



AMAMIHE: Journal of Applied Philosophy, Vol. 24. No. 1, 2026

ISSN Print: 1597 – 0779; ISSN Online: 3043- 5269

Department of Philosophy, Imo State University, Owerri, Nigeria

Indexed: Academic Journals Online, Google Scholar, Igwebuike Research Institute

MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE EROSION OF LEADERSHIP ETHICS IN NIGERIA: A PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY INTO THE CRISIS OF GOVERNANCE

Owere A. Ejidje Iliaro, Ph.D
Directorate Of General Studies
Federal University of Petroleum Resources, Effurun
iliaro.owere@fupre.edu.ng, 08061380454
ORCID: 0009-0008-4376-5755
(Corresponding author)

Francis Iroroyakpo Igben, Ph.D
Department of Philosophy
Delta State University, Abraka
figben@delsu.edu.ng, 08030666209

Abstract

Nigeria continues to experience persistent governance failure despite its vast human and natural resources. This study argues that the country's leadership crisis is fundamentally rooted in the erosion of moral responsibility. In many cases, political authority has shifted from public stewardship to private interest, thereby weakening institutional trust and democratic legitimacy. Using conceptual and analytical methods, this paper examines the philosophical foundations of moral responsibility and evaluates its relevance to leadership ethics in Nigeria. It draws on deontological ethics, virtue ethics, and theories of justice to show that moral responsibility is not optional in governance but essential for accountability, legitimacy, and sustainable development. The study further critiques the role of political opportunism, prebendalism, and cultural relativism in normalizing corruption and weakening ethical standards in public life. It concludes that meaningful governance reform requires moral reconstruction alongside institutional reform. The paper recommends ethical education, strengthened accountability mechanisms, transparent governance practices, and renewed civic engagement as practical pathways for restoring ethical leadership in Nigeria.



Keywords: Moral responsibility; Ethical leadership; Governance; Corruption; Accountability; Nigeria

Introduction

Nigeria is Africa's most populous country and one of its largest economies. Yet its political history has been marked by recurring governance crises. Despite abundant oil wealth, agricultural resources, and a youthful population, the country continues to face persistent corruption, fragile institutions, deep inequality, and periodic political instability. These challenges are not new. They have shaped Nigeria's post-independence trajectory and have repeatedly constrained democratic consolidation and sustainable development (Osaghae, 1998; Akinola, 2018). In similar respect, (Etebong, et al 2025) asserts that elite dominance and weak institutions are obvious problems in Nigeria.

Many scholars argue that these governance failures cannot be explained by institutional weakness alone. Joseph (1987) famously described Nigeria's political system as prebendal, a system in which public office is treated as a source of personal enrichment and patronage distribution. In such an environment, political competition often revolves around access to state resources rather than public service. Over time, this pattern reshapes expectations. Leadership becomes associated with accumulation rather than accountability, and democratic legitimacy gradually erodes (Smith, 2007).

At the center of this pattern lies a deeper concern: the weakening of moral responsibility. Moral responsibility, in its most basic sense, refers to the obligation of agents, especially those who wield power, to act in ways that respect justice, fairness, and the well-being of others. In politics, this obligation is amplified. Decisions made by leaders determine who gains access to education, employment, infrastructure, and security. When moral responsibility declines, governance shifts from protection to extraction. Citizens experience the state less as a guarantor of welfare and more as an arena of competition for privilege.

Philosophical ethics offers resources for clarifying this problem. From a deontological perspective, moral responsibility is grounded in duty. Kant (1997) argues that moral action must be guided by principles capable of universal application. Leaders, therefore, are required to act according to rules they would accept as binding on all. Political reasoning that treats citizens merely as instruments for electoral advantage or personal gain cannot satisfy this standard. If universalized, such conduct would undermine the very possibility of public trust. Virtue ethics



adds another dimension to the analysis. Aristotle (2004) emphasizes the formation of character and the cultivation of virtues such as justice, prudence, courage, and temperance. Ethical leadership is not secured by rules alone. It depends on the moral character of those who hold authority. Where leaders lack integrity, institutions often mirror that deficiency. Structural reform without moral formation may therefore remain incomplete.

