

# APHORISMS ON MENINGITIS OF LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY IN NIGERIAN PUBLIC SERVICE

**Eketu, Continue Anddison Ph.D**

*Department of Management  
University of Port Harcourt  
[eketuresearch@gmail.com](mailto:eketuresearch@gmail.com)*

**&**

**Edeh, Friday Ogbu**

*Department of Management  
Federal University, Ebonyi.*

## **Abstract**

*This paper identified and discussed some aphorisms which constitute meningitis on leadership accountability in Nigeria. The dominant methodological paradigms of the paper are interpretism and historical research used at arriving at plausible explanations. The paper contended the leadership responsibility is only meaningful within the context of leadership accountability. It also posited that the failure of leadership in every level of Nigeria public service is a metaphor of failure of accountability. Some of the aphorisms, identified as meningitis are: constitutional lapses, failure of the machinery of law; blame game, retrospective and retrogressive accountability; culture of silence and corruption; followers' mentality, dual conscience, promotion of mediocrity, and derogatory value system. The paper concludes that effective leadership accountability is the way out of Nigeria development tragedy, and suggested the publication of allocation and executed projects value of constituency projects, and expulsion of section 6(6)C of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal*

*Republic of Nigeria. It also listed behaviour modification through stiffer measures against misdemeanous acts in leadership accountability in Nigeria.*

**Keywords:** Aphorism, Meningitis, Leadership Accountability, Leadership Responsibility, Nigeria Public Service, Dual Conscience and Retrospective Accountability.

## **Introduction**

Leadership has experienced serial failure in every spectrum of the Nigerian society, particularly in the public sector. There is every indication that the depleting social economic, political and cultural values in the country's value system are metaphor of failure of the leadership paradigm. The indictment on leadership for the failure of organizations, agencies, governments, and commissions to meet up expectations in their responsibilities rests on the pivotal role of leadership in every collective endeavour. Also, because of the superior hierarchical position of the leader, Kelly (2006) has argued that

“without some element of leadership, the many at the bottom will be paralyzed with choices”. This points to the obvious fact that leaders steer society or organizations through teleologic direction, and most often, determine the fate of their followers.

However, it is almost a collective view that lack of accountability is the most dominant factor that has encouraged leadership failure in Nigeria, and its attendant executive misdemeanors. The failure of leadership accountability tends to imply failure of the “supremacy of law”, and regulations upon which the authority of the leader is established. Also, it points to the abuse of the principle of responsibility, which is the codified expectation on the leader with respect to duty, role and functions. Such instances also represent denigrating moral value of society-epitomized in the leader; and lack of ethical leadership, as integrity is comprised.

However, this paper views the aphorisms of leadership accountability problem in Nigeria from a comprehensive perspective, which examines the *menegities* in such complexities and dynamics surrounding regulations, authority, responsibilities, and accountability of leadership in Nigeria. The void on such contributory complexities constitutes the knowledge gap which the paper addresses. The concept of meningitis as adopted in this paper is rather metaphoric, used to explain the deformity and the paralyses which provide explanation for and understanding of the leadership failure in Nigeria.

The paper adopted historical research and interpretism to analyze journals, internet materials, prosecution and on-going cases, newspapers reports and comments, all related to mismanagement of public resources and authority in Nigeria. These methods were preferred because of the nature of the phenomenon investigated. Osunde (1993) and Eketu (2018) preferred this approach because it involves investigating, recording, analyzing and interpreting events with a view to arriving at a plausible explanation, which Gberevie, Shodipo & Oviasogie, (2013) also adopted in examining leadership and accountability in Nigeria.

## **Literature Review**

### **Conceptual Clarification**

#### **Meningitis**

This is a medical terminology for cerebral paralysis, which deforms the body and impedes its capacity for activity. It is used here to mean the factors that have accounted for the endemic problems that frustrate leadership accountability in Nigeria.

