

2015

# The Impact of Leadership on the Governance of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria

Michael Oziegbe Onolememen  
*Walden University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

---

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu](mailto:ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu).

# Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Michael Onolememen

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by  
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Robert Levasseur, Committee Chairperson,  
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Jason Lum, Committee Member,  
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Cassandra Caldwell, University Reviewer,  
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer  
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University  
2015

Abstract

The Impact of Leadership on the Governance of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria

By

Michael O. Onolememen

MS, University of Lagos, 1991

MS, University of Nigeria, 1988

BS, Bendel State University, 1985

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

August 2015

## Abstract

Research literature has documented Nigeria's leadership crisis since its independence from Great Britain in 1960. This crisis corresponds with political instability and infrastructure weaknesses, which have resulted in crime, corruption, poverty, lack of social cohesion and personal freedoms, environmental degradation, gender inequities, and deteriorating conditions of public works. No literature was located that addressed the impact of leadership on the governance and development of infrastructure in Nigeria. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to investigate this phenomenon in Nigeria between 1960 and 2010. The theoretical framework comprised Burns' and Bass' theories of transformational leadership, and Davis' and Toikka's theories of transformation and transition in governance. Data were collected through personal interviews with a purposeful sample of 13 past presidents of Nigeria, public officials, and infrastructure development experts, and by reviewing secondary data on leadership and development in Nigeria during the period 1960-2010. Data were analyzed using the constant comparative method to identify patterns and themes. Findings showed that (a) political instability and the Nigerian civil war have been obstacles to infrastructure development and implementation; (b) military dictatorships implemented improvements, although they neglected rural areas; (c) a new national infrastructure plan must be funded, developed, and implemented; (d) corruption must be combatted in awarding project contracts; and (e) Nigeria's governance should be based on a pragmatic-visionary form of leadership. The implications for positive social change include informing policy makers about the importance of infrastructure development in Nigeria in order to improve economic growth and the lives of citizens.

The Impact of Leadership on the Governance of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria

By

Michael O. Onolememen

MS, University of Lagos, 1991

MS, University of Nigeria, 1988

BS, Bendel State University, 1985

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

August 2015

## Dedication

This study is dedicated to the loving memory of my father, Elder Augustine Ezehiwele Onolememen, who motivated me to pursue my doctoral degree by his continued reminder that nothing but the best was expected of me in the doctoral program. I also dedicate this study to my loving wife, Bibian, and my children, Osose, Osemudiamen, Odalo, and Ehiremen, for their support and understanding throughout the program.

## Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge the uncommon support received from the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. Robert Levasseur, who mentored me throughout my doctoral program at Walden University. I cannot thank you enough for making each step of my doctoral journey at Walden University memorable. I acknowledge the support of my dissertation committee member, Dr. Jason Lum, Jenny Sherer of the office of research ethics and compliance, and indeed members of the institution review board. I wish to particularly acknowledge the selfless support I enjoyed throughout my doctoral program from my wife, Bibian, my children, Orose, Osemudiamen, Odalo, and Ehiremen. Many thanks go to my mother, Mrs. Comfort Onolememen, for her ceaseless prayers for my success.

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background.....	1
Problem Statement.....	7
Nature of the Study.....	9
Research Questions.....	10
Purpose of the Study.....	10
Conceptual Framework.....	11
Research Design.....	13
Definition of Terms.....	14
Assumptions, Limitations, Scope, and Delimitations.....	15
Assumptions.....	15
Limitations.....	16
Scope and Delimitations.....	17
Significance of the Study.....	17
Summary.....	18
Transition Statement.....	19
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	20
Introduction.....	20
Leadership and Leaders Defined.....	20
Concepts and Theories of Leadership.....	22
Trait Theory.....	22
Situational Theory.....	24



Contingency Theory.....	26
Transactional Theory .....	28
Transformational Theory .....	29
Leadership Styles .....	33
Concepts and Theories of Governance .....	37
Reflexive Theory .....	40
Deliberative Theory .....	40
Argumentative Theory .....	40
Network Theory .....	40
Transformation and Transition Theories .....	40
Political History of Nigeria.....	41
Civilian Political Leadership Era .....	43
Military Dictatorship Era .....	52
Reforms in Nigeria.....	56
Economic Reforms.....	56
Administrative Reforms.....	62
Socio-Political Reforms .....	65
Corruption in Nigeria.....	68
Infrastructure Development in Nigeria .....	72
Leadership and Good Governance.....	75
Summary .....	77
Transitional Statement .....	77
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	78

Introduction.....	78
Research Design.....	78
Qualitative Case Study.....	79
Data Collection .....	80
Researcher’s Role .....	81
Reliability and Validity.....	82
Methodological Issues in Using Existing Data.....	83
Confidentiality .....	83
Data Analysis .....	84
Summary .....	85
Transition Statement .....	85
Chapter 4: Results.....	86
Introduction.....	86
Setting.....	87
Data Collection .....	88
Data Analysis .....	89
Evidence of Trustworthiness.....	90
Presentation of Results.....	91
Thematic Category 1: Effects of Previous Military Administrations’ Policies	
on Infrastructural Development in Nigeria.....	92
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	92
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	95
Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	98

Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	100
Thematic Category 2: Major Category: Major Obstacles to Infrastructure	
Development in Nigeria.....	100
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	101
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	102
Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	102
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	103
Thematic Category 3: Major Obstacles to Implementation of Government	
Policies on Infrastructure Development.....	103
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	103
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	104
Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	106
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	108
Thematic Category 4: Favorable and Effective Government Policies on	
Infrastructure Development .....	108
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	109
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	111
Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	113
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	114
Thematic Category 5: Perceived Relationship between Performance and	
Public Trust in Infrastructure Development .....	115
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	115
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	117

Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	119
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	120
Thematic Category 6: Ways Corruption Impeded Infrastructure Development.....	120
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	121
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	121
Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	124
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	126
Thematic Category 7: Major Category: Impact of Reforms on Infrastructure Development.....	126
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	126
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	128
Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	129
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	130
Thematic Category 8: Major Category: Reforms that Affected Significantly Infrastructure Development .....	131
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	131
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	132
Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	135
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	136
Thematic Category 9: Leadership Style Best for Infrastructure Development in Nigeria .....	136
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	137
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	139

Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	140
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	141
Thematic Category 10: Impediments to Good Governance of Infrastructure	
Development.....	142
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	142
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	145
Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	146
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	147
Thematic Category 11: Major Category: Future Priority Areas of	
Infrastructure Development in Nigeria .....	148
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	148
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	149
Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	151
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	152
Thematic Category 12: Major Category: Benefits of Good Infrastructure	
Network in Nigeria .....	152
Group A: Former Heads of State .....	152
Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors .....	153
Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers .....	154
Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts.....	156
Data from the Archives.....	157
Summary of Findings.....	159
Transition .....	162

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations .....	163
Introduction .....	163
Discussion of Findings .....	163
Policies of the Previous Military Administrations .....	163
Policy Formulation and Implementation .....	165
Major Obstacle to Infrastructure Development .....	166
Obstacles to Implementation of Government Infrastructure Development	
Policies .....	167
Effective and Favorable Government Policies .....	168
Performance and Public Trust .....	169
Effects of Bureaucratic Corruption .....	170
Impact of Reforms .....	171
Leadership Style for Future Infrastructure Development .....	172
Impediments to Good Governance of Infrastructure Development .....	173
Future Areas of Infrastructure Development .....	175
Benefits of Good Infrastructure Development .....	176
Recommendations for Action .....	177
Recommendations for Further Study .....	180
Implications for Social Change .....	181
Conclusions .....	182
References .....	184
Appendix A: Interview Guide .....	196
Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter .....	204

Appendix C: Participants Consent Form .....206

## List of Tables

Table 1. Distribution of Participants ( $N = 13$ ) .....	88
Table 2.. Responses on Effect of Leadership on Policy Formulation and Implementation in Infrastructure Sector (Groups A and B).....	93
Table 3. Responses on Effect of Leadership on Policy Formulation and Implementation in Infrastructure Sector(Groups C and D).....	97
Table 4. Responses of All Participants on Obstacle to Infrastructure Development.....	101
Table 5. Responses of Participants on Major Obstacles to Implementation of Government Policies on Infrastructure Development (Groups A& B).....	104
Table 6. Responses of Participants on Major Obstacles to Implementation of Government Policies on Infrastructure Development (Groups C & D).....	106
Table 7. Responses of Participants on Favorable and Effective Government Policies on Infrastructure Development (Groups A and B)) .....	109
Table 8. Responses of Participants on Favorable aand Effective Government Policies on Infrastructure Development (Groups C and D).....	110
Table 9. Responses of Participants on Effect of Performance on Public Trust and Governance of Infrastructure (Groups A and B) .....	116
Table 10. Responses of Participants on Effects of Performance on Public Trust and Governance of Infrastructure (Groupd C and D) .....	117
Table 11. Responses of Participants on Effect of Bureaucratic Corruption on Performance in Infrastructure Sector (Groups A and B) ...	122
Table 12. Responses of Participants on Effect of Bureaucratic Corruption on Performance in Infrastructure Sector (Groups C and D) .....	123
Table 13. Responses of Participants on Effect of Reforms on Infrastructure Development (Groups A and B).....	127
Table 14. Responses of Participants on Effect of Reforms on Infrastructure Development (Groups C and D) .....	128
Table 15. Responses of Participants on Specific Reforms That Have Significant Impact on Infrastructure Development (Groups A and B).....	132



Table 16. Responses of Participants on Specific Reforms That Have Significant Impact on Infrastructure Development (Groups C and D) .....	134
Table 17. Responses of Participants on Preferred Future Leadership Style for Infrastructure Development (Groups A and B) .....	137
Table 18. Responses of Participants on Preferred Future Leadership Style for Infrastructure Development (Groups C and D) .....	138
Table 19. Responses of Participants on Impediments to Good Infrastructure Development Governance (Groups A and B) .....	143
Table 20. Responses of Participants on Impediments to Good Infrastructure Development Governance (Group C and D) .....	144
Table 21. Responses of All Participants on Future Priority for Infrastructure Development .....	150
Table 22. Responses of Participants on Benefits of Good Infrastructure Network (Groups A and B).....	153
Table 23. Responses of Participants on Benefits of Good Infrastructure Network (Groups C and D) .....	154
Table 24. Patterns of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria (1960-2010): Roads and Bridges.....	158
Table 25. Patterns of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria (1960-2010): Housing, Power, Telecommunications and Dams.....	159

## Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

### **Background**

Leadership is at the heart of public sector governance, and it is vital to the overall development of a nation as well as the welfare of the citizens. According to Lawal and Tobi (2006), the quality of leadership affects the pace of development in any country. Baets (2011) opined that there is a dearth of leadership skills required for effective public governance in Africa, and Ojo (2012) highlighted the leadership crisis and political instability in Nigeria. Ngowi (2009) studied the effect of political leadership on economic development in Tanzania and concluded that leadership is the defining factor that shaped the nature and path of economic development in that country. Poor leadership, and the endemic bureaucratic corruption that has characterized public sector governance since independence in 1960, have been blamed for the slow pace of development in key sectors of the Nigerian economy, especially in the infrastructure sector (Lawal & Tobi, 2006; Ogbeide, 2012). A change in the right direction in the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria might create a favorable climate for economic growth and social stability. Achebe (1988) stated that there is nothing fundamentally wrong with the Nigerian character except the persistent leadership failures. Burns (1978) pointed out that leadership is a moral necessity, and its expression and achievements are best measured by such virtues as liberty, equality, justice, opportunity, and the pursuit of happiness. In my opinion, these are good reasons for developing infrastructure in Nigeria.

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). The United Nations (2007) defined governance as the way society sets and manages the rules that guide policymaking and policy implementation. Toikka (2011) stated that public governance is concerned with the conduct of governments at all levels to bring about the best possible benefits to their citizens. Therefore, governance can be good or bad depending on the manner and mode of governing (Rotberg, 2005). Lawal and Tobi (2006) pointed out that good governance should focus on the welfare of the people, and should be geared toward the provision of good infrastructure that will promote the happiness of the citizenry. Oyedele (2012) posited that the success or failure of a leader or government is measured by the level and nature of infrastructure development embarked upon by the leader or government and how well it meets the aspirations of the people in democratic governance. Good and effective public governance helps to strengthen democracy, promote economic prosperity and social cohesion, and reduce poverty (United Nations, 2007).

Good governance must be perceived to solve social problems. Rotberg (2005) observed that governance is good when it allocates and manages resources to respond to collective socioeconomic and political problems. Cheema (2005) argued that good governance should promote gender equality, sustain the environment, enable citizens to exercise personal freedom, and provide tools to reduce poverty, deprivation, fear, and violence. Arguably, two key elements should be added to the list of things good governance should address that are vital to the Nigerian circumstances and the goals of

this study – infrastructure development and reduction of corruption . While Akinwale (2010) argued that the development of a society depends on the availability of infrastructure, Zuofa and Ochieng (2014) found out that corruption was among the key issues responsible for infrastructure project failures in Nigeria. This finding justifies the inclusion of bureaucratic corruption as one issue to explore in this study.

Researchers have mentioned different aspects of governance. Nzongola-Ntalaja (2002) identified three main types of governance. They are political or public governance, economic governance, and social governance. The three types of governance are inseparable and interrelated, particularly in the Nigerian context. It is difficult (a) to distinguish between the impact leadership has on each of the type of governance, and (b) to isolate its effects. In fact, leadership should affect all the aspects of governance simultaneously, and the results should be seen in all spheres of development (Kemp, Parto, & Gibson, 2005).

This study was focused on leadership and governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. In public sector governance, institutions are central to the development process. The World Bank Group (2002) remarked that the economic and sociopolitical development of most developing countries is dependent on the public sector institutions in those countries. Therkidsen (2001) noted that weak public institutions and poor governance have been identified as the bane of infrastructure development, which serves as the trigger for poverty and corruption in Nigeria. This finding is applicable to other African countries and present a common trend.

Nigeria received her independence in October 1960 from colonial Great Britain. More than 50 years have passed in the political history of Nigeria since independence.

The political history of Nigeria during this period can be divided into two major eras: (a) the era of military dictatorship, and (b) the era of civilian party politics and democracy (Ado-Kurawa, 2005). The focus of this study was on how political leadership affected the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria since 1960. In Chapter 2, an elaborate description of the political leadership in Nigeria will be provided beginning from independence in 1960 when Alhaji Abubakar Tafawa Balewa and Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe played leadership roles in the postindependence era, through the intervening military regimes that spanned about 30 years, to the year 2010 when President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua held the political mantle. Each political leadership instituted significant reforms aimed at transforming public governance in Nigeria.

Different political leadership in Nigeria initiated and implemented several economic, political, and social reforms between 1960 and the year 2010. Okonjo-Iweala and Osafo-Kwaako (2007) reported the progress and challenges of economic reforms in Nigeria. Ekpenkhio (2003) examined the public sector procurement reforms, and Afeikhena (2002) discussed the public enterprise reform from telecommunication perspective, while Ado-Kurawa (2005) dwelt on the Nigerian national political reforms. In Chapter 2, all these reforms will be discussed in greater detail.

The impact of leadership, or the lack thereof, on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria since achieving its independence in 1960 is the main focus of this study. Prior to the attainment of independence from Britain in 1960, Nigeria could boast of good transportation infrastructure that facilitated economic growth. As a policy of colonial Britain, railway transportation links were built between 1896 and 1932 linking the Northern commercial city of Kano with the Western seaport of Lagos, covering well

over a distance of about 1,000 kilometers; and another railway line was erected to connect the city of Maiduguri in the North and the Port Harcourt Southern seaport, spanning a distance of about 1,500 kilometers (Mbanefo, 2000). In recent years, infrastructure development has suffered significant neglect in the hands of the Nigerian leadership, leading to economic and social problems in the country. According to Akinwale (2010), inadequate infrastructure constitutes a great threat to human survival in Nigeria. Highways as well as electricity projects have progressed rather slowly over the past 50 years. Good infrastructure would drive economic development and create an atmosphere of good governance. It is against this background that this study is contemplated.

Bureaucracy is the institutional mechanism for carrying out the functions and responsibilities of the state, and it is the vehicle for administering the state based on hierarchy, rules, regulations, and orders, and helps to translate the vision of the leadership into reality (Hague, 1992). Public officers who work in the bureaucracy are active bureaucrats whose actions either promote or hinder good governance. In Nigeria, bureaucratic corruption is usually associated with the activities of bureaucrats, and takes the form of buying favor from bureaucrats who formulate and implement government policies (Lawal & Tobi, 2006).

Different reasons have been advanced for the prevalence of bureaucratic corruption in Nigeria, which includes innocuous bureaucratic structure of the public service, lack of value, and penchant for pecuniary gains (Lawal & Tobi, 2006). It can be said that bureaucratic corruption is an obstacle to good governance and poses a serious threat to the efficient management of resources and the improvement of the well-being of

the people. Ogbuagu, Ubi, and Effiom (2014) pointed out that there is a relationship between infrastructural decay in Nigeria and bureaucratic corruption, and argued that beyond lack of funds, corruption is principally responsible for the level of infrastructural decay in Nigeria. Lawal and Tobi (2006) stated that bureaucratic corruption has not only denied the Nigerian people good infrastructure, but has also distorted incentives, undermined institutions, and redistributed wealth and power to the undeserving without adding value to the nation's economy. This lack of good governance of the infrastructure sector provided the motivation to focus on the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria since 1960.

Corruption has been a major problem of the Nigerian society. According to Lawal and Tobi (2006), different political leaders in Nigeria have at one time or another instituted some form of anticorruption measures, but to no avail. Good governance cannot be attained in a chronically corrupt political leadership structure because, as Lawal and Tobi postulated that corruption violates public trust and deviate from high moral standard in exchange or anticipation of personal and pecuniary gains at the expense of the common good. Good infrastructure is required to spur good governance in order for people to realize their pursuit of happiness.

In Nigeria, corruption has placed a huge barrier on the path to individual rights to liberty, equality, justice, and national development, and has been blamed for the failure of the nation to provide employment, eradicate poverty, develop infrastructure, and institute good public governance (Lawal& Tobi, 2006). Corruption, lack of political will, and the absence of probity, accountability, and transparency are partly responsible for the failure of the previous development plans in Nigeria (Achebe, 1988). Notably, accountability

and transparency are vital indicators of good governance (United Nations, 2007), which help to engender public trust, and contribute to infrastructure development (Transparency International, 2006).

Few studies have been conducted on the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development. Madueke (2008) studied the role of leadership in governance in Nigeria in relation to the transformational leadership theory as an alternative that can bring about positive change. Madueke's study was descriptive and no empirical processes were employed to collect and analyze data. Olaseni and Alade (2012) examined vision 20:2020 and the challenges of infrastructural development in Nigeria, and argued that the realization of the vision is hinged on infrastructure development in the country. Olaseni and Alade recommended adequate funding of infrastructure in critical sector, good governance, population control and physical planning of settlements among others to ensure the realization of Nigeria's vision 20:2020. No scholar has investigated how leadership has affected the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. Hence, this study may be the first attempt at investigating leadership issues in relation to the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria using an empirical approach. In Chapter 2, most of the issues raised in the background of the study are discussed in detail.

### **Problem Statement**

A leadership problem exists in Nigeria (Achebe, 1988; Mustafa, 2004). Madueke (2008) found that Nigeria is in dire need of transformation, and suggested that additional research should be conducted into the role of leadership in national development from the Nigerian experience. Nowhere in Nigeria's public sector is the need for transformation



more compelling than the infrastructure sector (Akinwale, 2010; Mbanefo, 2000; Olaseni & Alade, 2012). The hopes of millions of Nigerians have been dashed due to repeated failure by successive political leaderships to provide good governance in Nigeria's public sector, which is needed to build sustainable infrastructure for the creative engagement of the citizens and generate national development (Ogwu, 2001). Good infrastructures serve as catalyst for economic growth and also provide the platform for the sociopolitical transformation of the nation (Akinwale, 2010; Olaseni & Alade, 2012).

For over 50 years since Nigeria gained her political independence, the nation has experienced a continuous leadership problem which has culminated in poor infrastructure, resulting in the loss of trust in the leadership of the country by the citizenry (Transparency International, 2006; Zuofa & Ochieng, 2014). Nigeria has made several attempts in the past at restructuring the economy and reforming public sector governance through the introduction of public service reforms (Okonjo-Iweala, 2012). The government of Nigeria continues to implement various reforms, including privatization and concession of key services and infrastructure to private sector operatives (Okonjo-Iweala & Osafo-Kwaato, 2007). Mustafa (2004) argued that these reforms have not yet yielded the expected outcomes partly because of problems emanating from poor leadership, which has led to the low quality of life of the citizenry. The leadership problem is more evident in the area of infrastructure development, which directly affects the general socioeconomic well-being of all Nigerians (Oyedele, 2012).

The importance of infrastructure development in Nigeria cannot be overemphasized. It is at the core of good governance and public welfare. Good infrastructure development in Nigeria is critical to the overall development of the

Nigerian economy, which in turn impacts the standard of living of all Nigerians. In this study, I examined the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria in relation to the formulation and implementation of public policies in the infrastructure sector.

### **Nature of the Study**

This study aimed at answering one major question: What is the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria? As a qualitative case study, the objective was to collect data from a wide range of sources over a period of 50 years in the political history of Nigeria, between 1960 and 2010, and analyze these data using an empirical approach. Creswell (2007) noted that in a qualitative case study the researcher explores in depth an event or a process over a period of time. This study was exploratory in nature, and relied on a vast amount of information gathering procedures, such as structured interview, secondary data, documentary information, government gazettes and archival records, and other relevant data that were analyzed to find answers to the research questions (Creswell, 2009; O'Sullivan & Rassel, 1999).

A qualitative case study methodology (Yin, 2003), complemented by the use of the constant comparative method for collecting and analyzing data (Merriam, 2009), is best suited for a study of this nature. Other qualitative research methods such as narrative, ethnography, and grounded theory, were not suitable for this study (Patton, 2002). In Chapter 3, further justification of the selection of the qualitative case study method for this study will be presented.

### **Research Questions**

The main research question of this study focused on how leadership has affected infrastructure development in Nigeria. Primarily, I sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How has leadership affected policy formulation and implementation in the infrastructure sector in Nigeria?
2. How has performance affected public trust in the governance of the infrastructure sector in Nigeria?
3. How has bureaucratic corruption affected performance in the infrastructure sector in Nigeria?
4. How have the various reforms of the different political era affected the development of infrastructure in Nigeria?
5. What form of leadership might better serve the infrastructure needs of the people of Nigeria in the future?

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria in the past 50 years. The main goal was to gain a proper understanding of the role played by different successive political leaderships in shaping the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. The bureaucratic institutions of the different military and civilian political eras were examined to see the extent to which leadership in the past has influenced the effectiveness of the bureaucracy. The effects of the various leaders and the public sector reforms in those 50 years on the development of infrastructure were investigated.

This study was conducted within the geographic boundaries of Nigeria. Personal interviews of some past leaders of Nigeria and key stakeholders (former senior bureaucrats, and heads of consulting and construction companies) who participated in infrastructure development in Nigeria during the period of 1960 to 2010 in the political history of Nigeria was conducted to gain better insight into the policies and programs of the different eras that shaped the governance of infrastructure development. It is hoped that this study will produce a comprehensive recommendation on ways that leadership in Nigeria can be redirected and improved to bring about public sector transformation and positive social change through the development of good infrastructure.

### **Conceptual Framework**

Leadership and infrastructure governance were the key variables in this study. The theoretical framework for this study was based on leadership and governance theories in the broadest context, which has been adapted to suit the Nigerian circumstances. Leadership as a concept has generated numerous theories such as the trait theory, the contingency theory, the behavioral theory, the situational theory, and the relationship theories (Burns, 1978). The relationship theories have been classified as the transformational leadership theories (Bass, 1990, 1985). Similarly, several theories of governance have emerged. They include the network theories, political economy theories, democratic and legal theories, and the theories of system transition and transformation (Toikka, 2011). These theories of leadership and governance were extensively reviewed in Chapter 2.

In this study, the transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978), and the theories of transformation and transition in governance (Davis, 2011; Toikka,

2011) were adopted as the most suitable conceptual framework. Burns (1978) defined transformational leadership as a process where leaders and followers engage in a mutual process of raising one another to higher levels of morality and motivation. The transformational leader appeals to the higher ideals and values of the followers in an unselfish manner to achieve collaboration and collective success. Bass (1990) defined transformational leadership in terms of how the leader affects followers, and identified three ways in which the leaders transform followers as:

- Increasing their awareness of task importance and value.
- Getting them to focus first on team or organizational goals, rather than their own interests.
- Activating their higher order needs.

Transformational leader is charismatic and inspirational. Bass (1985) agreed that transformational leaders are generally believed to transform their followers to higher levels of performance and other positive work-related outcomes through four dimensions: charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized considerations. Burns (1978) argued that the core agenda of transformational leadership is the protection and nourishing of happiness, and extending the opportunity to pursue happiness to all. One way of pursuing this agenda in Nigeria is the development of key infrastructures through good governance. As Bass (1990) observed, transformational leadership will help to unleash the creative potentials of individuals and groups, thereby generating social change.

The transformational and transition theories of governance have been used to explain the change from one regime type to another such as from authoritarianism to

democracy and vice versa, and in understanding the problems of governance that are involved in such changes (Davis, 2011). In effect, transformational governance creates an atmosphere of collective vision that inspires followers to look beyond their self-interests for the good of the group (Bass, 1990). Transformational theory of governance is therefore very relevant in explaining regime changes in Nigeria over the period of 50 years when political leadership rotated from military dictatorship to civilian democratic governments. The leadership role played by successive Nigerian administrations failed to represent the characteristics of transformational leadership. In this study, I explored this theoretical perspective in depth in Chapter 2.

### **Research Design**

There are three main approaches or methods of conducting research studies: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods (Creswell, 2009). Case study is one aspect of the qualitative approach. As Creswell (2007) noted, the qualitative case study is suitable in collecting open-ended data from participants in a collaborative manner that makes data interpretation meaningful. The qualitative case study design was employed in this study to explore and analyze data from the personal interviews and existing records on the ways in which leadership has affected the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. Qualitative data collection techniques were used to obtain data from the personal interviews, multiple existing data sources, documents, public records, and peer-reviewed journal articles (Yin, 2009). The constant comparative method (Merriam, 2009) was also used to collect and analyze existing data from public records and peer-reviewed articles covering the study period of 50 years.

Personal interviews of some past leaders and former top bureaucrats that were engaged in the development of infrastructure in Nigeria by the government during the study period of 1960 to 2010 were conducted to gain a better understanding of the policies and programs of the different political eras that shaped the development of infrastructure in Nigeria. Data triangulation was employed in sifting the data covering the study period of 50 years. The research problem served as a guide to appropriate sources of data (Patton, 2002). Five forms of data analysis and interpretation were employed in the study. These included: categorical aggregation, direct interpretation, patterns, naturalistic generalization, and description (Patton, 2002). The data collected were examined, analyzed, translated, interpreted and illustrated in Word and Excel documents to ensure that the data collected made sense and are easy to understand.

The data collected for this study were reviewed to discern common themes, coded, and pattern matched in order to address the research questions. The themes that evolved were analyzed in the context of each research question in order to address the findings.

### **Definition of Terms**

Some terms used in this study have been defined in the context in which they have been used. Creswell (2007) stated that terms are defined to enable readers gain better understanding of the operational meaning of the words used in the text.

*Bureaucratic corruption:* Corruption instituted or committed by government officials (Lawal & Tobi, 2006).

*Good governance:* The efficient allocation and management of resources aimed at providing quality services for public good (Rotberg, 2005).

*Invariant constituents:* Patterns in process and interaction in qualitative data analysis to create meaning out of the phenomenon under study (Holloway & Wheeler, 2013; p. 6).

*Leader:* A person of authority who exercises power for the purpose of influencing the behavior of others (Filey & House, 1969).

*Public sector:* The part of an economy that consists of state-owned institutions, including nationalized industries and services (United Nations, 2007).

*Secondary data:* Data produced for other researchers, but replicated in the study (Singleton & Straits, 2005).

*Triangulation:* Measures employed by researchers and have different methodological weaknesses (Singleton & Straits, 2005).

### **Assumptions, Limitations, Scope, and Delimitations**

#### **Assumptions**

The following assumptions have been made in this study due to the inability of the researcher to control them:

1. The research participants in the personal interviews provided accurate information and responded honestly to research questions drawing from their past experiences.
2. The secondary data, documents, and peer-reviewed journals examined for the study provided accurate information based on facts and historical data of Nigeria infrastructure sector governance, and the impact of leadership thereon from 1960 to 2010.



3. Documents received from government and nongovernmental international organizations were representative of the Nigerian public sector governance experience.

### **Limitations**

This study has a number of limitations. First, the human factor presented an obstacle in determining accurately the efficacy of the information provided by participants during the personal interviews. To mitigate the effect of this factor, participants were provided with detailed background information on the purpose and goals the study has set out to achieve. Participants were also assured of the confidentiality of the information that was provided by them. Prior to the analysis of the data, participants were given the opportunity to validate the data provided by them.

Time and money also presented a constraint, considering the fact that the former presidents of Nigeria and former top bureaucrats who were interviewed in this study live in different parts of the country, requiring extensive round-trip traveling. To mitigate this challenge, notices were given well in advance to these participants to ensure that rewarding personal interviews were conducted.

Third, this was a qualitative case study that relied on descriptive data analysis, and not on inferential statistical procedures. Although, data were compiled and organized using NVivo software, and descriptive statistics analyzed to establish patterns and recurring themes, the nature of qualitative research data precluded the use of inferential statistical analysis, which limits the extent to which the findings of this study may be generalized. As is the case with all qualitative studies, this study cannot be generalized.