Contemporary moral philosophy further complicates the issue of responsibility in political life. Nagel (1979) and Williams (1981) remind us that the possession of power does not reduce moral accountability. On the contrary, it intensifies it. Political actors may appeal to necessity or circumstance, but authority carries moral burden. The greater the power to affect human lives, the greater the obligation to justify its use.

In Nigeria, however, moral responsibility is frequently overshadowed by political pragmatism and selective moral reasoning. Practices such as patronage, clientelism, and corruption are sometimes defended as culturally embedded or politically unavoidable. Such justifications weaken the expectation that leaders owe equal moral regard to all citizens. As corruption becomes systemic rather than exceptional, democratic institutions lose credibility and public trust declines (Agbiboa, 2012).

This study therefore asks: How has the erosion of moral responsibility contributed to Nigeria's leadership crisis, and what philosophical resources can illuminate pathways toward ethical reconstruction?

The argument advanced here is that Nigeria's governance crisis cannot be resolved through technical or administrative reforms alone. Institutional redesign is necessary, but insufficient. What is required is moral reconstruction. Leadership grounded in duty, virtue, and accountability is indispensable for rebuilding institutional trust and expanding human freedom (Sen, 1999). The erosion of moral responsibility does not remain a private failing. It translates into institutional weakness and ultimately produces a crisis of governance legitimacy.

Methodologically, this study adopts a conceptual-analytical approach rooted in normative ethical theory. It draws on deontological ethics, virtue ethics, and theories of justice to interpret leadership failure in Nigeria as fundamentally moral rather than merely institutional or economic. By integrating philosophical analysis with political scholarship on Nigerian governance, the paper seeks to provide a normative framework for understanding and addressing the crisis of leadership ethics.



Conceptual Clarification of Key Terms

Philosophical inquiry depends on conceptual clarity. Discussions about leadership and governance often become confused when key concepts are used loosely or interchangeably. This study therefore clarifies the central terms that shape its argument. These include morality, moral responsibility, leadership, ethical leadership, and governance. Clarifying these concepts is necessary because the crisis under examination is not only political but also moral, and moral arguments require precision.

Morality refers to the principles that guide human conduct in relation to what is considered right or wrong. It concerns how persons ought to act, especially in situations where their actions affect others. Moral standards typically reflect expectations about justice, fairness, truthfulness, and respect for human dignity. Although moral practices may differ across societies, morality generally aims at promoting human well-being and reducing harm. In philosophical discourse, morality is not treated as mere personal preference. It involves rational justification and requires reasons that can be defended through argument. For this reason, moral discussions are often connected to concepts such as obligation, virtue, justice, and responsibility (Rawls, 1971).

Moral responsibility refers to the accountability of an individual for actions that affect others. A person is morally responsible when the action is performed freely, with awareness of its meaning, and in a manner that makes praise or blame appropriate. Moral responsibility therefore presupposes agency. It assumes that individuals have the capacity to choose and that their choices have ethical consequences. As Nagel (1979) explains, responsibility becomes complicated when external factors influence action, yet moral evaluation remains unavoidable because human life is structured around judgment and accountability.

Moral responsibility carries greater significance in leadership contexts. Leaders control institutions, influence policy priorities, and direct the allocation of public resources. Their actions shape the opportunities and security of large populations, including individuals they may never personally encounter. For this reason, leadership responsibility is not limited to private integrity. It extends to public consequences. Bernard Williams (1981) further argues that political actors often attempt to escape moral blame by appealing to circumstances or systemic constraints. Yet the exercise of authority does not remove responsibility. Instead, power increases accountability because it increases the capacity to shape human outcomes. Thus, one can speak unequivocally of moral responsibility within the context of leadership.



Leadership may be defined as the capacity to influence people and direct collective action toward shared goals. It involves guidance, decision-making, and coordination, but it also requires trust. Leadership is therefore not merely the ability to command. It is the ability to direct social life in ways that people can accept as legitimate. In political contexts, leadership refers specifically to those who hold public authority and determine national priorities. Because political leadership shapes laws, security structures, and economic policy, it carries a strong ethical dimension. Decisions taken by leaders affect human dignity, equality, and social stability.

