The Impact of Poor Leadership on the Economy of Nigeria (1986 -2023)

Cajetan Ifeanyi Nnaocha
Department of History
Faculty of Arts
Kaduna State University, Kaduna Nigeria

Abstract

This study examines the impact of poor leadership on the Nigerian economy from 1986 to 2023, with the aim of establishing the extent to which governance failures have shaped the country's economic trajectory. Anchored on a historical and analytical framework, the study interrogates leadership patterns from the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) era to the contemporary democratic dispensation, highlighting the link between leadership quality and economic outcomes. The methodology adopted is qualitative, relying primarily on secondary sources such as academic literature, government publications, policy documents, and reports from international organizations. These materials were systematically analyzed using content analysis to identify recurring themes and patterns in leadership practices and their economic implications. The findings reveal that poor leadership—manifested in corruption, policy inconsistency, weak institutions, lack of accountability, and limited commitment to inclusive development-has significantly constrained Nigeria's economic growth. These governance deficiencies have distorted resource allocation, discouraged investment, and undermined effective policy implementation. The study further finds that the socio-economic consequences of these failures are evident in persistent poverty, rising inequality, high unemployment, infrastructural deficits, and continued dependence on oil, which exposes the economy to external shocks. The study concludes that Nigeria's economic challenges are largely rooted in internal leadership failures rather than external factors. It submits that sustainable economic transformation is contingent upon a fundamental shift toward transparent, accountable, and consistent leadership committed to inclusive development. Without such reforms, Nigeria's vast economic potential will remain unrealized

Keywords: Leadership; Economic Development; Corruption; Policy Inconsistency; Institutional Weakness; Nigeria Economy (1986–2023)

Introduction

The relationship between leadership and economic development has long occupied a central place in political economy and development discourse (Daron Acemoglu & James A. Robinson, 2012; Victor E. Dike, 2014). In many developing countries, particularly in Africa, leadership is often identified as a decisive factor in shaping economic outcomes, determining whether nations progress toward sustainable development or remain trapped in cycles of stagnation and underdevelopment. Nigeria, Africa's most populous country and one of its most resource-endowed states, presents a compelling case for examining this relationship. Despite its vast human and natural resources, including abundant crude oil reserves, fertile agricultural land, and a vibrant entrepreneurial population, Nigeria's economic trajectory between 1986 and 2023 has been characterized by persistent instability, structural weaknesses, and uneven growth. This paradox raises critical questions about the quality of leadership and its impact on economic performance over time.

The year 1986 marks a significant turning point in Nigeria's economic history with the introduction of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) under military rule. SAP was designed to restructure the Nigerian economy, reduce dependence on oil, encourage diversification, and promote market-oriented reforms (World Bank, 1994). However, its implementation coincided with a period of political instability, authoritarian governance, and limited institutional accountability. From the late military era through the transition to democratic rule in 1999 and into the Fourth Republic, successive administrations have introduced various economic policies and reforms aimed at stabilizing the economy and promoting growth. Yet, these policies have often been undermined by inconsistencies, weak implementation, and leadership deficiencies (Emmanuel Ande Ivorgba, 2024). Understanding the historical context of leadership and economic policy from 1986 to 2023 is therefore essential for situating the broader argument of this study.

Leadership in Nigeria during this period has been marked by a complex interplay of military and civilian regimes, each bringing distinct approaches to governance and economic management. While some administrations articulated ambitious reform agendas, the outcomes frequently fell short of expectations due to entrenched systemic challenges. Issues such as corruption, lack of transparency, policy reversals, and weak institutional frameworks have persisted across regimes, limiting the effectiveness of economic initiatives (Ijevereme Ogbewere Bankole & Dunmade Emmanuel Olaniyi, 2021; Transparency International, 2020). Consequently, the Nigerian economy has experienced recurring cycles of boom and bust, largely tied to fluctuations in global oil prices, rather than sustained, diversified growth driven by sound leadership and strategic planning. This historical overview provides a necessary foundation for examining how leadership practices have shaped economic outcomes in Nigeria.

