subordinate the power to make decisions about their work (Chaudhry & Javed, 2012). They provide teams with resources and advice, if needed, but otherwise do not get involved. This leadership style can be effective if the leader monitors performance and gives feedback to team members regularly. The main advantage of laissez-faire leadership is that allowing team members so much autonomy can lead to high job satisfaction and increased productivity. It can be damaging if team members do not manage their time well or do not have the knowledge, skills, or motivation to do their work effectively. This type of leadership can also occur when managers do not have sufficient control over their staff (Ololube, 2013).

## **2.4. Conceptualization of Governance**

Good governance is an increasingly important umbrella term for integrating various desired outcomes of governmental interactions with its society. The concept is still a fuzzy one that generates controversy. However, the concept of good governance has always been linked to democratic governance by scholar and most especially by international financial institutions. For instance, the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), refers to good governance as the exercise of political power to promote the public good or the welfare of the people (Babawale, 2003). It is a relatively new term that is often used to describe the desired objective of a nation-state’s political development.



The UNDP Governance Policy Paper (2003: 3) sees good governance among other things as a process that is participatory, transparent and accountable. It is also effective and equitable in the distribution of the resources society to all and sundry irrespective of their class and status. It is truly a process that seeks to involve the people in the decision-making arrangement based on political and economic priorities, especially in the allocation of society's resources. Good governance according to Tukur (2004) is a style of government which facilitates the creation of a civil polity and tackling of socio-political and economic problems in a manner harmonious with the world view, way of life and temperament of the population.

To Akpa, (2011:67) Good governance, basically, is about integrity, efficiency, effectiveness and economy of government in the management of public affairs and meeting government's' expectations of the society. Good governance is in short anti-corruption whereas authority and its institutions are accountable, effective and efficient in service delivery. It is participatory, transparent, responsive, consensus oriented, and equitable , which allow for full respect of human rights, the rule of law, multi-actors partnerships, political pluralism, legitimacy, access to knowledge, information and education,

## **2.5. Ruler-ship versus Leadership and Development**

A comparative study of the development of Nigeria in consonance with other countries once within its development bracket points to the exacerbation of the concepts of ruler-ship and leadership. From the appraisal of the concept of leadership above, it becomes apparent that leadership is *sine qua non* in the development of an organization, region or country. Nigeria's contemporaries that have left her behind on the rung of development are those that with visionary leadership/leaders and not rulers. Ruler-ship refers to the situation where a powerful individual issues orders which are obeyed, whereas leadership involves setting example to be followed. Where a ruler commands, a leader shows. (Scorpio, 2010) By custom and history, Nigeria have been ruled and not led for generations past, and this has deprived the nation of progress comparable to what other developed countries have enjoyed unhindered over the same period. (Alalade, 2011).

Unlike the prerequisite special qualities and abilities that must be present and demonstrated in a way that makes the bearer stand out in a crowd before one can attain a leadership status, a ruler-ship status, on the other hand, is often attained in one of two ways; either by force (as in military takeover of government) or through hereditary means. So, while the attainment of a leadership status is akin to being rewarded by others as a sign of their unambiguous recognition of specific unique and uncommon qualities and abilities in the one who desires to lead, a ruler-ship status is handed down to the bearer not by the people's freewill or because the ruler possesses any special and uncommon qualities other than their heredity.

According to Alalade's (2011), the bane of development in Nigeria has been the preponderance of rulers instead of leaders. Nigerian leaders have collaborated to constitute the worst enemies of her country and region. Rulers in leadership positions have woefully failed miserably to lead, but have effectively ruled instead for their self enlightened interests. Nigerian leaders have not led their peoples to greatness. In the late 1980s when African countries along with other developing Asian countries were classified as third-world countries, a country like Nigeria, other African countries as well as Asian countries like Malaysia, Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea, etc. were grouped alike. In fact, with enormous human and natural resources, Nigeria was particularly considered as having an edge over these other countries. But today, Southern and Eastern Asian countries like Singapore, Malaysia, South Korea, and Taiwan have not only flourished technologically and politically, they have managed to surpass most African countries like Nigeria that was once ranked with them as third-world nations. It is quite perplexing to see that while these emerging economies and the developed ones have steadily evolved into lender nations over the past decades, Nigeria on the other hand, have increasingly turned to the west for help.