#### **Aphorism**

The concept of aphorism means a brief statement of a truth or principle. As used in this context, the aphoristic value of our claim on the meningitis of leadership accountability derives validity from the historic research and interpretive paradigms as approaches adopted in the paper. Thus, we declare as factual claim on the antecedents of sustained unaccountability, as the fundamental truth in the leadership space of Nigerian Public Service.

### **Leadership Responsibility**

Among organizational variables and concepts, leadership has received the most popular attention than any other. Mishane & Von Glinow (2018) argued that, “leadership has been contemplated since the days of Greek philosophers, and it is one of the most popular research topics among organizational behaviour scholars. The reason appears to centre on the importance of leadership to the entire wellbeing of organizations and societies. Chemers (1997) defined leadership as a process of social influence in which one person can enlist the aid and support of others (followers) in the accomplishment of a common task.

Robins & Sanghi (2014) contended that, “leadership is the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of goals. McShane and Von Glinow (2018) defined leadership as the process of influencing people and providing an environment for them to achieve team or organizational objectives. From the foregoing definitional approaches, there are the implications of the person (leader) who guides or directs other (Chemers, 1997); purpose (achievement of common goals); power (influence to compel obedience); social or relational concept (involving others in a group, with social status inequality); and competences (ability, values, personality traits, and characteristics of people) that lead to superior performance (McShane & Von Glinow, 2018).

Drawing from the foregoing, the concept of leadership responsibility derives its meaning and relevance from the position of authority occupies by the leader with stipulated roles as expected behavior

attached to the leadership position. According to Robins (2016), Henri Fayol in his General Administrative Management Theory” provided fourteen Principles of Management involving authority among others. In his contention, Robins (2016) posits that leaders must be able to give orders, as authority gives leaders this right. Along with authority, however, goes responsibility. Wherever authority is exercised, responsibility arises. Responsibility according to Robins (2016) is the obligation to perform. Thus, every authority comes with the responsibility to exercise the authority. From the dispositions above, leadership responsibility means the obligation of the leader to perform the role prescribed in the authority. Robins (2016) identified two basic responsibilities of the leader. These are operating responsibility, which is the one that can be passed on other, and ultimate responsibility, which must be retained by the leader. Thus, the responsibility of the leader is the burden of authorized duty, resting on the leader as a person who occupies the position of leadership. The concept of leadership implies position (authority) and responsibility (duty). The position emphasizes superior status symbol, as giving cause of duty and stewardship explained away in leadership responsibility.

### **Leadership Accountability**

The difference between leadership accountability and accountability leadership will not at first sight seem profound. The former is a duty and the latter is a character. Thus, leadership accountability is created within the leader’s duty as an obligation, while

accountability leadership is created in the norms, values, and expressed in the leadership disposition as the culture of the society or organization. However, if the accountability leadership becomes a cultural expectation, then it becomes a responsibility as well as a duty, as leadership accountability. Leadership accountability is the obligation of the leader to perform, to some satisfactory level. Robins (2016) contended that leadership accountability is the obligation the leader normally or naturally inadvertently inherit from the authority that created the leadership to carry out the role assignment in a satisfactory manner. The implied questions from this disposition are; what is the source of the leader's authority? and to whom is the leader responsible?

### **Leadership Responsibility and Accountability in National Sustainable Development**

There is a growing concern in the views of scholars regarding leadership responsibility and accountability as it relate to national development at all levels (Robert Denney Associate, Inc; 2009; Gberevbie, Shodipo & Oviasogie, 2013; Koppell, 2005; and Buhar, 2008). Robert Denney Associates holds the view that holding the members of the firm accountable is, to a degree important, but there is a problem. Accountability has a negative connotation. It requires people to answerable for, or explain their actions. Instead of emphasizing accomplishments and success, accountability tends to focus on lack of accomplishment or on failure. On the other hand, the concept of responsibility is perceived as being positive. Thus, assigning responsibility

indicates trust and confidence in one's ability to fulfill the responsibility. Gberevbie, Shodipo, and Oviasogie (2013) contended that actual correlation and functional relationship exist between development and accountability. Ninalowo (2003) argued that accountability implies that government functionaries should be prepared to be answerable for their actions at all times to member of the public, and be able to justify their action at all times to member of the public, and be able to justify their actions at all level of moral and ethical standard.

