

FROM CONTROL TO VALUE CO-CREATION: TOWARDS A SHARED LEADERSHIP MODEL IN AFRICA

Uzoechi NWAGBARA
University of Wales

Abstract

It is a given that Africa is at present embroiled in leadership throes. This leadership dilemma casts a long shadow of disempowerment on the continent to develop politically as well as limits the continent to effectively co-create value and wealth. This is inextricably linked to the continent's political leadership that is ad nauseam exclusive of the people. This is therefore a colossal impediment to Africa's political stability as well as shared, collegial leadership. In this paper, value co-creation will be used as an umbrella word to denote continental competitive edge in global marketplace of political leadership and value creation. An overriding denominator of Africa's leadership malaise is the leaders' inability to involve the people in the management of state. This has left a drawn-out aftertaste of control, a euphemism for dictatorship, and has inexorably impinged on the continent's value co-creation and development. The main thrust of this paper is: to achieve value co-creation and good political leadership on the continent, shared model of leadership is a precondition. Shared leadership is a multidirectional, collegial activity that emphasises all hands to the pump in leadership. Thus, this paper proposes this model for good leadership and governance on the African continent.

Keywords: African leadership; Control; Shared leadership; Leadership shadow; Value co-creation.

“Sir! What you are speaks so
Loudly I can't hear a word you
Are saying.”
--- Samuel Johnson.

“The final test of a leader is that
He lives behind him in other men
The conviction and the will to
Carry on.”
--- Walter Lippmann.

Introduction: Leadership – An Elusive Concept?

Since the advent of the organised state, there have been engaging discourses on the subject matter of leadership. From Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle to Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau – and from modern Western thinkers on this concept to African scholars in the humanities, social sciences and management studies, there is a convergence of thoughts: society develops on the axis of good leadership. It is within the parameters of this statement that the concept of leadership is a *sine qua non* for societal metamorphosis and African continental renaissance. This is the *raison d'être* for leadership being much talked about and popular as well as a concept widely researched in the academia.

The term leadership is taken from the verb *lead*. Etymologically, the word leadership came to light from the Old English word *leden* or *loeden*, which entails “to make go” or “to

show the way”. The word leadership also finds provenance in Latin with words such as *ducere*, which means “guide”, “pull” and “to drag”, among others. From the accounts available, virtually all European language with Anglo-Saxon as well as Latin origin from 1300 to the present era, have used words such as *lead*, *leader* and *leading*. It was France that seemed to be an exemption in the usage of the word leadership (Stogdill, 1948; Bass, 1997). It has been argued that the word *ducere* had been used in the Bible as well as other Christian books as early as 800 AD (Rost, 1991: 38). The earliest and clear indication of the use of the word *lead* or *leadership* was foreshadowed by Candrey (1604) and Cockeran (1623), but none of these books offered a clear-cut definition, including a precise meaning of the word. Not even Samuel Johnson’s dictionary of 1755 elevated the meaning of leadership beyond the provincial. In terms of semantics, the word leadership has existed nearly one thousand years. A historical investigation of the term leadership would change the direction of this paper. Thus, this paper will be taking a look at the contemporary impacts of the word on African political leadership processes and institutions for leading co-operation and change on the continent in relation to value/wealth co-creation.

Leadership has been described as one of the most researched or investigated topics in the world (Rost, 1991; Crainer, 1995; Peck and Dickenson, 2008). It is one of the most talked about concepts in politics, business and society yet least understood. In the thinking of the ace leadership guru Bass (1997) the imprecision about defining leadership finds resonance here: “there are as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (11). This has made the word leadership “an elusive concept” (Connell & Parry, 2002: 139) in terms of measuring its definitional contours. It is still within the confines of definitional war or terminological chaos (if you like) with regard to precise meaning of leadership that Bennis (1994) sees it as “beauty”, which is difficult to define – but recognised wherever it is seen. In their *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge* (2007), Warren Bennis & Burt Nanus reported about 350 definitions of leadership. Crainer (1995) identified over 400 definitions of this term, and thus considered these definitions offered to constitute what he called definitional “minefield”, where practitioners and experts have to tread carefully. Accordingly, Ralph Stogdill (1948) suggested that there are diverse definitions of leadership as there are persons who have identified the meaning of the term.