Beyond historical and context secondary sources, the dimensions of poor leadership in Nigeria reveal a pattern of governance failures with far-reaching economic implications. One of the most prominent features is corruption, which has permeated various levels of government and diverted resources away from productive investments. Public funds that could have been used for infrastructure development, education, healthcare, and industrialization have often been misappropriated or inefficiently managed. This has not only weakened public institutions but also eroded public trust and discouraged both domestic and foreign investment. Closely related to corruption is the problem of policy inconsistency, where frequent changes in economic direction create uncertainty and undermine long-term planning. Investors and businesses are often reluctant to commit resources in an environment where policies are unpredictable and subject to abrupt reversals.

Another critical dimension is the weakness of institutions tasked with economic governance. Strong institutions are essential for enforcing rules, ensuring accountability, and providing a stable environment for economic activities. In Nigeria, however, institutions have often been undermined by political interference, lack of autonomy, and inadequate capacity (Joseph Bamikole Adeyanju & Faith Omolola Adeyanju, 2023). Regulatory bodies, anti-corruption agencies, and economic planning institutions frequently struggle to perform their functions effectively, leading to inefficiencies and systemic dysfunction. Furthermore, leadership has often failed to prioritize inclusive development, resulting in policies that do not adequately address the needs of the broader population. High levels of unemployment, particularly

among youth, and persistent inflationary pressures reflect deeper structural issues linked to governance failures.

The consequences of these leadership deficiencies are evident in Nigeria's socio-economic landscape. Despite periods of economic growth, particularly during oil booms, the benefits have not been equitably distributed. Poverty remains widespread, with a significant proportion of the population lacking access to basic services and opportunities. Income inequality has widened, creating stark disparities between different regions and social groups. Infrastructure deficits, including inadequate power supply, poor transportation networks, and limited industrial capacity, continue to hinder economic productivity and competitiveness. These challenges are further compounded by issues such as capital flight, brain drain, and a heavy reliance on imports, which undermine domestic economic resilience. Moreover, the failure to effectively diversify the economy away from oil dependence has left Nigeria vulnerable to external shocks. Fluctuations in global oil prices have repeatedly exposed the fragility of the country's economic structure, leading to fiscal crises, currency instability, and declining public revenues. While successive governments have acknowledged the need for diversification, progress has been slow and uneven, reflecting deeper issues of strategic vision and leadership commitment (Praise Fisayo Duyile, 2023). The inability to translate policy intentions into tangible outcomes underscores the central argument of this study: that poor leadership has been a significant constraint on Nigeria's economic development between 1986 and 2023.

Against this background, this study examines the impact of poor leadership on Nigeria's economy from 1986 to 2023. It explores the historical evolution of leadership and economic policies in the country, analyzes the various dimensions of poor leadership and their economic implications, and assesses the resulting socio-economic consequences and developmental outcomes within the polity.

Historical Overview of Leadership and Economic Policies in Nigeria (1986–2023)

The trajectory of Nigeria's economy from 1986 to 2023 cannot be fully understood without situating it within the broader context of leadership transitions and shifting policy regimes. This period captures a critical phase in Nigeria's political economy, beginning with the adoption of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in 1986 and extending through successive military and civilian administrations. It is a period marked by policy experimentation, institutional fragility, and recurring tensions between reformist intentions and weak implementation. The interplay between leadership styles and economic management during these decades provides a foundation for understanding the persistent challenges confronting the Nigerian economy.

The introduction of SAP in 1986 under the military administration of General Ibrahim Babangida represented a watershed in Nigeria's economic history. SAP was implemented in response to severe macroeconomic imbalances caused by declining oil revenues, mounting external debt, and fiscal deficits (Iyoha, 1996). The programme, influenced by the prescriptions of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, sought to liberalize the economy through currency devaluation, deregulation, trade liberalization, and privatization of state-owned enterprises (Olaniyan & Ekundayo, 2019). In principle, SAP aimed to reduce the role of the state in economic activities and promote efficiency through market mechanisms.