Richardson (2008) argued that accountability is a basic prerequisite for sustainable development of society and organizations. Likewise, Koppell (2005) listed leadership accountability, transparency, reliability, controllability, responsibility; and responsiveness as five dimensions of leadership accountability. This foregoing connotes the leadership accountability is a measure of the trustworthiness of the leader, knowing that effective leadership gives credence to mutual trust (Dive, 2008). Thus, leader accountability is the personal demonstration of the obligation to prove diligent and honesty in one's stewardship. Lack of accountability of leadership is apocrusticus to sustainable national development.

The foregoing presupposes that responsibility without accountability is more or less a fallacy of stewardship, because accountability is the conscience of duty and responsibility. Without a measure of standard of duty, responsibility rests on the discretion of the steward. Such discretion may be fatal

where steward is inordinate, cruel, egoistic and materialistic. Thus, Edoho (2007) established a positive link between effective leadership and proper accountability in the handling of the leader's responsibility in the quest for sustainable development. The consciousness of institutionalize accountability may as well therefore, represent the mechanical conscience of the leader to perform his responsibility with decorum. Thus, accountability is the score card that evaluates how satisfactory responsibility is performed.

Cornett (2018) espousing on the difference between accountability and responsibility posits that responsibility can be shared, but accountability cannot be shared. Accountability is more or less specific to an individual, depending on skills, set role or strengths; while responsibility is task oriented. Accountability is responsibility subsequent, meaning that accountability occurs after responsibility has been performed or presumed to be performed. This accountability is the leader's responsibility and taking of ownership over the results of the performance of his responsibility (his role of leadership). Responsibility consist of tasks, roles, duties, job descriptions and process to achieve a goal, while accountability is the commitment to the successful completion of task, roles, etc, and the willingness to take responsibility (take blame or praise) of its consequences. Accountability cannot be contemplated without responsibility, as no measure of performance occurs in a vacuum.

### **Theoretical Reflection**

This paper adopts the "Upper Echelon" baseline organizational theory which provides a general understanding on the philosophical perspective of leadership as an organizational variable. Upper Echelon Theory by Hambrick & Mason (1984) states that the attribute and the preference of the most powerful actors – the top executive of organization and society, determine and affect the performance of such entities, developing personalized actions, experiences, values, and personalities that shape out as modeled behavior.

The Upper Echelon Theory sees the leader as representing the apex status upon which every activity revolves around. Pfeffer (2006) metaphorize leadership as the organizational soul, thus determinative of its very essence and existence. It implies in the Echelon Theory that the leadership demeanor or misdemeanor directly or indirectly determine the trajectory of the organization or society's sustained or arrested development.

Within the context of this, the paper also explores the "Authentic Leadership Theory" to explain the character, attitude, disposition and behaviour of a leader, requisite to achieve efficiency and effectiveness in his responsibility. This theory is formulated on the conviction that organizations and to a large extent, society are efficiency seeking systems (Pfeffer, 2006). This implies that leaders of society and organizations should lead with the mindset to procure enhanced development through accountability on how their responsibility has been

performed. The adoption of the authentic leadership theory in this paper rests on the predisposition and presupposition that successful organizations require transparent, moral, and ethical leadership behaviour necessary to improve performance (Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Kuaba, 2010; and Gordon, 2010).

The authentic leadership theory according to Luthans & Avolio (2003), is a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self regulated positive behaviour on the part of the leader and associates, fostering positive self-development. The common traits of authentic leaders are transparency, trust, honesty and accountability. For instance, Kauda (2010) contended that profound similarity exists between authentic leadership and master servant-leadership. The authenticity of the leader found expression in the servant-leader values, as servant-leadership is based on the devolution of power to the followers (Kuada, 2010). The leadership climate and disposition are built on the leader's stewardship and accountability to improve followers' wellbeing, as well as the organizational effectiveness. Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans & May (2004) identified the unique characteristics of the authentic leader as having the capacity to build trust, transparency, tolerance, collaborative relationship, transformational capacity, and charisma, among others.