In his *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century* (1991), Joseph Rost advanced the argument regarding the imprecision as well as elusiveness associated with exact meaning of the term leadership:

I analysed 221 definitions of leadership that I found in 587 books, book chapters and journal articles which by title indicated that they were primarily concerned with leadership ... I could find only one definition of leadership from the nineteenth century... (44).

This is why Bennis & Nanus (2007) identified leadership as

a word on everybody’s lips. The young attack it and the old grow wistful for it. Parents have lost it and police seek it. Experts claim it and artists spurn it, while scholars want it. Philosophers reconcile it (as authority) with liberty and theologians demonstrate its compatibility with conscience. If bureaucrats pretend they have it, politicians wish they did (1).

Despite the haziness about a definite, precise definition of leadership, it is in the main captured in Stephen Robbins' book, *Organisational Behaviour* (2000) as "... the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of goal" (314).

Further to this, as Michael Walton instructed, "leadership role confers a wide range of rights and privileges; it accords power and status and allows freedom of action to influence the course of events... such influence, status and power, however, is not without constraints..." (2008: 121). Thus, leadership although confers on one the ability to lead, it is not without constraints or limits. It is this limit or boundary that makes good leadership, which is shared and inclusive of all. John Kotter in *The Leadership Factor* (1988) views leadership as primarily the structural bolts and nuts that inhere in planning, organising, controlling, influencing and allowing others' views for effective leadership. Leading in this sense includes societies, nations, and organisations. Thus, leaders are not independent actors (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Nwagbara, 2011). Beyond the mantra of "on-the-spot leadership" (Bolman & Deal, 2008: 342) or things making leaders happen (Weiss, 2007), leadership process is a continuum as well as a spectrum that factors everybody in for shared, participatory leadership.

In congruence with this position, according to Conger (1992)

leaders are individuals who establish direction for a working group of individuals, who gain commitment from these group members to this direction, and who then motivate these members to achieve the direction's outcomes (18).

The above reads from the same songbook as Kotter's assertion about the characteristics of leadership in his acclaimed work, *A Force for Change* (1990), where he talks about cardinal principles in ascertaining good leadership to include the following: visioning, establishing direction, motivating, inspiring, aligning people in relation to direction, communicating direction and goal and planning to achieve set goals within the ballpark of organisation's (nation's) collective vision. Motivation, a prerequisite for sense of shared, collective goal that is being elicited via what Kotter (1990: 64) identified as "energy surge" is crucial for reinventing political leadership in Africa. In addition, Beerel (2009) has defined leadership as thus: "leadership is a relational activity where an individual(s) guide(s) or directs(s) others (followers) to attain an objective or goal" (64). Great leaders such as Jesus Christ, Nelson Mandela, Abraham Lincoln, Julius Nyerere, Kwame Nkrumah, Nnamdi Azikiwe, Abubakar Balewa and Mohandas Gandhi definitely led in a transformational sense and by the words of Ghandi, "we must be the change we wish to see in the world". This prescient statement is critical for Africa's leadership renaissance.

In all political and organisational attempts to define the concept of leadership, the main purpose is to find the most effective way of leading and managing people, society and organisations effectively, as well as managing change in turbulent time. Thus, all the postulations about leadership styles and theories emphasise finding alternative order out of leadership crisis. Thus, leadership has been defined in relation to individual traits, influence over others (followers), interaction patterns, role relationships, behavioural moulds, hierarchical position, and perception of others regarding legitimacy as well as influence. Below is a diagrammatic representation of leadership spectrum. Although other leadership charts exist, this paper will only be offering the one below.

APPROACH	EMPHASIS	DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATION
Great man	Personal traits	Few – leader are born, not made
Situational/personal—situational	Context dependence	Can develop the interpersonal to some degree, but mostly developing use of different approaches in certain contexts
Psychological profiling	Psychological traits	Limited development of the interpersonal
Behavioural	Actions appropriate to followership	Development of the intrapersonal
Transformational	Relationship between leader and follower	Development of the inter and intrapersonal
Post-transformational	Sense making	Development of the inter and intrapersonal

Source: Adapted from Peck and Dickinson (2008), *Managing and Leading in Inter-agency Setting*, Bristol.