### **Scope and Delimitations**

By choice, this study was narrowed down to the study of Nigeria as a geographic entity, in relation to the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development. This was a major delimitation and definition of scope of the study. The period under study which is well-defined in scope is from independence in 1960 to the year 2010.

By electing to conduct a qualitative case study, which is the best approach for a study of this nature, the scope of the study has been narrowed. Another factor that constrains the scope of the study is the decision to select the former presidents of Nigeria, former top bureaucrats and other key players in the infrastructure sector during the study period as the main source of information and data on leadership and infrastructure governance in Nigeria.

### **Significance of the Study**

Few studies have been conducted on the impact of leadership on infrastructure development in Nigeria. Madueke (2008) examined the role of leadership in governance in Nigeria in a broader context. This was the first time that a study of the role of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria was conducted. Furthermore, there is a dearth of literature about how leadership affects infrastructure development, not only in Nigeria, but in Africa as a continent. This study, therefore, has the potential to make a contribution to the literature on leadership and infrastructure development by filling this gap.

I explored the impact of leadership on infrastructure development in Nigeria based on an interest in understanding the genesis of the poor public sector governance in

Nigeria, particularly in the area of infrastructure development. This is intended to contribute to the reinvention of Nigerian public institutions by highlighting the failures of the past 50 years, and charting a new path that will help to improve the governance of infrastructure development and provide the needed support to economic growth in Nigeria.

There was a social change component to this study. The findings of this study provide a framework on ways to improve leadership and a general improvement of the Nigerian infrastructure sector in a way that promotes the standard of living of the people through the enhancement of the capacity of citizens to pursue productive ventures that will lead to consequential increase in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of Nigeria. In the final analysis, this study would provide some useful findings on how Nigeria could evolve positively into transformational leadership that could replace the poor governance of the past half a century and manifest in good infrastructures which will bring about positive social change in Nigeria.

### **Summary**

In this chapter, the background of the study has been clearly presented and the focus vividly identified as leadership and infrastructure development in Nigeria. Definitions of leadership and infrastructure were provided. A brief review of the political history of Nigeria, and the various reform programs were presented. I also explored patterns and systems of public sector governance in Nigeria, and the impact of leadership on the infrastructure sector in Nigeria from 1960 to 2010. The problem statement was articulated around poor leadership and bad governance which has adversely affected the infrastructure sector.

Factors such as participants' willingness to give accurate information, relevance of secondary data, time and money, were some of the challenges that were faced in this study. Steps such as giving the participants adequate notices before the personal interviews, and the validation of the data provided by participants before the data analysis, as well as content analysis of secondary data prior to their usage in the study, were taken to mitigate the challenges.

The nature of the study and the research methodology were clarified and justified as qualitative case study relying on personal interviews and existing data for data collection. Data analysis approach was explained. The transformational theories of leadership and governance were adopted for the study, and its relevance to the Nigerian circumstances stated. In this chapter, research questions were presented, and the limitations, scope, and significance of the study presented.

### **Transition Statement**

The next chapter is devoted to extensive review of the literature. The concepts as well as the different theories of leadership and governance were critically examined to explain and justify their relevance to the study of how leadership affects the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. The history of political leadership in Nigeria and the various reforms associated with the different political leadership eras, and the evolution of the infrastructure sector, were reviewed. Finally, literature materials relating to research methods and designs were reviewed to support the approach used in this study.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

### **Introduction**

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, leadership role in the governance of infrastructure development has become more critical to the economic and sociopolitical development of nations across the globe. According to Ogbeide (2012), poor leadership and bureaucratic corruption have led to the absence of good governance in Nigeria. In this study, I investigated how leadership affected the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria between 1960 and 2010.

This chapter provides the theoretical framework for this study by espousing the theories of leadership and governance. Key elements of both theories were considered in relation to their impact on infrastructure development. In this chapter, the review of related literature is presented. Furthermore, I examined the national development plans and political leaderships of the different eras, as well as reforms in Nigeria's public sector from pre independence era to post independence era. Additionally, I also present the public sector environment in Nigeria and the challenges of political leadership in Nigeria.

### **Leadership and Leaders Defined**

The term leadership has been defined in several ways. Northhouse (2013) defined leadership as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal. Riggio and Murphy (2003) stated that leadership is a process by which a person influences others to accomplish an objective and directs the organization in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent. These definitions identify leadership as a process involving an individual who is wielding some level of influence in such a manner as to bring about the accomplishment or fulfillment of certain objectives.

Researchers have defined a leader in different ways. Fiedler and Garcia (1987) posited that a leader is a “person who is elected or appointed or who has emerged from the group to direct and coordinate the group members’ efforts toward some given goal. The leader generally plans, organizes, directs, and supervises the activities of group members and develops and maintains sufficient cohesiveness and motivation among group members to keep them together as a functioning unit” (p. 2). In essence, a leader marshals and challenges people to transform a vision into a reality. Perhaps, the most comprehensive definition of a leader was provided by Winston and Patterson (2006), who stated:

A leader is one or more people who selects, equips, trains, and influences one or more followers who have diverse gifts, abilities, and skills and focuses the followers to the organization’s missions and objectives causing the followers to willingly and enthusiastically expend spiritual, emotional, and physical energy in a concerted coordinated effort to achieve the organizational mission and objectives. (p. 7)

While this definition captures all the elements of leadership, Bass and Bass (2008) provided a definition of leadership that is very relevant to the conceptual framework of this study, and it states that “transformational leaders motivate their followers to do more than the followers originally intended and thought possible. The leader sets challenging expectations and achieve higher standards of performance” (p. 618).

Leadership and leaders are not synonymous, but are analogous to one another. While leaders are expected to lead and influence their subordinates, leadership is a process of influencing people towards achieving a clear goal.

## **Concepts and Theories of Leadership**

Leadership theories have evolved over the years. Kendra (2012) highlighted eight leadership theories which include: the “great man” theories, the trait theories, the contingency theories, the situational theories, the behavioral theories, the participative theories, the management theories, and the relationship theories. Other classifications of leadership theories exist. Wolinski (2010) presented the following leadership theories: the trait theory, the skills theory, the situational theory, the contingency theory, the path-goal theory, the transformational theory, the transactional theory, and the servant leadership theory. All these theories of leadership are believed to be grounded in one or more of the following three perspectives: leadership as a process or relationship, leadership as a combination of traits or personality characteristics, or leadership as a measure of certain behavior or skills (Avolio, 2005).

### **Trait Theory**

According to the trait theory of leadership, people are either born or not born with the qualities that predispose them to success in leadership role (Wolinski, 2010). People inherit certain qualities and traits that make them better suited to leadership. Leaders are born and not made, and an individual must inherit the leadership genes in order to be a leader. In this regard, the trait theory of leadership is not different from the great man theory which assumes that the capacity for leadership is inherent (Kendra, 2012). Early studies of leadership focused on identifying traits of leaders and what distinguished one leader from the other. According to Filley and House (1969), many of the early studies were designed to uncover universal traits such as intellect, social, emotional, and physical

anatomy of a leader. Stogdill (1974) conducted two separate scientific studies on the traits of a leader.

In the first study which surveyed a group of leadership traits, Stogdill (1974) found that an average person in leadership role differed from an average group member in (a) intelligence, (b) alertness, (c) insight, (d) responsibility, (e) initiative, (f) persistence, (g) self-confidence, and (h) sociability. At the end of the second study, Stogdill (1974) listed 10 characteristics of a leader, thus: (a) drive for responsibility and task completion, (b) vigor and persistence in the pursuit of goals, (c) venturesomeness and originality in problem solving, (d) drive to exercise initiative in social situations, (e) self-confidence and sense of personal identity, (f) willingness to accept consequences of decision and action, (g) readiness to absorb interpersonal stress, (h) willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, (i) ability to influence behavior of others, and (j) capacity to structure social interaction systems to the task at hand. Although Stogdill (1974) showed there were personality traits associated with leadership effectiveness in situations, Stogdill did not clearly demonstrate that there were a number of such traits that differentiate successful leaders from unsuccessful leaders.

Leaders inherit some traits. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) identified six traits that distinguished a leader from nonleader: (a) drive, (b) desire to lead, (c) honesty and integrity, (d) self-confidence, (e) cognitive ability, and (f) knowledge. While Stogdill (1974) and Kirkpatrick and Locke pointed out that there were personality traits that differentiate leaders from non-leaders, Wright (1996) argued that other researchers found no difference between leaders and followers with respect to these characteristics. As Filey and House (1969) pointed out, if particular characteristics are required for each



situation, and characteristics must vary as the situation varies, it is unlikely that the traits required for leadership are widely distributed throughout the population at large. As such, the possession of these traits and characteristics will not differentiate leaders from non-leaders until the traits are combined with appropriate situations. Filey and House stated that leadership goes beyond the personal characteristics of a leader, and argued that the effectiveness of a leader depends on the interaction between the leader and the group members, and how the group members perceive the leader's behavior as supportive of their own well-being. In my opinion, leadership is an acquired trait

### **Situational Theory**

Situational theory focuses on leadership in situations based on observed behavior, as distinct from the trait theory of leadership. As Kendra (2012) posited, the situational theory of leadership proposes that leaders chose the best course of action based on situational variables. According to Hersey and Blanchard (1977), leadership is a dynamic process that varies from situation to situation in line with observed changes in leaders, followers, and situation in the environment. In my opinion, situations define leaders based on how an individual handles a situation.

Leaders have different attributes. Gardner (1990) argued that there were some qualities or attributes that a leader in one situation could lead in another. In a study of a number of North American organizations, Gardner listed the qualities identified in the leader as follows:

1. Physical vitality and stamina
2. Intelligence and action-oriented judgment
3. Eagerness to accept responsibility

4. Task competence
5. Understanding of followers and their needs
6. Skill in dealing with people
7. Need for achievement
8. Capacity to motivate people
9. Courage and resolution
10. Trustworthiness
11. Decisiveness
12. Self-confidence
13. Assertiveness
14. Adaptability/flexibility

Leadership behaviors are influenced by several factors. Hershey and Blanchard (1977) identified four different relationships that impact leadership behaviors in different situations and how they affect the perception of leaders as effective or ineffective: (a) high task and low relationship, (b) high task and high relationship, (c) high relationship and low task, and (d) low relationship and low task.

Leaders use different style in the act of governance. Fiedler and Garcia (1987) stated that the effectiveness of a leader is predicated on the leadership style the leader exhibit and the extent to which the situation gives the leader locust of control and influence over the followers. Fiedler and Garcia also identified the following conditions as essential to a leader's success: (a) the relationship between the leader and followers, (b) the structure of the task, and (c) position power. While the situational leadership approach demands that leaders vary their behaviors according to the situation, leaders

exposed to the same situation may not exhibit the same behavior due to environmental differences.

### **Contingency Theory**

The basic tenet of the contingency leadership theory assumes that no single way of leading, and that every leadership style should be based on certain situations, which indicates that the performance of a leader depends on circumstances (Burns, 1978). This theory which is predicated on the principles of situational theory upholds that leadership can be explained only in terms of the interaction between the leader and many variables in the environment that might determine the style of leadership that is best in different situations. Leadership from this perspective is perceived as the exercise of certain kind of behaviors required to command the loyalty of followers and to motivate them in accomplishing set goals (Filey& House, 1969). In my opinion, no leadership style is best in all situations, rather, success depends on a number of prevailing situations.

Fiedler (1969) analyzed the styles of hundreds of leaders working in different contexts in military organizations, in a study to assess the style of leadership in their work situations and determine whether they were effective or not. At the end of the study, Fiedler successfully made empirically grounded generalizations on which styles of leadership were most appropriate for given situations, and which were least appropriate. Fiedler classified group-task situations into eight groups. Three dimensions of leadership measured one aspect of the situation that determines the degree to which a leader can influence his followers and how favorable the situation is.

In order to determine the most favorable and least favorable situation, Fiedler (1969) proposed some assumptions. One of these assumptions was that leaders with clear

objectives possess expert power, attraction power, and coercive power. Conversely, leaders who do not have clear objectives will not enjoy the support of their followers. Another assumption proposed by Fiedler was that the relationship between leaders and followers determine how favorable the situation is; and leaders who are favored will be able to influence their followers, while leaders who are not favored will not be able to influence their followers. Based on these assumptions, Fiedler pointed out that the leaders-followers relation dimension is more important, followed by the task-structure dimension in determining how favorable a leader is.

Fiedler (1969) stated that group performance is associated with leadership styles and the degrees to which situations provide the leaders with opportunities to influence their followers. Consequently, relationship-oriented leaders tend to perform best in situations which they have only moderate influence because they are not too well accepted although their position power is high and the task is structured. In favorable conditions in which leaders have power, informal backing, and a relatively well-structured task, the followers are ready to be directed and told what to do. In a relatively unfavorable situation, it is expected that task-oriented leaders will be more effective than will considerate leaders who are concerned with interpersonal relations. In situations which are only moderately favorable or which are moderately unfavorable for leaders, a considerate, relationship-oriented attitude seems to be most effective. However, under these conditions in which accepted leaders face ambiguous task, or one in which the tasks are structured but the leaders are not well accepted, the considerate, relationship-oriented leadership style is more likely to result in effective team performance.

Bass and Bass (2008) argued that leaders who are more highly rated by supervisors and peers, most highly satisfying to subordinates, and whose approaches result in the good performance of followers, are likely to be both relations-oriented and task-oriented in an integrated fashion. In contemporary society, leaders are not expected to have expert power as the various institutions of government have them in abundance. While coercive power is exercised under draconian leadership like military rule, it has no place in a democratic society. Attraction power on the other hand, can be a veritable tool for building strong leader-followers relationships for improved and efficient job performance in relatively favorable situations.

### **Transactional Theory**

The transactional theory of leadership is characterized by the elements of transaction made between the leader and the followers. According to Burns (1978), transactional leadership is the exchange of relationships between leader and followers geared towards satisfying their self-interests. Burns opined that leadership over a group of persons sets in when person with clear motives mobilize resources, in competition or conflict with other persons as to arouse, engage and satisfy the motives of followers, leading to the realization of mutually held goals by the leader and followers. Bass (1985) posited that the transactional leader is most efficient when the leader develops a mutually reinforcing environment that facilitates exchanges between the leader and the followers, predicated on contingent reward and management by exception. According to Bass, the leader and followers must accept interconnected roles and responsibilities to reach established goals, with the leader acting as agent of reinforcement for the followers. Kouzes and Posner (1995) pointed out that the transactional leader resembles closely the

traditional manager. The theory is based on the notion that a leader's job is to create structures that make it abundantly clear what is expected of the followers, and also the consequences of meeting or not meeting expectations of the leader (Wolinski, 2010). The transactional theory assumes that humans in general are seeking to maximize pleasurable experiences and to diminish unpleasurable experiences.

The transactional leadership model sought to demonstrate the leadership process, and how leadership is established and exerted (Shafritz & Russell, 2003). The elements of transactional leadership advanced by Bass (1990) involves a person taking initiative to contract with others for the purpose of engaging in an exchange of valued reward that may be economic, political or psychological. According to Burns (1978), this type of leadership is the most common type of leadership, and people can be trained to acquire the right leadership skills for leadership emergence based on contract. Burns (1978) argued that the interaction between leader and followers occur in two different leadership models, namely transactional and transformational models of leadership. Despite the common categorization, Burns submitted that transactional leadership and transformational leadership are at the opposite ends of a continuum.

### **Transformational Theory**

Unlike transactional leadership where the follower is rewarded with carrot for meeting agreements and standards or beaten with a stick for failing in what was supposed to be done (Bass & Bass, 2008), transformational leadership motivates followers to exceed expectations and goals. Burns (1978) defined transformational leadership as a process where leaders and followers engage in a mutual process of raising one another to higher levels of morality and motivation. Transformational leaders raise the bar by

appealing to higher ideas and values of the followers, and in doing so; they model the values themselves and use charismatic approaches to attract people to the values and to the leader. According to Burns, transformational leadership is more effective than transactional leadership because while transactional leadership appeals more to selfish concerns, transformational leadership appeals to social values which encourages people to collaborate rather than working as individuals. In his opinion, transformational leadership is an ongoing process rather than the discrete exchanges of transactional leadership.

According to Bass (1990), good visioning, impression-management, and rhetorical skills are central to transformational leadership. Bass argued that transformational leaders employ these skills to evoke strong emotions in followers, and motivate them to performance beyond expectations. Wolinski (2010) explained transformational leadership as a process by which an individual engages with others and is able to create a connection that results in increased motivation and morality in both followers and leaders. This theory is often termed the theory of charismatic leadership which assumes that leaders with certain qualities, such as confidence, extroversion, and clearly stated values, are best able to motivate followers (McLaurin & Amri, 2008). Hopen (2010) posited that it is crucial in transformational leadership that the leader is attentive to the needs and motives of followers in an attempt to help reach their maximum potential. Essentially, transformational leadership describes how leaders can initiate, develop, and implement important changes in organizations, institutions, and governments. The essence of transformational leadership theory is that leaders transform the followers through their inspirational nature and charismatic personalities. Rules and

regulations are flexible and are guided by group norms, which in turn, provide a sense of belonging for the followers as they easily identify with the leadership and its purpose (McLaurin & Amri).

Bass (1985) defined transformational leadership in terms of how the leader affects followers, who are intended to trust, admire and respect the transformational leader. He identified three ways in which leaders transform followers as enhancing the level of task significance and value; focusing primarily on collective goals; and stimulating the apex needs of the followers. Bass (2000) identified charisma as a necessary element of transformational leadership, and explained that the transformational leader uses charisma to evoke strong emotions and to cause identification of followers with the leader. Notably, Bass and Riggio (2006) explained that authentic transformational leadership is grounded in moral foundations that are based on four components:

- Idealized influence
- Inspirational motivation
- Intellectual stimulation
- Individualized consideration.

In addition, Bass highlighted the three moral aspects of transformational leadership as:

- The moral character of the leader.
- The ethical values embedded in the leader's vision, articulation, and program which followers may embrace or reject; and



- The morality of the processes of social ethical choice and action that leaders and followers engage in and collectively pursue.

It is important to point out that Burns (1978) perceived transformational leadership as being inextricably linked with higher order values, while Bass (1985) visualized it as amoral, and attributed transformational skills to charismatic leaders. However, Bass (1985) argued that there are major differences between transformational and charismatic leaders, pointing out that although charisma is a necessary component of transformational leadership, it is not sufficient to equate charismatic leadership with transformational leadership. As Bass and Bass (2008) put it more succinctly, “Nevertheless, the charismatic leader is likely to be transformational, but it is possible – although unlikely – to be transformational without being charismatic” (p. 620). In the final analysis, transformational theory of leadership is a relationship theory that focuses on the connections formed between leaders and followers, based on the assumption that the transformational leader motivates and inspires people by helping group members or the public to see the importance and higher good of a specific task. The transformational leader is charismatic and often has high ethical and moral standards. The ultimate goal of the transformational leader is to transform the followers to achieve optimal group success.

According to Denhardt, Denhardt, and Aristigueta (2002), transformational leadership is deeply rooted in studies of political and governmental leadership. They asserted further that public leaders help to create vision for their community, state, or country; and also help to build the public policy agenda; mobilize public opinion with

respect to policy proposals, and play an important role in shaping and implementing those programs and policies that government undertakes. These views are pertinent to Nigeria.

Shafritz and Russell (2003) argued that transformational leadership aims at changing the culture of an organization with new vision for the organization. As Shafritz, Russell, and Borick (2007) stated, “a transformational leader is one with the ability to change an embedded organizational culture by creating a new vision for the organization and marshalling the appropriate support to make that vision the new reality” (p. 381).

Bryant (2003) argued that while transformational leaders inspire, provide a vision, and stimulate followers intellectually, they tend to be weaker on systems, structures, and implementation which are areas of strong influence for transactional leaders. Bass (1990) argued that transformational leadership had an incremental effect over and above transactional leadership. Bass (1990) pointed out, that while transactional leadership can provide for structure and consideration, transformational leadership adds to it by helping the followers transcend their own self needs towards achievement and self-actualization.

### **Leadership Styles**

Over the years, different leadership styles and models have emerged in various disciplines. Kendra (2012) cited by Lewin (1939), identified three leadership styles. They include:

- Authoritarian or autocratic leadership.
- Participative or democratic leadership.
- Delegative or Laissez-Faire leadership.

Zerva and Lassiter (2005) suggested a broader range of leadership styles. They are:

- Coercive leadership.
- Task-oriented leadership.
- Authoritarian or authoritative leadership.
- Bureaucratic leadership.
- Affiliative leadership.
- Laissez-Faire leadership.
- Empowering leadership.
- Democratic or participative leadership.
- Pacesetter or charismatic leadership; and
- Coaching.

Goleman (2000) added two more leadership styles to this long list: commanding, and visionary leadership. Extensive as the list may seem to be, the different styles of leadership are interrelated and usually leaders use them simultaneously in the process of governance (Dereli, 2010), although leadership styles of men and women may differ in some instances (Eagly & Johanneses-Schmidt, 2001).

The authoritarian leader provides clear expectations for what needs to be done, when it should be done, and how it should be done. This style is used when leaders tell their followers what they want done and how they want it accomplished, without getting the advice of their followers. Authoritarian leaders make decisions independently with little or no input from the rest of the group (Kendra, 2012). In many ways, the coercive and bureaucratic leadership styles are autocratic in nature. Zervas and Lassiter (2005) stated that the fundamental element of the coercive leadership style is control of people,

jobs, and that results are obtained through direct, explicit, instructions on expectations, and demanding compliance from followers. Similarly, bureaucratic leadership requires subordinates to follow procedures and rules mandatorily. In the Nigerian context, the political leadership during the military era falls under the autocratic leadership category, and this will be analyzed later in the review.

The democratic or participative leadership style forges consensus through participation (Goleman, 2000; Northouse, 2013), and relies on the functioning of a group or team to achieve results. Subordinates take part in the decision-making process, and decisions result from group consensus. Participative leaders encourage group members to participate, but retain the final say over the decision-making process (Kendra, 2012). Group members feel engaged in the process and are more motivated and creative. As Zervas and Lassiter (2005) posited, the style tends to foster responsibility, flexibility, and high morale, and because staff are engaged in the decision-making and planning, there is a tendency for them to be more realistic about what is possible and what is not possible. Lewin (1939) argued that the participative or democratic leadership style is generally the most effective leadership style because the democratic leader offers guidance and encourages group members to be part of the leadership process. In the Nigerian context, the civilian democratic political party system ought to reflect the ideals of the participative or democratic leadership style. In my opinion, this has been the case with various democratic governments in Nigeria.

Delegative or Laissez-Faire leadership offers little or no guidance to group members or followers, and leaves the decision-making process up to group members (Kendra, 2012). The leader allows the followers to make the decisions with limited

interference in the leadership process. There is a deliberate policy not to influence subordinates, resulting in subordinates having a great deal of autonomy and authority. Zervas and Lassiter (2005) argued that the Laissez-Faire leadership style tends to be effective only under the very specialized situation when team members are highly skilled and knowledgeable in a specific area of expertise, and when the goals of the organization are clearly stated and acceptable to the leader and the followers. However, this style of leadership has the potential of leading to poorly defined roles and resulting in lack of motivation among subordinates, groups, and followers.

There are other leadership styles identified by various writers. The commanding leader demands immediate compliance from subordinates (Goleman, 2000) which places this leadership style squarely under autocratic leadership style. The coaching leader develops people for the future and places greater emphasis on the development of the subordinates and their capabilities through the identification of the unique skills and the strengths and weaknesses of the subordinates and linking them to personal career aspirations. Coaching leadership style involves delegating tasks, building skills, and assessing outcomes. Visionary leadership style encourages the mobilization of people toward the realization of a vision, and the pacesetter leader sets high standards for performance by subordinates, while the affiliative leader creates harmony and builds emotional bonds (Goleman). Leadership styles may produce different outcomes or results (Ekaterini, 2012; Howard, 2005), but ultimately, a good leader is one that applies any or a combination of the leadership styles in a manner and approach that provides direction and motivates people to achieve desired goals.

## **Concepts and Theories of Governance**

A better understanding of the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria can be gained through a review of the concepts and theories of governance. The World Bank Group (2011) defined governance as the way power is exercised through a country's economic, political, and social institutions. It is the political leadership of a country that exercises power. According to World Bank group (2011), governance is the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised for the common good. This includes the following characteristics:

- The processes by which those in authority are selected, monitored and replaced.
- The capacity of the government to effectively manage its resources and implement sound policies.
- The respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them.

The term governance is viewed by UNDP (1997) as the exercise of economic, political, and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels and the means by which States promote social cohesion, integration, and ensure the well-being of their citizens; and invariably, governance embraces all methods used to distribute power and manage public resources, including infrastructure development. It encompasses the mechanisms, processes, and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations, and resolve their differences. Consequently, governance is a process of decision-making and implementation.

The Asian Development Bank (2005) provided a broader definition of governance as the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's social and economic resources for development, and the way those with power use that power. It summarizes the concept of governance with the following characteristics:

- The processes by which governments are chosen, monitored, and changed.
- The systems of interaction between the administration, the legislature, and the judiciary.
- The ability of government to create and to implement public policy.
- The mechanisms by which citizens and groups define their interests and interact with institutions of authority and with each other.

UNDP (1997) stated that good governance is a basic precondition for sustainable human development. In a developing country such as Nigeria, good governance is critical to infrastructure development. It is therefore necessary to explain what good governance really means. According to UNDP (1997), good governance depends on public participation to ensure that political, social and economic priorities are based on a broad societal consensus and that the poorest and most vulnerable members of the society can directly influence political decision-making, particularly with respect to the allocation of development resources. Notably, good governance is effective, equitable, and promotes the rule of law and the transparency of institutions, officials and transactions. World Bank Group (2011) stated that good governance is epitomized by predictable, open and enlightened policy making; a bureaucracy imbued with a professional ethos; an executive

arm of government accountable for its actions; and a strong civil society participating in public affairs; and all behaving under the rule of law.

The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) articulated eight major characteristics of good governance. UNESCAP (2012) stated that good governance is participatory, consensus-oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable, inclusive, and follows the rule of law. Participation can be achieved directly or through legitimate intermediate institutions or representatives. Good governance requires fair legal frameworks that offer protection to all citizens, particularly the minorities and less-privileged in society. It also requires that institutions produce results that meet the needs of society which covers the sustainable use of natural resources and the development of infrastructures (Kemp et al., 2005). The responsive nature of good governance requires that institutions and the decision-making processes aim to serve every segment of the society. Accountability is an important component of good governance which makes it mandatory for those in authorities to show transparency and accountability to those they govern (United Nations, 2007). Good governance as articulated by Bojic (2011) focused on five key economic principles: (a) public sector management, (b) organizational accountability, (c) the rule of law, (d) transparency, and (e) access to information.

Some theories of governance have emerged over the years. Toikka (2011) identified the following governance theories: “normative, environmental, reflexive, adaptive, and deliberative” (p. 16). The Vienna School of Governance (2012) outlined some theories of governance which includes: argumentative, cultural, democratic and



legal, network, political, and system transition and transformation. A brief review of the theories of governance has been provided.

### **Reflexive Theory**

This governance theory focuses on processes which divide governance into first-order and second-order reflexive governance (Sairinen, 2009). It emphasizes the richness of objects and events as central to the process of governance.

### **Deliberative Theory**

Deliberative governance visualizes governance as a process that opens up the participatory process of democracy, particularly in relation to language interpretation in the decision-making process (Davis, 2011).

### **Argumentative Theory**

This governance theory focuses on the constitutive forces and formative conditions for emergence of government regimes, paying specific attention to arguments in the interpretation of policy-making and governance (Fischer, 2003).

### **Network Theory**

This theory includes approaches that investigate patterns of interest intermediation and public and private interactions in the making and implementation of public policies. As Davis (2011) argued, the network theory of governance advances the idea of transformation from government to governance as an important component of contemporary political leadership.

### **Transformation and Transition Theories**

The theories of transformation and transition as they relate to governance share similarities with transformational leadership theory (Toikka, 2011; Davis, 2011). It

explains the process of governance in terms of the exercise of political, economic, and administrative authority from one regime type to another. In the Nigerian context, the transformation and transition theories of governance provides a vital tool for explaining the process of decision-making and project implementation between the authoritarian military regimes that controlled a significant portion of the Nigerian leadership history and the process of governance, and the democratic civilian administrations. It is important that a proper understanding of the problems encountered in the process of governance between the two political leadership eras in Nigeria are closely analyzed in order to determine their effects on infrastructure development from 1960 to the year 2010.

### **Political History of Nigeria**

The focus of this study is the effect of leadership on the infrastructure development of Nigeria between 1960 and 2010. In 1960, Nigeria gained her independence from Great Britain under a constitution that provided for a parliamentary system of government. During the period under review, Nigeria passed through different political leadership and governments. Gambari (2011) outlined a brief summary of the political history of Nigeria:

- Between 1960 and 1963, the first democratic civilian government of Nigeria was formed between two political parties: the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC) and the Northern People's Congress (NPC), which produced Dr. Nnandi Azikiwe as the Governor-General, and Alhaji Abubakar Tafawa Balewa as the Prime Minister.