### **Legal Instrument and Institutional Framework for Accountability**

There appears to be a clear intension to demonstration for accountability in the Nigeria public service. These provisions indicate national anathema against executive corruption among public office holders. Whether these demonstrated intensions are translated to gainful reality is in itself questionable.

#### **a. The 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria as Amended**

The constitution is purported to be the *grundnorm* and the Supreme Law of the land, because it is the collective will of the people. It creates responsibilities for every elective and executive position, but retains the power in the people who by implication have delegated authority to the public office holders. This implies that the public office holders are accountable to the people for the responsibilities given to them. In its **Section 14(2)** the constitution states that "it is hereby, accordingly declare that – (a) Sovereignty belong to the people of Nigeria from whom government through this constitution derives all its power and authority"

#### **b. The Criminal Code and Penal Code**

These legal instruments criminalize fraud among public office holders, and also proscribe punishment for offenders. The Criminal Code applied to the South, East and West; while the Penal Code applies to the North as a Sharia legal ordinance. The codification of these laws against fraud indicates a tendency towards accountability.

**c. Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) & Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) Act**

These acts are legal instruments established by the National Assembly to ensure accountability, and to punish offenders on fraud, money laundering not only on public office holders, but to any offender. This implies a security on executive accountability.

**d. Code of Conduct Bureau**

This is another Federal Government institution created by law to prevent the fiscal misdemeanor of public office holders. Among other prescriptions, the Code of Conduct Bureau mandates every public office holder to fill “Assets Declaration Form” before assuming any appointment or office, to procure accountability in the management of public funds and resources.

**e. The Police and Court Systems**

These institutional frameworks established by law, for prosecution and trial of offences related to corruption of all kinds, particularly misappropriation of public funds.

**f. National Procurement Agency and Due Process Rule**

The National Procurement Agency was prescription by the United Nations to member states to establish an institutional framework scrutinize all government procurements at every level of government. This was preconceived on the conviction that large volume of fraud occurs during and in government procurement process. In Nigeria, it is trite law that all government businesses,

including procurement must be approved by the National or State Procurement Agencies, as the case may be, in complaint with the due process rule.

Beside these, there are other administrative provisions for the prevention of public fund embezzlement, to ensure accountability in public service in Nigeria.

**Aphorisms on Meningitis of Leadership Accountability in Nigeria**

Several factors have contributed to build the complex, dynamic and seemingly insurmountable leadership failure in Nigeria. As viewed in this paper, these in part are contextualized in the occasioned frustration that has marred accountable leadership in Nigeria. It is the view of Gberevbie, Shodipo & Oviasogie (2016) that, the lack of accountability has in no small measure encourage corruption in the public sector. As such, it is rather regrettably unfortunate that a very high profile executive should use such laughable and shameful allegories as “*monkey swallowed money*”, “*snake swallowed money*”. It is also unbelievable that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, large amount of money should be misappropriate for personal gains without any mechanism of alerting the system before such monies are carted overseas. All of these points to gross failure of accountability, either from the internal mechanism or from the external mechanism, as institutionalized framework to secure accountability.

The paper examines critical elements of the Nigerian leadership environment that have catalyzed the sustenance of the gross anomalies of leadership without

accountability. These are discussed below:

**a. Constitutional Lapses**

The 1999 constitution provides in its chapter II, section 13-23, the Foundational Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy, whereby duty and responsibility of all organs of government, authorities and persons are stated. The same constitution in its Section 6(6)C clearly states and implies that, chapter II is not justiciable. This means that judiciary, executive and legislative officers cannot be taken to court for their reckless reluctance to adhere to the provisions in Chapter II. This is a gross legal recklessness, as it presumed to have given responsibility without accountability, yet the same constitution pretends in Section 23 that, “the national ethics shall be tolerance and patriotism”.