However, the outcomes of SAP were mixed and, in many respects, controversial. While certain sectors experienced short-term gains, the broader socio-economic effects were largely adverse. The devaluation of the naira led to increased import costs, inflationary pressures, and declining real incomes for many Nigerians (Adebayo, 2007). Furthermore, the removal of subsidies and reduction in public spending adversely affected social services such as education and healthcare. Leadership during this period was characterized by a lack of transparency and limited public participation in policy formulation, which contributed to widespread public dissatisfaction and resistance to reform measures (Osaghae, 1998). The inability of the Babangida administration to effectively manage the social consequences of SAP underscored the limitations of top-down economic reforms implemented without strong institutional support.

Following the Babangida regime, the brief and unstable transition period culminating in the annulment of the June 12, 1993 presidential election further destabilized the economy. The subsequent military government of General Sani Abacha (1993–1998) adopted a more interventionist economic approach, reversing some of the liberalization policies of SAP. While the Abacha regime recorded relative macroeconomic stability, particularly through the accumulation of foreign reserves and control of inflation, it was also marked by unprecedented levels of corruption and international isolation (Lewis, 2007). The concentration of power in the executive and the lack of accountability mechanisms facilitated the misappropriation of public funds on a massive scale. Consequently, the apparent economic stability of the period masked deeper structural weaknesses and governance failures.

The transition to civilian rule in 1999 under President Olusegun Obasanjo marked the beginning of Nigeria's Fourth Republic and raised expectations for improved governance and economic recovery. The Obasanjo administration introduced a series of economic reforms aimed at restoring macroeconomic stability, promoting private sector development, and re-engaging with the international community. Notably, the government implemented the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), which emphasized poverty reduction, wealth creation, employment generation, and value reorientation (National Planning Commission, 2004). In addition, significant progress was made in debt relief negotiations, culminating in the Paris Club's forgiveness of a substantial portion of Nigeria's external debt in 2005 (Soludo, 2007).

Despite these achievements, the Obasanjo era was not without its shortcomings. Critics have pointed to persistent corruption, uneven implementation of reforms, and limited impact on poverty reduction (Ojo, 2010). While macroeconomic indicators improved, the benefits of growth were not widely shared, and structural challenges such as unemployment and infrastructural deficits remained largely unresolved. Leadership during this period demonstrated a stronger commitment to reform compared to previous regimes, yet it also revealed the difficulties of translating policy frameworks into tangible developmental outcomes.

The administration of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua (2007–2010) introduced a policy shift toward a more inclusive and rule-based governance approach. Yar'Adua's "Seven-Point Agenda" prioritized critical sectors such as power, infrastructure, and human capital

development. His administration also emphasized adherence to the rule of law and due process. However, the effectiveness of these initiatives was constrained by health challenges that limited his active engagement in governance and slowed policy implementation (Suberu, 2012). As a result, many of the proposed reforms did not achieve their intended impact before his untimely death in 2010.

Under President Goodluck Jonathan (2010–2015), Nigeria experienced a period of relative economic growth, driven largely by high global oil prices. The rebasing of Nigeria's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2014 positioned the country as the largest economy in Africa. The Jonathan administration also introduced transformation agendas in key sectors, including agriculture, telecommunications, and banking (Sanusi, 2012). However, this period was also characterized by significant governance challenges, including allegations of corruption, mismanagement of oil revenues, and security concerns, particularly the Boko Haram insurgency in the northeastern region. These issues undermined the sustainability of economic gains and highlighted ongoing leadership deficiencies.

The election of President Muhammadu Buhari in 2015 marked another turning point, as his administration campaigned on a platform of anti-corruption, security, and economic reform. Buhari's leadership coincided with a sharp decline in global oil prices, which exposed the vulnerabilities of Nigeria's oil-dependent economy. In response, the government introduced policies aimed at economic diversification, including the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP) (Federal Government of Nigeria, 2017). While some progress was made in agriculture and local production, the economy experienced a recession in 2016 and faced continued challenges such as inflation, unemployment, and foreign exchange constraints (World Bank, 2020). Critics have argued that policy inconsistencies and slow decision-making hindered the effectiveness of economic reforms during this period.