- In 1963, Nigeria became a Republic. Between 1963 and 1966, the political leadership shifted to the United Progressive Grand Alliance (UPGA), an alliance between the NPC and the Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP).
- In January 1966, the first military government of Nigeria under the leadership of Aguiyi-Ironsi took over political power, but did not last long.
- Between July 1966 and 1975, the military government under Yakubu Gowon held political leadership. During this period, Nigeria witnessed a civil war between 1967 and 1970.
- Another military government headed by Murtala Mohammed exercised political power between 1975 and 1976.
- Between 1976 and 1979, Olusegun Obasanjo was in charge of yet another military government in Nigeria.
- Democratic civilian administration returned to Nigeria on October 1, 1979. Between 1979 and 1983, Alhaji Shehu Shagari and the National Party of Nigeria (NPN) exercised political power in Nigeria.
- In 1983, the military returned to the political leadership scene, and Muhammadu Buhari held power between 1983 and 1985.
- Between 1985 and 1993, Ibrahim Babangida presided over yet again another military government in Nigeria.
- Sani Abacha headed another military government in Nigeria between 1993 and 1998.

- Between 1998 and 1999, Abdulsalami Abubakar exercised political power in another military government.
- The return to civilian political government occurred in 1999 with Olusegun Obasanjo assuming power, this time as a retired army General. Between 1999 and 2007, Obasanjo headed a civilian administration under the banner of the People's Democratic Party (PDP).
- Between 2007 and 2010, Umaru Musa Yar'Adua became the civilian president of the Federal Republic of Nigeria under the umbrella of the PDP.

Based on this review, it is quite obvious that the political history of Nigeria has been a turbulent mixture of military dictatorship and civilian political party democratic leadership. The historical events of the political history of Nigeria between 1960 and 2010 can be classified into two prominent eras: the era of military dictatorship, and the era of civilian political party democratic leadership. In the subsequent review, the two eras in the political history of Nigeria were extensively x-rayed and the effect of leadership during these eras examined in relation to infrastructure development in Nigeria between 1960 and 2010.

### **Civilian Political Leadership Era**

On October 1, 1960, Nigeria became a sovereign state within the British Commonwealth. This achievement of independence from colonial rule was the result of the intensive activities of the nationalist movements headed by such political personalities as Herbert Macaulay, Dr. Nmandi Azikiwe who became the Governor General, Alhaji Abubakar Tafawa Balewa who served as the Prime Minister, Chief Obafemi Awolowo, and other eminent Nigerians (Ige, 1995). Between 1960 and 2010,

Nigeria witnessed four civilian democratic governments which are categorized into four separate republics. Therefore, the civilian political leadership of Nigeria is essentially the history of four distinct republics interspersed by military dictatorships (Enefe, 2008).

The declaration of independence in 1960 marked the beginning of Nigeria as a sovereign state. In 1963, Nigeria became a republic. This marked the beginning of the first republic in the governance of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Nnamdi Azikiwe and Tafawa Balewa were entrusted with the leadership of the sovereign state of Nigeria. Both men served as Governor General and Prime Minister respectively. The political leadership of the first republic was preoccupied with the process of nation building and forming a government of national unity to bring together the numerous tribes and ethnic groups that made up the geopolitical entity called Nigeria. The political parties which were formed understandably along tribal and ethnic affiliations were busy jostling for supremacy and prominence. As Ige (1995) and Enefe (2008) explained, the politics of the first republic in Nigeria was characterized by regionalism, tribalism, and opportunism. It was a fragile experiment at instituting democracy in a country of enormous diversity and ethnic mistrust.

The political history of Nigeria is essentially a confounding tale of how the British colonial power amalgamated the predominantly Muslim Northern population and the predominantly Christian Southern population into one country (Ojo, 2012). The leaders of the first republic inherited from the British colonial administration a country with little or no infrastructure in place. Only a few railway and highway network were in existence. Water and electricity were not available to the vast majority of the Nigerian population that was predominantly illiterate. The young republic was saddled with

several problems that threatened its existence. The 50<sup>th</sup> Nigerian Independence Compendium compiled by the Federal Republic of Nigeria (2010) identified the numerous issues that contributed to the demise of the first republic as:

- Mutual suspicion and lack of trust between the tribal-oriented political parties which permeated the sociopolitical fabrics of the Nigerian public.
- Episodes of widespread corruption and election violence all over the nation.
- Religious and ethnic rivalry.
- Educational and economic disparities between the North and the South.
- British post-colonial interest and agenda.

Faced with such daunting challenges, the political leadership of the first republic collapsed in 1966 when the military took over power. Ojo (2012) stated that the political crisis of 1966 led to a regime change with the military intervening in the governance of the country, arguing however, that the intervention failed to put the political crisis to an end. This was the beginning of the era of military dictatorship in Nigeria. The governance of Nigeria was in the hands of the military until the establishment in 1979 of another phase of civilian government known as the second republic.

Alhaji Shehu Shagari became the president of the federal republic of Nigeria under the banner of the National Party of Nigeria (NPN) on October 1, 1979 after an election that was marred by controversies. For a brief moment, the political leadership of the second republic was shared between two political parties, the NPN and the Nigerian People's Party (NPP) in a fragile coalition that collapsed almost as soon as it was formed. It is pertinent to point out that while the first republic was a parliamentary system of

government replicating the colonial British style of leadership and governance, the second republic was a presidential system of government fashioned after the United States democratic system. There was a huge expectation among Nigerians that the presidential system of government would eliminate the problems of tribalism, ethnicity, regional allegiance, and religious intolerance that characterized the first republic. What Nigerians wanted so much from the second republic was a leadership committed to national unity and good governance (Enefe, 2008).

The economic climate of the second republic was that of abundance and wealth derived from petroleum. According to the Federal Government of Nigeria (2010) report, Nigeria became the wealthiest country in Africa during the 1970s with a rapid expansion of petroleum exports which led to economic growth and prosperity. The leadership of the second republic was able to embark on a number of projects because of the revenue derived from this era of oil boom. The construction of infrastructures in the new capital territory, Abuja took center stage. New universities and tertiary institutions were established. In the area of agriculture, the political leadership initiated a colossal project termed the “Green Revolution”. Politicians and a few highly placed Nigerians amassed wealth through political party loyalty. The general public did not experience the benefits of good governance from the leadership. Political conflicts and protests from the other political parties consumed the nation after the results of the general elections that would have reelected Alhaji Shehu Shagari were widely rejected. Corruption that was the bane of the first republic reemerged. It was obvious that all the signs were in place for the demise of the second republic. The Federal Government of Nigeria (2010) report summarized the reasons why the second republic collapsed as:

- The Nigerian economy went into recession after oil prices dropped in 1981 which resulted in diminished economic prosperity.
- High inflation and rising unemployment which led to an increase in urban crime rates.
- Poor governance by the political leadership that served the interests of a few to the detriment of the majority.
- Corruption among government officials.
- Massive vote rigging in favor of the political party in power.
- Civil unrest, riots and protests from a public that was dissatisfied and disgruntled.

The second republic had become as corrupt and chaotic as the first republic. The public dissatisfaction with the political leadership was overwhelming. The nation was drifting dangerously into anarchy. The military had no choice than to come to the rescue and take over the political leadership of Nigeria for the second time. On December 31, 1983, Muhammadu Buhari emerged as the leader of another military dictatorship in Nigeria, ending the second republic that lasted only four years.

Ten years of military dictatorship passed in the history of the governance of Nigeria before another civilian political leadership emerged. It was short-lived and lasted just one year with Chief Ernest Shonekan presiding over the affairs of the third republic of Nigeria in a make-shift and hurriedly executed handover of power. In 1999, after a prolonged era of military dictatorship, the fourth republic was established with retired General Olusegun Obasanjo assuming the mantle of political leadership under the banner



of the PDP. He was at the head of the political leadership of Nigeria between 1976 and 1979 under military dictatorship. This was his second political leadership role. It is important to stress that Olusegun Obasanjo was the only person to exercise the power of governance for a second time in the history of Nigeria politics as a military leader and a civilian leader.

The period between 1999 and 2010 in the political history of Nigeria has been termed the fourth republic. It is possible to identify several attempts at providing positive governance by the administration. The Federal Government of Nigeria (2010) report stated that under the Obasanjo administration, Nigeria's international image and reputation which had been tarnished by the long military dictatorships, was improved. The leadership was committed to positioning Nigeria as a leader in the promotion of democracy and economic growth not only in Nigeria, but throughout Africa (Enefe, 2008). The West African subcontinent as well as South Africa witnessed enhanced economic relationship with Nigeria as a deliberate policy of the Obasanjo administration. Perhaps, the most prominent legacy of the 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 relative peace and tranquility under the Obasanjo administration. His ability to prevent another military dictatorship in Nigeria has been acclaimed as a huge accomplishment. The economic policies of his administration were remarkable and included: the telecommunication sector reform which resulted in the introduction of

wireless telephone system in Nigeria; and the poverty alleviation program aimed at eradicating poverty and improving the quality of life of the rural people (FGN, 2010).

Enefe (2008) highlighted the achievements of the Obasanjo administration as follows:

- Formulation and implementation of the national economic empowerment and development strategy (NEEDS) localized as state economic empowerment and development strategy (SEEDS) for the states and local economic and development strategy (LEEDS) for the local governments.
- The implementation of the millennium development goals (MDGs) which in essence is a United Nations stimulated development program which fundamentally targets poverty alleviation and basic needs of citizens.
- Implementation of the monetization policy geared towards improving the living conditions of the Nigerian civil servants.
- Implementation of the privatization and commercialization policy aimed at economic empowerment of Nigeria's public enterprises with the aim to make them more efficient.
- Implementation of the due process policy (DPP) intended to make government and private sector businesses abide by established rules and procedures.
- Implementation of the universal basic education (UBE) policy aimed at giving all Nigerian children free and compulsory education at primary and secondary education levels.
- Establishment of the independent corrupt practices commission (ICPC) and the economic and financial crime commission (EFCC).

- Implementation of the recapitalization policy aimed at strengthening banks and other financial institutions.
- Implementation of a robust foreign policy aimed at diplomatic image repackaging for Nigeria and disengaging the country from excessive and unbeneficial Afro-centric policy.
- Successful recovery of stolen money from corrupt public officers.
- Providing leadership role in the restoration of peace and democracy in the two West African countries of Sierra-Leone and Liberia.
- Established a pension reform scheme which led to the emergence of credible public and private pension scheme.
- Secured \$18 billion debt cancellation for Nigeria.

The long list of accomplishments by the Obasanjo's civilian government attests to credible elements of good governance in civilian political leadership in Nigeria. It is pertinent to observe that Obasanjo was the only leader in the history of Nigerian politics to hand over power peacefully to an elected civilian administration in 2007. 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 Nigeria in the fourth republic under the banner of the PDP. He was in power between 2007 and 2010. Notably, his tenure marked the end of the political history of the scope of this study.

The Yar'Adua administration was, to all intents and purposes, an extension of the Obasanjo administration. The policies and programs of this administration were directed

at target areas of governance. Enefe (2008) discussed the seven-point agenda of the Yar'Adua government as follows:

- Infrastructure development policy which proposed a radical and massive rural and urban transformation through the resuscitation of the ailing infrastructure; construction of new roads, rail roads, sea and airport facilities; upgrading and expansion of existing infrastructures; and the provision of such basic social amenities as water and electricity.
- Reforming the energy sector of the Nigerian economy to increase electricity production to the projected 10,000 megawatts output, and enhancing oil and gas production.
- Confront and address the social unrest and militancy in the oil producing Niger Delta region of the country through the provision of infrastructures and amenities, poverty reduction, and wealth redistribution.
- Transformation of the public health sector by building more health facilities across the country to fight epidemic and pandemic diseases, and reduce maternal and infant mortality.
- Revolutionize the educational system by transforming the tertiary institutions, and make education affordable.
- Pursue a zero tolerance for corruption, probity, accountability and transparency.
- Reduce unemployment through the creation of jobs in the public and private sectors.

Commendable as these government objectives were, the Yar'Adua political leadership lasted for only three years as the president died of natural illness in 2010.

### **Military Dictatorship Era**

This study explores the political leadership of Nigeria between 1960 and 2010. For 38 years of the 50 years study period, Nigeria was under military dictatorship. Following the attainment of independence in 1960, and the transition to a republic in 1963, the civilian political leadership of Nigeria was faced with several problems such as tribalism, religious intolerance, mutual suspicion between the Northern and Southern population, and lack of national unity. In January 1966, a group of military officers ended the first republic in a bloody coup. Aguiyi-Ironsi became the leader of the first military government of Nigeria. Seven months after the first coup, another military coup was executed that brought Yakubu Gowon to power. Ojo (2012) pointed out that the ethnic coloration of the masterminds and victims of the first military coup in 1966 led to further unrests culminating in a counter coup. The emergence of military dictatorship in Nigerian governance was the result of tribal and regional antagonism that plagued the first republic. This period witnessed chains of tragic events in the political history of Nigeria that culminated in the Nigerian civil war that lasted between 1967 and 1970. Many Nigerians lost their lives, and the Eastern region of Nigeria seceded and formed the Republic of Biafra under the leadership of Chukwuemeka Ojukwu, leading to a civil war that ensured that Nigeria remained one country.

In 1975, Nigeria witnessed another military coup, and Murtala Muhammed took over the political leadership of Nigeria. Yakubu Gowon was deposed. The Murtala Muhammed administration did not last up to one year. He was killed in yet another

military coup and Olusegun Obasanjo became the head of the next military dictatorship. His administration lasted four years, and he was able to hand over power to the civilian administration of Shehu Shagari in 1979. Some of the notable programs the military governments implemented for the governance of the nation included the establishment of the universal primary education (UPE) aimed at providing free basic education to Nigerian children, and the aggressive agricultural program termed, operation feed the nation (OFN). The civilian administration of Shehu Shagari was terminated in 1983 by yet another military coup that brought Muhammadu Buhari to power. Two years later, Nigeria witnessed another military coup. Ibrahim Babangida became the head of the next military dictatorship in Nigeria. Babangida remained at the head of the political leadership of Nigeria from 1985 to 1993.

The period of Babangida administration had a profound effect on the governance of Nigeria. Emordi (2012) described it as the era of extreme military despotism, while Enefe (2008) identified it as a period of ambivalence and political deceit. Notably, the leadership indicated it was committed to returning Nigeria to civilian political administration, and the Political Bureau (PB) was set up to fashion out a viable political future for the nation. A wide range of policies and programs were instituted by the Babangida administration. Enefe (2008) outlined the policies and programs as follows:

- Initiating the structural adjustment program (SAP) as an alternative economic development strategy for Nigeria as against the International Monetary Fund (IMF) loan option.
- The establishment of the Directorate for Social Mobilization to help inculcate the spirit of patriotism and unity among Nigerians.

- Establishment of the National Electoral Commission (NEC) entrusted with the responsibility of returning Nigeria to a democratic civilian administration.
- Establishment of the directorate of foods, roads and rural infrastructure (DFRRI).
- Implementation of a privatization and commercialization policy.

Emordi (2012) reported that there were several coup attempts aimed at toppling the Babangida administration. An attempt by the Babangida administration to exclude some segment of the Nigerian society from participating in the electoral process drew public outrage. When the leadership annulled the results of the 1993 presidential election, Nigeria was at the brink of another civil crisis. Babangida was forced to relinquish power to a make-shift civilian administration headed by Ernest Shonekan. Corruption, coupled with the unresolved election results, threw the nation into chaos and instability. Sani Abacha took over power in another coup that ushered in yet another military dictatorship in the political history of Nigeria.

Sani Abacha assumed the political leadership of Nigeria in 1993 which lasted till 1998. He was known for his brutality and the imprisonment of prominent Nigerians who disagreed with him including Olusegun Obasanjo, Shehu Musa Yar'Adua, Moshood Abiola, and Ken Saro-Wiwa. Emordi (2012) opined that Abacha unleashed an era of terror unprecedented in the political history of Nigeria. Bombs were exploding, opponents were murdered, and challengers were harassed and intimidated. Despite the atrocities, the Abacha administration can be attributed to some achievements as Enefe (2008) highlighted:

- Initiation of the Petroleum Trust Fund (PTF) aimed at funding such infrastructure development projects as urban and rural roads, transport schemes, educational and health institutions' infrastructure projects, and environmental remediation schemes.
- Implementation of the federal character and quota system in government policies and programs.
- Establishing foreign exchange stability.
- Creation of more states and local government entities.
- Introduction of Vision 2010 program aimed at comprehensive economic and industrial development of Nigeria.
- Taking up leadership position in the peace-keeping efforts in the West African sub-continent nations of Liberia and Sierra-Leone.

The international community led by Britain and the United States isolated the Abacha administration because of its flagrant human rights abuse and lack of respect for the rule of law. Corruption was witnessed at an unprecedented level in the Nigerian political history during the Abacha's administration. The nation heaved a sigh of relief when Abacha died in July 1998, and Abdulsalam Abubakar took over the political leadership of Nigeria in what can be described as the last military dictatorship that lasted one year. Under his administration, corruption continued to haunt the process of governance in Nigeria until power was transferred to the leadership of the fourth republic's democratically elected government of Olusegun Obasanjo in 1999.



## **Reforms in Nigeria**

Different political leaderships have initiated various reforms in Nigeria between 1960 and 2010. Olaopa (2010) examined the Nigerian civil service reform and the requirements for successful reforms. The National Planning Commission (2004) and the Oxford Business Group (2011) articulated a variety of reform programs in Nigeria ranging from the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), to the business and electoral reform policies. The Federal Government of Nigeria (2012) traced the Niger Delta development reform plan as well as the road map for power sector reform, and also the road sector reform program in Nigeria as major reforms embarked upon by the government. Okonjo-Iweala and Osafo-Kwaako (2007) analyzed the progress and challenges of the Nigerian reform programs. These reforms can be categorized into economic, administrative, and sociopolitical.

### **Economic Reforms**

The Nigerian economy was heavily based on agricultural production during the first republic to satisfy domestic consumption needs primarily, although some of the produce was exported. It was during the military administration of Yakubu Gowon that the economic status of Nigeria took a boost with oil production and revenue generated from exporting petroleum products. The third national development plan (1975–1980) and the fourth national development plan (1981–1985) published by Nigeria Federal Ministry of Economic Planning (1986) demonstrated a period of progressive economic prosperity which brought about significant economic reforms. The privatization policy of the Federal Government of Nigeria was a significant economic reform that helped to redirect the public sector governance. Okonjo-Iweala and Osafo-Kwaako (2007) stated that

between 1999 and 2006, about 116 enterprises were privatized in Nigeria including various loss-making government-owned enterprises operating in industries such as aluminum, telecommunications, petrochemical, insurance, and hospitality industry. A major component of the privatization program was the unbundling of the Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) into 18 companies responsible for power generation, transmission, and distribution.

Reform in the energy sector of the Nigerian economy has been gradual and steady. At independence in 1960, Nigeria's main energy supply came from coal and the National Electric Power Authority (NEPA). Neither the supply of coal nor the electricity output was adequate which made energy reforms imperative. Between the first republic and the year 2010, significant energy reforms had been put in place especially with the discovery of oil and liquefied natural gas (LNG) in abundance in Nigeria. Schiere (2012) identified and discussed the following energy reform phases in Nigeria:

- Government encouragement of the private sectors to invest in the electricity industry thereby breaking the monopoly of NEPA and generating competition.
- Establishment of the Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission to supervise and regulate energy policy of the government.
- Privatization of the energy industry to encourage competitiveness.
- Creating consumer awareness on the efficient use of energy.
- Initiating deregulation program.

A major economic reform program in Nigeria was initiated during the Olusegun Obasanjo's administration. In 2000, the government launched a Poverty Alleviation

Program (PAP) which was an emergency measure aimed at poverty reduction, creation of employment, constructing rural infrastructure to stimulate growth, and provide amenities such as water and electricity (Obadan, 2003). The poverty alleviation program developed into a more elaborate economic reform package called the national economic empowerment and development strategy (NEEDS). According to the National Planning Commission (2007), “the Nigerian economy was in distress, characterized by policy instability, rising poverty level, poor governance, high rate of inflation, unemployment, huge budget deficit, corruption, and near collapse of the social and economic infrastructure by the year 1999” (p. 2). It was against this background that NEEDS as an economic reform program was introduced. The goal was primarily on poverty reduction, focusing on employment generation, wealth creation, and value reorientation. The underlining strategy was to promote the private sector as the engine for growth. For this economic reform program to succeed, the National Planning Commission (2007) identified the following critical factors:

- Justice and good governance must prevail in addition to promoting constitutional democracy, fighting corruption and upholding the rule of law.
- Ensuring security of life and property in order to attract domestic and foreign investments to boost economic growth.
- Pursuing an aggressive policy on developing physical and human infrastructural facilities as well as maintaining and rehabilitating existing infrastructure.

- Developing a professional and result-oriented public service that can transform the socioeconomic framework of the nation.
- Strengthening the bonds of collaboration among the different tiers of the federal system of government to promote good governance.

Marcellus (2009) posited that the NEEDS policy was not different from previous development plans of the government, despite the claim to the contrary, and argued that poor prioritization of policies and programs, and lack of commitment of the leadership robbed the country from achieving the objectives of the policy.

Another economic reform program during the period under review was the banking sector reform. Okonjo-Iweala and Osafo-Kwaako (2007) opined that prior to this reform; the Nigerian banking sector was weak and fragmented due to its poorly managed liberalization during the structural adjustment program of the 1980s. To strengthen the financial sector and improve availability of domestic credit to the private sector, a bank consolidation exercise was launched in 2004 which required “deposit banks to raise minimum capital base from \$15 million to \$192 million by the end of 2005” (p. 15). Banks merged as a result of this reform bringing about financial solvency and economic stability. Reform of the insurance sector which consolidated the 103 insurance businesses in Nigeria in 2004 to about 30 with a capitalization of about \$1.6 billion brought significant economic prosperity. Ploch (2010) argued that financial sector reforms in Nigeria included the policy of budgeting based on a conservative oil price benchmark which resulted in the creation of an Excess Crude Account in 2003 that generated funds for infrastructure and economic development in Nigeria. Ogujiuba and Obiechina (2011)

traced the evolutionary stages of financial reforms in Nigeria since independence and identified the following three phases:

- The foundation phase between 1950 to 1970, characterized by the establishment of financial institutions and the development of the necessary legal framework. During this phase, the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) was established.
- The expansion phase between 1970 and 1985 during which commercial banks established branches in the rural and semi-urban areas making lending to private sector more accessible.
- The consolidation and reform phase which started in 1986 and continued to 2010 under the different political leaderships of Nigeria. Prominent reforms of this phase included the initiation of the Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) which started in 1986, and the establishment of the Nigeria Deposit Insurance Corporation (NDIC) under the Babangida's administration.

Although the structural adjustment program was aimed at economic growth and poverty reduction, Akinwale (2010) pointed out that the SAP led to increase in the gap between the rich and the poor and intensification of poverty in Nigeria.

The trade policy reform was another important economic measure aimed at establishing good governance. Following the SAP in 1988, a seven-year tariff schedule was adopted which significantly reduced tariff averages, leading to the introduction of policies on import prohibitions which banned selected products that were viewed as strategic for the growth of the economy in order to protect the infant industries (Okonjo-Iweala & Osafo-Kwaako, 2007). By liberalizing its import regime and adopting the

common external tariff (CET) of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Nigeria's trade policies became more transparent and predictable, thereby enhancing good governance. It is important to mention that Nigeria witnessed significant public sector reforms during the Obasanjo's administration.

Telecommunication reform constitutes a significant economic reform program in Nigeria. At independence, telecommunication was at its infancy in Nigeria with only a single telephone services company operating in the country. Different political administrations had taken measures aimed at improving telecommunication in Nigeria. As Olumide (2011) opined, the reform of telecommunication in Nigeria helped to open the market to local and foreign private investors thereby injecting competition and improvement into this sector. The Nigerian Communications Commission (NCC) reported that an estimated USD 37.5 billion was invested in the telecommunication sector between 2003-2007, resulting in increased ownership of telephone from 450,000 in 1999 to 38 million in 2007, rising to 85 million by 2010 (Okonjo-Iweala, 2012). According to Okonjo-Iweala, the biggest and most successful push happened in the telecommunications sector. Government reform in the telecommunications sector was primarily through deregulation which eliminated monopoly in the sector. The reform process included:

- Privatization which resulted in selling state-owned companies and establishing private operators.
- The introduction of the Mobile Telephonic System in Nigeria in 1992.
- Introduction of the National Telecommunication Policy in the year 2000.

Olumide (2011) summarized the benefits of the telecommunication reforms in Nigeria as:

- Telecommunication services are now readily available to many Nigerians including consumers in the rural communities.
- General improvement in the quality of telecommunication services provided by companies.
- Lower service cost brought about by competition.
- Enhanced teledensity in the country.

### **Administrative Reforms**

The Nigerian civil service (NCS) constitutes the administrative arm of the federal government of Nigeria. Political leaderships come and go, but the civil service remains and serves the government of the day. Essentially, the role of the civil service in public sector governance and infrastructure development cannot be overemphasized. Nwanolue and Iwuoha (2012) identified the NCS as a body of government employees entrusted with the administration of the country, and mandated to carry out the policies of the government of the day. In 1960 when Nigeria gained independence from Britain, it inherited a civil service that was fashioned after the colonial parliamentary system. Olaopa (2010) observed that the Nigerian civil service was strong and very professional between 1960 and 1975, before it began to decline due to politicization and bureaucratic corruption. Over the years, several commissions have made recommendations for reforming the civil service in Nigeria including the Margan Commission of 1963, the Adebo commission of 1971, and the Udorji Commission of 1972-1974 (Nwanolue &

Iwuoha, 2012). There was also an attempt to reform the civil service in 1985 by the Dotun Philips Panel, and the 1988 civil service reorganization decree promulgated under Babangida's administration. Notably, the Nigerian civil service has been undergoing gradual and systematic reforms and restructuring between 1960 and 2010 which has made some impact on governance in Nigeria.

After independence, the challenge that Nigeria faced was to begin the process of replacing expatriate colonial administrators with well-trained Nigerian civil servants. The Nigerianization of the civil service was a daunting task. Through aggressive staff development programs, qualified Nigerians took over and administered the civil service. As Adejumo (2012) observed, a quiet revolution in the Nigerian civil service began in the first republic with the aggressive move to replace expatriate colonial administrators. During the military administrations, the civil service became politicized, and corruption became the order of the day which engulfed the civil servants as transparency and accountability were undermined (Olaopa, 2010; Okotoni, 2001). Consequently, the methods, standards and values of the civil service dropped jeopardizing good governance. Over a period of time, the civil service witnessed some decline. Some of the factors responsible for this trend included: weak performance by ill-trained management staff; lack of proper manpower planning, forecasting, budgeting and control; and the removal of occupational classifications by the Udorji Commission in 1974. The 1988 reforms introduced by the Babangida's administration recognized the politicization of the civil service and initiated major changes. Administrators were appointed by the political leadership and promotions were no longer based on merits. Top civil servants became very powerful public officers with allegiance to politicians.



Nwanolue and Iwuoha (2012) articulated some of the measures taken by successive governments to reform the Nigerian civil service, including:

- Demilitarization which ensured that the system was guided by the constitutional provisions, the public service rules, and the financial regulations.
- Reintroduction of the pooling system which ensured that all officers were assigned appropriate tasks that enhanced professionalism, harmonized development, and led to efficient transfer of skills and talents within the service.
- Restoration of the office of the Head of Civil Service which aimed at providing solid leadership, maintaining political neutrality, and improving staff welfare.
- Centralization of training for all categories of staff which ensured efficient manpower development.
- Comprehensive restructuring of the civil service system which helped to streamline roles and responsibilities and define expectations.

Despite these reforms, Olaopa (2010), and Nwanolue and Iwuoha (2012) agreed that major problems existed in the Nigerian civil service. First, civil servants were poorly paid and this was identified as one of the reasons for poor performance, and a trigger for corruption which was endemic in the Nigerian civil service. Favoritism and politicization of the service constituted a major stumbling block. Finally, inadequate training especially in the area of technology has been implicated. Fajana et al. (2011) advocated openness

and objectivity of the recruitment and selection process, as well as strategic development of staff for optimal utilization as some of the steps required to improve the performance of the human resource managers and practitioners in Nigeria that constituted the civil service workforce. Notably, the civil service renewal program of the Obasanjo's regime had been adjudged the most comprehensive and far-reaching in its effect on good governance in Nigeria (Olaopa, 2010).

### **Socio-Political Reforms**

In 1960, Nigeria inherited a parliamentary political system of government from colonial Britain. The system was new and strange to the politicians who had little or no knowledge of the parliamentary system of government. Most of the political mistakes and problems of the first republic can be blamed on this factor (Emordi, 2012). During the long military era that followed, Nigerians embarked on a desperate search for a political system that could work better for the nation. A drastic political reform came into existence when Nigeria embraced and adopted the presidential system of government fashioned after the American democratic system. This was a significant political reform in Nigeria that ushered in the Shagari's presidential political leadership in a multi-party system of government (Ado-Kurawa, 2005). Therefore, the political process in Nigeria transitioned from the parliamentary system in the first republic, to a presidential system in the second republic. The series of military interventions in the political history of the nation clearly demonstrated that the problem with Nigeria had little or nothing to do with the political system operating in the country (Emordi, 2012; Achebe, 1988). It has more to do with endemic corruption, ineffective leadership, poor governance, and a host of

other social issues such as tribalism, religious intolerance, and lack of patriotism (Transparency International, 2010).