**b. Failure of the Machinery of Law**

Because the law is passive, the non-punishment of offenders has marred the notion of accountability as such behaviour precepts as: Thorn-Dike’s (1911) Law of Effect; Bandura’s (2000), Social Learning Theory, and Skinner (1988) Classical Conditioning Theory, have all taken effect, encouraging total lawlessness on the accountability and responsibility of public office holders. Thus, “when leaders are accountable, it inspires other leaders to exude the same traits” (Cornett, 2018), but when they are not, and without consequence, it equally inspires others to misbehave.

**c. Blame Game, Retrospective and Retrogressive Accountability**

People trust leaders who are not quick to blame others if anything doesn’t go as planned, but who instead take accountability for their role in the consequences (Cornett, 2018). Unfortunately, leaders in Nigeria justify their incompetence on past leaders, thereby excusing themselves away from accountability of the stewardship at any given time. This results in the distraction of accountability from the present to the past leaders.

**d. The Culture of Silence and Corruption**

Lack of leadership accountability is encouraged by the silence of the populace even when things get terribly wrong. There is no consequence that encourages wrongful acts more than the silence of the victim. For Martin Luther King Jr once said, “we will have to repent in this generation not merely for the hateful words and actions of the bad people, but for the appalling silence of the good people”. Silence on unaccountable leadership breeds and sustains corruption. Corruption begets corruption, and accountability becomes the anathema to corrupt regime (Eketu, 2019).

**e. The Followers’ Mentality**

Cornett (2018) contended that “accountability requires a mental shift in the workplace; leaders have to be willing to give up followers’ mentality, and focus their effort in a productive way to ensure that they achieve results”. Unfortunately, it appears that leaders in Nigerian public service abdicate their accountability role with relegated

willingness to bear their role consequences, but only to look around for whom to blame, as if they are the followers or subordinates.

**f. Promotion of Mediocrity**

The promotion of mediocrity through political, ethno-tribal, and religious, bigotry has in no mean measure encouraged the neglect on the culture of accountability in Nigeria public service. This has very often resulted to selective justice, double standard, and loss of moral obligation to sanction offender, or call for probes.

**g. Failed Administrative Mechanism, Executive Lawlessness, and Reckless Stewardship**

Ineffective and insufficient mechanism for accountability have promoted executive lawlessness and reckless stewardship, whereby the failure of checks and balances merely represents executive fiscal anarchy in managing public funds in Nigeria.

**h. Derogatory Value System, Laced with the Culture of Impunity**

Very close to executive fiscal anarchy and reckless stewardship is the derogatory value system encouraged by the culture of impunity. The hunt for the acquisition of wealth as the top most preference on our value system has relegated moral values to inconsiderable status on the value system. Accountability is thrown to the woods, and impunity is celebrated.

**i. Paradox of Corruption Anathema**

There appears to be a disconnect between the law and the behaviours of the law makers, law executors and the

law interpreters. A situation better described as executive anomie, for want of a fit expression in Durkheim (1951) philosophy. The tone of the law clearly expresses corruption anathema, but the body language of the government depicts encouragement of corruption. Public officers with grievous allegations and trial related to public fund embezzlement are rather honoured with elective and selective positions. This tramples on the foundation of accountability in our national culture (Eketu, 2019).

**j. The Vapourization of the Moral Right of Duty**

Right begets obligations. Moral rights of duty exist where moral justification and equitable sense of Sanction exists. However, in Nigeria, because of the pervasive and prevalent corruption at every spectrum of governance and public service, the moral right of duty and obligation to hold public office holders accountable has vaporized, dwindled and vanished. This has simply made unaccountability a norm of public governance.

**k. Chronic Irresponsibility Mentality Syndrome (CIMS)**

There is indeed yet a gross sense of irresponsibility that has grown to the status of chronic irresponsibility, with glaring lack of any good conscience to the call of duty. Thus, the dignity and obligation attached to public duty is relegated, compromised, abused, neglected, and abandoned for self seeking-personal gains. This syndrome is so endemic that before most public officers are selected, elected or pointed, they have already prepared to be irresponsibly unaccountable. This

explains why an illiterate will contest for position that can only be effectively occupied by a graduate because unaccountability is promised *ab initio*.