By 2023, Nigeria's economic landscape reflected both continuity and change. The transition to a new administration brought renewed expectations for reform, yet the structural challenges accumulated over decades remained deeply entrenched. Persistent issues such as inadequate infrastructure, high public debt, currency instability, and limited industrialization underscored the enduring impact of past leadership decisions. The historical evolution of leadership and economic policies from 1986 to 2023 reveals a pattern of ambitious reform initiatives undermined by weak implementation, institutional fragility, and governance deficits.

Overall, the period under review demonstrates that Nigeria's economic performance has been closely linked to the quality of its leadership. While different administrations have adopted varying policy approaches—from the market-oriented reforms of SAP to the state-led interventions of subsequent regimes—the outcomes have consistently been shaped by the effectiveness of leadership in managing resources, implementing policies, and ensuring accountability. The recurring challenges of policy inconsistency, corruption, and weak institutions highlight the central role of leadership in determining economic outcomes. This historical overview thus provides a critical foundation for analyzing the specific dimensions of poor leadership and their implications for Nigeria's economy.

Dimensions of Poor Leadership and Their Economic Implications

The economic trajectory of Nigeria between 1986 and 2023 has been significantly shaped by identifiable patterns of poor leadership, which have manifested in various structural and systemic deficiencies. While different regimes—both military and civilian—have introduced policies aimed at economic reform and national development, the persistence of governance failures has undermined these efforts. Poor leadership in Nigeria is not merely a matter of individual inadequacies but reflects entrenched institutional and political practices that have constrained economic progress. Key dimensions of this phenomenon include corruption, policy inconsistency, weak institutional frameworks, lack of accountability, and the failure to pursue inclusive development. These elements have collectively contributed to Nigeria's economic instability, limited growth, and persistent socio-economic challenges.

One of the most dominant features of poor leadership in Nigeria is corruption, which has become deeply embedded in the political and economic systems. Corruption, in this context, encompasses bribery, embezzlement, contract inflation, and the diversion of public funds for private enrichment. It has been widely documented that corruption reduces the effectiveness of public expenditure and distorts economic priorities (Mauro, 1995; Transparency International, 2021). In Nigeria, revenues derived from oil—arguably the backbone of the economy—have often been mismanaged or siphoned off by political elites. This has deprived the state of the resources needed for critical investments in infrastructure, education, healthcare, and industrial development.

The economic implications of corruption are multifaceted. Firstly, it discourages investment by creating an unpredictable business environment characterized by rent-seeking and informal practices. Both local and foreign investors are less inclined to commit resources in a system where transparency is lacking and where access to opportunities may depend on political connections rather than merit (Ogundiya, 2009). Secondly, corruption exacerbates inequality by concentrating wealth in the hands of a few, thereby widening the gap between the rich and the poor. Thirdly, it undermines fiscal discipline, leading to budget deficits, increased public debt, and inefficient allocation of resources. Consequently, corruption has remained a major impediment to Nigeria's economic development.

Closely linked to corruption is the issue of policy inconsistency and lack of continuity in economic planning. Effective economic management requires a stable and predictable policy environment, yet Nigeria's experience has been marked by frequent policy reversals and discontinuities. Successive administrations often abandon or significantly modify the policies of their predecessors, leading to a lack of coherence in economic strategy (Anyanwu, 2014). From the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) to the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), Vision 20:2020, and the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP), Nigeria has witnessed a proliferation of policy frameworks with limited continuity in implementation.

The consequences of such inconsistency are detrimental to economic growth. Investors require policy stability to make long-term decisions, and the absence of this stability increases uncertainty and risk. Moreover, policy discontinuity leads to the abandonment of ongoing projects, resulting in wasted resources and incomplete infrastructure. This pattern has contributed to Nigeria's chronic infrastructural deficits, particularly in power supply,

transportation, and industrial capacity. The lack of sustained commitment to long-term development goals reflects a broader failure of leadership to prioritize national interests over short-term political considerations.

Another critical dimension of poor leadership in Nigeria is the weakness of institutions responsible for economic governance. Institutions such as regulatory agencies, anti-corruption bodies, and economic planning commissions are essential for ensuring accountability, enforcing rules, and maintaining economic stability. However, in Nigeria, these institutions have often been undermined by political interference, inadequate funding, and limited autonomy (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012). As a result, they are frequently unable to perform their functions effectively.