Under the political leadership of Yakubu Gowon, new states were created during the Nigerian civil war. In 1970 when the war ended, the geo-political map of Nigeria had changed from regional structure – Northern, Eastern, and Western regions, to a country of 12 states. State creation as a socio-political reform measure was based on the assumption that Nigerians would abandon regional and ethnic allegiance and embrace national unity and practice tolerance (Ado-Kurawa, 2005). Based on this philosophy, subsequent political leaderships of Nigeria, namely the Babangida, and Abacha administrations, created more states totaling 36 by the year 2010. State creation may have brought government activities closer to the people and generated rural development; it has also become the source of another type of social problem in Nigeria. People now focus more on misappropriating state resources recklessly and often unchallenged. With the creation of more states comes the pressure to create more local government authorities. Nigeria has 744 local governments by the year 2010 serving as the third level of government. This is a significant political reform in Nigeria.

The quest for political stability in Nigeria led to two attempts aimed at reforming the constitution. A new constitution for the third republic was drafted, debated, and approved in 1989 under Babangida's administration but was not implemented (FRN, 2010). In 1999, government set up a committee to review the constitution and recommend amendments that will encourage good governance. In 2003, the national assembly set up a committee to review the 1999 constitution. A national political reform conference was convened in 2005 by Obasanjo's administration charged with a

responsibility to produce far-reaching constitutional changes (FRN, 2005). The report of the national political reform conference touched on several issues including the political rights of minorities, creation of states and local governments, the role of traditional institutions, revenue allocation formula, and how to reform the electoral process (FRN, 2005; Okoye, 2012). The totality of the constitutional reform efforts by successive administrations in Nigeria resulted in the Electoral Act of 2006, and the nature and outcome of the 2007 elections (Okoye, 2012).

A very important aspect of the socio-political reform in Nigeria was the measures taken by the various political leaderships between 1960 and 2010 aimed at improving the electoral process. At the core of Nigeria's social and political unrest is the constant problem of election rigging and results that claimed to elect individuals who were never elected by the people, but rather appointed by the politicians into power. Songi (2008) and Ado-Kurawa (2005) agreed that the electoral process in Nigeria was anything but free and fair, and can best be imagined as a mockery of democracy. Elections in Nigeria have been characterized by violence, malpractices, and controversies (Songi, 2008; Ploch, 2010). As Songi (2008) pointed out, Nigerians do not have a voice and choice in the electoral process, and the pervasive culture of impunity and executive lawlessness in governance has nourished and intensified competitive rigging, and the independent national electoral commission (INEC) was biased and had vested interest in the results of elections in Nigeria. Although, the Electoral Act of 2006 made provisions for sanctions and punitive measures to be exerted on electoral offenders, no one has ever been successfully prosecuted and punished (Songi, 2008). Despite the electoral problems in Nigeria, the reform process has achieved some recognizable progress over the period

under review. This include the control on the specific term of office of political leaders, and the fact that for the first time in the Nigerian political history, a presidential election result was declared free and fair by international observers in 2003, and a smooth transfer of government from a civilian administration to another civilian administration occurred in 2007 without rancor and bitterness (Ploch, 2010).

### **Corruption in Nigeria**

Nigeria has been rated as one of the most corrupt nations in the world (Transparency International, 2001; 2010). The corruption perception index has been used as a global barometer for measuring corruption, as well as a yardstick for good governance (World Bank Group, 2002; Forum for New World Governance, 2011). On all of these indexes, the level of corruption in Nigeria has been adjudged to be disturbingly high. Dike (2008) grouped corruption in Nigeria into three categories:

- Political corruption which occurs at the highest level of the political spectrum and involves politicians and the political decision-makers engaged in distortion and manipulation of the process and institutions of governance.
- Bureaucratic corruption which occurs in public places among public officials and people encounter on daily basis.
- Electoral corruption which includes all electoral malpractices involving exchange of money in the process of rigging election.

Notably, the other forms of corrupt practices in Nigeria include bribery, fraudulent activities, embezzlement of public funds, and extortion. Ploch (2010) stated that due to decades of widespread corruption in Nigeria, the educational and social systems as well as key infrastructures such as industries and refineries have suffered

tremendous setback. The reality is that because of the magnitude of corruption in Nigeria, good governance has become practically impossible, which in the opinion of Mustapha (2010) borders on extensive misuse of public power for private gains, and an indicator of the extent to which the Nigerian political system had become dysfunctional. As Lawal and Tobi (2006) rightly observed, corruption has so permeated the Nigeria society that in the Transparency International Corruption Perception Index of 1995 – 1997, Nigeria was named the most corrupt nation in the world. Regrettably, gains of good governance and development continue to elude Nigeria because of bureaucratic corruption. The corruption notoriety status of Nigeria has not changed in recent indexes (Transparency International, 2013). It is therefore necessary to examine the reasons why corruption had been so endemic in Nigeria. To be able to accomplish this, corruption as a phenomenon in the Nigerian context needs to be properly conceptualized.

Corruption could broadly be defined as a perversion or a change from good to bad in violation of established rules, which has been made manifest in a total misuse of public power for private gains (Dike, 2008). Viewed as an anti-social behavior, corruption assumes the ugly images of embezzlement and misappropriation of public funds and resources, bribery, fraudulent practices, and extortion (Ado-Kurawa, 2005; Mustapha, 2010). In an elaborate contextual exploration of the concept of corruption, Osaghae (2008) and Mustapha (2010) made a binary distinction of two forms of corruption in Nigeria: the state-orchestrated corruption through the bureaucratic machinery; and corruption at the social fabric of the society. Mustapha, (2010) used the term “informal spoilization of the state” (p.170) to distinguish the state-centric corruption that involves the bureaucratic machinery of the state, and the culture of corruption that focuses on

more pervasive forms of societal impropriety. According to Lawal and Tobi (2006), in the final analysis, “corruption can best be visualized as a conscious attempt to divert public resources from the satisfaction of the general interest to that of a selfish personal interest” (p.643).

Some factors have been identified as the root causes of corruption especially in developing countries. Dike (2008) outlined them as:

- Inequality in wealth distribution.
- Political office as the primary means of gaining access to wealth.
- Conflict between changing moral codes.
- The weaknesses of social and governmental enforcement mechanisms.
- The absence of a strong sense of national community.

Corruption in Nigeria can be attributed to a number of factors, prominent among them are: greed, insatiable appetite for wealth, complete disregard for the rule of law, lack of altruism, the get-rich-quick syndrome, diminished moral values, winner-takes-all attitude, provocative display of affluence and ill-gotten wealth, lack of sanctions for perpetrators of bureaucratic corruption, high poverty rate, wide economic gap between the rich and the poor, a dysfunctional society, and lack of patriotism (Ado-Kuwara, 2005; Dike, 2008; Lawal & Tobi, 2006; Mustapha, 2010; Osaghae, 2008; & Ploch, 2010). In their contributions to the corruption in Nigeria discussion, Okonjo-Iweala and Osafo-Kwaako (2007) examined ways corruption and poor governance affected growth and public service delivery in Nigeria. They argued that in a corrupt environment such as was the case in Nigeria, resources for human capital development and investments in

infrastructure, health and education are diverted, hurting poor households. They recommended two economic reform strategies for tackling corruption as: embedding anti-corruption measures in a comprehensive reform program, and conducting diagnostic studies to identify specific areas in which corruption had a high negative impact on the public welfare. Surprised by the level of corruption in high places by people entrusted with political authority and public funds, Okonjo-Iweala (2012) argued that most accounts of corruption in Nigeria pale in comparison with the brazen corruption of General Sani Abacha, Nigeria's military ruler from 1993 to 1998. Dealing with corruption problems in Nigeria is critical to promoting good governance and infrastructure development in the nation.

Political instability in Nigeria for over half a century was caused by the monumental level of bureaucratic corruption among the different political leaderships. To a large extent, military coups in Nigeria were inevitable interventions to rescue Nigerians from corrupt civilian administrations, but sadly, the military regimes became engulfed in even worse corrupt practices. Notable among corrupt practices in Nigeria are the infamous "419" fraud scam that gave the nation an ugly international image; oil theft popularly known as "illegal bunkering"; and billions of dollars of public funds stolen by different political leaderships. The adverse effects of corruption on public sector governance and infrastructure development in Nigeria cannot be overemphasized. Ogbuagu, Ubi and Effiom (2014) pointed out that corruption was responsible for the state of infrastructure decay in Nigeria. Corruption reduces the ability of government to provide adequate goods and services to the public and this hampers good governance (Okonjo-Iweala, 2012). It equally affects economic growth and discourages investments.



Perhaps, the most destructive effect of corruption in Nigeria was that the resources that could have been utilized in the development of infrastructure in Nigeria for the general benefit of the public were misappropriated and diverted for personal gains by a few individuals.

### **Infrastructure Development in Nigeria**

The development of any nation depends largely on the availability of infrastructure. As Akinwale (2010) stated, there is acute shortage of infrastructure in Nigeria which constituted a great threat to human survival and national prosperity. Infrastructure can be defined as a system of resources that can be harnessed for the development of a society, and essentially includes telecommunication, energy, transportation, governance, and other public utilities (Frischmann, 2007). An elaborate definition of infrastructure was provided by Craven (2012) as a broad spectrum of facilities which derive from engineering activities for the use and convenience of people such as transport (road, rail, water and air), water supply and sewages, steel plants, electricity, petrochemical complexes, and facilities for information management. It is pertinent to remark that a narrower perspective of the concept of infrastructure will be examined in the study with emphasis on roads, rails, air and water transportation, telecommunication, electricity and governance.

Akinyosoye (2010) contended that infrastructure contributes immensely to the economic development of any nation by increasing productivity and providing amenities which enhances the quality of life. A solid and adequate infrastructure base will translate into an increased aggregate output and flourishing economy. Infrastructure is the bedrock of development of a society. Foster and Briceno-Garmendia (2010) traced the

development of infrastructure in Africa and concluded that there is an urgent need for transformation. Gwilliam (2011) discussed the challenges African countries, including Nigeria, face in providing and maintaining such infrastructure as roads, railways, and governance. Roads constitute a major infrastructure in any developing nation, and they dominate the transport sector. In Nigeria, highways and rural roads make up the essential network of transportation on which economic prosperity hinges. The railway system is relatively underdeveloped. Consequently, infrastructure development in Nigeria is critical to good governance (Akinwale, 2010).

At independence in 1960, Nigeria inherited traditional infrastructure from colonial Britain which consisted of tarred roads of minimal dimension, railways, ports, urban electricity, health centers, schools, basic communication networks, and a few other infrastructures (Akinwale, 2010). Over the years, and through the efforts of different political leadership and administrations, a significant development in the infrastructure of Nigeria has been achieved. Compared to other African nations such as South Africa, infrastructure in Nigeria remains inadequate (Adeyeri, 2013; Ahmed, 2011; Akinwale, 2010, & Gwilliam, 2011) despite the huge human and natural resources the country is endowed with. Ploch (2010) blamed this unfortunate trend on corruption in Nigeria. According to Akinwale, Nigeria is replete with several cases of inadequate infrastructure including irregular supply of electricity, shortage of piped water, fuel scarcity, unreliable healthcare services, unstable educational institutions, bad roads, malfunctioning ports, and erratic telecommunication services. Compared to other countries in Asia, a significant gap exists in the pace of infrastructure development (Akinyosoye, 2010;

World Bank Group, 2009). There is need for urgent measures to address the infrastructure deficiency in Nigeria (Adeyeri, 2013).

The advent of the public private partnership (PPP) initiative which represents a balance between state and private sector management and ownership of infrastructure, raised hope of significant improvement in infrastructure development, and better public sector governance in Nigeria (Ahmed, 2011). Under the PPP scheme, Nigeria could attain infrastructure sufficiency in the following sectors: schools, hospitals, transportation, and power (Akinyosoye, 2010). The road sector reform bill articulated several measures aimed at improving road infrastructure in Nigeria. The measures as outlined by the Federal Republic of Nigeria (2012) include:

- The establishment of the National Roads Board to oversee a wide range of issues relating to roads infrastructure in Nigeria.
- Introduction of five year rolling roads plan program that provides a guiding framework for developing road networks in Nigeria.
- Creation of the roads fund to ensure proper maintenance of roads in Nigeria.
- Provision for road sector regulation.
- Stipulation of the role of the National Transport Commission.
- Legal proceedings in relation to road related litigations.

Despite these measures, road management challenges exist in Nigeria ranging from administrative to technical and financial (Unuigbo, 2011). Even more challenging is the grossly inadequate development of the railway network in Nigeria (Gwilliam, 2012).

In the final analysis, the failure of successive governments in Nigeria to develop the infrastructure sector can be traced partly to the absence of good governance in the sector.

### **Leadership and Good Governance**

Political leadership is inextricably connected to good governance or lack of it, and good governance is a necessary precondition for the development of needed infrastructure in a country (Okonjo-Iweala, 2012). According to Oyelaran-Oyeyinka (2006), good governance can only exist in an environment that is transparent and accountable.

Looking at Nigeria's history, three different kinds of political leaderships have led the country during the study period between 1960 and 2010:- colonial administration, military administration, and democratic administration. The three different kinds of administrations have impacted on the quality of the Nigerian civil service and the efficiency of the bureaucracy that is saddled with the implementation of government's policies, programs, and projects. While the command and control structure of the Nigerian civil service in the three decades of military authoritarianism stunted the growth of the Nigerian civil service and incapacitated it from effectively delivering services in the area of infrastructure development, the different democratic administrations did not fare better due to the seeming lack of capacity by the highly undermined Nigerian civil service (Oyelaran-Oyeyinka, 2006).

Although Olaopa (2010) pointed out that the Nigerian civil service was strong and very professional between 1960 and 1975, however, the story was different between 1975 and 2010. According to Okonjo-Iweala (2012), reform of the Nigerian civil service was inevitable if development programs in the country were to be implemented satisfactorily.

Okonjo-Iweala (2012) pointed out that preserving the government's bureaucracy had become the main purpose of the budget, rather than investing in infrastructure and improved service delivery for the population. Moreover, the Nigerian civil service had become over bloated in size, poorly skilled, and poorly remunerated, leading to poor service delivery (Okonjo-Iweala). What happened to the once vibrant merit-based Nigerian civil service that was inherited from colonial Britain, and nurtured to an enviable position in Africa in the 1970s? According to Okonjo-Iweala, decades of military authoritarianism have severely undermined the Nigerian civil service. As Okonjo-Iweala posited, "public service recruitment exercises were often used as political tools to appease various constituencies. The result was a large and underskilled work force in which employees often did not possess the technical skills needed for the job. Hierarchy and seniority were often rewarded over merit and performance" (p. 52).

The Nigerian civil service was further undermined in 1979 with the introduction of the "Federal Character" principle, which sets a quota for the number of civil servants to be recruited from each of the 36 states of the Nigerian federation (FRN, 2005). This policy entrenched mediocrity and favoritism over and above meritocracy in the Nigerian civil service, and led to the erosion of hitherto held values in the Nigerian civil service. Leadership has a role to play in bringing about good governance (Okonjo-Iweala, 2012).

Madueke (2008) found that transformational leadership theory as an alternative can bring about positive change. Madueke's study was descriptive and no empirical processes were employed to collect and analyze data. Olaseni and Alade (2012) examined vision 20:2020 and the challenges of infrastructural development in Nigeria, and concluded that the realization of the vision is hinged on infrastructure development in

the country. The study failed to establish a relationship between leadership, good governance and infrastructure development. These gaps in the literature are what this empirical study seeks to close.

### **Summary**

In this chapter, attempts were made to define leadership and distinguish between leader and leadership. Concepts and theories of leadership from trait theory to situational theory; contingency theory to transactional theory; and transformational theory to leadership styles were examined alongside concepts and theories of governance. The political history of Nigeria, reforms in Nigeria, and history of infrastructural development in Nigeria, were examined.

### **Transitional Statement**

In chapter 2, the connection between leadership, good governance and infrastructure development was explored to provide a foundation for this qualitative case study. The next chapter presents the methodology that was employed in the study.

## Chapter 3: Research Method

### **Introduction**

In this chapter, the overview of the research design that was employed in this qualitative case study is explored in relation to the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria by the different regimes from 1960-2010. In this section, I described the research design, population, sampling, data collection, researcher's role, and data analysis. An explorative case study design was used for the study based on the theoretical framework of leadership and governance theories as adapted to suit the Nigerian circumstances. This was appropriate for this research, as a case study research is a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (Creswell, 2007), with data converging in a triangulating manner (Yin, 2009). Qualitative researchers use triangulation to minimize the threat of validity. I used triangulation in this study to ensure validity of data.

### **Research Design**

The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria, and use the result of the study to proffer solutions geared towards addressing the infrastructure gap in the country through the provision of world-class infrastructure in Nigeria. The main research question of this study focused on how leadership has affected infrastructure development in Nigeria.

Secondary data from multiple sources were analyzed on leadership and infrastructure development governance issues in Nigeria from 1960-2010. Personal

interviews of 13 participants selected through purposeful sampling, including some past presidents and past top bureaucrats and infrastructure development experts who served or participated in infrastructure development in Nigeria during the study period (1960-2010) were conducted to gain a better understanding of the policies and programs of the different political eras that shaped the development of infrastructure in Nigeria, as well as the challenges faced during the period. Data triangulation was employed in sifting the data covering the study period of 50 years.

Researchers must select appropriate research designs in a qualitative study. According to Yin (2009), “in the most elementary sense, the design is the logical sequence that connects the empirical data to a study’s initial research questions and, ultimately, to its conclusions” (p. 26).

### **Qualitative Case Study**

A qualitative case study approach was used in this study as the method provides insights into events through interpretive meanings to participants’ lived experiences. According to Creswell (2009), a qualitative research is a form of interpretive inquiry in which researchers make an sense of what they see, hear and understand. The goal is to strive to build a complex, holistic picture of the problem or issue under study. Trochim and Donnelly (2008) argued that qualitative research generates detailed information to tell stories behind phenomena. Qualitative research should enable a researcher to describe the research phenomenon in the language of the participants.

I relied on existing secondary data and personal interviews to gain a detailed insight into the research’s phenomena. O’Sullivan and Rassel (1999) suggested the use of a case study research strategy if one wants to learn the details of how something



happened and why it may have happened. Merriam (2001) pointed out that a qualitative research is an umbrella covering several forms of inquiry that help researchers to understand and explain the meaning of a social phenomenon with as little description of the natural setting as possible. Qualitative tradition provides the researcher and participants the opportunity to clarify and confirm information presented during in-depth interviews. According to Yin (2009), a qualitative case study represents an inquiry process that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in an depth manner that helps to provide clarity. Qualitative case study approach is suitable in collecting open-ended data from participants in a collaborative manner that makes data interpretation meaningful.

A case study design should meet four critical conditions to maximize its quality. These are (a) construct validity, (b) internal validity, (c) external validity, and (d) reliability (Yin, 2009).

### **Data Collection**

Qualitative data collection techniques were employed in the study. Archival data were drawn from multiple sources, such as secondary existing data such as government gazettes, official reports, nongovernmental documents, annual reports by multilateral development agencies, public records, project reports, and peer-reviewed journal articles on leadership and infrastructure development in Nigeria.

Data were also collected from personal interviews with 13 subject matter experts, made up of three former Heads of States of Nigeria, four Heads of Service and Directors, four Former Cabinet Ministers and two Private Sector Infrastructure Experts selected through purposeful sampling, to gain a better understanding of the policies and programs of the different political eras that shaped the development of infrastructure in Nigeria.

The personal interviews were recorded by means of a tape recorder. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2005), participants at the personal interviews will espouse the issues and counter issues of past and present events, with the hope of finding a common thread that binds them together. The use of the one-to-one interviews with participants, who lived the various experiences that shaped infrastructure development in Nigeria during the study period, further enriched the study. An interview guide was used to ensure that relevant themes were explored during the interview sessions. According to Patton (1990), the interview guide helps to ensure that the interviewer focuses on relevant issues in the research issue being explored. Follow-up questions that elicit more information from the participants were employed to get additional information during interview sessions. Creswell (2007) viewed interviewing as a series of steps that include: identifying interviewees based on purposive sampling, determining what type of interview will provide the most useful information to answer research questions, and adopting appropriate recording procedures during interview sessions.

The use of multiple data collection techniques in this study enabled a better understanding of the research phenomena, provided a more detailed understanding of the case study, and allowed me to address a broader range of historical, attitudinal, and behavioral issues. As Yin (2003) pointed out, a major strength of qualitative case study data collection is the opportunity to use different sources of evidence.

### **Researcher's Role**

My role in this study was to draw inferences for the study based on objective analysis of the data collected from multiple sources such as archival materials, existing secondary data and the in-depth personal interviews. Data triangulation was employed in

analyzing and comparing data from multiple sources to establish a chain of evidence. This helped to ensure construct validity (Yin, 2009).

During the face-to-face personal interviews, I ensured that probing questions that provide clarity to the research questions were asked to enable participants provide detailed information that added value to the outcome of the study. I avoided bias in structuring questions during the interview sessions, as not to elicit predetermined responses from participants. As Babbie (2010) pointed out, the meaning of someone's response to a question depends in large part on its wording.

### **Reliability and Validity**

Reliability entails the ability to arrive at the same findings and conclusions in a research when repeated by a different researcher under the same conditions (Yin, 2009). Reliability extends to all aspects of a research whether it is the data collection or the analysis of the data collected. In this study I ensured that the procedures adopted were documented. I employed the case study protocol in the documentation and development of the study's database. Yin suggested that the way to approach the reliability problem is to engage in as many steps as operational possible, and to conduct research in a professional manner.

Validity refers to the level of harmony between an operational definition and the concept the research purports to measure (Singleton & Straits, 2005). Data from different sources of existing data were reviewed and coded as to enhance triangulation and ensure validity. Participants' validation of the interview transcripts were obtained to ensure that the data used in the study are valid. Pattern matching and explanation building were employed in the analysis of the data, while providing rival explanations. Logic models

were used to draw inferences in the study. Creswell (2009) pointed out that qualitative validity entails the researcher checking “for the accuracy of the findings by employing certain procedures” (p. 190). According to Yin (2003), a major strength of qualitative case-study is the opportunity to use many different sources of evidence. He pointed out that researchers should improve validity by employing strategies such as triangulation, peer debriefing and support, and prolonged involvement.

### **Methodological Issues in Using Existing Data**

A major problem in the use of secondary data is the sourcing of available data that are sufficiently pointed to the research questions. Trochim and Donnelly (2008) advised that such existing data should be subjected to content analysis, employing the process of unitizing and coding of existing documents into different themes to obtain the most reoccurring themes in relation to contexts and how they can be related. The constant comparative method (Yin, 2003) was used for this purpose in the study.

Data quality is another methodological issue in the use of existing data. I relied on my personal knowledge of the history of infrastructure development in Nigeria to ensure that only quality secondary data were used in the study. Singleton and Straits (2005) pointed out that in using historical data the researcher should ensure the authenticity of the historical documents, through the researcher’s knowledge of the historical period from which the data originate.

### **Confidentiality**

According to Babbie (2010), confidentiality in research refers to the researcher collecting a given participant’s responses in a private environment, and making sure the information obtained is kept secret. One of the ethical issues in this study was to ensure

the confidentiality of the personal interviews. The research participants were duly informed about the interview procedures and the use of information provided in the study. Information provided during the interview sessions will be treated confidentially when sharing the research findings with governments or any interested party. Adequate provision was made to protect the participants' identities and the propriety of information they provided in the study. McNabb (2008) explained that the fundamental moral standards involved in research are those that focus on right and wrong.

Babbie (2010) stated that anyone involved in a social research needs to be aware of the general agreements shared by researchers about what is proper and improper. He identified five important ethical agreements a researcher must uphold when conducting social research as: voluntary participation by participants, not harming the participants, maintaining anonymity and confidentiality, identifying the researcher and ensuring adherence to the code of professional ethics in the analysis of data and reporting of the research's results. These ethical agreements were adhered to in this study.

### **Data Analysis**

Research analysis is the logical sequential step following data collection. The constant comparative method (Merriam, 2009) was used to analyze existing data from public records covering the study period of 50 years, as well to analyze the primary data collected from the personal interviews of past presidents, former top bureaucrats and infrastructure development experts to gain a better understanding of the policies and programs of the different era that shaped public governance of the infrastructure sector. Creswell (1998) suggested that multiple sources of data should be analyzed to determine evidence for each step in the evaluation of the case.

The data collected in this study were pointed to the study's research questions. According to Yin (2003), research data should be linked to the research questions of the study. Pattern matching was employed in this study and constant comparative method was used to analyze data in order to link data analysis to the research findings and establish themes. Yin (2003) argued that pattern matching is one approach of linking data to proposition in a case study. Data collected for this study were coded and reviewed to discern emerging themes related to each of the research questions.

### **Summary**

In this chapter, I explained the research design employed for the study which is a qualitative case study methodology used to explore the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria from 1960 to 2010. I presented a justification for the research methodology employed for the study, from the research design through the data collection process from existing secondary data and personal interviews, to data analysis.

### **Transition Statement**

I have described the procedures in handling participants in the personal interviews, as required by research ethics. The next chapter presents the findings of the analysis of existing secondary data collected from multiple sources from 1960 to 2010, as well as data from the personal interviews, in order to evaluate current conditions of leadership and governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria.

## Chapter 4: Results

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to evaluate the impact of leadership on public sector governance and infrastructure development in Nigeria. The reason for conducting this study was because poor leadership, and the endemic bureaucratic corruption that has eaten deep into the fabric of the of public sector governance since independence in 1960, have been blamed for the slow pace of development in key sectors of the Nigerian economy, especially in the infrastructure sector (Ogbeidi, 2012; Ploch, 2010). The goal was to gain a better understanding of the role played by different successive political leaderships in shaping the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. The conceptual framework was based on leadership and governance theories adapted to suit the Nigerian circumstance. The study involved the application of the transformational leadership theory and the theories of transformation and transition in governance as the most suitable conceptual framework.

In this section of the study, I present the findings from individual interviews of three of the former Heads of States of Nigeria, four Heads of Service and Directors, four Former Cabinet Ministers and two Private Sector Infrastructure Experts to gain a better understanding of the policies and programs of the different political eras that shaped the development of infrastructure in Nigeria and the challenges during the period of 1960 to 2010. The major research question was the following: What is the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria? All the participants answered the 12 open-ended questions designed for the interview sessions. The data were transcribed verbatim by me and imported into QRS Nvivo 10 version for coding going

through all the rigorous process of sorting, coding, and re-classification. There was further arrangement of the codes into categories through forming patterns and commonalities which helped for a better understanding of the topic under study.

### **Setting**

Following the approval of the study by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Walden University (See Appendix B), I sent letters to all the eligible participants to be interviewed asking for an appointment to interview them. All the participants were chosen based on the established criteria and their role at the time they served in government in the infrastructural development in Nigeria in the 50 years following the attainment of independence in 1960. The participants who showed interest and volunteered to be interviewed were interviewed by me.

The interviews were conducted face-to-face at the private office of the participants for security reasons due to the positions held by the individuals in the country, away from distraction and for confidentiality of the information. Prior to the interviews, participants were fully informed of the purpose of the study and were asked to sign a written consent (See Appendix C). The participants were not under any conditions that could influence their experience at the time of the interview that would affect the results. All of the participants surveyed were Africans of Nigerian origin. Table 1 presents the distribution of participants.



*Table 1**Distribution of Participants (N = 13)*

	# of Participants	% of Participants
Former Heads of State (A)	3	23.08
Retired Perm. Secretary, Heads of Service, and Directors (B)	4	30.77
Former Cabinet Ministers (C)	4	30.77
Private Sector Infrastructure Experts (D)	2	15.38

Thirteen participants were interviewed. The age range of the participants was 55 – 75 years, and their average level of education was above college degree. Some are retired while others are still in active employment. There were 12 male participants and one female participant in the study and they all reside in Nigeria. Participants are divided into 4 groups as indicated on Table 1. Former Heads of State constituted one group or 23.08% of participants. Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service and Directors constituted another group or 30.77%. Former Cabinet Ministers made up 30.77% of the participants, while 15.38% come from private sector experts.

### **Data Collection**

I conducted a total of 13 individual face-to-face interviews for the study comprising three former heads of state of Nigeria, four retired permanent secretary, heads of service, and directors, four former cabinet ministers and two private sector infrastructure experts, observing that the Walden IRB protocol to ensure the research ethical principles of respect for the person, beneficence, and justice were maintained. After reviewing the informed consent form, I asked the participants if they understood the process and if they had any questions before they signed the form. The participants understood that participation was voluntary and that they had the option to withdraw at

anytime if they felt uncomfortable with the interview. Consent was obtained when the individuals appended their signature on the consent form. There were no interviews until consent was obtained. All the participants were given a copy of the consent form.

The interviewees all answered the 12 open-ended research questions designed to answer the primary research question which was the following: What is the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria? I sent out the letters to the research participants between June 2 and June 6, 2014. I started conducting the interviews from June 15 to July 21, 2014 at the private office of the participants in Abuja, Abeokuta, Minna and Lagos in Nigeria. The interviews lasted between 90 and 140 minutes with an average time of 100 minutes. Some of the participants had more information to offer, thus taking more time than others. All the interviews were recorded with a digital voice recorder and notes were taken during the interviews. Identity of the participants was protected; audio tapes and transcripts are stored in locked up cabinets in my private office and my personal computer protected by passwords to maintain confidentiality. The participants were assigned numbers prior to the study to protect their identity. After the interview, I used member checking to validate the responses to make sure they understood the research topic and to ascertain that I understood them.

### **Data Analysis**

I started the data analysis by listening to, reading, and transcribing the audio recording of the interview data as well as organizing data and reading through and coding to formulate the themes. The transcribed data were imported into QRS Nvivo 10 software which helped to manage, shape, and analyze the qualitative data (Creswell, 2009). The data went through the rigorous process of sorting, coding, and re-

classification, which made it possible for constant comparison of individual responses of the participants from the research questions, and to identify the core themes and the similarities of the participant responses that emerged during the process of data collection that reflect the conceptual relationship. The descriptive statistics as presented in the tables in this chapter indicate the groupings that emerged from the study, such as the thematic categories, codes, ideas, subthemes, and the core themes in relation to the topic under investigation (See Appendix A).