### 3. LEADERSHIP STYLES AND ITS IMPLICATION ON GOVERNANCE (1999-2015)

At the inception of the new democratic dispensation on May 29, 1999, every Nigerian, at home and in the diasporas, were expectant that the messiah has come in the person of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo. A people who has been under the trauma of military jackboot for almost two decades after the second republic, hoped for a fresh breath or to heave a sigh of relief after the draconian rule of military dictators. Chief Olusegun Obasanjo was most favoured because he was to bridge the gap between the military and civilians, the poor and the rich. The people saw the will power and ability to deliver the people and the nations from socio-economic and political quagmire. He was seen as a man who has seen both sides of life, like Nelson Mandela of South Africa who came out of the prison to be the President of South Africa. The federal Government of Nigeria (2010) report stated that under the Obasanjo's administration, Nigeria's international image and reputation which had long been tarnished by the long military dictatorships, was improved. His leadership was committed to positioning Nigeria as a leader in the promotion of democracy and economic growth in Nigeria.

Perhaps, the most prominent legacy in his administration aimed at instituting good governance in Nigeria was the determination to eradicate corruption. The establishment of the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) to prosecute government and public officials for corruption and to recover stolen funds from public servants was a landmark government policy and an act of good governance. Nigeria enjoyed a relative peace and tranquility under the Obasanjo administration. His ability to prevent another military dictatorship in Nigeria has been acclaimed as a huge accomplishment, and the economic policies of his administration were remarkable. In this instance, it could be said that Obasanjo adopted a democratic leadership style in respect to his policies above. In the same vein, there are instances or situations whereby Obasanjo adopted other forms of leadership styles. An example is the Odi Massacre, an attack carried out on November 20, 1999, by the military on the predominantly Ijaw town of Odi in Bayelsa state. This attack was ordered by the regime of Obasanjo, now, this act is synonymous to an autocratic leadership style. (Aneh, 2012).

The people were disappointed that the messianic sooth balm from civilian government in the delivery of the dividend of democracy to the people later turned sour on the nation's economy. Some of his economic reforms were anti-people. During his regime, there were indiscriminate sale of the nation's asset to private individuals: incessant increment in the pump price of petroleum products and controversial third term agenda almost heated the polity to a boiling point. The constitutional amendment that was ongoing in the National Assembly could not see the light of the day. The law makers threw the baby with bath water in order to kill the third term agenda of the president (African Age International Magazine, 2011).

In the Fourth Republic, especially, President Olusegun Obasanjo administration, assumed the posture of a personal ruler with wide dictatorial powers, who relied on dispensing benefits to supporters, while opposition were severely brutalized (Aderibigbe, 2004). In a federal system, the state governors were supposed to enjoy some level of autonomy, but under Obasanjo, Nigeria was run as a military regime where regional autonomy was subjected to federal powers. Obasanjo never hesitated to use the party machinery, resource allocation and security agencies to threaten any "recalcitrant" state governor. Governors such as Bola Tinubu of Lagos, Joshua Dariye of Plateau, Victor Attah of Akwa Ibom, Ibrahim Adamu of Adamawa, Orji Kalu of Abia and Chris Ngige of Anambra were variously threatened by Obasanjo (Akpaekong, 2004; Ajaero, 2003:20). In the civil society, groups like the Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC) and the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) that opposed his undemocratic actions or unacceptable policies have all been enervated. The total control Obasanjo had over the National Assembly made it possible for him to function as personal ruler. (Elesho and Attah, 2003).