In Africa, the emphasis on studying as well as understanding the nature of leadership is essentially precipitated by the fact that African leaders see it as winner-takes-all kind of game. Claude Ake, one of the experts on African political economy, offers this perspective:

African leaders place more value on capturing political power for themselves and grow increasingly fearful about what seem to be the grave consequences of losing it to their rivals in the competition for control of the state power... (1992: 35).

In advancing Ake's thesis, Chinua Achebe in his latest treatise on Nigeria, *The Education of a British-Protected Child* (2009), which is sequel to his oft-quoted chapbook on Nigeria, *The Trouble with Nigeria* (1983), assays the same point. In Achebe's wavelength, African leaders' inability to relinquish political power or mantle of leadership is more than a function of insecurity; he takes it further:

Leadership is a sacred trust, like the priesthood in civilised, human religions. No one gets into it lightly or unadvisedly, because it demands qualities of mind and discipline of body and will far beyond the need of the ordinary citizen. Anybody who offers himself or herself or is offered to society for leadership must be aware of the unusually high demands of the role and should, if in any doubt whatsoever, firmly refuse the prompting (Achebe, 2009: 143).

Leadership as Achebe sees it in the above quote, is about sacred duty that demands doing things right, which is a far cry from how African leaders envision leadership.

The nature of leadership that is envisaged from the above inheres in a theory of leadership that makes the people political operators as well as leaders in the process of realising good leadership. This takes cognisance of people's involvement in the political process; a state of affairs made possible through shared leadership, which is participatory, inclusive and collective in scope and reach. Accordingly, one of the challenges of African leadership is surmised by Vil-Nkomo, who asserted that a major obstacle to African leadership is

the notion of the zero-sum game ... still dominates the utilisation of scarce economic resources. Within their own regions, leaders tend to believe in the rhetoric they create for themselves without testing it at other levels of the societies they purport to represent. Hence a major gap between themselves and their societies (2002: 295).

In rising above the political mindset of viewing leadership as a "zero-sum game", it should be considered as efforts and experimentation on social policy, politicking, resource allocation and governance exerted by partisan representation for collective vision and goals of the electorates or the people (Okadigbo, 1987; Ologbenla, 2007). This paper solicits this paradigm shift in political leadership for Africa's rebirth.

Theoretical Framework

As this paper shall argue, African brand of leadership that is built on shared leadership, which is collective, organic, collegial, participatory, populist-oriented, connected and inclusive, will bring about continental value co-creation and good leadership in the comity of nations. Against the backdrop of insensitive, selfish and disempowering leadership model in Africa that African leaders have utilised to their own selfish ends, this paper will be launching a change of approach to governance and leadership premised on shared leadership in order to attain continental bliss. It is only within the borders of leading through shared leadership that Africa could be reinvented.

Consequently, "leadership in Africa is typified more by disfiguring examples – the Idi Amins and Robert Mugabes – than by positive role models as Mandela and Seretse Khama... During the past three decades, roughly 90% percent of sub-Saharan Africa's leaders have behaved despotically" (Rotberg, 2003: 28). The basic reason for this political landscape is that the people that traditionally should matter in politics are being politically disempowered in the leadership equation (Ake, 1991, 1992, 1994; Diouf, 1993). Henry Mintzberg, the Canadian management guru, in a recent article on African leadership offered some insights into leadership failure in Africa. One of the themes is "lack of institution building" (Mintzberg, 2010: 7), which is a spin-off effect of lack of credible, legitimate leadership. This paper will be utilising the concept of shared leadership as a compass that will lead Africa out of dark wilderness of political leadership failure. It is in recognition of the implications of shared leadership to societal building that citizens in developing nations are in revolt for social justice and equitable order. Thus,

all over Africa, ordinary people are in revolt against a leadership whose performance has become life-threatening.
... They link their misery to leadership performance and they

are convinced that their condition will not improve until they empower themselves to intervene in public life for the improvement of their own lives (Ake, 1994: 3).