Ethical leadership refers to leadership guided by moral principles such as justice, honesty, accountability, and commitment to the common good. Ethical leaders do not treat authority as private property. They regard power as a public trust and exercise it in ways that promote fairness and protect human welfare. Ethical leadership therefore goes beyond legal compliance. A leader may operate within legal frameworks while still acting unjustly. Ethical leadership requires a deeper moral commitment to the dignity of persons and the public good. Kant's (1997) moral philosophy is particularly relevant here because it insists that human beings must always be treated as ends in themselves, not as instruments for political advantage.

Governance refers to the processes, structures, and institutions through which societies are organized and directed. It includes the mechanisms by which decisions are made, policies implemented, and public resources distributed. Governance also involves accountability systems that ensure power is exercised responsibly. In democratic societies, governance should reflect legitimacy, transparency, and responsiveness to citizens. Where governance becomes corrupt or unaccountable, citizens experience the state less as a protector of welfare and more as an instrument of exploitation. In such contexts, the moral legitimacy of leadership becomes questionable, and public trust in political institutions begins to decline.

These concepts provide the framework for understanding the Nigerian leadership crisis as both a political and moral problem. Clarifying these terms allows the study to examine governance failure not only as institutional weakness but as ethical breakdown. It also establishes the foundation for evaluating how moral responsibility can be restored as a guiding principle of leadership in Nigeria.

Moral Responsibility and its Relevance to Leadership in Nigeria

The relevance of moral responsibility to leadership in Nigeria becomes clearer when leadership is understood as a force that shapes the everyday lives of citizens. Governance is not an abstract



activity carried out in distant political institutions. It determines access to employment, education, healthcare, infrastructure, and security. It also shapes how citizens experience dignity, belonging, and protection within the state. For this reason, leadership decisions carry consequences that extend far beyond political elites. When leadership fails morally, citizens often experience the effects immediately through poverty, insecurity, unemployment, and declining public services.

From a deontological standpoint, moral responsibility is grounded in duty. Kant (1997) argues that moral action is defined by adherence to principles that can be universalized. A leader's actions must therefore be guided by standards that could reasonably apply to all leaders in similar circumstances. This requirement has serious implications for governance in Nigeria. If corruption were treated as acceptable political conduct, and if such conduct became a general rule, public institutions would inevitably collapse. If electoral fraud were normalized and universalized, democratic legitimacy would lose meaning. If public funds were routinely treated as private wealth, development would remain unattainable. Kant's moral philosophy also insists that human beings must never be treated merely as means but always as ends in themselves; act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means but always as an end. In Nigeria, however, citizens are sometimes reduced to instruments of political ambition, particularly when public resources are distributed selectively in order to secure loyalty rather than promote justice. When palliatives are given to win political points rather than for humanitarian purpose. These conducts among others violate the moral obligation to respect citizens as autonomous persons. From this perspective, many leadership failures in Nigeria represent not simply administrative weakness but a fundamental collapse of duty.

Virtue ethics provides a different but equally significant framework for understanding leadership responsibility. Aristotle (2004) argues that morality is not primarily a matter of obeying rules but of developing good character. Virtues such as honesty, justice, courage, and practical wisdom are cultivated through moral discipline and habitual practice. This approach is particularly useful for understanding why corruption persists even when formal institutions exist. The problem is not only structural weakness. It is also the moral character of leaders who have been shaped by political environments that reward self-interest and patronage. Joseph (1987) describes Nigeria's political system as prebendal, where political office is frequently treated as a means of wealth accumulation and a tool for rewarding supporters. Within such a system, leaders may be praised not for integrity but for their ability to distribute resources to loyal networks. This distorts public service ethics and weakens civic accountability. Virtue ethics therefore suggests that Nigeria's



leadership crisis is also a crisis of moral formation. Reforms may remain fragile unless leaders cultivate the virtues required for responsible public service.

The issue of justice further clarifies the moral responsibilities of leadership in Nigeria. Rawls (1971) argues that a just society requires fairness in the distribution of social goods and equal opportunity for all citizens. Institutions must be designed to protect the vulnerable and prevent the domination of the weak by the powerful. This framework speaks directly to Nigeria's persistent inequality and uneven development. Many citizens experience exclusion shaped by regional disparities, ethnic politics, and unequal access to infrastructure. While some communities enjoy better public services, others remain neglected and marginalized. Such patterns weaken the moral legitimacy of the state, since the state exists to serve all citizens rather than privileged groups. Rawls also emphasizes the importance of public justification. Leaders must be able to defend their policies with reasons that citizens can accept as equals. When governance operates through secrecy, manipulation, and selective enforcement, legitimacy becomes fragile and democratic trust declines.