The implications of weak institutions are evident across various sectors of the economy. In the financial sector, weak regulatory oversight has historically contributed to banking crises, necessitating costly interventions by the Central Bank (Sanusi, 2012). In the oil sector, poor governance and lack of transparency have led to significant revenue leakages and inefficiencies. Furthermore, weak legal and judicial systems hinder the enforcement of contracts and property rights, which are essential for a functioning market economy. Without strong institutions, economic policies—no matter how well designed—are unlikely to achieve their intended outcomes.

In addition to institutional weaknesses, the lack of accountability and transparency remains a defining feature of poor leadership in Nigeria. Accountability mechanisms, including legislative oversight, judicial review, and civil society engagement, are critical for ensuring that leaders act in the public interest. However, these mechanisms have often been weakened, allowing public officials to operate with minimal scrutiny (Ekeh, 1975). This has fostered a culture of impunity, where misconduct is rarely punished and public resources are mismanaged without consequence.

The economic implications of this lack of accountability are significant. It leads to inefficiency in public administration, as officials are not incentivized to perform effectively. It also undermines public trust in government, which can affect economic behavior, including tax compliance and investment decisions. When citizens perceive governance structures as corrupt or ineffective, they are more likely to disengage from formal economic activities, thereby limiting the state's capacity to generate revenue and implement development policies. Another important dimension of poor leadership is the failure to prioritize inclusive development. Inclusive development entails ensuring that economic growth translates into improved living standards for all segments of society. In Nigeria, however, growth has often been uneven and exclusionary. Despite periods of economic expansion, poverty levels have remained high, and unemployment—particularly among youth—has been persistent (National Bureau of Statistics, 2022). Regional disparities in development have also contributed to social tensions and economic imbalances.

The neglect of inclusive development has serious economic consequences. High levels of poverty and unemployment reduce aggregate demand, limit productivity, and increase the burden on social services. Moreover, inequality can lead to social unrest and insecurity, which further deter investment and disrupt economic activities. The rise of insurgency, militancy,

and other forms of conflict in different parts of Nigeria can, in part, be linked to socio-economic exclusion and governance failures. Thus, the failure to pursue inclusive development reflects not only a moral shortcoming but also a significant economic risk.

Furthermore, poor leadership has been evident in the inability to effectively diversify the Nigerian economy. Despite repeated commitments to reducing dependence on oil, successive administrations have made limited progress in developing other sectors such as manufacturing, agriculture, and technology. This overreliance on oil revenues has made the economy highly vulnerable to external shocks, particularly fluctuations in global oil prices (World Bank, 2020). The failure to implement sustainable diversification strategies highlights the lack of strategic vision and long-term planning in Nigeria's leadership.

The dimensions of poor leadership in Nigeria-corruption, policy inconsistency, weak institutions, lack of accountability, and limited commitment to inclusive development—have had profound implications for the economy. These factors have not only constrained growth but have also perpetuated structural weaknesses and socio-economic inequalities. Understanding these dimensions is essential for explaining Nigeria's economic challenges and for identifying pathways toward sustainable development.

Socio-Economic Consequences and Developmental Outcomes

The cumulative effects of poor leadership in Nigeria between 1986 and 2023 are most evident in the country's socio-economic outcomes. While earlier sections have examined the historical trajectory of leadership and the structural dimensions of governance deficiencies, this section focuses on the tangible consequences of these failures on the economy and society. These consequences manifest in persistent poverty, widening inequality, infrastructural decay, unemployment, capital flight, and the continued vulnerability of the economy to external shocks. Together, they reflect the broader developmental challenges that have hindered Nigeria's progress despite its resource endowments.

One of the most striking outcomes of poor leadership is the persistence and deepening of poverty. Despite periods of economic growth, particularly during oil booms, a significant proportion of Nigeria's population continues to live below the poverty line. This paradox of "growth without development" highlights the disconnect between macroeconomic performance and improvements in living standards (World Bank, 2020). Poor leadership has contributed to this outcome by failing to ensure that economic policies translate into inclusive growth. Resources that could have been invested in poverty alleviation programmes and social welfare have often been mismanaged or diverted, limiting their impact.