Rethinking Shadow of Leadership: Theorising Shared Leadership Model

In all areas of life, what leaders do casts a shadow on the people. How a leader carries out his leadership functions impacts on people's interest and wellbeing as well as reverberates with their motivation, sense of morality and performance. This is why leadership is being considered today to be one of the greatest challenges of leading effectively. The importance of leadership to any nation or organisation as it is inextricably tied to leader-follower dynamics is being captured in a bold relief here:

Others ... who tend to become dependent on a visionary leader, may perpetuate the problem through their own actions. They may idealize their leader excessively and thus ignore negative aspects and exaggerate the good qualities. As a result, they may carry out their leader's orders unquestioningly and leaders may in certain circumstances encourage such behaviour because of their needs to dominate and be admired (Conger, 1990: 291).

Since leadership is a symbolic interaction (Vickery, 2006), meaning that sending and receiving messages, symbols and signals is a function of verbal as well as non-verbal symbols to generate meaning (Vickery, 2006), it is crucially important to understand the complexities of the term leadership. This is also helpful in apprehending the dynamics of leader-follower interface for shared leadership that is transformational as well as fit for purpose.

Hence, leadership is primarily a non-verbal activity capable of generating influence that is enshrined in social interaction and cognitive sense-making. This is what Bennis & Nanus (2007) characterised as the management of meaning; Manion (1988) tagged it "shared meaning" (58), which is a nomenclature or another phrase for shared leadership. Though much has been written on the gains of effective and transformational political leadership in Africa, far less has dwelt on the possible negativity generated by a culture that supports leadership that is self-serving as well as disempowering of the people. This is part of leadership crisis in Africa. It is not an abstraction that leadership has shadow. Though a corporeal activity, leadership casts some shadow that motivates or de-motivates followers. Mullins (2004) considers shadow of leadership to be the effects of leadership on followers. Shadow of leadership allows the transfer or generation of meaning (shared experience) that robs off on people's motivation, commitment and the Kotterian "energy surge", a nomenclature for involvement. This has resulted in the study of leadership as symbolic, interpersonal game that is directed towards achievement of collective goals and objectives. This is essentially why leadership as a concept is being understood contemporarily as a non-coercive influence (Lester, 1995; Vickery, 2006; Hackman & Johnson, 1991).

Managing state functions in a nation demands that leaders provide basic amenities for the people; provision of political goods would technically guarantee less friction in terms of nation-state conflict. This will in the final analysis bring about good leadership. Political goods include provision of infrastructural amenities, security, the existence of virile rule of

law, economic opportunities, empowered civil society, monopoly of violence by the state, free political participation by all and good governance, among others. Interestingly, for any nation to provide the public goods highlighted, it ought to have shared, legitimate leadership. Thus, the intervention of human agency is crucial in realising a nation's public goods. The intervention of human agency resonates with good, legitimate leadership. Taking a cue from this, how a nation's leadership affects the citizenry gauges the effectiveness of public good being delivered. In other words, this could be called shadow of leadership. Robert Rotberg in one of his pieces in *Daedalus* captioned "On Improving Nation-State Governance" adds credence to this:

Good governance (a correlate of good leadership) does not occur by chance. It must be nourished explicitly and consciously. The Intervention of human agency is therefore critical. There is no good governance absent intentional, positive leadership. Conversely, where nation-states are badly led, the delivery of the essentials of governance falters, neglect becomes common, and the decay of nation-state becomes obvious, especially to its stakeholders. Idi Amin in Uganda, Siaka Stevens in Sierra Leone, and Mobutu Sese Seko in Congo/Zaire are all African examples of how narcissistic, avaricious, and incompetent leaders create extreme situations of lamentable governance with deleterious consequences (My parenthesis, 2007: 153).

One of the major "deleterious consequences" of bad leadership is the negative shadow it casts on the people. Shadow of leadership goes beyond a setting where leaders exert negative influence on the people; it is rather the institutionalisation of a culture that promotes leadership, where "subtle social and psychological factors interact to undermine the very principles that good leadership is meant to address" (Bolden, 2007: 1).

Conversely, in bettering African continent in terms of provision of good governance as well as inclusive leadership, there is need to rethink this along the axis of shared leadership, a correlate of good leadership. Shared leadership is an alternative order for Africa's leadership renaissance. Shared leadership has been characterised in different ways, all different characterisations point to the same theme: collegial leadership, community of leaders, partnership-leadership, distributed leadership, connected leadership, horizontal leadership-followership paradigm, post-heroic leadership, and others (Moxley, 2000; Lipman-Blumen, 1996). African Countries have over time experienced highly centralised political governance and inept leadership in which the government has exercised uncontrolled powers in all sectors of society thereby excluding the people from participating in the political as well as leadership process. Socially and politically, the government controlled the society in such a style that no function would take place without government's approval and permit. This situation has led to some resistance to decipher the leadership mystique. This is what Yukl (2006) characterised as leadership "mysterious process" (1). Here lies the essence of shared leadership.