A related ethical problem is the tendency to justify corruption through cultural relativism. Patronage networks, favoritism, and political reward systems are sometimes defended as culturally embedded practices. While culture shapes political behaviour, it cannot provide moral justification for exploitation. Gewirth (1978) argues that moral reasoning must preserve human agency and dignity. When cultural explanations are used to excuse corruption, citizens are reduced to victims of elite power struggles. Culture may help explain why certain practices persist, but it cannot morally legitimize them. Ethical leadership requires principles that protect the rights and dignity of all citizens regardless of local political customs. Without such principles, accountability becomes unstable and justice becomes negotiable.

Moral responsibility is also inseparable from development. Sen (1999) argues that development should be understood as the expansion of human freedom. Economic growth is insufficient if citizens remain deprived of education, healthcare, security, and meaningful participation in public life. In Nigeria, corruption and irresponsible leadership reduce freedom by weakening public institutions and limiting opportunities. When public funds are diverted, citizens lose access to the conditions necessary for a dignified life. Schools deteriorate, healthcare systems remain underfunded, unemployment persists, and insecurity deepens. The absence of moral responsibility therefore produces not only political instability but also long-term developmental stagnation.



These philosophical insights suggest that governance cannot be sustained without a strong ethical foundation. Political leaders do not own the state. They hold authority in trust and are morally accountable for how they exercise it. When moral responsibility weakens, corruption becomes normalized and citizens become cynical. Democracy may continue in form, but it loses substance. Institutions cease to inspire confidence, and civic participation declines. Restoring moral responsibility in Nigerian leadership therefore requires more than administrative reforms. It demands ethical renewal alongside institutional strengthening. Leadership culture must be rebuilt around integrity, fairness, transparency, and public accountability. Without this moral foundation, governance reforms will remain superficial and fragile.

The Nigerian Leadership Crisis: Historical and Structural Dimensions

Nigeria's leadership crisis cannot be fully understood without attention to its political history and the structural conditions that sustain governance failure. The problem did not emerge suddenly in contemporary politics. It developed through historical processes that shaped political institutions, leadership expectations, and patterns of accountability. The colonial state, for instance, was not designed to cultivate participatory governance or moral responsibility. Its primary function was administrative control and economic extraction. Falola and Heaton (2008) argue that colonial governance weakened indigenous political structures and reduced opportunities for collective accountability. This legacy contributed to a post-independence state that possessed authority without strong democratic foundations.

Following independence in 1960, political competition quickly became intertwined with ethnicity and regional identity. Rather than consolidating a shared national political culture, elites often mobilized support through ethnic loyalty and regional advantage. Diamond (1988) observes that the First Republic struggled partly because political leaders prioritized factional and sectional interests over national cohesion. Under such conditions, political office became associated with access to state resources rather than responsibility to a unified citizenry. The state gradually came to be perceived not as a moral institution serving the common good, but as a prize to be captured and distributed.

Achebe (1983) famously argued that Nigeria's central problem was leadership failure. His critique was not merely political but moral. He pointed to the absence of discipline, integrity, and a genuine commitment to public service among political elites. Although Achebe's intervention was reflective rather than empirical, it remains significant because it highlights an ethical reality



that continues to define Nigerian governance: leadership without moral character cannot sustain national development. His argument remains relevant because it exposes how political decay often begins with moral collapse.

Military intervention further reinforced this trajectory. Between 1966 and 1999, Nigeria experienced repeated military rule, and governance became defined by centralized authority, command structures, and limited civic participation. Military regimes weakened democratic accountability by restricting transparency and removing public justification from decision-making. Over time, the exercise of political power became associated with dominance rather than stewardship. The result was the gradual normalization of impunity and the weakening of institutional restraints on leadership conduct.

Joseph (1987) provides a particularly influential interpretation of this historical evolution through the concept of prebendal politics. In a prebendal system, public office is treated as a source of personal wealth and a mechanism for rewarding loyal supporters. Political authority is therefore not primarily seen as a responsibility to serve the public but as an opportunity to “share the national cake.” This pattern shaped both military and civilian political culture. Importantly, it did not disappear with the return to democracy. Instead, it became embedded in the logic of political competition.