Closely related to poverty is the issue of income inequality. Economic gains in Nigeria have been unevenly distributed, with wealth concentrated among a small elite while the majority of citizens face economic hardship. This inequality is exacerbated by corruption, weak institutions, and policies that do not adequately address structural disparities (Oxfam, 2017). The resulting socio-economic divide has significant implications for national development, as it undermines social cohesion and limits the potential for broad-based economic participation. High levels of inequality also reduce aggregate demand, as a large segment of the population lacks the purchasing power necessary to drive economic growth.

Another major consequence is the persistent challenge of unemployment and underemployment, particularly among Nigeria's rapidly growing youth population. Poor leadership has failed to create an enabling environment for job creation, especially in key sectors such as manufacturing and agriculture. Instead, the economy has remained heavily dependent on oil, which is capital-intensive and generates limited employment opportunities (National Bureau of Statistics, 2022). The lack of industrialization and inadequate support for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) have further constrained job creation. As a result, many young Nigerians are either unemployed or engaged in informal and precarious forms of work, which limits their economic prospects and contributes to social instability.

Infrastructural decay represents another critical dimension of Nigeria's developmental challenges. Adequate infrastructure—such as electricity, transportation networks, and communication systems—is essential for economic productivity and competitiveness. However, decades of poor leadership have resulted in chronic underinvestment and mismanagement in this sector. The power sector, in particular, remains a major bottleneck, with unreliable electricity supply increasing the cost of doing business and discouraging investment (Adenikinju, 2005). Similarly, poor road networks and inadequate transportation systems hinder the movement of goods and services, reducing efficiency and increasing transaction costs. These infrastructural deficits significantly constrain economic growth and development.

The issue of capital flight further underscores the economic consequences of poor leadership. Capital flight refers to the large-scale movement of financial resources out of a country, often driven by a lack of confidence in the domestic economy. In Nigeria, political instability, corruption, and weak institutions have contributed to the outflow of capital to more stable and secure environments (Ajayi, 1997). This trend deprives the economy of much-needed investment resources, limiting its capacity for growth and development. Additionally, the phenomenon of brain drain—where skilled professionals emigrate in search of better opportunities—has further weakened Nigeria's human capital base, reducing its potential for innovation and productivity.

Another significant outcome is the continued vulnerability of Nigeria's economy to external shocks and vicissitudes. The failure to diversify the economy away from oil dependence has left it highly exposed to fluctuations in global oil prices. Periods of declining oil prices have often resulted in fiscal crises, currency depreciation, and economic recessions, as seen in 2016 (World Bank, 2020). Poor leadership has played a central role in this vulnerability by failing to implement effective diversification strategies and by neglecting sectors such as agriculture and manufacturing. As a result, the economy remains structurally weak and unable to withstand external pressures.

Furthermore, poor leadership has contributed to declining public trust in government and institutions. Trust is a critical component of economic development, as it influences citizen engagement, tax compliance, and investment behavior. In Nigeria, widespread perceptions of corruption and mismanagement have eroded confidence in governance structures (Ogundiya, 2009). This lack of trust has broader economic implications, including reduced government revenue and increased reliance on external borrowing. It also undermines the effectiveness of public policies, as citizens are less likely to support or comply with government initiatives.

The socio-economic consequences of poor leadership are also evident in the rising levels of insecurity across different parts of the country. While insecurity is often viewed primarily as a political or security issue, it has significant economic implications. Conflicts, insurgency, and criminal activities disrupt economic activities, destroy infrastructure, and deter investment. Agricultural production, for example, has been severely affected in regions experiencing insecurity, leading to reduced food supply and increased prices (International Crisis Group, 2021). The resulting economic disruptions further exacerbate poverty and inequality, creating a vicious cycle of underdevelopment.

In addition, the mismanagement of public debt has emerged as a growing concern. Over the years, Nigeria's public debt has increased significantly, raising questions about fiscal sustainability. While borrowing can be a legitimate tool for financing development, poor leadership has often resulted in the inefficient use of borrowed funds, with limited impact on economic growth (Debt Management Office, 2022). High debt servicing costs reduce the resources available for critical sectors, further constraining development efforts. This highlights the importance of prudent fiscal management and accountability in ensuring sustainable economic outcomes.