According to Pearce and Conger (2003), shared leadership is characterised in the following ways:

- Distributed and interdependent leadership
- Leadership embedded in social interaction
- Leadership as a learning process
- Relational activity
- Rewriting the image of self through self-in-relationship building
- Rewriting the language of self
- Rewriting leadership development
- Rewriting the nature of power
- Leadership by dialoguing – generative dialogue
- Creation of less hierarchical system

It is to this end that it has been averred that

shared approaches to leadership question ... individual level perspective, arguing that it focuses excessively on top leaders and says little about informal leadership or larger situational forces. ... Shared leadership offers a concept of leadership practice as a group-level phenomenon (Pearce & Conger, 2003: 22).

Similarly, with the shift from political or leadership heroism to post-heroic leadership, a paradigm shift occurred in the manner in which political leadership was conceived. This was basically what triggered the concept of transformational leadership, which echoes shared leadership. The Burnsian concept, transformational leadership that was adopted in leadership and management studies, was *prima facie* a political experimentation with finding alternative political order for good governance (Burns, 1978). What animated James MacGregor Burns' interest? It was failure of political leadership. In doing this, he made two resonant leadership distinctions: transactional and transformational leadership models. The former is characteristic of African leadership, while the latter is what this paper proposes: shared leadership – participatory, collective and inclusive. Thus, in political leadership:

the emphasis has changed from one person clearly highlighting the pathways forward, to a group-based view of leadership, whereby, understanding and being responsive to multiple stakeholders in their context, is the prime concern Effectively addressing multiple stakeholders, means recognising and responding to multiple agendas. Transversing pathways through a multiplicity of issues and circumstances, would be near impossible for any one individual to effectively confront (Cooper, 2005: 76).

This is the leadership challenge in Africa that needs reinvention for continental bliss. Thus, the urgency to rearticulate political leadership in Africa would be possible via shared leadership, a leadership style that places premium on value co-creation and collective engagement, rather than control. The rhetoric of control is coercive, unilateral, unrepresentative, marginalising and above all undemocratic.

From Control to Value Co-Creation: The Triumph of Balance through Human Side Political Leadership and Motivation

For African leadership to rise above control and take on board co-operation, engagement and value co-creation there is need to rethink the idea of achieving this via the axes of motivation, human side political leadership and ultimately shared leadership. In their article ‘Leadership Competencies: Time to Change the Tune?’, R. Bolden and J. Gosling reasoned that despite the mountain of theories and perspectives on leadership, it is still a concept that needs more illumination for proper understanding of how organisations and societies work. In their view, the term leadership is still ‘under-theorised’ (Peck and Dickinson, 2008: 23). From time immemorial, management theorists and experts have been concerned about coming to terms with what makes certain people more motivated than others. This has also culminated in torrents of scholarships on what makes a people to commit to a cause or task. Political participation is one of the arenas that humanity can show commitment for societal re-engineering. In politics, when people are not adequately motivated to be part of the political process, it is judged to be uncooperative, disempowering and undemocratic. This is essentially typical of African leadership calculus that limits the realisation of shared leadership.

In self-determination theory, organisational researchers and leadership scholars see motivation as a crucial building block in the development of useful theories of effective, result-oriented management practice and political systems (Steers et al., 2004). In his *The Human Side of Enterprise* (1960), Douglas McGregor, the former MIT Sloan School of Management professor, opined theory X and Y. The former deals with factors that undermine organisational growth and wealth creation; while the latter deals with what he described as ‘hygiene factors’, which have humanistic potentials and capable of motivating people to contribute in the equation of leadership. This sense of inclusiveness brings about shared leadership and value co-creation in the final analysis.

In his treatise, ‘Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Reinforcement, and Inequity’, Deci (1972), talks about intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation paradigms. Deci (1972) considers the former to be satisfaction derived from doing a piece of work itself, while he sees the latter as other factors that drive people to perform better. No matter what the factors are, people need to be motivated so as to get the best out of them. Accordingly, Pinder (1998) depicts motivation as a:

set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual’s being, to initiate work-related behaviour, and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration (99).