While historical developments explain the emergence of Nigeria’s leadership crisis, structural conditions explain its persistence. One of the most significant structural drivers is the political economy of oil. Nigeria’s heavy dependence on oil revenue has created a rent-based state that generates wealth without strong accountability to taxpayers. In many political systems, taxation encourages accountability because citizens demand transparency when they finance government. In contrast, rentier economies reduce such pressure, since political elites can distribute state resources without requiring broad public consent. Akinola (2018) argues that struggles over oil revenue have shaped political rivalry in Nigeria, encouraging corruption, elite competition, and policy inconsistency. As a result, governance is often oriented toward controlling wealth rather than producing development.

Agbibo (2012) describes corruption in Nigeria as a form of state capture, where political elites do not merely steal public funds but also manipulate institutions to protect their access to resources. Under such conditions, corruption becomes systemic rather than incidental. Institutions meant to enforce accountability may be weakened, politicized, or compromised. This explains why corruption often survives changes in government. It is not simply the moral failure of individuals, but a structural condition reinforced by political incentives.



Electoral fragility also sustains the crisis. Although democracy returned in 1999, elections have often been contested, shaped by irregularities, violence, and patronage politics. Suberu (2007) notes that Nigeria's elections have frequently produced legitimacy concerns and weakened public confidence in democratic institutions. Where electoral processes lack credibility, leadership becomes disconnected from genuine public consent. This creates a moral deficit because political authority is no longer rooted in transparent legitimacy. Citizens may view government as imposed rather than representative.

The long-term consequence of electoral weakness is public cynicism. When citizens repeatedly observe leadership failure, many begin to withdraw from political engagement. Smith (2007) argues that corruption in Nigeria has shaped everyday life to the extent that it influences public expectations and civic attitudes. In such a context, citizens may come to regard corruption as inevitable. This resignation is ethically significant because it weakens civic responsibility and reduces the pressure required for accountability. It also creates a cycle in which unethical leadership becomes easier to sustain.

Institutional fragility further deepens this crisis. Effective governance requires independent courts, functional legislatures, and credible anti-corruption agencies. In Nigeria, however, institutions often face political interference, weak enforcement capacity, and selective justice. When accountability depends on political alignment, moral responsibility becomes unstable. Citizens lose trust in the rule of law because punishment appears inconsistent. From a Rawlsian perspective, institutions must protect citizens fairly and safeguard the least advantaged (Rawls, 1971). When institutions fail to uphold impartial justice, governance loses legitimacy and the moral basis of citizenship becomes fragile.

The consequences of these historical and structural conditions are severe. They include economic stagnation, unemployment, insecurity, and widening inequality. Sen (1999) argues that development should be understood as the expansion of human freedom. Yet corruption and weak governance reduce freedom by limiting access to education, healthcare, employment opportunities, and social security. The leadership crisis therefore cannot be treated as merely political. It is a moral and developmental crisis with direct human costs.

Nigeria's leadership crisis is sustained by a combination of historical inheritance and structural incentives. Colonial governance weakened accountability. Military rule normalized impunity. Oil wealth encouraged rent-seeking politics. Weak elections reduced legitimacy. Fragile institutions made consistent accountability difficult. Together, these conditions created a political environment in which moral responsibility is frequently displaced by opportunism. Diamond's



(1988) analysis of the collapse of the First Republic reinforces this point, showing that democratic failure is not merely institutional but ethical. Political actors often abandon moral restraint when power becomes the primary goal. This historical lesson remains relevant, because institutional design alone cannot guarantee ethical leadership where political culture rewards irresponsibility.

Nevertheless, the crisis is not irreversible. Political structures can be reformed, and leadership culture can change. Yet meaningful reform requires recognition of a central fact: governance is not only technical. It is ethical. Without moral responsibility, leadership becomes an instrument of domination rather than development, and the state loses its legitimacy as a moral community.

Moral Responsibility in Nigerian Leadership: A Philosophical Critique

Nigeria's leadership crisis cannot be reduced to institutional weakness or administrative inefficiency. At a deeper level, it reflects a sustained ethical breakdown. What appears as corruption, electoral fragility, and governance failure is often the visible expression of a more fundamental erosion of moral responsibility. Leadership, in its ethical sense, requires accountability not only to legal codes but to standards of justice, honesty, and public trust. When those standards weaken, governance loses its moral anchor.