### **Evidence of Trustworthiness**

Establishing trustworthiness is a major issue in qualitative research due to threats of external validity, such as bias on the part of the participants and the researcher. However, threats to validity can be minimized by engaging in strategies to describe the research findings in a genuine and authentic way that represents the meaning as described by the participants (Lietz, Langer, & Furman, 2006). To minimize the threats and to make the findings credible, I employed member checking by asking some of the participants to verify the data and confirm the accuracy of my interpretation. This provided an opportunity for the participants to provide information to the questions that were omitted at the interview. I accomplished triangulation with NVivo 10 by collecting data, merging it, and establishing themes from information provided by the participants. Although the findings of the study cannot be generalized due to the small sample size, the participants demonstrated a good knowledge of the topic under study and provided rich description of the events that took place during the period they were in office, which added to the credibility of the study. Furthermore, interview audio recordings were validated by a

qualitative research expert to authenticate responses from participants who spoke with heavy accent.

### **Presentation of Results**

In this section of the study, the findings of the individual interviews of three former Heads of State of Nigeria, four retired Permanent Secretary, Heads of Service, and Directors, four Former Cabinet Ministers and two Private Sector Infrastructure Experts are presented. I interviewed the participants individually to seek their opinion on and their role in shaping the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. Each individual responded to a set of interview questions aligned with the transformational leadership theories adapted to suit the Nigerian circumstance with intention to obtain information and gain a better understanding of their role with particular reference to the topic under study. The effects of the various leadership on public sector reforms over 50 years on the development of infrastructure were investigated to determine if there was any difference in leadership performance and how it affected the infrastructure development in Nigeria. This could help in making policies that would improve the development of infrastructure in Nigeria especially in areas that were found to be ineffective.

The results of the interviews were captured in 12 thematic categories while identifying the sub-themes that emerged. Descriptive narrative on what the participants said about the issues under investigation were presented using data tables to describe the invariant constituents which are the patterns in process and interaction in qualitative research to create meaning out of the data collected from participants (Holloway & Wheeler, 2013).

**Thematic Category 1: Effects of Previous Military Administrations' Policies on  
Infrastructural Development in Nigeria**

Research Question 1: How have the policies of the previous military administrations affected the development of infrastructure in Nigeria between 1960 and 2010?

The first research question was to determine how the different leaders perceived the effects of the policies of the previous military administration during the period in their response to the question during the interview. Tables 2 and 3 present responses of Groups A, B, C and D participants.

**Group A: Former Heads of State**

One participant mentioned the concept of rural infrastructure. A statement such as this reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

So we came out with the concept of rural infrastructure, including rural roads and every other thing so that we will help the rural farmer. So, most of our infrastructural development was informed development for the purposes of enhancing the capability of both the people and the country. I think leadership has a role to play in this.

Another participant mentioned the military upsetting the democratic civilian government.

A statement such as this reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

Not as if that was what one wanted; after the second coup in Nigeria, the military was again also involved, so you can see the military upsetting the democratic civilian government, and they (military) also intervened and upset the first

military government. (That was) when I came in and of course in the history of Nigeria, there was one coup after the other. My hope when I got involved was that we would not have any more coups in Nigeria. But unfortunately, that was not the case, and myself, I was affected by a coup.

Table 2

*Groups A and B Responses on Effects of Leadership Policies on Infrastructure Sector*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
The concept of rural infrastructure.	1	7.69
You can see the military upsetting the democratic civilian government.	1	7.69
Effective on power, roads, railways& transport.	1	7.69
Group B		
Power, transportation, ports, developments, railways and roads.	2	15.38
National Development Plans helped in ensuring whatever government wanted to do in terms of infrastructure development.	1	7.69
Because of policy somersaults, policy reversals, and continuity became a problem.	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on effect of leadership on policy formulation and implementation in infrastructure sector ( $N=13$ ) for all groups

One participant mentioned that the policies were effective especially in the areas of power, roads, railways, and transport. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The military administration did well especially in the areas of power, transport, railways and roads. By the way we had to develop a new railway system; we could not rely on the railway that was developed in 1903, which was supposed to carry only three million tons of goods. It was a narrow gauge with bends and curves. We took up railways seriously, and then went into the plan for a 25-year railway development. We extended the gauge, made it double tracks in some places, put up a new and modern communications system and the design that is around 150 km per hour. We then also said that apart from doing this, it would provide employment for people, directly and indirectly. Another thing we found was power. When we came in 1999 under democratic government, we found that between, 1979 and 1999, a space of 20 years, there was virtually no addition of generating units. In addition, for a country of Nigeria's size, that neglect was criminal. Then there was telecommunications; we were lucky that as we were coming in, the GSM was coming in, and we took the bold step of not asking government to handle GSM, so we succeeded in mastering that. In power, we did not get people from the private sector that will come into it initially because power was heavily subsidized. However, we worked out a plan on power and we started what we called the National Integrated Power Project (NIPP). We refurbished some existing ones, which would have taken us to about 10,000 MW of electricity generation. In addition, the reform was to separate privatized power

into three; generation, transmission and distribution. That we did not complete before 2007 when I left. However, the following government has taken it up; the generation we were doing, the following government held it up for two and a half years. It meant that as the following government holds it up, the infrastructure will cost you more, and the delay of two and a half years may even cost you more than that time overall.

**Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

One participant said the policies of the previous military administrations positively affected the development of infrastructure in Nigeria. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The policies of the previous military administrations, positively affected the development of infrastructure in Nigeria between 1960 and 1993 when I left the service. A lot of the policies were obtained first, through the five-year national development plans. This was the time where the administrations developed a five years National Development Plan, which listed the infrastructural development that the government and the people of Nigeria must enjoy during this plan period.

Two participants mentioned power, transportation, ports developments, railways and roads. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The major infrastructure developments then, you could look at power, transportation, ports developments, railways and roads. Under transportation too, you could add aviation, with all the airports. You are dealing really, I suppose with physical infrastructure and you are not going into education and all of that.



So once you deal with power, transportation, which includes both seas, rivers and so on, and communications. So what did we have in place? When the military struck, in terms of power, you know we were working very much with the World Bank, and we didn't have surplus funds.

One participant mentioned National Development Plans (NDP). Statements such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

There used to be National Development Plans, and they helped in ensuring that whatever government wanted to do in terms of infrastructure development, it was clearly laid out and with proper funding, it was possible to go ahead and develop the infrastructure. Somehow, if funds do not come out at the appropriate time, once we have identified them for particular projects, rolling over was no problem. Unlike what has now happened with civilian governments. That was one basic problem I saw, particularly after 1999; so I can say that one has been a veteran of most of the National Development Plans. I was also lucky to be a part of the Ministry of National Planning, which later became the National Planning Commission when it really performed key roles in the planning and economic management of the Nigerian development process.

One participant said that because of policy somersaults, or policy reversals, continuity became a problem. His statement reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Even before 1999, it isn't that government didn't have good policies, but there were a lot of policy reversals or policy somersaults, as you may say. In addition, because of policy somersaults, or policy reversals, continuity became a problem.

Therefore, a policy that we would have thought out well would end up being truncated, and therefore we stalled development. That is just one aspect, and I can go on and on.

Table 3

*Groups C and D Responses on Effects of Leadership Policies in Infrastructure Sector*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group C		
Telecommunications, road and power	2	15.38
Planning	1	7.69
Under General Gowon's administration we paid attention to roads and public buildings	1	7.69
Group D		
Major cities benefitted but not rural communities	1	7.69
The military administration did not recognize the importance of quality infrastructure, and the need to keep the cost of such infrastructure down in ways that would give value for money.	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on effect of leadership on policy formulation and implementation in infrastructure sector

**Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

The former cabinet ministers in this group shared their own views. Two participants identified telecommunication. One participant reflected the evidence to support the subtheme by stating:

In the 2000s, we began straightening all of that out, and that gave the basis for now looking in at infrastructure, such that you could now ask, what is wrong with the infrastructure of this economy? In addition, the first one was telecoms; we recognized that in telecoms, Nigeria was so far behind. Other countries were beginning to have mobile telecommunications, and we were still with these 450,000 landlines in a country of over 140 million people. That was when President Obasanjo after preparing the ground opened up and liberalized that sector, starting actually in 2001 and 2002. Once we opened up that sector, it had its initial transition problems, but it really took off, and today, we have one of the most rapidly growing telecommunication sectors in the world. Then work started on other aspects of infrastructure, and we were looking at road, but the worst was power. People kept saying we just need to invest and we will have 10,000 Megawatts, but that was not true. The power infrastructure had decayed so much. For two decades, 20 years, we did not really invest, and then trying to catch up in four years of governance. It is not possible; it will take another five to 10 years to be able to get back. (It is so because) many of the technologies were obsolete, but during the time between 2003 and 2006, we were able to move forward on how to improve the power sector situation by unbundling the sector.

Another participant reflected the evidence to support the subtheme by mentioning planning with a comment:

And we thought that money was what would solve the problem, forgetting that planning is very critical. Sometimes, you can have money, but if you do not have proper plans, and the capacity to implement the plans, especially infrastructure, you might end up just wasting the money. The technical capacity has to be there; it is not just enough to have the money, you need the technical capacity and the structured and well-articulated plans. I think the fact that we literally almost stopped planning, affected us.

One participant said one of the things that he did under General Gowon's administration was that he paid attention to roads and public buildings. His statement reflected the evidence to support the subtheme. One of the things that we did under General Gowon's administration was that we paid attention to roads and public buildings. I must say that we did not pay much attention to railways, except people going into what we developed at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. However, on roads, the policy was that we should have five North South roads, and three East West roads. The five North South roads started from a port or near a port, and then go up North. One is the Badagry-Kainji-Sokoto road. Another one is the old Lagos-Ibadan-Ilorin-Jebba-Kaduna road; the third one is what I will call the Warri-Sapele-Benin-Lokojaroad. In addition, the fourth one is Port Harcourt-Owerri-Enugu road, which also goes to Markurdi and so on; the fifth one was Calabar-Lafia-Maiduguri road. The idea was that these roads should be developed into minimum two lane dual carriage ways.

### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

One participant said the military administration did not recognize the important role and quality aspects and adequate design had in one, delivering quality infrastructure, and two, keeping the cost of such infrastructure in ways that would give value for money.

A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

So you had a situation where I feel that the military administration did not recognize the important role and quality aspects and adequate design had in one, delivering quality infrastructure, and two, keeping the cost of such infrastructure in ways that would give value for money.

One participant mentioned major cities in a statement that reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The military administrations concentrated on major cities only and left the small cities and the small projects all over the country. Rural infrastructure was not given attention.

### **Thematic Category 2: Major Category: Major Obstacles to Infrastructure Development in Nigeria**

Interview Question 2: What were the major obstacles to infrastructure development during the period under study?

In response to the research question, the participants described what they envisaged as the major obstacle to infrastructure development during the period under study. Table 3 presents the responses of participants on major obstacles to infrastructure development in Nigeria.

Table 4

*Responses of Participants on Major Obstacles to Infrastructure Development in Nigeria*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
The political situation	2	15.38
The Nigerian civil war	1	7.69
Group B		
The war was bound to cause a lot of destruction of certain infrastructural facilities or industrial facilities.	3	23.08
Political instability	1	7.69
Group C		
Lack of will by government	2	15.38
Effects of the war	2	15.38
Group D		
Institutional framework	1	7.69
Political and social upheaval	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on major obstacles to infrastructure development ( $N = 13$ )

**Group A: Former Heads of State**

Two participants mentioned the political situation. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The political situation certainly is the most serious because if you have a serious political situation (instability), which virtually forces you into an action whereby you may have to divert resources more towards the restoration of political stability. Then there is the question of limited resources to be able to do more than what we had done. However, we made sure that we were able to maintain virtually all the infrastructure in the country, whether you talk of transport, road, air and waterways. And then of course, there was the provision of certain health infrastructure.

**Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

Three participants blamed the Nigerian civil war as obstructing infrastructure development in Nigeria. One participant put it this way, which reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

However, the important thing that should also be taken note of is that the war was bound to cause a lot of destruction of certain infrastructural facilities or industrial facilities. So one made sure that as much as possible, we did whatever we could to protect industries, and other projects, so that we will not destroy anything, which will cost us so much again to build. I gave that instruction to the federal side, and I told them that as far as I was concerned, they should make sure they do not destroy any facilities because we may need those same facilities after the war.

**Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

Two participants in this group identified lack of political will by people in government as major obstacles to infrastructure development during the period under review with a comment such as, “There was a total lack of political will by those in

power.” Two other participants indicated, “The war in Nigeria was a major impediment to infrastructure development and the effect is still with us today.”

**Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

One participant mentioned institutional framework. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I mean, in terms of implementing government policy, once the policy is demonstrated, in my view, the single most important issue that rests with the implementation of government delivery of these policy issues is really an enabling institutional framework across the bulk of all the infrastructure sectors.

One participant blamed sociopolitical upheaval.

**Thematic Category 3: Major Obstacles to Implementation of Government Policies on Infrastructure Development**

Interview Question 3: What were the major obstacles to the implementation of government policies on infrastructure development in Nigeria during the period under study. Tables 5 and 6 present the responses of Groups A, B, C and D participants.

**Group A: Former Heads of State**

One participant said there was no problem. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I think there was no problem whatsoever. The people involved were committed and therefore what I considered was that all I needed to do is to support them because they believed in what we were trying to do and I believed that was the right thing to do. That has helped us a lot in getting there.



Table 5

*Groups A and B Responses on Major Obstacles to Infrastructure Policy Implementation*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
No problem	1	7.69
Money and manpower	2	15.38
Group B		
Finance	1	7.69
Political intervention	1	7.69
Funding	2	15.38

*Note.* Thematic Categories and Invariant Constituents on Major Obstacles to Implementation of Government Policies on Infrastructure Development ( $N = 13$ ) for All Groups

Two participants identified money and manpower. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

Well, money is one thing; it doesn't matter how good your policy is. Another thing is manpower; I had to develop and build up manpower capacity. In fact at one time, when I was Military Head of State, I embarked on something we call crash programs of training in which we sent about ten to twelve thousand people all over the world for three to four years technical courses. Some of them didn't come back.

**Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

One participant mentioned finance. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Finance was the major obstacle, and it still remains a major obstacle, in the sense that because of the diversity, of the ethnic groups in Nigeria, we had to have a situation where development is spread as much as possible throughout the country. In addition, sometimes, you make the plans, project funding for the plans, but at the end of the day, you have a situation in which the funds fall short of the plans. So, a project that should last for 36 months would creep to 48 months and even more.

Another participant reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme when he mentioned political intervention:

I had said political intervention, and I am sorry to say, it was basically more from National Assembly members. When you say federal road for example, for them, there is nothing like a federal road. They say they are the ones that determine what constitutes federal roads, which is not true. The minister is in charge, and he must come up with a proposal to adopt a federal road. If the minister does not because he already has enough problems on the existing roads, they cannot now be forcing it. However, for them it does not matter. It was a major problem.

Two participants indicated funding, which reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

There is the normal problem of funding; in the past, the minister will propose that this is what he needs, but now, there is this issue of envelope; another was also funding, because most of the funds required for these development plans relied on oil, and any time there was an oil shock, it meant that all the expectations under the plan became unachievable. As

such, transport projects suffered, just like projects in other areas, so funding and volatility of events in the country also made it very difficult.

Table 6

*Groups C and D Responses on Major Obstacles to Infrastructure Policy Implementation*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
<b>Group C</b>		
Executive capacity	1	7.69
The lack of resources & the lack of a coordinated approach to implementing priorities	1	7.69
The lack of proper policies and money to invest; too much vested interests	2	15.38
<b>Group D</b>		
Inadequate budgetary provisions, hostile local communities, inflation, inadequate security, and the devaluation of the currency	1	7.69
A combination of a temporary government, and a civil service which was now ready to aid and abet corruption	1	7.69

*Note:* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on major obstacles to implementation of government policies on infrastructure development

**Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

For Group C, one participant talked about executive capacity. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

We must identify executive capacity, and that was one area in which successive development plans focused on trying to address. It was important to quickly develop a hardcore of indigenous contractors who can handle these things, and when they are not available, it slows down in the area of implementation because of the lack of executive capacity.

Another participant reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme when he mentioned the lack of resources and coordinated approach to implementing priorities:

The most serious constraint is the lack of resources. Secondly, there is the lack of a coordinated approach to implementing priorities.

Two participants indicated the lack of proper policies, money to invest, and vested interests in a statement that reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I think there were three main obstacles worthy of mention. One is the lack of proper policies. We had to change the sectional policy environment in order to make it possible to reform, which we did in telecoms, and then we started in the other sectors. The second challenge was money to invest, so we started investing, but it was still not enough because we were so far behind and we needed much more. I think the third and most difficult challenge was the vested interests; I think some of the obstacles are clearly about first, inadequate planning of the projects themselves. Luckily, you are Minister of Works, and you know that in the past, we embarked on projects that did not even have proper designs and costing. So the second is inadequate budgetary provisions.

### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

Two participants were of the opinion that inadequate budgetary provisions, hostile local communities, inflation, inadequate security, and the devaluation of the currency constituted major obstacles. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I want to highlight the most important obstruction in our field; number one is inadequate budgetary provisions, hostile local communities, inflation, inadequate security, and the devaluation of the currency.

One participant mentioned a combination of a temporary government, and a civil service that was now ready to aid and abet corruption. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

So when you now have a combination of a temporary government, and a civil service which was now ready to aid and abet corruption, instead of the man collecting 10% out of a N100 million project, which is N90 million performance, the man says: I must make some money.

### **Thematic Category 4: Favorable and Effective Government Policies on Infrastructure Development**

Interview Question 4. Which government policies on infrastructure development would you consider favorable and effective?

In response to this question, the participants described the policies that they considered most effective in infrastructure development in Nigeria during the period under study. Tables 7 and 8 present the responses of participants on favorable and effective government policies on infrastructure development.

Table 7

*Responses of Participants on Favorable and Effective Government Policies on Infrastructure Development (Groups A and B)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
The Kaduna refinery & the Warri refinery	1	7.69
A provision for a National Transport Coordinating Commission	1	7.69
Mambilla Plateau	1	7.69
Group B		
Planning	3	23.08
The National Development Plan	2	15.38
The Public Procurement Act	2	15.38
The Ministry of Planning	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on favorable and effective government policies on infrastructure development ( $N = 13$ ) for all groups

#### **Group A: Former Heads of State**

One participant cited the Kaduna refinery and the Warri refinery. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Take the Kaduna refinery, it came up during the military; take the Warri refinery, it also came up during the military.

Table 8

*Responses of Participants on Favorable and Effective Government Policies on Infrastructure Development (Groups C and D)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group C		
The whole procurement system and the privatization and commercialization	3	23.08
Prices in the economy	1	7.69
The recognition that one needed strategic communications	1	7.69
Niger Delta development	1	7.69
Group D		
The whole procurement system and the privatization and commercialization	2	15.38
The rationalization of the big government institutions	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on favorable and effective government policies on infrastructure development

Another participant mentioned a provision for a National Transport Coordinating Commission. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

In the 1980 development plan, and I think it was there in the 1985 plan, which contained a provision for a National Transport Coordinating Commission. It was supposed to coordinate investments across modes of transportation, and also

ensure there was a balance in the development of the various modes.

One participant felt so proud that he was able to contribute to the Mambilla Plateau project as part of his infrastructural redevelopment effort. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I feel that you know I'm a person that can motivate people. Helping them meet their goal. I define myself as someone who motivates my team to help them grow throughout the organization with open communication.

**Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

Responses from Group B participants showed interesting trend. One participant mentioned planning. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I think first, it is planning; even for private companies, they have their plans; for instance, where you are going to position General Motors or Microsoft tomorrow. So planning is of essence, and if you are planning...Never mind that we removed five years from the original vision of Goldman Sachs, so instead of 2025, they have been talking 2020, but we have not started. Once we thought we were doing that, and then you look at where you want to be, and what will take you there. How much power, roads, and other infrastructure, do you need. Infrastructure is not something you do and wait for people to come. It must make sense in the context of your overall projections for development, so planning is essential. Two, there is the discipline of adhering to the plan; it is one thing to make a plan as we did, and they dragged on. I was Chairman of the National Working Plan; we did



2010-2013, 2014-2017, and 2017-2021 because I wanted us to emphasize continuity.

Two participants indicated the Third National Development Plan. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

It was the policy of the military government immediately after the war.

Specifically, I think it was the third National Development Plan, and it was very effective. That was when we had all those developments in Lagos, including all those flyovers and the expressways from Lagos to Ibadan, Onitsha to Enugu and Enugu to Port Harcourt, and then Abuja to Kano.

Two participants talked about the coming into existence of the Public Procurement Act which helped to sanitize the contracting process. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

So the Public Procurement Act was really meant to introduce competition and transparency, so that if you introduce that, then you get the best, and it is the country that will then benefit from it. We also insisted that if you must commit to a contract, there must have been an appropriation. To that extent, and without being biased, I can say that the Public Procurement Act has actually brought some transparency, even though many people didn't like it, I believe that many people are coming on board now.

One participant reflected the evidence to support the subtheme by saying that the basic policy that encouraged development was the existence of a central planning organization in the Ministry of Planning:

The basic policy that encouraged development was the fact that we had a central planning organization in the Ministry of Planning. I think now it is the Ministry of Planning and Economic Development. Plans were drawn up, with of course, equal participation from all the ministries; normally, they were 5-year development plans and later on, they became three year rolling plans.

### **Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

Two participants identified the whole procurement system and the privatization and commercialization policy as important government policy efforts. Statements such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I think of the whole procurement system that was put in place to guide and standardize public procurement, even though that I will say is still not as adequate as it should be. As you know for example, the procurement office is where a lot of the expertise is concentrated. The procurement office needs to be expanded, so that that expertise is also replicated in agencies, and that it still must achieve fully. I think the privatization and commercialization is also another critical element, because it began to ask the question: Is government the best provider of this kind of services?

One participant indicated prices in the economy. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I think the most favorable is that first, we had a stable economic environment, so at least, prices in the economy were stable. When you are trying to repair infrastructure with fluctuating prices of cement; of steel and so on, it creates a lot of uncertainty, so I think that was one good one.

One participant mentioned the recognition that one needed strategic communications. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Another positive policy is the recognition that one needed strategic communications to link all geo political zones of the country, and to tailor the way the transportation network was developing, and how the infrastructure would develop to make for increase.

Another participant talked about the special policy on Niger Delta development. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

But much more importantly, he had a special policy on Niger Delta development. Even before the granting of the amnesty, he thought that we should have a plan for that region. These were some of his key policy issues, which determined his intervention in infrastructure.

#### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

Participants in Group D pointed at areas such as the whole procurement system and the privatization and commercialization. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

It is the prioritization of important projects like the Abuja-Abaji-Lokoja road, the Benin-Ore-Shagamu Road, the Lagos-Ibadan Road, and the Loko-Oweto Bridge; these are very important projects in the country and they are very important trunk roads in Nigeria. And to phase the project into sections or phases, it will ease the funding, thereby helping the project financing.

One participant mentioned the rationalization of the big government institutions. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

I am not quite sure when it started, but it was clear the decision was made at some stage...I think it happened at some stage there was the rationalization of the big government institutions.

**Thematic Category 5: Perceived Relationship between Performance and Public Trust in Infrastructure Development**

Research Question 5: What relationship do you perceive between the performance of previous administrations and the public trust in the development of infrastructure in Nigeria?

The responses of participants on perceived relationship between performance and public trust in infrastructure development are presented on Tables 8 and 9.

**Group A: Former Heads of State**

One participant said the leader must be both a man of words and a man of action. His statement reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

People study you very well, and the leader must be both a man of words and a man of action because the first thing they will do is to feel your pulse.

Another participant mentioned the continuous efforts on infrastructural development. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

This is a question to which only one answer can be; the continuous efforts on infrastructural development is creating public trust and increasing the faith of the people in government.

One participant talked about power. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Power is one area where people today are still talking about how many megawatts we have, so the people are not happy. So when you then compare the investments so far, and the outcome, then, there is reason for citizens not to be happy.

Table 9

*Responses of Participants on Perceived Relationship between Performance and Public Trust in Infrastructure Development (Groups A and B)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
A man of words and a man of action	1	7.69
The continuous poor efforts on infrastructural development	1	7.69
Power	1	7.69
Group B		
The greed and selfishness of the present crop of politicians	2	15.38
The Nigerian public was able to endure the military rule for so long	1	7.69
The Nigerian public was really not satisfied because there was a lot to do, and there was a limit to what could be done	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on effect of performance on public trust and governance of infrastructure ( $N = 13$ ) for all groups

Table 10

*Responses of Participants on Perceived Relationship between Performance and Public Trust in Infrastructure Development (Groups C and D)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group C		
Roads and power	2	15.38
The Nigerian public had very low trust in government	1	7.69
The Nigerian public was able to believe and trust	1	7.69
Group D		
Education, housing, electricity & roads	1	7.69
Dissatisfied public	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on effect of performance on public trust and governance of infrastructure

### **Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

Two participants in Group B identified the greed and selfishness of the present crop of politicians as a factor. One participant made the following statement, which reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The people see in graphic terms, the greed and selfishness of the present crop of politicians, and the blame for the inadequacies, I believe is being placed more at the doors of the present than the past. And thanks to the crudeness of some of the propaganda of the major military years, when they started writing books like *For Their Future We Gave Our Present*, yet people see you building places for

yourselves, I think we are beginning to hear people say that they look back with some nostalgia at the time of Gowon and the first republic. Certainly, the older ones will know that there was a dramatic improvement between 1955 and 1972, even during the civil war.

Another participant said the Nigerian public was able to endure the military rule for so long. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

Of course, there is no doubt in my mind that the people were able to endure the military rule for so long because they could see development on the ground. They could see that we were building new roads, bridges and ports and so on. In a country like ours that is still developing, where development directly affects the common man, if you build a new road, the masses would use it, so development affects the common person very directly. Therefore, there is this feeling that the military has done very well because they can see what is on the ground.

One participant said the Nigerian public was not satisfied because there was a lot to do, and there was a limit to what we could do. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

They were really not satisfied because there was a lot to do, and there was a limit to what could be done. If you allow, I would give an example of the Benin-Shagamu Expressway. There was not that political will to face the problem; the ministry was ready to solve the problem, but government will not provide the funds, until very recently. Nobody would have awarded a 53 billion naira contract on a road like Benin-Shagamu, nobody would have thought of it. The political will was not there, instead, we were always doing limited rehabilitation of 1.7 or

1.8 billion naira. We even tried to do Benin-Ore for N9 billion until the contractor said no, and there was now an augmentation, and we now started doing the correct thing. Now you are talking of outstanding work of N65 billion. Nobody would have thought of it, not on Benin-Shagamu.

### **Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

Two participants in Group C mentioned roads and power. One had this to say: The relationship is that every government, every regime, every succeeding administration will like to have a pride in the sense of saying: I have provided good roads and especially electricity for the masses.

Another participant said the Nigerian public had very low trust in government because it has not delivered the services their citizens needed for all sorts of reasons. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Even during the time I was there... The point is that even till today, the Nigerian public has very low trust in government, and that is one of the things that we suffer from. Nigeria is not unique in this regard. If you look at public opinion polls around the world, there is a wave of citizens, not trusting their government. In Nigeria, it is particularly low because over time, governments have not delivered the services their citizens need for all sorts of reasons, including lack of capacity, corruption etc. In addition, the only way you can really rebuild this trust is by investing in infrastructure. Once people see improvement, they begin to feel better.

One participant opined that the Nigerian public was able to believe and trust. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:



Again, it goes back to what I was saying before, that because there was comprehensiveness in planning and in the selection and approval of projects for inclusion in the national development plan, and the plan document was published for general information, communities were able to know well in advance what was coming to them, and therefore became participants in the projects. They were able to believe and trust, and say: ok, we are expecting this from government.

#### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

One participant in this group identified education, housing, electricity, roads, and transport as relevant factors with a statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Once you can satisfy those minimum needs of the average Nigerian, in terms of education, housing, electricity, roads, transport and so on, most Nigerians will be, not only very happy, but also very appreciative of government. So that is the link; that whatever we are doing in government, we need to focus on how that affects the quality of life of the average Nigerian.

One other participant talked about “public dissatisfaction with low performance of government in the infrastructure sector resulting in total mistrust.”

#### **Thematic Category 6: Ways Corruption Impeded Infrastructure Development**

Research Question 6: In what ways has bureaucratic corruption impeded the development of the infrastructure sector in Nigeria during the period under review?

In response to this question, the participants described their opinions and concerns about how bureaucratic corruption impeded the development of the infrastructure sector in Nigeria during the period under review. Tables 11 and 12 present the responses of

participants on bureaucratic corruption as impediment to infrastructure development in Nigeria.

**Group A: Former Heads of State**

Two participants mentioned availability of funds. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

It had some effects, but let me mention a number of areas. I talk of money or availability of funds; if civil servants, because they enjoy free housing, free cars and all these things, and they spend a lot of money maintaining them, and they claim that they renovate their houses every three years, that is colossal waste of money and corruption. Even when we then said: buy your house and do whatever you like, I understand that they have now come back in another form.

One participant talked about award of contracts to unqualified contractors, incidences of abandoned projects, and poor quality jobs. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Award of contracts to unqualified contractors, incidences of abandoned projects, and the third one is poor quality jobs.

**Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

One participant mentioned bureaucrats' complete loss of status, power, recognition and access to the decision makers had a negative impact. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

If you define bureaucrats as the paid public servants, more than corruption, I will say that their complete loss of status, power, recognition and access to the decision makers and their degradation in terms of quality had a negative impact.

Not only did we purge the public service by 1975, we abandoned the respect for minimum qualifications and the structured training and retraining in the public service, which very soon led to a situation in which the organizational structures and the organograms of the Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) were not addressed to things to be done.

Table 11

*Responses of Participants on Bureaucratic Corruption as Impediment to Infrastructure Development in Nigeria (Groups A and B)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
Availability of funds	2	15.38
Award of contracts to unqualified contractors, incidences of abandoned projects, and poor quality jobs	1	7.69
Group B		
Bureaucrats' complete loss of status, power, recognition and access to the decision makers had a negative impact	1	7.69
If you had a corrupt system, you had a major problem	1	7.69
Selfishness	1	7.69
Salaries	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on effect of bureaucratic corruption on performance in infrastructure sector ( $N = 13$ ) for all groups

Table 12

*Responses of Participants on Bureaucratic Corruption as Impediment to Infrastructure Development in Nigeria (Groups C and D)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group C		
Infrastructure development has attracted features of corruptive tendencies	1	7.69
Vested interests and privatization	3	23.08
Politicians	1	7.69
Lack of courage	1	7.69
Group D		
Vested interests	2	15.38

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on effect of bureaucratic corruption on performance in infrastructure sector

One participant said that if you had a corrupt system, you had a major problem. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

If for instance you budget N100 million for a road construction job, and at the end of the day, only N80 million comes to the road, it means that the N20 million that has not been on the road is money that has been badly spent or money that has been given to other people or money that has been corruptly acquired. Therefore, the issue of corruption is very important in the sense that if you have a corrupt system, you have a major problem. The corruption in the civilian regime, in my mind is not proportional to the corruption in the military.”

Another participant mentioned selfishness. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

But for as long as you remain selfish, and are waiting to be compensated for a job that you are paid for, you will continue to impede progress.

Notably, one participant mentioned salaries. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Look at it from this point of view; salaries are poor. For example, before 1999, as a Deputy Director, you would probably earn N60,000 until the President came in 1999 and started improving it by the time I was retiring in 2007, my salary as a Director was only N145,000. Meanwhile, I am managing projects totaling over N100 billion, and I am getting so poor a pay. So invariably, the probability was there that there would be corruption. I am only trying to be frank with you.

### **Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

Participants in Group C gave their opinion. One participant mentioned infrastructure development has attracted features of corruptive tendencies. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

But infrastructure development has attracted features of corruptive tendencies because everybody will come to the Ministry of Works and say give me a contract. You cannot come and get contract without having the feeling that you will gain.

Remarkably, all participants mentioned vested interests and privatization as crucial factors. Statements such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Like I said, vested interest is just another way of describing people who were corruptly enriching themselves from the existing bad system. Some of the privatizations we tried did not even work well, like the case of NITEL. One other thing you need to realize is that some people are opposed to privatization because if you are manning let us say the government system in NITEL, you have to award licenses, give permits and so on, and every single transaction fetches you money, and that is corruption. If we now privatize it, as we have done today, if you want to buy a phone today, you just go to a vendor on the street; you buy and get your package.

One participant said politicians had their own agenda. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

And what has happened in previous administrations is that politicians when they come to office come with a whole lot of aides. Sometimes, they replicate what is happening in the line administration at the level of the minister's office with his aides, and they have their own files. In addition, when they leave, they leave with the files, and there is no record of activities. Then the aides and the line civil servants are forever struggling for roles. That should not happen because government at the end of the day is the worst for it.

Another participant mentioned the lack of courage to do what is right. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The courage is no longer there because if you were to give an advice, which your political boss doesn't like, you stand the risk of being fired.

### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

The two participants in this group mentioned vested interests. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Vested interests, be it in the power sector, and as we have in this case, the road sector. Perhaps, if the vested interest allowed institutions to create those things, then we will be in a better place. I think it is really a question of vested interests not allowing this things to happen, and may be to some extent, the lack of political will.

### **Thematic Category 7: Major Category: Impact of Reforms on Infrastructure Development**

Research Question 7: Explain the impact of the various reforms (economic, political, administrative) initiated by different administrations on the development of infrastructure in Nigeria.

In this research question, the participants made great efforts to explain the impact of the various reforms (economic, political, and administrative) initiated by different administrations on the development of infrastructure in Nigeria. Tables 13 and 14 present participants' responses on impact of reforms on infrastructure development.

### **Group A: Former Heads of State**

In response to the question, one participant in this group said that administrations paid more attention in putting all these infrastructures in place. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

So we more or less empowered the ordinary person during the process of our reforms. In addition, for the economy, I just would say that we were far ahead of

our time because if I sit back now to find that what we have introduced as if commercialization and privatization continued to go on in different names. The development of these things, you can only do when the infrastructure is set, and therefore we paid more attention in putting all these infrastructures in place so that we meet up with those targets.

Table 13

*Participants' Responses on Impact of Reforms on Infrastructure Development (Groups A and B)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
Administrations paid more attention in putting all these infrastructures in place	1	7.69
Roads development and power	2	15.38
Group B		
The PPP arrangement	3	23.08
Education	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic Categories and Invariant Constituents on Effect of Reforms on Infrastructure Development ( $N=13$ ) for all groups

Two participants opined that the administrations brought issues like roads development, and power into clearer focus. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

To some extent, they did; at least to be able to identify areas of need, and they put special effort to achieve those needs is an improvement. No matter what you



would say, at least, we brought areas like roads development, and power into clearer focus. Whether we succeeded or not, at least you know that, these are the constraints in roads development, power, and railways. And these were very well articulated, so we were not doing things blindly.

Table 14

*Participants' Responses on Impact of Reforms on Infrastructure Development (Groups C and D)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group C		
The various reforms initiated by different administrations have impacted greatly on our infrastructural development especially the PPP	4	30.77
Group D		
Roads development and power	1	7.69
The PPP arrangement	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic Categories and Invariant Constituents on Effect of Reforms on Infrastructure Development

**Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

Three participants in Group B talked about the PPP arrangement. Statements such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

This tells us that government alone cannot handle development, so we must then find other ways, and that is why the PPP arrangement becomes very relevant.

That again was what led to the Infrastructure Concession Regulatory

Commission. However, whether we have done it right or not is subject to questioning. As a student, you learn, but I believe that we didn't get it right from the very beginning because the Commission itself should not be participating in implementation. The PPP arrangement is also becoming very popular and very important in this field.

One participant mentioned education. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Maybe it was education; in my time, when I just joined the ministry, how many universities were there providing admissions to Nigerian students? However, today, there has been major reform in the sector to the extent that virtually every state now has a university. So for education I know there have been major reforms that worked.

### **Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

All participants indicated that the various reforms initiated by different administrations have affected greatly our infrastructural development especially the PPP. Statements such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

There is no doubt that those reforms have impacted greatly on our infrastructural development. Now we have airports terminals that are privately developed. We have bridges, roads and ports that are being constructed or managed through PPP. These reforms have impact, not only on the development of infrastructure, but also on doing business in Nigeria.

Another participant added:

I think the reforms had a very good impact on the economy, and like I said, the macro economic reforms had a tremendous impact, so much so that the economy tripled in growth. We went from about 2.4 percent to 6 percent. That is great, and that is the clearest evidence you can have, not me saying we did better. The numbers show it, and Nigeria has never looked back in terms of its growth since then. We have been doing very well; I think the reforms on the macro side also enabled us to start paying attention to what was wrong in the infrastructure sector, and realizing that we cannot sustain the growth rate of the economy without adequate investment in infrastructure.

Another one shared his views by saying:

I think each and every one of them had its impact; there have been gradual changes.

#### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

One participant said administrations have brought areas like roads development, and power into clearer focus. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The power sector is one example; the reform started by past administration (1999-2007) on the rail sector is yielding some results; I think the policy in terms of concentration in the rail sector, and the talk about getting the railways working again and reform in the road sector to put it on a much more sustainable footing, I think are working. The power sector is a real area of change and we have seen the effects in the power sector.

Another participant mentioned the PPP arrangement. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The privatization model in the area of transportation in terms of the PPP is there, and we have seen the groundswell of those sorts of initiatives all beginning to bear fruits just about now.

**Thematic Category8: Major Category: Reforms that Affected Significantly  
Infrastructure Development**

Interview Question 8: In your opinion, which reforms had significant impact on infrastructure development in Nigeria?

This research question addressed specific reform programs that may have impacted significantly infrastructure development in Nigeria. Participants' responses are presented on Tables15 and 16.

**Group A: Former Heads of State**

Two participants in Group A mentioned rural infrastructural development A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I think that has gone a long way especially the rural infrastructural development.

The rural farmer knows that the people will come to him despite the fact that he is living in a village and not just a decent road to his place, but people including breweries are coming to him. The farmers now feel they are important and I think that had a significant impact.

Also two participants identified Public Private Partnership (PPP). A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

It probably has not shown itself completely yet, but I believe that the reform with the most impact is the idea of Public Private Partnership.

Table 15

*Responses of Participants on Reform Programs That May Have Impacted Significantly Infrastructure Development in Nigeria (Groups A and B)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
The rural infrastructural development	2	15.38
Public Private Partnership	2	15.38
Group B		
Rural infrastructure development plan	1	7.69
The tenure policy	2	15.38
The National Development Plan	4	30.77
The Civil Service Reforms	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on specific reforms that have significant impact on infrastructure development ( $N = 13$ ) for all groups

#### **Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

In Group B, one participant said it was not about reform, it was about rural infrastructure development. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

While I served as civil servant, it was not about reform, it was about rural infrastructure development; I was Permanent Secretary under Balewa, so when

they talk about the first republic developments, we were there. However, certainly, I was also a member of the economic and finance committee set up by Balewa for cross cutting issues, advice, and so we would consult. There was nothing he wanted to do on infrastructure, it would involve finance, planning, and we are all members of this committee, so you look at it. I told you about airports, where we had to dismiss the British; I have been flying into Heathrow since 1953, and they are always under some construction; there is no master plan. They (British) thought we will just be nibbling along.

Two participants indicated the tenure policy. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

That was when the TRACOM project started and was completed during this present administration. So by and large, it is a combination of all of these, and to key into these, the tenure policy was crucial because we need a well-motivated work force.

All the participants talked about the National Development Plan. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Before the time of oil boom, we had the National Development Plan in which once a project is admitted, it must be implemented. It is not a question of now, where you say you have a project and a contract, which ordinarily should take four years, but is taking 10 years because of poor funding. So I will say the National Development Plan because I keep admiring that period.

Table 16

*Responses of Participants on Reform Programs That May Have Impacted Significantly Infrastructure Development in Nigeria (Groups C and D)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group C		
The Structural Adjustment Program	1	7.69
Program of Commercialization and Privatization	2	15.38
The National Development Plan	3	23.08
The Macro economic Reforms	1	7.69
Group D		
The Procurement Reform	2	15.38
Competitive tenders, due process, and intervention	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on specific reforms that have significant impact on infrastructure development

Civil Service Reforms was mentioned by one participant. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

The reforms that come to mind in terms of infrastructure development are the civil service reforms that were initiated by the military.

**Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

In Group C, one participant mentioned the Structural Adjustment Program (SAP).

A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

The major one was during the Babangida administration when we had the Structural Adjustment Program (SAP). Even though it was short lived, basically it was in place for just two years, but that was when literally the liberalization started and to the credit of Babangida, he also was the initiator of the privatization and commercialization program.

Two participants stated that the program of commercialization and privatization had serious impact on infrastructure development. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I will say that that program of commercialization and privatization had serious impacts on infrastructure development because it required the tolling of roads, in order to reduce the dependence on the treasury for their maintenance.

Three participants indicated the National Development Plan. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

If you are talking from the time of independence, certainly it is the Development Plan.

One participant mentioned the macro economic reforms. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

You have to listen hard to understand what I am going to say. I still believe that the reforms in Nigeria that have had the biggest impact on infrastructure, agriculture and every other sector are the macro economic reforms. In my mind



that is without question; the fact that we have a stable exchange rate, single digit inflation today, a fiscal deficit that is very narrow and our balance of payments is in good condition.

#### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

In Group D, two participants mentioned the procurement reform. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

If I have to say which one has been the most impactful, certainly the procurement reform, not only created and enhanced transparency, it helped in other areas.

Another participant identified the competitive tenders, due process, and intervention funds as specific reforms that made remarkable impact. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

Competitive tenders, due process, and intervention funds have significantly impacted infrastructural development in this country

### **Thematic Category 9: Leadership Style Best for Infrastructure Development in Nigeria**

Research Question 9: What form of leadership might better serve the infrastructure needs of the people of Nigeria in the future?

Tables 17 and 18 present data on participants' responses on the best leadership style that could serve Nigeria's infrastructure development needs in the future.

Table 17

*Participants' Responses on the Best Leadership Style That Could Serve Nigeria's Infrastructure Development Needs in the Future (Groups A and B)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
A leadership that is willing to work with people	1	7.69
A pragmatic leadership	3	23.08
Visionary leadership	2	15.38
Group B		
A strong leader to effect infrastructural development	1	7.69
Servant-leader	1	7.69
The military leadership	2	15.38
A very powerful, willing and courageous leadership	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic Categories and Invariant Constituents on Preferred Future Leadership Style for Infrastructure Development ( $N = 13$ ) for all groups

#### **Group A: Former Heads of State**

One participant in Group A mentioned a leadership that is willing to work with people who on their own could have been in their position. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The important thing is getting a leadership that is willing to work with people who on their own could have been in their position. We must pray and try to get a man, who is self- confident enough, not arrogant, humble enough before the lord to realize that many

other people have good talents, and that he is therefore willing to allow good and talented people to work with him.

Table 18

*Participants' Responses on the Best Leadership Style That Could Serve Nigeria's Infrastructure Development Needs in the Future (Groups C and D)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group C		
The project by project leadership	1	7.69
Visionary leadership	3	23.08
Group D		
People-oriented leadership	2	15.38
Visionary leadership	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic Categories and Invariant Constituents on Preferred Future Leadership Style for Infrastructure Development

All participants in this group identified pragmatic leadership. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I think a pragmatic leadership will do; I am talking of someone who believes in a cause, and goes for the cause, but then he has to have people who share the same vision with him on these things, so that they all work together to achieve that. That will serve this country.

Two participants indicated visionary leadership. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I think that what we need is a leadership that has a clear vision of the kind of infrastructure, quality and standard it wants to provide for the nation. When that vision is very clear, every other thing follows.

**Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

One participant talked about a strong position to effect infrastructural development. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

So leadership plays a strong role in the development of infrastructure. In terms of that singular development, one can say because of the command structure of the military, it is in a strong position to effect infrastructural development, much more than a fractious civilian regime that does not have all the powers.

Another participant mentioned servant-leaders. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Therefore, since we know it is so, whoever the President or the governor is, it is key that these must be the right people who have vision and have the interest of the citizens at heart. They must be selfless; they must be servant-leaders, so to speak. Not people who would ask: what is in it for me, but those who would ask: what will my people benefit? That is how I will want to describe it.

Two participants preferred military leadership. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Unfortunately for me, the military leadership was better; take the issue of the Petroleum Trust Fund (PTF) for example. Ideally, even the civilian leadership should be able if there is proper planning and proper funding. Not necessarily

government funds; there are many sources of funding, so really the civilian should be able. But for me in my career, it is the military that has really been able to deliver on infrastructure development.

One participant said a very powerful, willing and courageous leadership will serve Nigeria best. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

We need a very powerful, willing and courageous leadership. Nigeria needs a no nonsense leader.

### **Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

In Group C, one participant mentioned the project-by-project leadership. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

We also need what you called the project by project leadership at the level of those who have the responsibility to implement the project, so that with the background of the visionary leadership and plans that they have, how do you now execute the projects? You are a professional and you know that in project implementation, there is need for what I call the technical, as well as managerial expertise that is necessary for things to work. So it is at different levels.

Three participants showed strong inclination to visionary leadership. One of the participants stated:

You really need strong and enlightened leadership that focuses on solving problems. You need a leadership that can come with a vision; without vision, you will not be able (to succeed) because infrastructure, is all inter related. We tend to look at it separately; power, roads, rails and others.

Another reiterated as follows:

You need a leadership that can come with a vision; without vision, you will not be able (to succeed) because infrastructure, is all inter related. We tend to look at it separately; transport, roads, rails and others. If we really want to look at infrastructure, we have to look at it across board. If we invest more in one area, we may not need to invest in another area or you invest in a complementary fashion.

And another one added:

We need visionary leadership at either the national or state level because that is needed to begin to see things dispassionately, and to begin to have the need for a long term view and a long term plan where somebody is looking at the forest, not the particular trees in the forest, and it is only a visionary leader that can have that thing, to look at the whole system, and how it is in fact integrated. And also, not just looking at it for today, but for tomorrow, three years, five years and longer even beyond the person's administration where it is going. So we need visionary leadership at the highest levels of national and state government.

#### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

In Group D, all participants mentioned people-oriented leadership. One participant reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme in this statement:

People who have feeling, are willing, who understand the lives of Nigerians, and the important things to Nigerians like good roads and other things that are useful for the country, the people and for the quality of life.

Another participant opted for visionary leadership. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The leader has to be fairly visionary to see how he wants to see the country. So it is a visionary leadership, and one that will ignore the current day trend, but who looks to the future to see what he wants to do, and that by implication means being fairly autocratic in adopting those visions or in pursuing the dreams, so to speak.

### **Thematic Category 10: Impediments to Good Governance of Infrastructure Development**

Interview Question 10: What are the impediments to good governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria?

In response to the research question, the participants mentioned the factors that contributed to good governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. Tables 19 and 20 present the responses of participants on impediments to good governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria.

#### **Group A: Former Heads of State**

Two participants identified funding. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Funding is a problem for everything; infrastructural development, education and so on. So it is the management of the resources and prioritizing, and allocation of resources to the various sectors of the economy, which is of utmost importance.

One participant mentioned mundane interests. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

So these mundane interests, you need to do the best you can to get rid of it, so that whatever infrastructure you put, it is not necessarily for the benefit of a community, but for the benefit of all communities.

Table 19

*Responses of Participants on Impediments to Good Governance of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria (Groups A and B)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
Funding	2	15.38
Mundane interests	1	7.69
Lack of continuity in policy and implementation	3	23.08
Group B		
Privatization	1	7.69
The National Assembly. Funding	4	30.77
Corruption	3	23.08

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on impediments to good infrastructure development governance ( $N = 13$ ) for all groups



Table 20

*Responses of Participants on Impediments to Good Governance of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria (Groups C and D)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group C		
Leadership, structure, environmental issues, and finance	1	7.69
Lack of proper planning	2	15.38
The human resources & PPP	1	7.69
Corruption	3	23.08
Group D		
The need to create strong infrastructure institutions	1	7.69
Inadequate infrastructure, poor budgetary provisions, and the ageing of infrastructure	2	15.38

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on impediments to good infrastructure development governance

Three participants indicated lack of continuity in policy and implementation. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I believe it is continuity in policy and implementation. You are building things up, and another government will come and say stop! When you stop a project...and you will hear that for 'the first time ever,' as if Nigeria is just starting. Therefore, it is continuity and integrity. Government must be honest with the people because

government is more or less a contract with the people. If I say vote for me, I will do this, If I don't I have breached the terms of the contract.

**Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

One participant mentioned privatization. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The impediment is that what we have done so far on privatization is not very encouraging, and therefore for the serious boys abroad to take us serious, we have a long way to go.

Another participant mentioned the National assembly. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

That was the point I was making earlier on that when you have a system in which no matter how good your intentions are, you have block of people in a place like the National assembly, whose interests may conflict with what you as a government perceive as the way forward, then you have a problem.

All the participants identified funding. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Funding gaps, selfishness; We didn't have the money When the project was awarded, it took the ministry three years to pay the contractor the necessary advance, something that should have taken a matter of days or weeks or months.

We were too ambitious and we were not ready.

**Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

One participant mentioned leadership, structure, environmental issues, and finance. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Well, I will put them in this order, leadership, structure, and when I say structure, that is the institutional arrangement for executing infrastructure development because I think that is important. I think also that there are environmental issues, and of course, finance, which again I think is tied to the fiscal structure that we have in Nigeria.

Two participants talked about lack of proper planning. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I think we have captured them; certainly for me, lack of proper planning; that is very critical.

One participant mentioned human resources and PPP. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

One is weak capacity, which is having inadequate human resources. If we are going into PPPs, do we have the qualified people? A lot of the things I see as PPPs in Nigeria today are not that. It means we have people who do not really understand what a PPP is. I am just giving that as an example. I see that for infrastructure across the board, we need the expertise; the engineers. Now we need many people who know how to do financial engineering; that is why we are getting stuck now because people go into an arrangement and they do not know

what it means. They just package something and say it is an investment, when it is actually a loan. So we lack the human capital.

Remarkably, all participant indicated corruption. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The second impediment is corruption. Corruption at all levels of government and deep in the fabric of society continues to be the main impediment to good infrastructure development in Nigeria.

#### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

One participant mentioned the lack of strong infrastructure institutions across the MDAs and all sectors of the infrastructure development. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

The big impediment is the lack of strong infrastructure institutions across the MDAs and all sectors of the infrastructure development.

One participant mentioned privatization. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The impediment is that what we have done so far on privatization is not very encouraging, and therefore for the serious boys abroad to take us serious, we have a long way to go.

Two participant indicated inadequate infrastructure, poor budgetary provisions, and the ageing of infrastructure. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Inadequate infrastructure, poor budgetary provisions, and the ageing of infrastructure. These are the most impediments to good governance of infrastructure.

**Thematic Category 11: Major Category: Future Priority Areas of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria**

Interview Question 11: What areas of infrastructure development should be of utmost priority to the future leadership of Nigeria?

Table 21 presents the responses of participants on future priority areas for infrastructure development.

**Group A: Former Heads of State**

Three participants indicated power, transportation, and water. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Power, transportation, and water; I think we have done fairly well in telecommunication. But power is very key; when I am talking of transportation, I am talking of land, water and air.

One participant said that a lot of emphasis should be put on trying to reach out. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

I think we should put a lot of emphasis on trying to reach out; this is a country so diverse and if we want to remain one country and one people, then all parts of the country should be able to communicate, travel and interact. In addition, you can only do this if you have a system that allows people to travel from one point to the other, a system that allows people to feel free in any part of the country. I used to say that before 1914 there was movement up in Bagga in the North and down

South, and from South to Bagga. In those days, those things were going on and I think we should look at all the infrastructures that tend to solidify our oneness and unity in the country.

One participant mentioned the attitude and the approach. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Again, for me, the attitude and the approach are even more important; honestly, if government develops the right framework, the appropriate regulatory and liberalization framework of opening up and attracting resources, you will see that the whole infrastructure picture will be transformed.

**Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

All participants indicated areas such as roads, railways, electricity and the other forms of energy. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

In this country, it is roads, railways, electricity and the other forms of energy; so first and foremost, roads are key as not everyone can fly. So if you have good roads and even the train service, those are the two in my view that would be very key as a priority, talking about roads and rail; “With the experience I am seeing in Nigeria, I think it is rail. I say so because even if you put the whole capital budget of the Federal Government into roads, we will not get it; we need to work on rail. I still think for its potential for dramatic improvements on the economy, the first is power. It has to happen in such a way that what the man paying for power in Nigeria is paying is not more than what he will pay in India or Thailand;” “I think all infrastructure, but I guess here you are talking of physical infrastructure. If it is

physical infrastructure, clearly, everybody agrees that it is power. If we provide enough power to Nigerians, they will do a lot of other things.

Table 21

*Responses of Participants on Future Priority Areas for Infrastructure Development*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
Power, transportation, and water	3	23.08
A lot of emphasis on trying to reach out	1	7.69
Attitude and approach	1	7.69
Group B		
Roads, railways, electricity and the other forms of energy	4	30.77
Group C		
Road infrastructure	3	23.08
Transportation	1	7.69
Education, health, and water	1	7.69
Power	2	15.38
Group D		
Power and transport	2	15.38
Roads and health	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on future priority for infrastructure development ( $N = 13$ )

**Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

Three participants indicated road infrastructure. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

But having said that because of the force of history, and the peculiarities of our own environment, obviously, road infrastructure is key, and so there has to be enormous attention paid to road infrastructure, first to correct the problems that are on the ground, and then to be able to provide the necessary quality and standard going forward.

One participant mentioned transportation. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

Transportation infrastructure especially from an integrated point of view is also critical. That is also very important.

One participant mentioned education, health, and water. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

No, there is also, education, health, and water.

Two participants indicated power. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Power is very important; again, if you look at some of these plans, you will see that the Third National Development Plan envisaged that the country would move from generating capacity of 4000 megawatts to 10,000 megawatts by 1980.

Therefore, we were already up to 4000 megawatts by 1975, and that is the same figure we are still quoting now; “then there is housing”.



### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

Two participants in this group identified power and transport. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The infrastructure that engenders growth and contributes most to the economic growth of the country is certainly power and transportation. Road transportation carries around all the people that move around in the country.

One participant mentioned roads and health. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

Because these can affect each moment of life; water you need to live, electricity and power you need to live and to work in the commercial sector. Roads will take you from place to place safely, and health is one of the most important things in life.

### **Thematic Category 12: Major Category: Benefits of Good Infrastructure Network in Nigeria**

Interview Question 12: What are the benefits of good infrastructure network in Nigeria?

On Tables 21 and 22, the key responses of participants on possible benefits of good infrastructure network in Nigeria are presented.

### **Group A: Former Heads of State**

Two participants mentioned youth unemployment. Statements such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

Nigeria will be able to achieve the Vision 20:2020, which is to make Nigeria one of the 20 largest economies, without rebasing, I will say that. And if we go on,

that way, we will not have too much of the problem of youth unemployment, and the agitation that will come from youth unemployment.

Table 22

*Responses of Participants on Possible Benefits of Good Infrastructure Network in Nigeria (Groups A and B)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group A		
Youth unemployment	2	15.38
Economy	3	23.08
Group B		
The infrastructure would be seamless	1	7.69
Economy	3	23.08

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on benefits of good infrastructure network ( $N=13$ ) for all groups

### **Group B: Retired Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Service, and Directors**

One participant said the infrastructure would be seamless. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

It actually goes without saying; in fact, it should be that the transportation infrastructure would be intermodal, all of them connected. The infrastructure would be seamless; that for me is a benefit.

Three participants spoke about the economy. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

The economy will be boosted tremendously.

Table 23

*Responses of Participants on Possible Benefits of Good Infrastructure Network in Nigeria (Groups C and D)*

Invariant Constituents	# of Participants	% of Participants
Group C		
The economy	4	30.77
Group D		
The economy	2	15.38
Good infrastructure would help us develop faster	1	7.69

*Note.* Thematic categories and invariant constituents on benefits of good infrastructure network

### **Group C: Former Cabinet Ministers**

Four participants mentioned the economy. Statements such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

I think it is about two things; many more ordinary Nigerians will be connected to the economy in a good way. If we have power, welders in the village can work throughout. The welder in my own village came to me and said: ‘just give me power for three days a week.’ He said if he knows there will be power on Monday Tuesday and Wednesday, and even if he will not have for the rest of the week, he will be able to organize his contracts and other small works for those days. He said what is so disorganizing for people like him who are trying to have a small business is that he does not know when the power will come, and for how long he will have it. This is my welder in my village, and the power thing spoils the

quality of work he is able to deliver. Therefore, when he starts welding, the power goes. I have brought him to do welding in our house, and we had to change everything he had done (because of the power problem). When he starts and the power goes, and when he returns, the cutting and other things are no longer the same. There is a need for consistent power supply for him to finish pieces of work at once. It is not the kind of work that lends itself to doing something small and coming back later. That was what he told me that if you started working on a piece of iron, you needed to finish it at that time, and not do it halfway because that spoils the quality. I think improving the service delivery to the people, particularly in the rural areas and making them a part of the economy is the biggest thing. The second is that the overall growth rate of the economy (would increase with better power infrastructure). If we are growing at 6% to 7 % now with the little power we have, the biggest benefit from good infrastructure is that you are going to see Nigeria go up to 9% or 10%. That means that we can bring down poverty faster all round. So I really believe that good infrastructure is vital to bringing the poverty rate down in the country, empowering people, and making them feel better off.

Another participant said:

That is the driver of the economy; you can't do without good infrastructure, whether it is power, roads, rails, or air transportation. Can you imagine what would have happened, if we had our internal waterways functioning? As an economist, we know if we had the right kind of infrastructure, the size of our economy will be massive. For example, if we had adequate power, this economy

can begin to grow at rates that are over 10%. That is double digit growth, and with double-digit growth, every seven years, you double the size of your economy. So the potential to grow the economy and create jobs is huge ;they are the bedrock of economic development. If you say we are the biggest economy in Africa and we do not have good roads, it is just being comfortable without anything to show for it. You have been to a number of countries, they have excellent infrastructure and they attract investment and tourism, and the economy is growing relative to the size of the country, and they are comfortable. However, when you have a large population to feed and you count them as a big economy, without giving them the wherewithal, the necessary basic things of life; No matter how big your economy is, it is just a wishful thinking that you have a very contented nation.

#### **Group D: Private Sector Infrastructure Experts**

All the participants indicated the economy. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the subtheme:

One participant said one of the benefit is that good infrastructure would help us develop faster. A statement such as the following reflected the evidence to support the sub-theme:

I think one of the benefit is that good infrastructure will help us develop faster.