### **l. Executive Dual Conscience and Dual Consequence**

The high level of executive bigotry has translated to ethnic religious, political and tribal discrimination in the public service. Meaning making of any misbehavior by a public officer is determined by the tribe of the person making the meaning and that of the person who misbehaves. And so goes the consequence.

### **m. Regime of Inconsequentialism**

One of the fundamental meningitis that has crippled leadership accountability in Nigeria is the inconsequential character of government. There is no encouraging reward for being good, as there is no detriment for evil doing. The ultimate consequence on behavior is the tendency to do self-rewarding acts that may be at the cost of the public good. The regime inconsequentialism mere promotes unaccountability, as no doom is directly anticipated of wrongful acts, and as the anti-graft law are mere sanctions on paper, and only given effect to extent to which an alleged offender is a friend or a foe to the constable. It therefore further means that the “good conscience” of the public officer in Nigeria is mere wholesome fear of the constable.

### **n. Punilization of Accountability**

Leadership accountability ought to be a natural consequence of responsibility. It is the feedback of executed responsibility, be it incremental or wholistic. However, the growing

disposition of the populace, which has become an endemic public attitude and perception, is that accountability is a witch-hunt of a predecessor by a cruel or unfriendly successor in authority. This disposition has affected the mentality of both “the leader” and “the led” to the extent that superior authorities now use it as an instrument of political coercion and punity against opposition or any form of contrary opinion. This is a gross abuse of the philosophy upon which accountability is established. Leadership is the soul of society, and accountability is the soul of leadership. Accountability is the last phase of responsibility. It is therefore, the part of the acceptance of responsibility. Thus, it is not a punitive device, but the self-evaluation of one’s stewardship. The implication of the punitive mindset is the preponderance or probability, and not the possibility of certainty that every responsibility given must be accounted for.

### **o. Leadership Gullibility to Destructive Sycophancy**

Leaders most often regard sycophancy of their subject as a measure of fame, popularity and loyalty. For this reason, they surround themselves with all kinds of praise singers, who will never ever tell the truth to the leader, rather tell what they want the leader to hear or what the leader will like to hear. This gullibility of sycophancy mere *mares* the leaders sense of interim or process accountability. Because the process of accountability is jeopardized, ultimately the leader’s terminal accountability is frustrated. The leader’s gullibility to sycophancy has its potency in the leader’s veil of ignorance which tints the

leader's vision of good conscience in all doings.

### **Way Forward and Conclusion**

It appears logical to reason that the correctives require to institute a practical accountability rest largely on the same people who benefit from the meningitis of leadership accountability in Nigeria. If this be, then the Latin aphorism "*nemo jus sibi dicere postest*" – No one can give judgement for himself, becomes a caveat. *Ubi Jus Ibi remendum* – Where there is wrong, there is remedy. Unfortunately those who influence the law are the same, those as who benefit from the injustice of unaccountability in the public space. However, a smart way to curtail executive fiscal anarchy is to have a national print and electronic media accessible to all and sundry, where allocations for confederal and state constituency projects are published, with the receivers of such allocations expected by law to publish the projects and monetary value of these projects on quarterly basis. This should apply to State Governors, Local Government Chairmen, Ministers, Heads of Parastatals, Vice Chancellors, and any other public office holder.

The veil of immunity should be lifted from elected public office holders whereby injunction can be invoked to stop any form of financial mismanagement. The practice whereby a public officer leaves office before any litigation can be brought against them merely postponed accountability for misdemeanors, at then they would have acquired what it take to manipulate justice.

The excessive allowances and salaries of elected public office holders is no less a form of executive irresponsibility in a country where other very crucial public servants annual earnings is less than the monthly salary and allowances of elected public office holders. This disparity and irresponsibility mars accountability. A drastic slash of elected officers' remuneration should be done.