It is in this regard that motivation is considered as a set of energetic forces both internally and externally that lead people to do things within the parameters of set goals. The subject matter of motivation in sustaining people’s appetite to commit to any task – be it politics or organisational vision is central for leadership that drives change in the right path as well as supports shared leadership, a correlate of transformational leadership.

Both Abraham Maslow and Henry Herzberg’s theories of motivation feed into motivating people to commit to task (Stewart & Stewart, 2002: 46). This is also true of Douglas MacGregor’s insights above. As humanistic psychologists, both of them articulated

the human side of any enterprise in order to lead effectively without friction in taking cognisance of motivation. This why “the work of Herzberg is often cited at the same time as Maslow’s” (Stewart & Stewart, 2002: 48). Maslow reckoned that there is a general outline of needs recognition and satisfaction that people follow in generally the same sequence. This saw the birth of Maslow’s hierarchy of need. Similarly, Herzberg’s theory of motivation rests on what he calls “two-factor” theory of motivation. One of the facets of this “two-factor” paradigm, binary components is what Herzberg terms the “hygiene factors”, which entail the gross dissatisfaction consequent upon not satisfying the needs of people – be it employees or the citizenry. These needs could be good working environment or political goods among others. On the other hand, the presences of other less tangible factors like recognition for doing a piece of work well and involving people in governance, etc could create or facilitate motivation. Herzberg calls these “motivators” or satisfiers (Gawel, 2009). However, there are other theories of motivation, but this is not the direction of this discourse.

Consequently the motivation theories discussed above are significant for rethinking African leadership. As has been stated earlier, Africans should be motivated to take part in the political process through shared leadership that empowers as well as makes them participants in the drama of the continent’s social change. Failure to do this will be catastrophic for the continent in terms of guaranteeing virile, legitimate leadership that has human face – that will lift the continent from her present political doldrums to leadership bliss. This approach will also bring about collective value creation (between the state and the people) for the continent of Africa. This is what has been considered in this paper to be value co-creation. Thus, strategies that would help usher in an era of good political leadership are being highlighted below.

Strategies for Sustaining Good Political Leadership

- Identifying resistance

This is important in leading change effectively politically and organisationally. This could be achieved by governments making policies and strategic planning that they think will have less resistance amongst the people. In actualising this, people’s opinion should be sought through involving them; this will make room for less resistance (Kets de Vries, Manfred & Balaz, 1999), which is a form of reaction against a political landscape.

- Dialogue Not Communication

Dialogue goes a step further than mere communication (Watson et al., 2004: 54). It is about consensus-building process of shared meaning and communication based on shared values and beliefs. This is what Manion (1988) has identified to be management of meaning; a process that ignites the light of shared reality. This is also what Gelb (1995: 135) called “synvergent communication”, a bridge between convergence and divergence that rewrites the image of self by foregrounding associational nuances of another person’s world. Also, as has been argued in support of this, in dialogue, “the goal is changed from conquering to growing; from silencing to knowing; from telling to asking” (Watson et al, 2004: 54).

- Creativity/creation

Involving people’s views makes a case for creativity, innovation and value co-creation. In this regard, if people see themselves as stakeholders in the political process, they will put in their best to see change in the right direction. This is what Porter (1980) called the value chain that brings about competitive edge, which is important for Africa’s transformation in

the comity of nations. This also brings about consensus building based, collegiality and shared leadership.

- Motivation through shared leadership

Through shared leadership that is collective and participatory, people will be interested in getting involved in the political process. This is because they are being considered in the political experimentation. This is what Conger & Pearce (2003) characterised as multidirectional, collegial leadership. The question of self is rather put on the back burner in this situation. According to McClelland (1961), motivating people through what Bass (1985) considers as individualised consideration in his transformational leadership schema, deals with these factors: power, achievement and affiliation. By considering people's views and inputs, they see themselves as part of the political system; this is akin to affiliation, which also gives people power and sense of achievement. Lumped together, this brings about sense of shared experience, a correlate of value co-creation and collective bargaining.