Foreigners or other nations will love to come here because we have all sorts of good infrastructure, road networks, railways, and so on. If we have good and well developed infrastructure, Nigeria will in a very short period become a first or second world nation.

### **Data from the Archives**

In addition to the data collected from participants using semi structured interviews, archival data were collected for this study. In a qualitative case study, researchers often use data triangulation approach involving different sources of information to minimize the threat of validity (Guion, Diehl, & McDonald, 2011). Data collected from the archives were mainly focused on patterns of infrastructure development in Nigeria between 1960 and 2010, and covering several eras of military and civilian administrations. Table 24 presents data on patterns of infrastructure development in the areas of roads and bridges.

As indicated on Table 24, during the military political era between 1981 and 1990, significant infrastructure development activities were recorded. 9,891 kilometers of paved roads and 12 kilometers of bridges were constructed in Nigeria. Shortly after independence in 1960 and up to the year 1970, 7,064 kilometers of paved roads and 1.40 kilometers of bridges were constructed. Notably, the post-colonial civilian administration embarked on aggressive infrastructure development program to provide the much needed infrastructure for the nation. By comparison, 8,694 kilometers of paved roads, 3,037 kilometers of rail roads, and 22.12 kilometers of bridges were constructed during the British colonial administration. Between 1991 and 2000, 4,941 kilometers of paved roads and 12 kilometers of bridges were constructed. Evidently, limited rail road construction activities were carried out by different administrations particularly during the 1971 – 1980, and 1991 – 2000 political eras.

Table 24

*Patterns of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria (1960 – 2010) - Roads and Bridges*

Period	Roads & Bridges		
	Paved Roads (km)	Rail Roads (km)	Bridges (km)
1960 – 1970	7,064	468	1.40
1971 – 1980	2,351	Nil	23.60
1981 – 1990	9,891	274	15.38
1991 – 2000	4,941	Nil	12.00
2001 – 2010	2,059	187	16.00
Baseline during Colonial Period (up to 1960)	8,694	3,037	22.12

*Note.* Sources: Federal Ministry of Transport of Nigeria (2013 & 2007) Project Reports; Federal Ministry of Works & Housing of Nigeria Inventory of Federal Roads (2011).

Table 25 presents archival data on the patterns of infrastructure development between 1960 and 2010 in the areas of housing, power, telecommunications and dams. The political period between 1981 and 1990 was a remarkable era in infrastructure developing in Nigeria. 47,200 housing units, 1,162.05 mgh/h electrical power output, 118,000 telecommunications lines, and 16.48 bcm dams were provided to the Nigerian population. By contrast, 500 units of housing and 46,000 telecommunications lines were provided in 1960 – 1970 political period. The period between 2001 and 2010 showed a tremendous development in telecommunications development in Nigeria with 89.800,000

lines added to the infrastructural growth of Nigeria. There was a significant improvement in electrical power supply in Nigeria, from 459.69 mgh/h to 2,587.98 mgh/h between 2001 and 2010.

Table 25

*Patterns of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria (1960 – 2010) - Other Infrastructures*

Period	Other Infrastructures			
	Housing (units)	Power (MG H/H)	Telecoms (lines)	Dams (BCM)*
1960 – 1970	500	N/A	46,000	0.01528
1971 – 1980	28,500	459.69	241,000	3.35
1981 – 1990	47,200	1,162.05	118,000	16.48
1991 – 2000	1,014	1,693.20	400,000	1.63
2001 – 2010	5,417	2,587.98	89,800,000	0.917
Baseline during colonial period (up to 1960)	N/A	N/A	18,724	N/A

*Note.* Sources: Nigerian Communications Commission (2011) Annual Reports; Federal Ministry of Power (1960 – 2010) Annual Reports; Federal Ministry of Works & Housing (1960 – 2010) Annual Reports.

### Summary of Findings

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the impact of leadership on governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria between 1960 and 2010. The study participants were selected from former heads of state; retired permanent secretaries, heads of service and directors; former cabinet ministers; and private sector infrastructure



experts in Nigeria. Using the case study methodological approach, I identified common themes, thematic categories and patterns that emerged from the data collection and analysis to generate better understanding on how leadership impacted the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. Furthermore, I explained how participants were selected, the interview process, the consent procedure followed, how data were collected, and the approach used to analyze data.

Archival data collected from different official government sources were tabulated to reveal the patterns of infrastructure development in Nigeria between 1960 and 2010.

Below is the summary of findings made from data analyses:

1. Majority of the participants (61.52%) were of the opinion that the policies of the previous military administrations between 1960 and 2010 on infrastructure development in Nigeria were beneficial especially in the areas of roads construction, electrical power production, transportation, and airport and seaport development. Archival data support participants' opinions. However, rural infrastructure development was neglected by the military governments.
2. Participants (53.84%) pointed out specifically the National Development Plans as the most effective tools in the formulation and successful implementation of government infrastructure development programs.
3. The overwhelming majority of participants (76.92%) identified the major obstacles to infrastructure development in Nigeria during the period under review as the combined effects of political instability and the Nigerian civil war.

4. On major obstacles to implementation of government policies on infrastructure development, participants (69.24%) opined that funding constraints and lack of human and material resources were the factors responsible.
5. Participants (53.84%) identified the Public Procurement policy and privatization schemes as most effective and favorable government policies that boosted infrastructure development.
6. The majority of participants (53.84%) stated that public trust was very low, and this is because of government poor performance on infrastructure development during the period under review. Archival data indicate relatively unimpressive government activities in several areas of infrastructure development for the same period.
7. On the effects of bureaucratic corruption on government performance in infrastructure development, participants (61.52%) opined that government officials at all levels were corrupt and had vested interest resulting in poor performance in infrastructure development.
8. Majority of participants (84.61%) stated that economic reforms generally benefitted infrastructure development in Nigeria during the period under review, and they identified several reform programs ranging from the Structural Adjustment Program, the National Development Plan, the Telecommunication sector reform, to the introduction of the Private-Public Partnership (PPP) in infrastructure development.

9. The National Development Plan was identified by participants (53.48%) as the main reform program that significantly affected infrastructure development in Nigeria during the period under study.
10. Participants (69.24%) were of the opinion that the pragmatic-visionary leadership style would serve Nigeria best in the future infrastructure development plan.
11. On impediments to good governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria, participants identified three factors: funding constraints (46.16%); lack of planning and continuity (38.46%); and corruption (30.76%).
12. The overwhelming opinion of participants (92.30%) on future areas of infrastructure development in Nigeria were :roads, railways, power, and transportation. Archival data support participants' responses.
13. Better economy, youth employment and improved condition of living were identified as the main benefits of a good infrastructure network in Nigeria.

### **Transition**

In chapter 4, I discussed the findings made from core themes as identified from participants' responses on thematic categories, themes and sub-themes. Also, I discussed how the core themes relate to the conceptual framework of the study which is based on transformational leadership theory and the theories of transformation and transition in governance. Conclusions, recommendations, and the social change implications of the study are presented in Chapter 5.

## Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

### **Introduction**

The development of infrastructures is vital to the economic growth and prosperity of any nation, especially in a developing economy as Nigeria. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to find out the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria beginning from 1960 when Nigeria got her independence from Great Britain, to the year 2010 toward the end of the civilian political administration of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua. Different military and civilian political leaderships have exercised the authority of infrastructure governance in Nigeria during this period beginning with the first democratic civilian government under Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe as President (1960-1963) to the civilian administration headed by President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua (2007-2010). In between these two political dispensations, military dictatorships governed infrastructure development in Nigeria for over 30 years. Civilian governments were in power for 11 years. I have presented a detailed analysis of all the military and civilian political leaderships that governed Nigeria in the literature review segment of this study in Chapter 2. In Chapter 4, I have presented a summary of the findings made from analyzing the responses of the participants on all the interview questions. The findings are now discussed in this chapter.

### **Discussion of Findings**

#### **Policies of the Previous Military Administrations**

The majority opinion of participants was that military governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria was beneficial particularly in the areas of highway construction, electrical power production, transportation, and construction of airports and

seaports. Nigeria was governed for a longer period of time by the military than the civilian administrations. Between 1981 and the year 2000, the military constructed about 14,832 km of paved roads and 27.38 km of highway bridges. Similar trends are revealed by archival data during President Gowon's administration (1966-1975). Housing, power, and telecommunications recorded a considerable surge during military governance. The strict adherence to planning principles and the national development plans more than any other accounted for the success of the military administrations in infrastructure development, especially between 1966 and the year 1985, when the military administration of president Babangida took over the leadership of Nigeria. However, the military paid little attention to rural infrastructure development and the construction of rail roads. Although president Babangida set up the directorate for rural infrastructure (DFRI) during his tenure between 1985 and 1993 to mitigate this, it was short-lived as it was abrogated by subsequent military regime.

Another possible reason for the military infrastructure development accomplishments was the increase in oil revenue during General Yakubu Gowon's administration (1966-1975) and President Babangida's administration (1985-1993) and subsequent military administrations. Nigeria's export revenue from oil rose significantly during these political periods (Okonjo-Iweala, 2012). Money was available to implement projects on infrastructure development.

Under a military dictatorship, government plans and projects are implemented faster than in civilian parliamentary systems, due to the authoritarian nature of military regimes with inherent command and control. Political bickering and delays in legislative approval and bureaucratic procedures in civilian democratic administrations have a way

of slowing things down. The military governed by decrees and dictatorial ordinances, and had limited accountability issues obstructing project implementations. Kendra (2012) pointed out that under authoritarian leadership style, decision making is faster as the leader makes decision with little or no input from the rest of the group, in contrast to democratic leadership style where consensus is usually forged with consequential delays (Rogger, 2014).

Within an established accountable framework in democratic governance, infrastructure governance can be enhanced and projects delivered in a timely manner when appropriate institutions are created and strengthened to drive infrastructure development on sustainable basis. Zuofa and Ochieng (2014) posit that adhering to governance mechanism that incorporate processes and guidelines that support projects to meet organizational objectives coupled with good project management will ensure timely delivery of projects.

### **Policy Formulation and Implementation**

Participants identified the National Development Plan policies as contributing to the development of infrastructures in Nigeria. Lawal and Oluwatoyin (2011) stated that the first national development plan policy in Nigeria was formulated between 1962 and 1968 with the objectives of creating development opportunities in such areas as health, education and employment, and little or no focus on infrastructure development. The second development plan period was between 1970 and 1974 and priorities were in the areas of agriculture, industry, transport, manpower, defense, electricity, communication, and water supply (Lawal & Oluwatoyin, 2011; Marcellus, 2009). It was during the military administration of General Yakubu Gowon that infrastructure development

became a priority in the Nigerian national development planning scheme. The third national development plan period (1975-1980) focused mainly on rural agricultural development programs such as the Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) during Obasanjo administration. Infrastructure development was not a priority. Marcellus (2009) categorized national development planning in Nigeria into four phases: the colonial era (pre-1960 independence), the fixed medium-term era (1962-1985), the era of rolling plan (1990-1998), and the new democratic dispensation era (1999 – Present) It was within the era of the fixed medium-term that four successful national development plans were executed with significant impact on infrastructure development (Marcellus, 2009).

According to the findings of the study, there is a need to revisit the concept of national development plans and develop an infrastructure master plan for the country over a given number of years to enable government to focus better on the development of critical national infrastructure in an ordered manner, and to remove the arbitrariness that currently pervades in the sector. Beyond the development of infrastructure master plan for the country, Lawal and Oluwatoyin (2011) pointed out that faithful implementation of national development plan, leadership commitment and absence of corruption are critical to achieving sustainable development in Nigeria.

### **Major Obstacle to Infrastructure Development**

Political instability and the Nigerian civil war were the main major obstacles to infrastructure development in Nigeria as indicated by the participants. Between 1960 and 2010, Nigerians witnessed 12 government regime changes. Bouchat (2013) has blamed instability in Nigeria on politics of ethnicity, religious intolerance, and poor governance. Several military coups in Nigeria disrupted the continuity of governance and

infrastructure development as government projects such as road constructions were either abandoned or revoked by succeeding administrations for no justifiable reasons. Political interference creates uncertainty and stifles the process of bureaucratic decision-making which in turn affects infrastructure development (Rogger, 2014). According to Akinwale (2010), inadequate infrastructure was a major cause of political crisis in Nigeria resulting in the Nigerian civil war (1967-1970). During the war, resources were diverted to prosecuting the war to the neglect of infrastructure development (Oyedele, 2012). In fact, the war resulted in the destruction of available infrastructures. After the war, there was a slow recovery effort at rebuilding infrastructural facilities such as roads, bridges, telecommunication, and power. The effect of the war on infrastructure development is still visible today in the war affected areas of Nigeria.

Instability witnessed in the political environment has direct consequences in the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. The situation created by decades of political turbulences still has relapsing effects on the growth and development of infrastructure in Nigeria. Political stability reinforces private sector investors' interest in infrastructure development through public private partnerships. Efforts should be made to ensure credible processes of electioneering and regime change to ensure that political stability and peace prevail in the country.

### **Obstacles to Implementation of Government Infrastructure Development Policies**

The implementation of government policies on infrastructure development has been hampered by funding constraints and lack of skilled manpower and material resources. These were the main opinion expressed by participants. Olaseni and Alade (2012) identified funding constraints as the major challenge to infrastructural



development in Nigeria over the years. Successive administrations in Nigeria have relied heavily on foreign loans as the main source of funding infrastructure development projects in the country, and this has resulted in huge foreign debt totaling over \$40bn in 1999 (Olaseni & Alade). By the end of 2010, Nigeria's debt accumulated from international borrowing to execute infrastructure development projects had skyrocketed to a worrying proportion. Revenue generated from oil export is inadequate to fund all development programs including agriculture, education, rural development, and the provision of social amenities.

Material resources needed for infrastructure development in Nigeria are imported from overseas including bitumen for highway construction, iron and steel for bridges, railroads and housing projects. In addition, Nigeria relies on foreign construction companies such as Julius Berger and Reynolds Construction Company to execute satisfactorily major infrastructure projects. Human and material resources are lacking in most areas of the construction industry particularly in road construction, telecommunications and electrical power production. A comprehensive approach toward confronting the challenges of infrastructure development in Nigeria has been advocated. (Akinwale, 2010; Olaseni & Alade, 2012; Oyedele, 2012).

### **Effective and Favorable Government Policies**

The Public Procurement policy and the various privatization schemes of the different Nigerian governments are considered effective and favorable by participants in boosting infrastructure development in Nigeria. The Public Procurement Act of 2007 stipulated a number of measures to be followed in the award of contracts especially in the area of infrastructure development. The Federal Government of Nigeria under President

Obasanjo in 1999 invited the World Bank to conduct a thorough assessment of Nigeria's procurement system with the goal to reform contract award procedures especially in the infrastructure development sector, in order to eliminate corruption, political and personal interests, and remove obstacles that lead to abandonment of government projects (Ezeh, 2013) As Ogbonna and Kalu (2012) explained, the Public Procurement Act helped to create economic efficiency and effectiveness consistent with best practices. Corruption was the main obstacle to infrastructure development in Nigeria, and the public procurement policies helped to significantly address the problem (Anigbogu & Shwarka, 2011).

During the civilian Obasanjo administration ((1999-2007) major privatization and commercialization policies were initiated in Nigeria. The sale of state-owned infrastructure agencies such as the electric power generating company, National Electrical Power Authority (NEPA), Nigeria telecommunication company (NITEL), and the Nigerian Airways, marked a shift in government policy to involve the private sector in infrastructure development (Mohammed, Chapola, & Bello, 2013). While the impact of privatization on the economic growth of Nigeria may be considered beneficial to some degree (Udoka & Anyingang, 2012), there is need for reforms and improvement (Muogbo, 2013).

### **Performance and Public Trust**

Participants indicated that public trust was very low based on perceptions of poor performance on infrastructure development by successive governments in Nigeria. Irohama (2012) remarked that in Nigeria, public trust or distrust is measured largely by public perception of corruption. When the public perceive government as working hard to

manage issues relating to corruption, level of trust increases significantly, and when the public perceive government as doing little to minimize corruption especially in infrastructure development, public trust drops. Lack of accountability especially in executing infrastructure projects has been the main element that affected public trust in Nigeria (Okekeocha, 2013). As Akinwale (2010) pointed out, Nigerians have developed apathy to their governments, against the backdrop of inadequate infrastructure provision, manifesting in gross violation of laws leading to the prevalence of a semblance of lawless society in parts of the country.

### **Effects of Bureaucratic Corruption**

Participants were of the opinion that government officials at all levels were corrupt and had vested interests in the award of contracts which affected performance in the infrastructure sector. The infrastructure sector in Nigeria is associated with corruption (Hawkins, 2013). Estimates of financial losses range between 10% and 30% of the total value of publicly funded construction projects (Transparency International, 2013). Most infrastructure projects in Nigeria are abandoned or fail because of bureaucratic corruption (Zuofa, & Ochieng, 2014). In their study of project failure in Nigeria, Zuofa and Ochieng identified corruption, lack of professionalism, inexperienced project managers and project personnel, bureaucratic procurement process as the main causes of project failure in Nigeria, and argued that governance mechanisms which integrates processes and guidelines that support projects to meet organizational objectives should be in place to avoid project failure. As Ogbuagu, Ubi and Effiom (2014) stated, infrastructural decay can be traced to corruption and lack of accountability and transparency by bureaucratic office holders in Nigeria. For Nigeria to make palpable progress in the area of

infrastructure development, corrupt practices must be tamed through ensuring that the bureaucratic institutions involved in infrastructure development are made more transparent and accountable (Egwemi, 2012). Furthermore, Zuofa and Ochieng (2014) canvassed the enforcement of punitive actions against erring project personnel who engage in corrupt and unethical practices.

### **Impact of Reforms**

The majority of participants stated that economic reforms benefitted infrastructure development. In the previous section, the National Development Plans were discussed as the main reform program participants identified as benefitting infrastructure development in Nigeria. This can be attributed to the early post-independence leaders' fidelity to the National Development Plans. As Lawal and Oluwatoyin (2011) explained, the beauty of any development plan lies in the faithful implementation of such plan. Two other reform programs – The Structural Adjustment Program (SAP), and the Public Private Partnership (PPP) were specifically identified as helping the development of infrastructure in Nigeria. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank have been involved in helping Nigeria restructure the economic programs of the country. It was during Babangida administration (1985-1993) that the nation experienced a major structural adjustment program. Nigeria was required to devalue her currency to stem inflation and took several economic recovery measures in order to meet the requirements for international loans needed for infrastructure development (Taye & Dada, 2012). The SAP was a major economic reform that had negative consequences for the economic growth of Nigeria.

The Public Private Partnership (PPP) program involves the public and private sectors working in cooperation and partnership to invest and conduct business activities for the purpose of designing, planning, financing, constructing, and providing infrastructure and services in Nigeria (Babatunde, Akinsiku & Opawole, 2012). This emerging economic reform program has helped in sourcing finance for infrastructure projects and collaborating with agencies in terms of skilled manpower and expertise in the infrastructure sector (Idris, Bashir & Kura, 2013). There is a need to improve the PPP program by developing capacity among public officers and enhancing government investments in project preparation. This could serve as a necessary precondition for investment by private sector investors, especially in relation to infrastructure development in Nigeria, in the face of the huge infrastructure deficit and dwindling revenue of the government (Dahiru, Abdul'Azeez, & Bala, 2013).

### **Leadership Style for Future Infrastructure Development**

Participants were of the opinion that Nigeria as a nation needs a pragmatic and visionary leader for future infrastructure development of the country. Pragmatic leadership involves emphasis on practical issues, active, and to some degree dictatorial in order to accomplish set goals (Beddell-Avers et al., 2009). Pragmatic leadership is result-oriented. A pragmatic leader exhibits charisma. Attributes of visionary leadership include open-mindedness, foresight, sensitive to the needs and aspirations of people, capable of predicting the future, persistent, creative, and strong conviction (Turner, 2013), which are elements of transformational leadership. According to McLaurin and Amri (2008), the theory of transformational leadership is often termed the theory of charismatic leadership which assumes that leaders with certain qualities, such as confidence, extroversion, and

clearly stated values, are best able to motivate followers. As Bass (1990) argued, good visioning, impression-management, and rhetorical skills are central to transformational leadership. Essentially, transformational leadership describes how leaders can initiate, develop, and implement important changes in organizations, institutions, and governments. In my opinion, participants were seeking a transformational leader.

There is a relationship between the finding on leadership style and the conceptual framework of the study. This study is based on the theory of transformational leadership. Burns (1978) defined transformational leadership as a process where leaders and followers engage in a mutual process of raising one another to higher levels of morality and motivation. Transformational leaders raise the bar by appealing to higher ideals and values using charismatic strategies. Bass and Riggio (2006) identified attributes of transformational leadership as increase in awareness of the importance of task ahead signifying the need for great vision; team work, and emphasizing higher order needs. Charisma is seen as necessary. A pragmatic-visionary leader is to a large extent, a transformational leader.

### **Impediments to Good Governance of Infrastructure Development**

Funding constraints, lack of planning and continuity, and corruption were identified by participants as constituting major impediments to good governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. Although Olaseni and Alade (2012) argued that revenue generated from oil export is inadequate to fund all development programs of government, and that successive administrations in Nigeria have relied on foreign loans as the main source of funding infrastructure development projects in the country, archival data on the patterns of infrastructure development between 1960 and 2010 indicate

otherwise. Lawal and Oluwatoyin (2011) pointed out that Nigeria's enormous oil wealth should be invested to build a viable industrial base for the country and for launching an agrarian revolution to liquidate mass poverty. Poor planning of infrastructure development, dearth of skilled workers in the civil service, poor budgeting, low capital allocations and high recurrent allocations, as well as corruption combine to account for the poor service delivery in the infrastructure sector in Nigeria. According to Okonjo-Iweala (2012), the main purpose of budget has been reduced to the preservation of the government's bureaucracy, rather than improved service delivery in the infrastructure sector. Poor leadership was responsible for the failure to use Nigeria's oil wealth to build critical national infrastructure that would have catalyzed economic growth in the country.

Authoritarianism has consequences. Okonjo-Iweala (2012) explained that, decades of military authoritarianism have undermined the Nigerian civil service, as public service recruitment exercises were often used as political tools to appease various constituencies. The "Federal Character" principle introduced in 1979, which sets a quota for the number of civil servants to be recruited from each of the 36 states of the Nigerian federation, undermined the effectiveness of the Nigerian civil service. This policy entrenched favoritism over and above meritocracy in the Nigerian civil service, and led to the erosion of hitherto held values in the Nigerian civil service, leading to bureaucratic corruption. According to Okonjo-Iweala and Osafo-Kwaako (2007), corruption and poor governance affected growth and public service delivery in Nigeria. They argued that in a corrupt environment such as the case in Nigeria, resources for human capital development and investments in infrastructure, health and education are diverted, hurting poor households.

Corruption in Nigeria can be attributed to a number of factors, prominent among them are: greed, insatiable appetite for wealth, complete disregard for the rule of law, lack of altruism, the get-rich-quick syndrome, diminished moral values, winner-takes-all attitude, provocative display of affluence and ill-gotten wealth, lack of sanctions for perpetrators of bureaucratic corruption, high poverty rate, wide economic gap between the rich and the poor, a dysfunctional society, and lack of patriotism (Ado-Kuwara, 2005; Dike, 2008; Lawal & Tobi, 2006; Mustapha, 2010; Osaghae, 2008; & Ploch, 2010). Only transformational leadership anchored on high morality and charisma (Bass & Bass, 2008) can address this cankerworm that has eaten deep into the soul of the Nigerian nation.

### **Future Areas of Infrastructure Development**

Participants identified roads, railway, power and transportation as key areas for future infrastructure development in Nigeria. According to Akinwale (2010), Nigeria inherited traditional infrastructure from colonial Britain at independence in 1960, such as tarred roads of minimal dimension, railways, and ports developed along trans-Atlantic trade routes largely to serve the colonial interests and that of a few elites who lived in the cities. For example the two North-South narrow gauge, single track rail lines, the western line and the eastern line were designed and built with the sole aim of moving slaves, raw materials like cotton and groundnut from the hinterlands in the North to the seaports of the South for onward shipment to Europe and America. It was not aimed at local economic growth or national integration. Akinwale argued that the pattern of development of infrastructures in the colonial era became the trigger for the rural-urban migration experienced in the postcolonial era. While postindependence leaders attempted to maintain and extend the inherited colonial infrastructures, they failed due to official



negligence and mismanagement of available resources by the government's bureaucracy (Akinwale).

With a population of about 167 million, Nigeria needs an inter modal and integrated transportation systems like modern rail lines and highways, water and air transportation to move the vast majority of the population, goods and services from one place to another and to support economic growth. As Oyedele (2012) puts it succinctly, in developing countries, infrastructure refers to roads and transport infrastructures. And with 60 percent of Nigerian population lacking access to electricity (Akinwale, 2010), an efficient power supply is needed in Nigeria to improve manufacturing and provide jobs for the teeming unemployed youths in Nigeria.

### **Benefits of Good Infrastructure Development**

The Nigerian economy will benefit from good infrastructure network. This was the majority opinion of study participants. Good infrastructure serves as a catalyst for economic growth and also provide the platform for the socio-political transformation of the nation (Lawal & Tobi, 2006). According to Oyedele (2012), infrastructure facilitates the production of goods and services: the supply of raw materials to the factory and distribution of finished products to (markets. Good infrastructure development in Nigeria will lead to a general improvement of the Nigerian infrastructure sector in a way that promotes the standard of living of the people through the enhancement of the capacity of citizens to pursue productive ventures that will lead to increase in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the country.

### **Recommendations for Action**

The results of this study revealed the challenges various leaderships faced in the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. The study provided insight into a roadmap for the good governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria that can bring about sustainable national economic growth. One fact that emerged was the importance of a sound National Development Plan that provides comprehensive guidelines on infrastructure development over a period of time. Presently, the national development plans were jettisoned and this action has had a negative impact on infrastructure development in Nigeria. Based on the findings made in this study, I have made a number of recommendations. First, I recommend that the Nigerian government should revisit the concept of national development plans and restore it as a vital tool for developing an infrastructure master plan for the country for a specific number of years. This measure would enable government to focus more on the development of critical national infrastructure in an orderly manner. Furthermore, I recommend that government should establish and reposition appropriate institutions with requisite due process practices and strong project delivery guidelines, to facilitate timely implementation of projects. This would enhance transparency in project delivery.

Corruption and poor governance affected public service delivery of critical infrastructure in Nigeria. The results of this study revealed that bureaucratic corruption was the main impediment to infrastructure development in Nigeria. Corruption manifest itself in the complete disregard for the rule of law, lack of altruism, the get-rich-quick syndrome, diminished moral values, and lack of sanctions for perpetrators of bureaucratic corruption. I therefore recommend a proactive engagement against corruption in the

Nigerian bureaucracy by holding bureaucrats accountable to rules of procedure and processes. Corrupt public officers should be punished for proven corrupt practices. This will help to purge the bureaucracy of corruption. Bureaucratic institutions involved in infrastructure development should be made more transparent and accountable. Training should be provided to bureaucrats on the need to practice and maintain high morality in service delivery.

The findings of this study indicate that political instability and insecurity have direct consequences on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. Political stability would encourage private sector investors to invest in infrastructure development in Nigeria through public private partnerships (PPP). The situation created by decades of political turbulence still has negative effects on the growth and development of infrastructure in Nigeria. Foreign investors are reluctant to provide funds for infrastructure development. I recommend that government should engage critical stakeholders to address the twin issue of political instability and insecurity which could pave the way for increased private sector investments in infrastructure development in Nigeria. This would help government to redirect funds and resources to other sectors of the economy.

The results of this study revealed that funding constraints affected infrastructure development, and the revenue generated from oil export was inadequate to fund all development programs including infrastructure development. Also, the material resources needed for infrastructure development in Nigeria including bitumen for highway construction, iron and steel for bridges, railroads and housing projects were imported from overseas. Nigeria relies heavily on foreign construction companies such as Julius

Berger and Reynolds Construction Company to execute major infrastructure projects I recommend a major reform of the infrastructure sector to make it attractive to private sector investment. The huge population of Nigeria of about 167 million people should provide a ready market that would patronize privately built infrastructure, whether they are tolled roads, private electricity distribution companies, private transportation companies, or private water distribution companies. To address the issue of funding constraints, I recommend that government should look beyond its lean budgetary resources and explore creative ways of tapping into private sector finances. This can be accomplished through such mechanisms as floating infrastructure bonds for projects that are self-sustaining and can be paid off over a short period of time. Different private finance initiatives should be taken to minimize funding constraints. Local sourcing of materials should be integrated into the designs of infrastructure projects in Nigeria to eliminate the need for imported construction materials. A policy should be formulated by government to patronize local companies and help them in building business capabilities that would enable them to carry out most of the construction contracts.

The findings of this study indicated that roads, power and transportation are the key priority areas for future infrastructure development in Nigeria. For a country of 167 million people, while power is vital to manufacturing and entrepreneurial activities, good transportation and infrastructure network are needed to move persons, goods and services from one part of the country to another. I recommend that government should have as its infrastructure development priority, the production of adequate electrical power and transportation. Government should leverage on collaboration with the private sector to unleash the creative potentials of Nigerians, and help promote sustainable economic

growth and development in Nigeria. This would help to build public trust and promote good governance in Nigeria. Finally, I recommend that while accountability and transparency should be firmly entrenched in the processes guiding infrastructure development in the country, a communication strategy should be instituted whereby citizens are briefed periodically on critical national infrastructure projects. This would lead to creating a citizens' awareness forum, and restore public trust in government.