With the exit of Olusegun Obasanjo after an electoral process that was declared free and fair for the first time in Nigeria by international observers, Umaru Musa Yar' Adua became the second civilian political leader of the fourth republic. He was in power between 2007 and 2010. The Yar'Adua's administration was, to all intents and purposes, an extension of the Obasanjo administration. The policies and programs of this administration were directed towards the area of government. The decades of violence in the Niger-Delta region has prompted several initiatives aimed at addressing the causes of unrest in the region. The Niger-Delta after over half a century of crude oil exploration has remained grossly underdeveloped and indeed suffers from both human and ecological devastation, putting into cognizance the fact that previous government establishment of specialized agencies, Niger Delta Development board and so on, that appears to have failed to satisfactorily tackled the Niger Delta challenges, the late Umaru Musa Yar'adua led administration initiated the amnesty programme (Odigbo,2015).

At the inauguration of the administration on May 29, 2007, President Yar'Adua stated that the philosophy of his administration would be anchored on the principle of the rule of law. In his first few weeks in office, Yar'Adua's actions left no one in doubt that the rule of law was, for him, an article of faith as well as his covenant with the Nigerian people. It was also very clear to the people in government, especially in the administration's early days, that the president indeed subscribed to the time-honored view that society will flourish when it is governed according to law than by the whims of office holders. However, there were initial skepticism about its practicability in a country where the flouting of court judgments by the executive appeared to be the norm and not the exception and where the concept of the big man still evoked some romantic notions. In the preceding administration, for instance, the attorney general of the federation was more or less the 'final arbiter', interpreting court judgments in the way and manner that suited the government and causing the same to be enforced to the consternation of Nigerians. Yar'Adua's pledge at every opportunity was therefore implicitly a repudiation of that era and a firm indication that he was not prepared to travel that route. The first major test of this conviction emerged on June 14, 2007, when the Supreme Court restored Mr. Peter Obi as governor of Anambra State and ordered Dr. Andy Uba, who had been sworn in as governor just two weeks earlier to vacate the Government House. In a unanimous decision of the seven justices, the apex court concluded that INEC went ahead to conduct elections into the office of the governor of Anambra State despite the fact that the matter was pending in court. The court therefore held that "there being no dispute that Governor Obi took his oath of office on March 17, 2006, his tenure of office expired on March 17, 2010." Adeniyi,(2011:1-2)

Also, under President Umaru Musa YarAdua's administration, there was an immediate release of the Lagos State local government funds amounting to 10.8 billion naira precisely, which had been seized by the previous administration, bringing to an end a long-drawn legal and political battle that had pitched the federal government against the Lagos State government. The controversy had started in April, 2004 following the creation of 37 local council development areas by then governor of Lagos State, Bola Tinubu. Riled by what he considered to be an impudent act, Obasanjo had directed that the funds of local government councils in Lagos be withheld, to be released only on the condition that the governor reverted to the original 20 local government councils in the state. Following this directive, the state had filed a lawsuit against the federal government at the Supreme Court, urging it to determine the propriety and legality of the action. In the somewhat controversial ruling that had followed, the Supreme Court had declared the 37 local council development areas (LCDAs) created by Tinubu inchoate and inoperable, since the National Assembly had not listed them in the constitution.

The apex court, however, had also ruled that the federal government had no right to withhold the funds of the state. With both the Federal Government and Lagos State claiming victory in what had become a personality clash between Obasanjo and Tinubu (with the former flexing presidential muscles), a stalemate was imminent. To stave off the stalemate, some prominent Yoruba citizens had intervened through a committee of elders led by Prince Bola Ajibola (SAN). That effort had culminated in the LGAs being rechristened Local Council Development Authorities (LCDAs) by Tinubu. This had brought a temporary truce between the duo and encouraged Obasanjo to order the release of a first tranche of N10 billion from the entitlements of the 20 local government councils then estimated at about N21 billion.



