

## Self Evaluation, Productivity and Integrity in Security Leadership in Nigeria

I attended a two day workshop on leadership and ethics in the public sector as a resource person. On the first day I was the second speaker among three other speakers, one was a retired military officer, Colonel J.B. Ajanaku and the other an academic, Dr. Paul Badiye, who ventured early in his career to the civil service and retired with the National Productivity Centre. I was from the academia.

On the second day I was scheduled as the last speaker. On the first day, the two speakers spoke on self evaluation in leadership and leadership and productivity. The papers were of interest to me to the extent that they shaped the preamble of my paper on the second day. The paper was on "making integrity work in the work place: leadership and ethics in leading". The previous day I presented a paper on "security leadership for communities: teaching and leading from Nigeria's history, experience and reality (HER). The paper addressed the prevailing failed and failing practice called security in Nigeria. The paper's thrust was on the need to imbue security not only with a philosophy or nature, meaning and purpose taken from Nigeria's history, experience and reality (HER). Fundamentally, security requires legal and policy platforms in order to ensure its effective and efficient governance and accountability.

The first speaker on self evaluation began his paper with a demonstration using three water bottles. The first bottle was filled with water. The second bottle was half filled with water and the third bottle was empty. According to the speaker, these three bottles signified the three types of leadership individuals prevalent in Nigeria. The first was a leader who was too full of himself/herself and cannot absorb any fresh or new idea(s) from anywhere or anybody. The second type was one who was receptive of input and the third type was completely empty and impervious to ideas.

The speaker also introduced three types of leadership - positioning, participatory and team. The first type came by the position one occupied in an organisation; the second was the type that allowed for some degree of input from individuals within the organisation and; the third was where the philosophy of leadership was team based and geared to attaining goal as everyone within the organisation was critical to the attainment of the end-state.

The presentation on productivity for most in the hall was an eye opener to the world of productivity and enabled individuals to rate their work on that scale. Indeed for some it was the first time they were close to anyone from the National Productivity Centre and their work. As one of the resource person confessed it was the first time he had of the NPC.

The issues addressed within the discourses on self evaluation and productivity by the two presentations was timely for me in particular. They were timely as I considered Nigeria's failed and failing security, the place of leadership or lack of it, leadership sensitivity to self evaluation and productivity in the face a so-called security practice that has failed is failing and will continue to fail. I had the opportunity of using self evaluation and productivity to address the prevailing and persistent failure of security and consequently security leadership in relation to the previous day's paper and to situate the next day's paper on integrity of these leaders particularly in the face of the repeated failure of the so-called security leadership they presided over in the country.

The first paper took much time and the interaction from the paper dragged into the day affecting other scheduled presentations. In view of the limited time available, the two remaining presentations were given few minutes to speak to the main issues of their papers. I was the last to speak. First I had to admit the impact of the previous day's papers on my thought especially self evaluation in relation to productivity in the area of security. I briefly recounted my presentation on security and the need to change the paradigm of security in Nigeria using Nigeria's history, experience and reality; I noted that the fact that what we described as security in Nigeria failed, was failing and would continue to fail pointed to crisis in security theory; the fact that we have had conferences/seminars/workshops/ dialogues on security in order to make it work and it was not working pointed to faulty leadership and self evaluation; that in spite of all these we still persisted in the same security practice was indicative of warped leadership and sense of productivity; that we persisted in the continuation of the same security practice not only questioned the entire leadership. It was clearest demonstration of INTEGRITY DEFICITS of leaders in Nigeria.

The three bottles were metaphors of the types of security leadership prevalent in the country. The first bottle represented security leadership that was full and had no place for new initiatives; the second bottle represented security leadership that was half full and possibly receptive to persuasion using facts and figures to new initiatives and; the third type represented security leadership that was empty. The full and empty leaders were the preponderant types in Nigeria and were engrossed with other issues to be aware of the crisis in security and their roles in perpetuating this crisis. The reality of Nigeria's failed and failing security lies between these three types of leadership.

This brought me to the issue of integrity, the subject of my cancelled presentation. I argued that making integrity count in the work place by leaders was subject to the application of ethics in leadership. Leaders unlike followers have several ethics to guide their disposition. Among these were personal, workplace and leadership ethics in this

order. The ability to abide by these three types of ethics by the leader established his/her integrity in the work place.