### **Recommendations for Further Study**

This qualitative case study was focused on the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria over a limited period of years (1960 – 2010). Sample size of participants was limited to 13 people with knowledge and expertise in infrastructure development issues in Nigeria. I recommend a larger sample size using other qualitative research methods. Involving participants from the public in a similar research might reveal unique results.

This study did not include pre-independence era and the infrastructure development activities of the political administration after 2010. I recommend that future research into infrastructure development in Nigeria should be extended to these political periods. In addition, I recommend a quantitative approach using survey method and statistical analytical tools to examine empirically if any significant impact exists between leadership and infrastructure development in Nigeria. I recommend that future researchers should replicate this study in other African countries with similar infrastructure development agenda to see if results would vary.

### **Implications for Social Change**

The findings of this study revealed several important social issues. The results indicated that inadequate funding, lack of planning, political instability, lack of political will, and corruption are some of challenges facing the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. Nigeria has not been able to break the cycle of economic inadequacy and underdevelopment since independence in 1960. Inadequate infrastructure is the root cause of Nigeria's economic problems. The Nigerian society would benefit from the provision of good and adequate infrastructural network in the country. It would make the distribution of goods and agricultural produce easier and more efficient. This could reduce the prices of goods in retail outlets. A good network of roads would help to minimize accidents and human deaths on Nigerian highways. If railways, airports and seaports are developed as advocated in this study, transportation constraints that Nigerians experience in the major cities of Lagos, Abuja, and Port Harcourt could become a thing of the past.

The development of communication and electrical power components of the economy would have a social impact on the people of Nigeria. Nigeria is currently plagued by erratic and unreliable supply of electrical power. This is a setback to the overall growth and development of the economy. Nigerians spend a huge amount of their personal incomes in providing personal electricity through the use of generators. The health hazards associated with pollution emissions from these generators cannot be ignored. Government ought to tackle the problem of electricity in Nigeria as a matter of urgency and priority. No economy can succeed without a dependable steady supply of electrical power. In the same token, business development and social interaction are

hampered by poor communication network. Developing these aspects of the Nigerian infrastructure would promote business and better living for the people.

### **Conclusions**

Infrastructure development in Nigeria between 1960 and the year 2010, especially under the military administrations, was beneficial particularly in the areas of highway construction, production of electricity, transportation and in the construction of airports and seaports. These accomplishments have significantly improved the infrastructural needs of the nation. National development plans in Nigeria contributed to infrastructure development in the past and ought to be developed, refined, and sustained in the future policies and plans of the government. This is critical to the future progress of infrastructure development in Nigeria. Political instability, religious intolerance, terrorism by Islamic extremists, and poor governance are impediments to infrastructure development in Nigeria and must be addressed squarely by government.

For Nigeria to reach a reasonable milestone in the development of infrastructure, sufficient funds and adequate manpower and material resources must be provided. The lack of funding was a major constraint in infrastructure development in Nigeria in the past 50 years. Government has a responsibility to adequately fund infrastructure development, and this calls for significant increase in the amount of money set aside for construction projects. Government efforts at boosting infrastructure development will be an exercise in futility if bureaucratic corruption that permeates the contract award system was not addressed. This is at the heart of the infrastructure development crisis in Nigeria. Corruption is a huge problem in Nigeria at every fabric of the society. The negative impact on infrastructure development is monumental. Nigeria needs a future leadership

that is committed to fighting corruption and ensuring that funds made available for infrastructure development are used strictly for that purpose. This is a challenge for the political leadership of the future in the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. This measure is vital for building public trust and maintaining good governance.

Government cannot accomplish the huge task of providing adequate infrastructure for the nation alone. Private sector participation is crucial to realizing this goal. The Public Private Partnership (PPP) initiatives currently embraced by private investors in Nigeria should be intensified especially in the area of infrastructure development. Government should provide incentives to attract investors in infrastructural projects. Foreign investors should be targeted. Over dependence on foreign loans to fund construction projects in Nigeria should be kept at the barest minimum because it is not good for the economy. Nigeria needs a visionary and pragmatic leadership for the future infrastructure development of the nation. Ultimately, the future governance of infrastructure development of the nation should be in the areas of roads, railway, power and transportation. In the final analysis, infrastructure development in Nigeria has had moments of progress between 1960 and 2010, but a lot more efforts by political leaders are required for Nigeria to reach satisfactory levels of growth and development in infrastructural network like the rest of the developing nations.



## References

- Achebe, C. (1988). *The trouble with Nigeria*. Enugu, Nigeria: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Adeyeri, S. (2013). Conflicts and political instability in Nigeria: A critical discourse. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 2(10), 119-130. Retrieved from <http://www.garph.co.uk>
- Ado-Kurawa, G. (2005). Nigerian politics and national political reforms. Conference Paper. Lagos, Nigeria: Tellettes Publishing House.
- Afeikhena, J. (2002). *Public enterprises reform in Nigeria: Evidence from the telecommunications industry*. Nairobi, Kenya: African Economic Research Consortium.
- Afegbua, I. A. (2010). Conflicts and political instability in Nigeria: Causes, consequences and prospects. *Journal of Social Science and Public Policy*, 2, 10-18. Retrieved from <http://www.cenresinpub.org>
- Akinwale, A. A. (2010). The menace of inadequate infrastructure in Nigeria. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*, 2(3), 207-228. Retrieved from <http://www.ajstid.com>
- Anigbogu, N. A. & Shwarka, M.S. (2011). Evaluation of the impact of the public procurement reform program on combating corrupt practices in public building projects delivery in Nigeria. *Environtech Journal*, 1(2), 43-51. Retrieved from <http://www.arcom.ac.uk/>
- Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Made or born*. Manhwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Awamleh, R., Evans, J., & Mahate, A. (2005). A test of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employees' satisfaction and performance in the UAE banking sector. *Journal of Comparative International Management*, 8(1), 3-19. Retrieved from <http://journals.hil.unb.ca/index.php/JCIM>
- Babatunde, S. O., Opawole, A., & Akinsiku, O. E. (2012). Critical success factors in public-private partnership (PPP) on infrastructure delivery in Nigeria. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 10(3), 212-225. doi:10.1108/14725961211246018
- Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research* (12th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Baets, W. (2011). Leadership and public governance: Complexity, uncertainty and societal responsibility. Retrieved from <http://gsbblogs.uct.ac.za/walterbaets/2011/05/18/leadership-and-public>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.  
doi:10.1108/01437730410538671
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14(5), 231-272.  
doi:10.1108/03090599010135122
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (92nd.). London, UK: Routledge.

- Bedell-Avers, Hunter, Angie, Eubanks, & Mumford, (2009). Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders: An examination of leader-leader interactions. *The leadership Quarterly*, 20, 299-315. Retrieved from <http://www.journals.elsevier.com/the-leadership-quarterly>
- Bouchat, C. J. (2013). The causes of instability in Nigeria and implications for the United States. Retrieved from <http://www.strategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bryant, S. E. (2003). The role of transformational and transactional leadership in creating, sharing and exploiting organizational knowledge. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(4), 32-44. doi:10.1177/107179190300900403
- Cheema, G. S. (2005). *Building democratic institutions: Governance reform in developing countries*. New York, NY: Kumarian Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dahiru, D. AbdulAzeez, A. D., & Bala, K. (2013). Study of measures for enhancing public private partnership towards infrastructure development in Nigeria. Conference Paper on Sustainable Building. Coventry University. Retrieved from <http://www.coventry.ac.uk/Global/Faculty%20events/SB13/SB13-42-Study-of-measures-for-enhancing-public-private-partnership-towards-infrastructure-development-in-Nigeria.pdf>
- Davis, J. S. (2011). *Challenging governance theory: From network to hegemony*. New

York, NY: Policy Press.

Denhardt, R. B., Denhardt, J. V., & Aristigueta, M. P. (2002). *Managing human behavior in public & nonprofit organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deloitte Global Series (2012). Public governance and accountability. Retrieved from <http://www.deloitte.com>

Dike, V. (2008). Corruption in Nigeria: A new paradigm for effective control. *Africa Economic Analysis*, 1-17. Retrieved from <http://www.africaeconomicanalysis.org>

Egwemi, V. (2012). Corruption and corrupt practices in Nigeria: An agenda for taming the monster. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 14(3), 72-85. Retrieved from <http://www.jsd-africa.com/Jsda/>

Ekpenkhio, S. A. (2003). Public sector procurement reforms: The Nigerian experience. Conference Paper. Nigeria. Retrieved from <http://www.wto.org>

Ezeh, E. M. (2013). Public procurement reform strategies. Retrieved from <https://cips.org/Documents/Engr.%20Emeka%20Ezeh%20presentation%20%2821%20May%29%20%5BRepaired%5D.pdf>

Fagbadebo, O. (2007). Corruption, governance and political instability in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 1(2), 28-37.

Retrieved from <http://www.academicjournals.org/AJPSIR>

Fiedler, F. E., & Garcia, J. E. (1987). *New approaches to effective leadership*. New York, NY: John Wiley.

Filley, A. C., & House, R. J. (1969). *Managerial process and organizational behavior*.

- Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Company.
- Gardner, J. (1990). *On leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Gardner, J. J. (2006). Transactional, transformational, and transcendent leadership: Metaphors mapping the evolution of the theory and practice of governance. *Leadership Review*, 6,62-76. Retrieved from <http://www.leadershipreview.org>
- Ghauri, P., Gronhaug, K., & Kristianslund, I. (1995). *Research methods in business studies: A practical guide*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Guion, L. A., Diehl, D. C., & McDonald, D. (2011). Triangulation: Establishing the validity of qualitative studies. Retrieved from <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu>
- Gwilliam, K. (2011). *Africa's transport infrastructure: Mainstreaming maintenance and management*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Hague, R. (1992). *Comparative government and politics: An introduction*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Hawkins, J. (2013). How to note: Reducing corruption in infrastructure sector. Conference Paper.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior* (3rd ed.). Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Holloway, I., & Wheeler, S. (2013). *Qualitative research in nursing and healthcare* (3rd ed.). New Jersey, USA; John Wiley & Sons.
- Idris, A., Kura, S. M., & Bashir, M. U. (2013). Public private partnership in Nigeria and improvement in service delivery: An appraisal. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 10(3), 63-71. Retrieved from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss.html>
- Ige, B. (1995). *People, politics and politicians of Nigeria (1940-1979)*. Ibadan, Nigeria:

Heinemann Educational Books (Nigeria) Plc.

- Iroghama, P.I. (2012). Trust in government: A note from Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, 2(1), 258-267.  
Retrieved from <http://www.hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/IJAREMS>
- Kemp, R., Parto, S., & Gibson, R. B. (2005). Governance for sustainable development: Moving from theory to practice. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 8(1/2), 12-30. doi:10.1504/IJSD.2005.007372
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawal, T., & Oluwatoyin, A (2011). National development in Nigeria: Issues, challenges and prospects. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 3(9), 237-241. doi:10.5897/JPAR11.012
- Lawal, G., & Tobi, A. (2006). Bureaucratic corruption, good governance and development: The challenges and prospects of institution building in Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 2(10), 642-649. Retrieved from <http://www.aensiweb.com/jasr.html>
- Lietz, C. A., Langer, C. L., & Furman, R. (2006). Establishing trustworthiness in qualitative research in social work: Implication from a study regarding spirituality, *Qualitative Social Work*, 5(441).doi:10.1177/1473325006070288.
- Madueke, C. N. (2008). *The role of leadership in governance: The Nigerian experience* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses

Database. (UMI No. 3320296)

Mbanefo, C. A. (2000). The role of engineering infrastructure in national development. In M. D. Abdullahi (Ed.), *Provision & maintenance of engineering infrastructure for technological development in Nigeria* (pp. 37-44). Kaduna, Nigeria. Fahimta Publishing Company.

Marcellus, I. C. (2009). Development planning in Nigeria: Reflections on the national economic empowerment and development strategies (NEEDS) 2003-2007. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 20(30), 197-210. Retrieved from <http://www.thescipub.com/journals/jss>

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mohammed, K., Chapola, D., & Bello, A. (2013). The state of Nigerian economy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Privatization and commercialization programs under Obasanjo-Atiku regime. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(19), 88-98. Retrieved from <http://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/>

Muogbo, S. U. (2013). Impact of privatization on corporate performance: A study of selected industries in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 2(7), 81-89. ISSN (Online): 2319-7722. Retrieved from <http://www.ijhssnet.com/>

Mustafa, A. R. (2006). Ethnic structure, inequality and governance of the public sector in Nigeria. *United Nations Research Institute for Social Development*, 1-55. Retrieved from <http://www.unrisd.org>

Mustapha, M. (2010). Corruption in Nigeria: Conceptual and empirical notes.

*Information, Society and Justice*, 3(2), 165-175. doi:10.3734/isj.2007.1102

- Ngowi, H. P. (2009). Economic development and change in Tanzania since independence: The political leadership factor. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 3(4), 259-267. Retrieved from <http://www.academicjournals.org/ajpsir/index.htm>
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nwanolue, B. O. G., & Iwuoha, V. C. (2012). The Nigerian civil service and promotion of sustainable human development: A critical analysis. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 1(9), 12-21. Retrieved from <http://www.arabianjbmr.com>
- Nzongola-Ntalaja, G. (2002). UNDP role in promoting good governance. Seminar for the International Guest at the Congress of the Labor Party, Oslo, Norway. Retrieved from [http://www.um.edu.mt/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/120837/2009\\_4.pdf](http://www.um.edu.mt/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/120837/2009_4.pdf)
- Obadan, M. I. (2003). *National development planning and budgeting in Nigeria: Some pertinent issues*. Lagos, Nigeria: Broadway Press Limited.
- Ogbeidi, M. M. (2012). Political leadership and corruption in Nigeria since 1960: A socioeconomic analysis. *Journal of Nigerian Studies*, 1(2), 1-25. Retrieved from [http://www.unh.edu/nigerianstudies/articles/Issue2/Political\\_leadership.pdf](http://www.unh.edu/nigerianstudies/articles/Issue2/Political_leadership.pdf)
- Ogbonna, B. C. (2012). Structural adjustment program (SAP) in Nigeria. An empirical assessment. *Journal of Banking*, 6(1), 19-40. Retrieved from [www.academia.edu/](http://www.academia.edu/)
- Ogbonna, A. C. & Kalu, L. U. (2012). Public procurement reform in developing countries: A critique of the real estate context in the Nigerian case. *International*



- Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research*, 1(8), 65-77. Retrieved from <http://www.ijmsbr.com/>
- Ogbuagu, U., Ubi, P., & Effiom, L. (2014). Corruption and infrastructure decay: Perceptible evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 5(10), 20-27. Retrieved from <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>
- Ogu, V. I. (2000). Stakeholders' partnership approach to infrastructure provision and management in developing world cities: Lessons from the sustainable Ibadan project. *Human Settlement Development*, 111, 1-18. doi:10.1016/S0197-3975(00)00015-1
- Ogujiuba, K., & Obiechina, M. E. (2011). Financial sector reforms in Nigeria: Issues and challenges. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(6), 222-233. doi:10.5539/ijbm.v6n6p222
- Ojo, E. O. (2012). Leadership crisis and political instability in Nigeria, 1964-1966: The personalities, the parties and the policies. *Global Advanced Research Journal of History, Political Science and International Relation*. 1(1), 6-17. Retrieved from <http://www.garj.org/garjhpsir/>
- Okekeocha, C. (2013). A case study of corruption and public accountability in Nigeria. A Practicum Paper for M.A. Degree. Kennesaw State University.
- Okonjo-Iweala, N. (2012). *Reforming the unreformable: Lessons from Nigeria*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Okonjo-Iweala, N. & Osafo-Kwaako, P. (2007). Nigeria's economic reforms: Progress and challenges. Retrieved from <http://www.brokings.edu/research/papers/200>
- Okotoni, O. (2001). Problems and prospects of Nigerian bureaucracy. *Journal of Social*

- Sciences*, 7(3), 223-229. Retrieved from <http://thescipub.com/jss.toc>
- Olaopa, T. (2010). *Public service reforms in Africa*. Ibadan, Nigeria: University Press Plc.
- Olaseni, M. & Alade, W. (2012). Vision 20:2020 and the challenges of infrastructure development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 5(2), 1-14. doi:10.5539/jsd.v5n2p63
- Olumide, H. A. (2011). Telecommunication reform and effects of competition on availability, quality and cost of services in Nigeria. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 1(3), 8-20. Retrieved from <http://www.iist.org/Journals/index.php/PPAR>
- O'Sullivan, E., & Rassel, G. R. (1999). *Research methods for public administrators* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Oyedele, O. A. (2012). The challenges of infrastructure development in democratic governance. *Constructive Economics and Management*, 1(6119), 1-15. Retrieved from [www.fig.net/TSOIC](http://www.fig.net/TSOIC)
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ploch, L. (2010). Nigeria: CRS report for congress. *Congressional Research Service*, 7(5700), 1-35. Retrieved from <http://www.crs.gov>
- Riggio, R. E., & Murphy, S. E. (2003). *The future of leadership development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rogger, D. (2014). The causes and consequences of political interference in bureaucratic decision-making: Evidence from Nigeria. Conference paper. Retrieved from

<http://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/sites/blavatnik/files/documents/04.%20Dan%20Rogger%20The%20Role%20of%20Politicians%20-%20paper.pdf>

- Rotberg, R. I. (2005). Strengthening governance: Ranking countries would help. *The Washington Quarterly*, 28(1), 71-81. doi:10.1162/0163660042518215
- Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2001). The transformational-transactional leadership model in practice. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 22(8), 383-394. doi:10.1108/01437730110410107
- Shafritz, J. M., & Russell, E. W. (2003). *Introducing public administration* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Shafritz, J. M., Russell, E. W., & Boricks, C. P. (2007). *Introducing public administration* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Singleton, R. A., & Straits, B. C. (2005). *Approaches to social research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Songi, O. (2008). Electoral reform in Nigeria: Prospects and challenges. Retrieved from <http://works.bepress.com>
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Taye, O. O., & Dada, M. O. (2012). Appraisal of private sector involvement in infrastructure development in Lagos, Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 399-412. doi:10.5901/mjss.2012.v3n2.399
- Therkildsen, O. (2001). Efficiency, accountability and implementation: Public sector reforms in East and Southern Africa. Democracy, Governance and Human Rights; UNRISD. Retrieved from <http://www.unrisd.org>
- Toikka, A. (2011). *Governance theory as a framework for empirical research: A case*

*study of local environmental policy-making in Helsinki, Finland* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Helsinki, Finland.

Transparency International (2014). Nigeria: Corruption and Insecurity. Retrieved from <http://www.transparency.org>.

Transparency International (2013). Transparency and accountability. United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Retrieved from [http://www.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PDACP977.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACP977.pdf)

Trochim, W. M. K., & Donnelly, J. P. (2008). *The research methods knowledge base*. Mason, OH: Centage Learning.

Udoka, C. A., & Anyingang, R. A. (2012). The effects of privatization on economic growth on Nigeria: 1979-2007 in retrospect. *International Journal of Economic Development, Research and Investment*, 3(2), 25-35. Retrieved from <http://www.icidr.org/>

United Nations (2007). Public governance indicators: A literature review. Retrieved from <http://unpan1.un.org>

World Bank Group (2002). Nigeria governance and corruption diagnostic study. Analysis of survey results. Final Report. Nigeria. Retrieved from <http://www.docstoc.com>

Wright, P. (1996). *Managerial leadership*. London: Routledge.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zuofa, T., & Ochieng, E. G. (2014). Project failure: The way forward and panacea for development. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 9(11), 59-71. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org/ijbm>

## Appendix A: Interview Guide

### Introduction

Thank you for taking time off your busy schedule to participate in this exploratory study aimed at identifying the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. My name is Michael Onolememen and I will be the sole conductor of this interview. This exploratory study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of a doctoral degree (PhD) in Public Policy and Administration (Public Management & Leadership). This study is seeking your honest opinion of how leadership has affected the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria between 1960 and the year 2010, and especially to understand the variables that produced the challenges that you faced while in office in your leadership of the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. The format of our discussion will center on discussing the specific questions relating to the issue of discourse. Please respond honestly to the questions that will be asked during the interview and as best you can. Your responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Let us begin.

Please, do not write your name. You may check one of the categories of respondents below:

- a) Retired Military Head of State ( )
- b) Former Civilian President ( )
- c) Former Public Officer ( )
- d) Retired civil servant ( )

- e) Private citizen ( )
- f) Infrastructure development expert ( )
- g) Private business owner ( )
- h) Other: ..... (please specify)

Discussion Question #1: How have the policies of the previous military administrations affected the development of infrastructure in Nigeria between 1960 and 2010?

Follow-up Questions:

- 1.....
- ....
- 2.....
- ...
- 3.....
- ....
- 4.....

Discussion Question #2: How have the policies of the previous civilian administrations affected the development of infrastructure in Nigeria between 1960 and 2010?

Follow-up Questions:

- 1. ....
- ....
- 2. ....
- .....
- 3. ....
- .....

- 4. ....  
.....

Discussion Question #3: What were the obstacles to the implementation of government policies on infrastructure development in Nigeria during the period that you served?

Follow-up Questions:

- 1. ....  
.....
- 2. ....  
.....
- 3. ....  
.....
- 4. ....  
.....

Discussion Question #4: Which government policies on infrastructure development would you consider favorable and effective?

Follow-up Questions:

- 1. ....  
.....
- 2. ....  
.....
- 3. ....  
.....

- 4. ....  
.....

Discussion Question #5: What relationship do you perceive between the performance of previous administrations and the public trust in the development of infrastructure in Nigeria?

Follow-up Questions:

- 1. ....  
.....
- 2. ....  
.....
- 3. ....  
.....
- 4. ....  
.....

Discussion Question #6: In what ways has bureaucratic corruption impeded the development of the infrastructure sector in Nigeria during the period under review?

Follow-up Questions:

- 1. ....  
.....
- 2. ....  
.....
- 3. ....



.....

4. ....

.....

Discussion Question #7: Explain the impact of the various reforms (economic, political, administrative) initiated by different administrations on the development of infrastructure in Nigeria.

Follow-up Questions:

1. ....

....

2. ....

....

3. ....

....

4. ....

....

Discussion Question #8: In your opinion, which reforms had significant impact on infrastructure development in Nigeria?

Follow-up Questions:

1. ....

.....

2. ....

.....

3. ....

.....

4. ....

.....

Discussion Question #9: Which form of leadership would best serve the infrastructure development needs of Nigeria?

Follow-up Questions:

1. ....

.....

2. ....

.....

3. ....

.....

4. ....

.....

Discussion Question #10: What are the impediments to good governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria?

Follow-up Questions:

1. ....

.....

2. ....

.....

3. ....

.....

- 4. ....  
.....

Discussion Question #11: Which areas of infrastructure development should be of utmost priority to the future leadership of Nigeria?

Follow-up Questions:

- 1. ....  
.....
- 2. ....  
.....
- 3. ....  
.....
- 4. ....  
.....

Discussion Question #12: What are the benefits of good infrastructure network in Nigeria?

Follow-up Questions:

- 1. ....  
.....
- 2. ....  
.....
- 3. ....  
.....
- 4. ....

....

**Additional Comments:**

Closing Remarks: I wish to thank you for accepting to participate in this interview and for your frank responses to the questions posed. Please if you would like to have a copy of the final report of this study, let me know so that I can accommodate your request.

## Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter

From : IRB [[IRB@waldenu.edu](mailto:IRB@waldenu.edu)]  
Date : 12/09/2013 03:06 PM  
To : "[m.onolememen@waldenu.edu](mailto:m.onolememen@waldenu.edu)" [[m.onolememen@waldenu.edu](mailto:m.onolememen@waldenu.edu)]  
CC : Walden University Research [[research@waldenu.edu](mailto:research@waldenu.edu)],  
"[robert.levasseur@waldenu.edu](mailto:robert.levasseur@waldenu.edu)" [[robert.levasseur@waldenu.edu](mailto:robert.levasseur@waldenu.edu)]  
Subject : IRB Materials Approved-Michael Onolememen

Dear Mr. Onolememen,

This email is to notify you that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved your application for the study entitled, "The Impact of Leadership on the Governance of Infrastructure Development in Nigeria."

Your approval # is 12-09-13-0072762. You will need to reference this number in your dissertation and in any future funding or publication submissions. Also attached to this e-mail is the IRB approved consent form. Please note, if this is already in an on-line format, you will need to update that consent document to include the IRB approval number and expiration date.

Your IRB approval expires on December 8, 2014. One month before this expiration date, you will be sent a Continuing Review Form, which must be submitted if you wish to collect data beyond the approval expiration date.

Your IRB approval is contingent upon your adherence to the exact procedures described in the final version of the IRB application document that has been submitted as of this date. This includes maintaining your current status with the university. Your IRB approval is only valid while you are an actively enrolled student at Walden University. If you need to take a leave of absence or are otherwise unable to remain actively enrolled, your IRB approval is suspended. Absolutely NO participant recruitment or data collection may occur while a student is not actively enrolled.

If you need to make any changes to your research staff or procedures, you must obtain IRB approval by submitting the IRB Request for Change in Procedures Form. You will receive confirmation with a status update of the request within 1 week of submitting the change request form and are not permitted to implement changes prior to receiving approval. Please note that Walden University does not accept responsibility or liability for research activities conducted without the IRB's approval, and the University will not accept or grant credit for student work that fails to comply with the policies and procedures related to ethical standards in research.

When you submitted your IRB application, you made a commitment to communicate both discrete adverse events and general problems to the IRB within 1 week of their

occurrence/realization. Failure to do so may result in invalidation of data, loss of academic credit, and/or loss of legal protections otherwise available to the researcher.

Both the Adverse Event Reporting form and Request for Change in Procedures form can be obtained at the IRB section of the Walden web site or by emailing [irb@waldenu.edu](mailto:irb@waldenu.edu): <http://researchcenter.waldenu.edu/Application-and-General-Materials.htm>

Researchers are expected to keep detailed records of their research activities (i.e., participant log sheets, completed consent forms, etc.) for the same period of time they retain the original data. If, in the future, you require copies of the originally submitted IRB materials, you may request them from Institutional Review Board.

Please note that this letter indicates that the IRB has approved your research. You may not begin the research phase of your dissertation, however, until you have received the Notification of Approval to Conduct Research e-mail. Once you have received this notification by email, you may begin your data collection.

Both students and faculty are invited to provide feedback on this IRB experience at the link below:

[http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=qHBJzkJMUx43pZegKlmdiQ\\_3d\\_3d](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=qHBJzkJMUx43pZegKlmdiQ_3d_3d)

Alex Dohm

-----  
Research Service Specialist  
Center for Research Quality  
Walden University  
100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 900  
Minneapolis, MN 55401

Follow us on Twitter for research resources and tips!

Twitter: @WaldenResearch

<https://twitter.com/WaldenResearch>

## Appendix C: Participants Consent Form

### Consent Form

You are invited to take part in a research study of the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria in the past 50 years. The researcher is inviting past leaders of Nigeria and key stakeholders such as former senior bureaucrats, heads of consulting and construction companies who participated in infrastructure development in Nigeria during the period of 1960 to 2010 to be in the study. This form is part of a process called “informed consent” to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named Michael Oziegbe Onolememe, who is a doctoral student at Walden University.

### Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of leadership on the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria in the past 50 years and gain a proper understanding of the role played by different successive political leaderships in shaping the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria. The bureaucratic institutions of the different military and civilian political eras will be examined to see the extent to which leadership in the past has influenced the effectiveness of the bureaucracy. The effect of the various leaders and the public sector reforms in those 50 years on the development of infrastructure will be investigated.

### Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to:

- Participate in a personal interview session that will last between 45 to 90 minutes.
- Participate in an interview review session that will last between 15 to 30 minutes

Here are some sample questions:

1. How has leadership affected policy formulation and implementation in the infrastructure sector in Nigeria?
2. How has performance affected public trust in the governance of the infrastructure sector in Nigeria?
3. How has bureaucratic corruption affected performance in the infrastructure sector in Nigeria?
4. How have the various reforms of the different political era affected the development of infrastructure in Nigeria?
5. What form of leadership might better serve the infrastructure needs of the people of Nigeria in the future?

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

This study is voluntary. Everyone will respect your decision of whether or not you choose to be in the study. No one at the ministry of works or any of its agencies will treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to join the study now, you can still change your mind later. You may stop at any time.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

Being in this type of study involves some risk of the minor discomforts that can be encountered in daily life, such as fatigue, stress or becoming upset. Being in this study would not pose risk to your safety or wellbeing.

This study will be beneficial as it is the first time that a study of the role of leadership on



the governance of infrastructure development in Nigeria will be conducted.

**Payment:**

There will be no compensation for your participation in this study. However, a thank you letter will be written and personally signed by me expressing my appreciation to you for contributing to the study.

**Privacy:**

Any information you provide will be kept confidential. The researcher will not use your personal information for any purposes outside of this research project. Also, the researcher will not include your name or anything else that could identify you in the study reports. Data will be kept secure by keeping in a locked file accessible only to the researcher. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university.

**Contacts and Questions:**

You may ask any questions you have now. Or if you have questions later, you may contact the researcher via +2348070888834 and michael.onolememen@waldenu.edu. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call Dr. Leilani Endicott. He is the Walden University representative who can discuss this with you. His phone number is +16123121210. Walden University's approval number for this study is 12-09-13-0072762 and it expires on December 8, 2014.

The researcher will give you a copy of this form to keep.

**Statement of Consent:**

I have read the above information and I feel I understand the study well enough to make a decision about my involvement. By signing below, I understand that I am agreeing to the

terms described above.

Printed Name of Participant

Date of consent

Participant's Signature

Researcher's Signature

---

---

---