This rapprochement, however, did not endure, because the balance was withheld when the Lagos State government insisted on conducting elections into the 37 LCDAs. This was the situation at the time Yar'Adua assumed office. Following widespread consultation with legal experts, who held that the decision to withhold the funds contravened the Supreme Court ruling on the matter, the president ordered the Accountant General of the federation to release the funds to the Lagos State Government. For a man whose ascendancy owed less to his personal effort than to the sleight of hand wrought by his predecessor, Yar'Adua was gradually becoming his own man. But given that one of the most challenging features of the rule of law is that it has no place for the strongman', there were also early signs that many Nigerians appreciated the importance of the foundation that Yar'Adua was trying to erect Adeniyi, (2011:6). It could be said that, based on the consideration of President Umaru Yar'Adua administration viewed in the above perspectives in this study, the leadership style could be likened to that of Democratic leadership style.

After President Yar'Adua's death on May 5th 2010, Dr. Goodluck Jonathan, hitherto Vice President and Acting President was sworn in as Alhaji Yar'Adua's successor on May 6th 2010, (BBC News, 2010) becoming Nigeria's 14th Head of State, while his vice, a former Kaduna State Governor, Mohammed Namadi Sambo, an architect, was chosen on 18 May 2010, by the National Assembly following President Goodluck Jonathan's nomination for Sambo to be his Vice President. (The Punch, May 18, 2010 & Akinlade May 18, 2010). Dr. Goodluck Jonathan served as Nigeria's President till 16 April 2011, when a new Presidential election in Nigeria was conducted. Dr. Goodluck Jonathan of the PDP was declared the winner on 19 April 2011, having won the election by a total of 22,495,187 of the 39,469,484 votes cast to stand ahead of Maj.Gen Muhammadu Buhari from the main opposition party, the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC), which won 12,214,853 of the total votes cast. (Purefoy, 2011) The international media reported the elections as having run smoothly with relatively little violence or voter fraud in contrast to previous elections (Nossiter, 2011). President Jonathan is the first Ph.D holder and the first citizen from the South-South geo-political zone to ascend to the presidency of Nigeria.

The populace, therefore, have great expectations of him. But there seems to be a general disenchantment with him especially for his "kids glove" approach to handling the then endemic and hydra headed corruption in the country and the issue of insecurity especially as it relates to the "Boko Haram" insurgency in the North Eastern part of the country, and kidnapping in the South South and South Eastern parts of Nigeria. Despite the President's promised succor for the populace, youth unemployment was over 65% and a national unemployment rate of 23.9% as at December 2011. Power supply was nearly non-existent despite claims to the contrary, which he (The President) made on the CNN interview with Christiane Amanpour in January 2013, the economy was not strengthened enough to withstand the stress and storms of poverty, inequality and unemployment which widened by the day; industries had gone moribund, and incidence of absolute poverty was indicated at 65% (NBS). And it was widely observed that Nigeria did not meet the millennium development goals, targets set by the international comity of nations as indices for measuring development of developing nations like Nigeria, which target was in 2015 (NBS, 2011).



#### 4. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted qualitative research technique which is based on descriptive analytical framework. Secondary sources of data were used which included text-books, newspapers, magazines, journals and internet material. In terms of the scope, the study covered the comparative analyses of leadership styles and its implications for governance in Nigeria, by using three administrations as case studies from 1999-2015.

#### 5. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Findings show that the state of underdevelopment, lack of progress experienced in every sectors of Nigeria economy, its backward level of economic growth and development is as a result of leadership style adopted by various Nigerian leaders during their administration. The study also reveals that there has been inadequate utilization of resources by her leaders. The resultant effect of this has manifested on the high level of unemployment, poverty, low standard of living, insecurity, irregular power supply, lack of infrastructural development which had tremendous implications on the economy. The various Nigerian leaders adopted different leadership styles in their respective administrations, for instance under Obasanjo administration from 1999-2007, adopted both democratic and autocratic leadership styles. His approach in dealing with the people of Ijaw town in Odi village of Bayelsa State is a good example of the Obasanjo leadership style during his administration. Also, his establishment of the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) to prosecute corrupt government and public officials and to recover stolen funds into the Federal government account shored up Nigeria's international image which was tarnished during the military regime. The Obasanjo administration was seen to have adopted another leadership style during his administration regarded as democratic leadership style.