- Resisting “Edifice Complex”

This is a sort of psychological fear or concern that a leader's legacy or leadership formation could be destroyed by another leadership. Sometimes, it could lead to a leader thinking that his successor would bring him to justice as well as become high-handed in dealing with how he has led a nation or even in organisations. This is critical in African leaders relinquishing power. The cases of Idi Amin, Abraham Babangida, Olusegun Obasanjo, Sani Abacha, Mobutu Sese Seko and others illustrate this attitude of clinging to power forever.

- Resisting the “Talion Principle”

This is the tendency in leaders to think that there could be reprisals, retaliation or punishment by the led or the people after they have left office, which largely stems from fear of insecurity that they did not do things right or they would have stepped on toes during their term. This is very characteristic of African leaders. This is a misguided as well as morbid fear that should be resisted. Clements (1999) sees this state of mind in leaders as “fear of reprisals”. The examples of Obasanjos, Babangidas, Amins, Sekos and others ring a bell of people being drunk with power and becoming afraid to leave for fear of being brought to book.

- Mirroring Problem

This is the ability of leaders to see themselves as their followers see them, which is a necessary ingredient for leaders to function selflessly and effectively. This will also reduce illusion and criticism. Palmer (1994) has noted that inability of leaders not to see themselves as they are being seen by their followers feeds on a costly delusional miasma.

- Follower flattery

Another way of rationalising leader-follower dynamic in terms of impacting in a positive way on leadership is follower flattery, which could be damaging sometimes to the leader. The leaders in this instance have to know when flattery is genuine so that they are not deluded. This is essential for good political leadership built on trust and genuine commendation.

- Leaders' ability to avoid “abrasive personality”

In his *Harry Levinson on the Psychology of Leadership* (2006), Hail Levinson articulated what he tagged “abrasive personality” as one of the deterrents to shared and good leadership. This is usually exhibited by leaders (and sometimes by followers or subordinates) in a way that their behaviour becomes harsh or condescending to others. Levinson considers this as being dangerous to growth in politics or organisation. It is in deed a psychological

state of mind that is unpleasant for shared leadership.

- Increasing Power of the Led/electorates

Increasing the power of the led or the electorate is crucial in sustaining political legitimacy and transformational leadership. This habitually brings about the ‘‘Pelz Effect’’, a concept developed by Donald Pelz (1952), meaning expanding influence and power of one’s subordinates by giving them opportunities to contribute their views through communication. Pelz was finding a way of distinguishing between leadership style and people’s satisfaction in relation to these styles.

Conclusion

It has been argued in this paper that for continental bliss in the comity of nations, Africa needs to rearticulate her political leadership to take stock of shared leadership, a leadership style that involves all and sundry in the political process. This will usher in an era of value co-creation and wealth for the continent. It will also help to stem the tide of incessant conflicts and strife on the continent. This paper has also argued that achieving shared leadership is a function of motivating the populace by involving them in the leadership process as well as engaging them rather than control and coercion. Thus, the shadow that African leadership should cast on the people is motivating them in the light of good governance consequent upon shared leadership that is collegial, participatory and collective.

References

- Achebe, C. (2009). *The education of a British-protected child*. London: Penguin Books.
- Ake, C. (1991). Rethinking African democracy. *Journal of Democracy*, 2(1): 1-13.
- Ake, C. (1992). Devaluing democracy. *Journal of Democracy*, 3, 32-36.
- Ake, C. (1993). The unique case of African democracy. *International Affairs*, 69(2): 239-244.
- Ake, C. (1994). Democratisation of disempowerment in Africa. *CASS Occasional Monograph*, 1.
- Bass, B. (1997). Does the transaction-transactional leadership paradigm organisational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(2): 130- 139.
- Beerel, A. (2009). *Leadership and change management*. London: Sage Books.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (2007). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Bennis, W. (1994). *On becoming a leader*. New York: Addison Wesley.
- Bolden, R. (2007). The shadow of leadership. *Effective Executive*, 9(2): 42-43.
- Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organisations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Candrey, R. (1604/1966). *A table of hard English words: The first English dictionary*. Gainesville, Florida: *Scholars Facsimile and Reprints*. (Facsimile of the original version of the book.)
- Clements, C. (1999). The two faces of leadership: Considering the dark side of leader-follower dynamics. *Journal of Workplace: Employee Counselling Today*, 11(5): 1-9.
- Cockeran, H. (1623/1930). *The English dictionary of 1623*. New York: Huntington. (Facsimile of the original version of the book.)
- Conger, J. A. & Pearce C. L. (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. London: Sage Publications.