The socio-economic consequences of poor leadership in Nigeria between 1986 and 2023 are multifaceted and deeply interconnected. Persistent poverty, inequality, unemployment, infrastructural deficits, capital flight, economic vulnerability, and declining public trust all point to the central role of leadership in shaping developmental outcomes. These challenges are not merely the result of external factors but are largely rooted in internal governance failures. Addressing them requires a fundamental shift toward more effective, transparent, and accountable leadership that prioritizes long-term development over short-term political gains

Conclusion

This study has examined the impact of poor leadership on the Nigerian economy from 1986 to 2023, situating the analysis within a historical, structural, and outcome-based framework. Beginning with the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) era and extending through successive military and civilian administrations, the article has demonstrated that Nigeria's economic trajectory has been profoundly shaped by the quality of its leadership. While different regimes introduced a range of economic policies and reform initiatives, the effectiveness of these measures has consistently been undermined by persistent governance deficiencies. The historical overview revealed a pattern of nuanced ambitious policy formulation accompanied by weak implementation, institutional fragility, and limited continuity, thereby setting the stage for the deeper structural challenges explored in subsequent sections.

At the core of this article is the argument that Nigeria's enduring economic challenges cannot be adequately explained by external factors alone, but must be understood primarily as a consequence of internal leadership failures. The analysis of the dimensions of poor leadership—manifested in corruption, policy inconsistency, weak institutions, lack of accountability, and limited commitment to inclusive development—has shown how these factors collectively distort economic management and constrain growth. Corruption has diverted critical resources away from productive sectors, policy inconsistency has

discouraged investment and long-term planning, and weak institutions have failed to enforce regulatory frameworks necessary for economic stability. These interconnected deficiencies have not only limited the effectiveness of economic policies but have also entrenched a cycle of inefficiency and underperformance.

The socio-economic consequences of these leadership failures further reinforce the central argument of this study. Persistent poverty, widening inequality, high unemployment, infrastructural decay, capital flight, and economic vulnerability to external shocks all point to the systemic nature of the problem. Despite periods of economic growth, particularly during oil booms, the benefits have not translated into meaningful improvements in the living standards of the majority of Nigerians. Instead, the economy has remained structurally weak, heavily dependent on oil, and unable to achieve sustainable and inclusive development. The evidence presented in this article thus underscores the extent to which poor leadership has constrained Nigeria's developmental potential over the past four decades.

The methodological approach adopted in this study—reliance on secondary sources and content analysis—has enabled a comprehensive synthesis of existing literature, policy documents, and empirical evidence. This approach has provided a robust basis for identifying recurring patterns and drawing connections between leadership practices and economic outcomes. While the study acknowledges the role of global economic dynamics and historical legacies, it firmly establishes that the primary drivers of Nigeria's economic challenges are rooted in domestic governance structures. This reinforces the importance of leadership as a critical variable in the political economy of development.

In view of the foregoing, the central submission of this article is that meaningful economic transformation in Nigeria is contingent upon a fundamental shift in the nature and quality of leadership. Incremental policy adjustments or isolated reforms are unlikely to yield significant results without addressing the underlying governance deficits that have persisted over time. What is required is a leadership paradigm characterized by transparency, accountability, policy consistency, and a clear commitment to inclusive development. Strengthening institutions, ensuring continuity in economic policies, and prioritizing long-term national interests over short-term political gains are essential steps toward reversing the negative trends identified in this study.

Furthermore, the study suggests that sustainable economic development in Nigeria will depend on the ability of leaders to move beyond rhetoric and implement policies effectively. This involves not only designing sound economic frameworks but also ensuring that they are executed with discipline and integrity. The challenge is not merely one of policy formulation but of governance capacity and political will. Without these, even the most well-conceived policies are likely to fail, as has been demonstrated repeatedly in Nigeria's economic history.
In conclusion, this article has argued that poor leadership remains the most critical constraint on Nigeria's economic development between 1986 and 2023. The persistence of governance failures across different political regimes highlights the need for a transformative approach to leadership that prioritizes national development above all else. Until such a transformation occurs, Nigeria's vast economic potential will remain largely unrealized. The findings of this study therefore contribute to broader debates on governance and development, emphasizing that the path to economic progress in Nigeria lies not merely in policy reform, but in the

emergence of effective and responsible leadership capable of translating vision into tangible outcomes.