The study revealed that there was strict application to rule of law under President Musa Yar'Adua's administration, as the Lagos State Federal government allocation fund that was withheld during Obasanjo's administration was released under the Former President Musa Yar'Adua's administration. His administration had made a promise immediately he resumed as the president of the Federal Republic of Nigeria that his government would be based on the practice and application of rule of law which was a proof that he adopted the democratic type of leadership style. Study also found that under the former President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan's administration, Laissez faire leadership style was adopted. This was due to how power and authority were used and delegated in addressing several issues during that administration.

The populace had great expectations from his administration. But there was general disenchantment with his administration, especially with his "kid glove" approach to handling the then endemic and hydra headed corruption in the country and the issue of insecurity especially as it relates to the "Boko Haram" insurgency in the North Eastern part, and kidnapping in the South South and South Eastern parts of the country. Despite the President's promised succor for the populace, youth unemployment was over 65% and a national unemployment rate of 23.9% as at December 2011. Power supply was nearly non-existent despite claims to the contrary, which he (The President) made on the CNN interview with Christiane Amanpour on January 2013. Economy was not strengthened enough to withstand the stress and storms of poverty, inequality and unemployment widened by the day, industries were moribund, and incidence of absolute poverty was indicated at 65% (NBS). And it was widely observed that Nigeria was unable to meet the millennium development goals targets set by the international comity of nations as indices for measuring development of developing nations like Nigeria, which target was in 2015.



## 6. CONCLUSION

The attainment of good governance and service delivery among the public officials and leaders at the federal, state and local level in Nigeria would only be possible if the leadership styles adopted by the elected representatives and leaders in this country (Nigeria) is geared towards the socio-economic and political development of the country at large, applicability of rule of law, infrastructural development. Based on the issues raised in this study, the following recommendations are offered as panacea to the effects of leadership styles on governance in Nigeria:

- Policy to be implemented by Nigerian leaders should be channeled towards engendering infrastructural development in the country and leaders in their respective administrations should be more transparent in discharging their duties and responsibilities.
- Nigerian leaders should change from being self-oriented leaders to be People-Oriented leaders so as to promote good governance and sustainable development in the country.
- There should be the existence of the supremacy of the constitution in its real sense over both the rulers and the ruled in Nigeria.