- Conger, J. A. (1992). *Learning to lead: The art of transforming managers into leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19, 44-45.
- Cooper, C. (2005). (ed.). *Leadership and management in the 21st century: Business challenges of the future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crainer, S. (1995). Have the corporate superheroes had their day? *Professional Manager*, March, 8-12.
- Deci, E. L. (1972). Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (22): 113-120.
- Diouf, M. 1993. Senegal's February 1993 elections: New factors in the political arena. *Codesria Bulletin*, 2, 4-7.
- Gawel, J. (2009). Herzberg's theory of motivation and Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 5(11): 1-5.
- Gelb, M. J. (1995). *Thinking for a Change: Discovering the power to create, communicate and lead*. London: Aurum Press.
- Hackman, M. & Johnson, C. (1991). *Leadership: A communication perspective*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
- Heifetz, R. A & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the Line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading*. Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kets, de V, Manfred, F. R. & Balazs, K. 1999. Transforming the mind-set of the organization. *Administration & Society*, 30(6): 640-75.
- Kotter, J. (1990). *A force for change*. New York: Free Press.
- Kotter, J. (1998). *The leadership factor*. New York: Free Press.
- Lester, R. I. (1995). Leadership is the art of influencing people to accomplish an organisation's purpose. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2, 6-25.
- Levinson. H. (2006). *Harry Levinson on the psychology of leadership*. Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1996). *The connective edge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- MacGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Manion, J. (1988). *From management to leadership: Interpersonal skills for success in healthcare*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Mintzberg, H. (2010). Developing leaders? Developing countries? *Leadership Journal*, 1(2): 1-10.
- Moxley, R. S. (2000). *Leadership and spirit*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mullins, L. J. (2004). *Management and organisational behaviour*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Nwagbara, U. (2011). Homing in on paradigm shift: Ryanair leadership in the age of expensive air travel. *Leadership Review*, (11): 204-214.
- Okadigbo, C. (1987). *Power and leadership in Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimensions Publishers.
- Olegunla, D. K. (2007). Leadership, governance and corruption in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 9(3): 97-117.
- Palmer, P. J. (1994). Leading from within: Out of the shadows, into the light. In: Conger, J. A, (ed.). *Spirituality at work: Discovering the spirituality in leadership*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Peck, E. & and Dickinson, H. (2008), *Managing and leading in inter-agency setting*. Bristol: Policy Press.

- Pelz, D. C. (1952). Influence: A key to effective leadership in the first-line supervisor. *Personnel*, (29):209-217.
- Pinder, C. (1998). *Work motivation in organisational behaviour*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy*. New York: Free Press.
- Robbins, S. P. (2000). *Organisational behaviour*. London: Pearson Education Publishers.
- Rost, C. J. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. London: Praeger.
- Rotberg, R. I. (2003). The roots of Africa's leadership deficit. *Compass: A Journal of Leadership*, 1, 28-32.
- Rotberg, R. I. (2007). On improving nation-state governance. *Daedalus*, 152-155.
- Stewart, V. & Stewart, A. (2002) *Managing the poor performer*. Hants: Gower.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, (25): 35-71.
- Vickery, J. (n.d.). Symbolic leadership: The symbolic nature of leadership. Retrieved July 30, 2011 from www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/au-24/vickery.pdf.
- Vil-Nkomo, S. (2000). Leadership for development in a globalised environment. *Journal of Public Administration*, 37(1): 292-305.
- Walton, M. (2008). Dealing with the inevitability of the constraints: Toxic sources? *Organisations & People*, 15(3): 121-125.
- Watson, C. et al. (2004). Fostering constructive dialogue: Building towards more effective communication in the educational technology field. *Educational Technology*, March/April, 50-62.
- Weis, S. A. (2007). Pastor-Principal relationship in the parish school. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 11(1):7-22.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organisations*. 6th ed. Upper Saddle River: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Author Information

Uzoечи NWAGBARA
Doctoral Researcher
Department of Human Resource Management
University of Wales
United Kingdom