However, more is demanded of mental reorientation through sanctions and punitive measures against offenders, devoid of any form of selective treatment, to serve as check on the tendency towards criminal and reckless lack of accountability. The reinforcement of the existing anti-corruption mechanisms is necessary. National Accountability Commission should be established and charged with the sole function of monitoring and ensuring accountability compliance. The paper concludes that proper management of the national resources to enthrone and sustain the needed national development in Nigeria can only be achieved through the enthronement of the culture of accountability leadership.

### **References**

- Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Walumbwa, F.O., Luthans, F. & May, D.R. (2014) Unlocking the Mask: A Look at the Process by which Authentic Leaders Impact Follower. Attitudes and Behaviours. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15: 801-823.
- Bandura, A. (2000) *Social Learning Theory*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

- Buhari, M. (2008) Discipline and Accountability Under Democratic Leadership. *Journal of African development Affairs*. 1 (1): 72-78.
- Chemers, C. (1997) Responsibility, Accountability and Leadership. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness* 3(2): 1-15.
- Cornett, I. (2018) *The Difference Between Responsibility and Accountability in Leadership*. Leadership and Succession Train & Development.
- Durkheim, E. (1951) *Suicide*, Glenoe: Free Press.
- Edoho, F. (2007) State Corporate Alliance: Ramification for Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Livelihood. *African Journal of Business and Economic Review*. 3(1):96-113.
- Eketu, C.A. (2018) Interpretive Paradigm on the Use of Fear as Workers Coercive Motivation. *Academy of Social Science Journal*. 3(5):25-39.
- Eketu, C.A. (2019) Behaviour Pathology on Reforming the Paradox of Corruption Anathema for National Integrity in Nigeria. *University of Port Harcourt Journal of Management Sciences*. 4(1):6-15.
- Hambrick, D.C. & Mason, P.A. (1984) Upper Echelons: The Top Management Team: Key to Strategic Success. *California Management Review*, 30 (1): 88-108.
- Gberevbie, D.E., Shodipo, A.O. and Oviasogie, F.O. (2013) Leadership and Accountability: Thought and Practice. *A Journal of the Philosophical Association of Kenya*. 5(1):121-140.
- Gordon, K. (2010) *A Diagnostic to Organizational Behaviour*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kelly, K. (2006) Quoted in *Business the Ultimate Resource*. Cambridge: A & B Publishers.
- Koppell, J.G.S. (2005) Pathologies of Accountability ICAN and the Challenge of Multiple Accountabilities Disorder. *Public Administration Review*. 65(1):5-8.
- Kuada, J. (2018) Culture and Leadership in Africa: A Conceptual Model and Research Agenda. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*. 1 (1):9-24.
- Luthans, F. and Avolio, B.J. (2003) *Authentic Leadership: A Positional Developmental Approach*. Cameron, K.S., Dulton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. eds Positive Organizational Scholarship Foundation of a New Discipline. San Francisco, C.A: Berrett-Kochler, p.241-258.
- Meshame, S.L. and M.A. Von Glinow (2018) *Organizational Behaviour, Emerging Realities for Workplace Revolution*, Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Osunde, A.U. (1993) *Historical Research in Ehiamentalor, E.T. and Nwadiani, M. eds. A Guide to Research in Education and Social Sciences*. Benin City: NERA Publications. P. 33-43.
- Pfeffer, J. (2006) *Organizations and Organizational Theory*. Boston: Pitman.
- Richardson, M. (2008) *Good Governance: The Vital Ingredient of*

- Economic Development. *Management in Nigeria*. 14 (4): 15-20.
- Robert Denney Associates (2009) What Makes for Effective Leadership, Accountability or Responsibility. *Legal Communiqué* [www.robertdenny.com](http://www.robertdenny.com)
- Robins, S.P. (2016) *Essentials of Organizational Behaviour*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Robins, S.P. and Sanghi, A. (2014) *Organizational Behaviour*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Skinner, B.F. (1988) *Contingency Reinforcement*. East Norwalk: Appleton-Century. Croffs.
- The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999.
- Thorndike, E.L. (1911) *Animal Intelligence*. New York: Macmillan