## REFERENCES

1. African AGE International Magazine Vol.4 No.12 June-July 2011” Jonathan Wind of Change” 78
2. Adekoya,(2012) “Paradox of growth without development, Declining Naira Value” The Guardian from <http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/p/leadtheories.htm>
3. Adekoya,(2012) “Paradox of growth without development, Declining Naira Value” The Guardian from <http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/p/leadtheories.htm>
4. Adeniyi O. ( 2011)”Power, Politics and Death” A front-row account of Nigeria under the late President Yar’ Adua. Published in Nigeria by Kachifo limited, Lagos.
5. Ajumogobia,(2011)”The Challenges of Leadership in Nigeria – An Address by H. Odein Ajumogobia at the Stern and Kay Seminar on Leadership in Nigeria 2011”.
6. AlaladeD. (2011), “Rulership Vs Leadership”;[www.nigeriaworld.com/articles/2011/apr/010.html](http://www.nigeriaworld.com/articles/2011/apr/010.html)
7. Apam, J. (2011) “ The Role of Governance in the Management of Ethno-Religious Conflict in Nigeria” In Nigerian Journal of Political and Administrative Studies. Benue State University, Makurdi, Nigeria Volume 2, No2.
8. Bolden, R. (2004) What is Leadership? Research Report 1, University of Exeter, Exeter, England.
9. Charry, K. (2012). Leadership Theories - 8 Major Leadership Theories. Retrieved March 23, 2014
10. Charry, K.(2012). Leadership Theories-8 Major Leadership Theories. Retrieved March 23, 2014 from <http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/p/leadtheories.htm>
11. Chaudhry,A.Q., & Javed, H.(2012). Impart of Transactional and Laissez Faire Leadership Style on Motivation. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3(7), 258-264.
12. Cherry,K.(2011). What is a theory? Retrieved March 19,2014, from <http://psychology.about.com/od/tindex/f/theory.htm>
13. Dickson, Eric S. (2008) Leadership, Followership and Beliefs about the World: Theory and Experiment, New York University, New York
14. Egwu, S.” and Jibrin, G. (2006) Defending the peoples mandate “ Election 2007 Abuja Global Right Campaign Project.
15. Eneanya, A.N. (2015). Theory and Practice of Public Administration. Published and Printed by University of Lagos Press and Bookshop Ltd, Lagos.
16. Enejo, E.k. (2008) “ The Contradictions of Democratic Governance in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic (1999-2007). “ Being a Paper Presented at the 27<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Nigeria Political Science Association (NPSA) on the theme “Electoral Reform, Political Succession and Democratization in Nigeria” Between 16-19, November, 2008 at the Benue State University, Makurdi.
17. Essoh, P.A., & Oluwabamide, A.J. (eds) (2006) Highlights of the Nigerian Cultural Heritage, Lagos, LizJohnson Publishers.
18. Goodnight,R.(2011). Laissez-Faire Leadership. Encyclopedia of Leadership. London,UK: Sage Publications.
19. [http://articles.cnn.com/2011-04-18/world/nigeria.elections\\_1\\_illegal-voting-muhammadu-buharikaduna?s=PM:WORLD](http://articles.cnn.com/2011-04-18/world/nigeria.elections_1_illegal-voting-muhammadu-buharikaduna?s=PM:WORLD). Retrieved 11 October 2011.
20. <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/17/world/africa/17nigeria.html?pagewanted=1&r=1&hp>. Retrieved 17 October 2012.
21. Ibara, E.C. (2010). Perspectives In Educational Administration. Port Harcourt, Nigeria: Rodi printing and Publishing.
22. *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science* ISSN: 2307-924X [www.ijlass.org](http://www.ijlass.org)
23. Jenking, T. (2013). Reflections on Kenneth E. Boulding’s The Image : Glimp sing the roots of Peace Education pedagogy: Journal of peace Education and Social Justice, 7(1), 27-37.
24. Lamb, R (2013). How can Managers Use Participative Leadership effectively? Retrieved March 17, 2014: from <http://www.task.fm/participative-leadership>.
25. NorthHouse, G. (2007). Leadership Theory and Practice (3<sup>rd</sup> ed) Thousand Oak: Sage Publications.



26. Nossiter, A. (2011). "Nigerians Vote in Presidential Election". *The New York Times*.
27. Offong, S.E. (2012) Raising Future Leaders in A rural Economy: The Challenge of Akwa Ibom
28. Ololube, N.P., Egbezo R. D.E, Kpolovie, P.J., & Amaele, S. (2012). Theoretical debates on school effectiveness Research: Lesson For Third World Education Development Agendas.
29. Ololube, N.P. (2012). *Sociology of Education and Society: an interactive approach*. Owerri, Nigeria: SpringFied Publishers.
30. Ololube, N.P. (2013). *Educational Management, Planning and Supervision: Model for effective Implementation*. Owerri Springfield Publishers.
31. Punch Newspaper, June 20, 2013
32. Purefoy, C. (2011) "Goodluck Jonathan retains Nigerian presidency". CNN. Sciences, University of Uyo. October
33. Scorpio, F. J., "Rulership Vs Leadership", [www.ethan.kristopher.tripod.com/archives/id13.htm](http://www.ethan.kristopher.tripod.com/archives/id13.htm)
34. Shafritz, J.M., Russel, E.W. and Borick, C.P. (2011). *Introducing Public Administration*, (7<sup>th</sup> edition). Newyork: Longman
35. Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L and Kaul, H. (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kitab Mahat.
36. State". Paper presented at the 1st International Conference of Social Sciences in the Faculty of Social
37. Tukur, M. ( 2004) *Leadership and Governance in Nigeria. The Relevance of Values: Great Britain: Hodder & Stoughton Educational*.
38. United Nations Division for Sustainable Development. Document: Sustainable Development Issues. Retrieved 2007-15-12 <http://en.wikipedia.org>