Bibliography

Acemoglu, Daron, & Robinson, James A. (2012). *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. Crown Business.

Adebayo, A. (2007). *Economic Reforms and the Nigerian Economy*. Spectrum Books.

Adenikinju, Adeola. (2005). Analysis of the Cost of Infrastructure Failures in a Developing Economy: The Case of the Electricity Sector in Nigeria. *African Economic Research Consortium Paper*, 148, 1–39.

Adeyanju, Joseph Bamikole, & Adeyanju, Faith Omolola. (2023). Leadership Deficit and Economic Development in Nigeria. *Kashere Journal of Politics and International Relations*.

Ajayi, S. I. (1997). An Analysis of External Debt and Capital Flight in Severely Indebted Low-Income Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. *IMF Working Paper*, 97(68).

Anyanwu, John C. (2014). Factors Affecting Economic Growth in Africa: Are There Any Lessons from China? *African Development Review*, 26(3), 468–493.

Bankole, Ijevereme Ogbewere, & Olaniyi, Dunmade Emmanuel. (2021). Leadership Crisis and Corruption in Nigerian Public Sector. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*.

Debt Management Office. (2022). *Nigeria's Public Debt Profile*. DMO Publications.

Dike, Victor E. (2014). Leadership and the Nigerian Economy. *SAGE Open*.

Duyile, Praise Fisayo. (2023). Leadership Crises and Sustainable Development in Nigeria. *ABUAD Journal of Social and Management Sciences*.

Ekeh, Peter P. (1975). Colonialism and the Two Publics in Africa: A Theoretical Statement. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 17(1), 91–112.

Federal Government of Nigeria. (2017). *Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (2017–2020)*. Ministry of Budget and National Planning.

International Crisis Group. (2021). *Violence and Insecurity in Nigeria*. ICG Reports.

Ivorgba, Emmanuel Ande. (2024). The Impact of Political Leadership on Economic Development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*.

Iyoha, M. A. (1996). *Macroeconomic Policy Management in Nigeria*. Mindex Publishing.

Lewis, Peter. (2007). *Growing Apart: Oil, Politics, and Economic Change in Indonesia and Nigeria*. University of Michigan Press.

Mauro, Paolo. (1995). Corruption and Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(3), 681–712.

National Bureau of Statistics. (2022a). *Labour Force Statistics Report*. NBS.

National Bureau of Statistics. (2022b). *Nigeria Poverty and Inequality Report*. NBS.

National Planning Commission. (2004). *National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS)*. Government Printer.

Ogundiya, I. S. (2009). Political Corruption in Nigeria: Theoretical Perspectives and some Explanations. *The Anthropologist*, 11(4), 281–292.

Ojo, Emmanuel O. (2010). The Politics of Economic Reform in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Science*, 5(2), 45–67.

Olaniyan, D., & Ekundayo, H.. (2019). Structural Adjustment Programme and its Impact on the Nigerian Economy. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 12(1), 89–104.

Oxfam. (2017). *Inequality in Nigeria: Exploring the Drivers*. Oxfam International.

Osaghae, Eghosa E.. (1998). *Crippled giant: Nigeria since Independence*. Hurst & Company.

Sanusi, Lamido Sanusi. (2012). Banking reform and its Impact on the Nigerian Economy. *Central Bank of Nigeria Journal*, 36(4), 12–23.

Soludo, Charles C.. (2007). Debt Relief and Nigeria's Economic Development. *CBN Economic Review*, 45(1), 30–45.

Suberu, Rotimi T.. (2012). *Federalism and Ethnic Conflict in Nigeria*. United States Institute of Peace Press.

Transparency International. (2021). *Corruption Perceptions Index*. Transparency International.

World Bank. (1994). *Adjustment in Africa: Reforms, results, and the road ahead*. World Bank.

World Bank. (2020). *Nigeria Economic Update*. World Bank Publications.