I observed, in connection to the present leadership in Nigeria, particularly Mr. President that never in the history of leadership in this country has integrity – personal integrity – meant so much as was the case since 2015. The President was elected as much for his personal integrity as to other reasons – individual/group interests, regional/religious sentiments – in 2015. How much of Mr. President's integrity permeated other facets of his administration since he assumed office in 2015? Was Mr. President aware of the need for self evaluation in his leadership since 2015 especially in the three areas of his agenda – security, anti corruption and the economy?

Was Mr. President aware of his government's productivity in these areas? Was there connection between self evaluation, productivity and integrity in his leadership let alone others in his administration? Where was Mr. President's credential on security in the face of the failed and failing security in Nigeria? Where was Mr. President zero tolerance for corruption in the face of revelation from members of his administration? Where would Mr. President place self in the metaphor of the three bottles on security leadership since 2015? Where would Mr. President place self in the context of positioning, participatory and team leadership since 2015?

I argued that personal integrity was the hall mark of Mr. President's leadership. However, how has personal integrity translated into the fulfilment of the three agendas he has set for himself to accomplish for Nigerians? The agendas were securing Nigeria, fighting a relentless war against corruption and revamping the economy in order to create opportunity for the youths. There was no doubt that there were motions and even movements in these areas. But to what degree were these motions and/or movements?

Take the case of security which was Mr. President's signature agenda. Mr. President's understanding of security was a chip off his military life. In spite of been the leading opposition figure since he was removed in 1985, Mr. President has not made the transition from a former military person into a civilian person and from his military perspective of security that represented one objective out of the many objectives of security particularly in a democracy and a Nigeria without its own philosophy of security.

Although Boko Haram (a metaphor for insecurity of this type) was promoted into a politically viable existential threat (a simultaneous process of politicisation and securitisation), the insecurity Boko Haram represented was the least concern for most Nigerians. The security Nigerians voted for Mr. President to provide was the all encompassing type that was founded on the third agenda of revamping the economy and

creating opportunity. This was the existential threat for most Nigerians. It should not just be youths and employment. It should be most Nigerians and opportunity.

Even in the limited occupational type security that Mr. President claimed expertise on, the evidence abound that he has failed and will continue to fail in this respect each time he associated security with this perspective. Thus Mr. President's leadership represented the positioning type as far as his three set agendas for Nigerians was concerned. Mr. President's leadership fed on the ignorance, interest and sentiment of most Nigerians. Nigerians were interested in his personal integrity only if it would solve their problems; Nigerians were interested in his personal integrity only if it will create a critical mass in form of participatory and team leadership at all levels of government and in the ministries, departments and agencies of the public sectors in order to address their problems. At the moment personal integrity was about the president alone and no one else! Mr. President cannot vouch for his appointees in all respect and to lead is NOT about the individual alone.

The positioning type of leadership that Mr. President represented has not addressed insecurity even the narrow and philosophically undefined type he was familiar with let alone expanding the terrain of security to include the type that Nigerians want him to address as reflected in "revamping the economy in order to create opportunity..." for most Nigerians. For many Nigerians involved in the first of the three corruption types identified by Transparency International – petty – and not the political and grand type of Mr. President, it was the lack of opportunity that drove them into petty corruption. Thus fighting a relentless war against corruption has transformed into fighting a relentless war against enemies of Mr. President and his allies.

In the context of the three types of leaders, Mr. President's leadership was clearly of the positioning type – positioning to the extent that he was the first citizen as president and his only card was his personal integrity. Mr. President lacked the participatory and team leadership necessary to galvanise his agendas across the nooks and crannies of the country. Positioning leadership couched on personal integrity should be the problem solving type because leading was about providing direction in the effort to solving problems. If personal integrity in leadership does not lead to productivity (solving problems) and self evaluation (asking questions on the mission) in relation to solving or addressing the country's myriad of challenges, it amounted to a demonstration of lack of integrity.

The preceding discourse and in particular the failed and failing leadership of the prevailing security practice required situating within the context of productivity, self evaluation and integrity. Where was productivity or its awareness in the failed and failing security practice? Where was self evaluation and its practice in the failed and failing security

practice? Where was integrity as far as addressing security and other myriad of issues bedvilling Nigeria?