One important factor in this erosion is the selective use of cultural relativism. Cultural relativism, in its moderate form, recognizes that moral practices vary across societies. However, it becomes ethically problematic when it is invoked to justify injustice or shield misconduct from criticism. In Nigerian, practices such as patronage, favoritism, and the selective allocation of public resources are sometimes defended as culturally embedded expressions of communal obligation. Yet such defenses obscure the moral cost. When public office is used to privilege a network or reward loyalty, citizens outside that network are effectively marginalized. Gewirth (1978) insists that moral reasoning must preserve human agency and equal dignity. Cultural context may explain political behaviour, but it cannot excuse the violation of rights or the erosion of fairness. Once cultural relativism becomes a tool of justification rather than understanding, ethical accountability begins to dissolve.

Closely related to this problem is political opportunism. In environments where power is unstable and competition intense, leaders may prioritize survival over principle. Decisions become guided less by justice and more by strategic calculation. Public office then shifts from stewardship to instrumentality. Kant's (1997) moral framework is instructive here. His insistence that persons must never be treated merely as means challenges political practices that reduce



citizens to voting blocs, patronage recipients, or instruments of elite rivalry. When leadership becomes opportunistic, the public sphere is transformed into a marketplace of exchange rather than a domain of shared responsibility. Moral responsibility weakens because action is measured by advantage rather than obligation.

The gap between ethical ideals and political reality further compounds this problem. Nigeria's constitutional framework affirms justice, equality, and accountability. Political leaders routinely invoke these values in public rhetoric. Yet the lived experience of governance often contradicts these commitments. This disjunction produces frustration and, eventually, distrust. Rawls (1971) argues that political legitimacy depends on fairness and public justification. Policies must be defensible to citizens as free and equal participants in a shared political order. Where governance operates through secrecy, selective enforcement, or elite privilege, that justification becomes thin. Legitimacy then erodes not through dramatic collapse but through gradual withdrawal of public confidence.

The normalization of prebendal politics intensifies this ethical disconnect. Joseph (1987) describes how public offices in Nigeria are frequently treated as opportunities for distributing benefits to loyal supporters. In such a system, accountability is redirected away from the broader citizenry and toward patrons, party structures, or ethnic constituencies. Over time, this logic reshapes political expectations. Leaders may come to view public resources as entitlements attached to office rather than responsibilities attached to trust. Corruption thus becomes embedded within institutional practice rather than perceived as deviation from it. The ethical consequences are significant: citizenship becomes stratified, and equal moral regard gives way to preferential obligation.

Public reaction to these patterns also has moral implications. When citizens repeatedly observe unpunished misconduct, cynicism grows. Political participation declines, and resignation replaces expectation. Smith (2007) notes that corruption in Nigeria has permeated everyday life to such an extent that it shapes ordinary assumptions about governance. Once unethical behaviour becomes anticipated rather than shocking, moral standards adjust downward. This is one of the most corrosive outcomes of leadership failure. It does not merely damage institutions; it reshapes collective moral imagination.

Achebe's (1983) critique of Nigerian leadership remains instructive in this respect. He argued that the absence of discipline and integrity among leaders had weakened national cohesion. Although articulated decades ago, this observation continues to resonate because it identifies



character deficiency as central to political decay. Leadership crises, in this view, are not accidental. They reflect sustained moral neglect.

Philosophically, such circumstances illustrate what Williams (1981) describes as the moral vulnerability of political action. Leaders often appeal to necessity, pressure, or systemic constraint as justification for ethically questionable conduct. Yet moral responsibility does not disappear under pressure. If anything, it becomes more urgent. The capacity to shape institutions and influence collective outcomes increases the weight of accountability. Political authority amplifies responsibility rather than diminishing it.

The developmental implications of this ethical erosion are substantial. Sen (1999) argues that development should be understood as the expansion of substantive freedoms. These freedoms include access to education, healthcare, security, and meaningful participation in public life. When leadership is ethically compromised, these freedoms contract. Misallocated resources weaken social services, insecurity persists, and inequality deepens. The result is not merely economic stagnation but human deprivation. Moral failure in governance therefore produces tangible consequences for the everyday lives of citizens.

These considerations suggest that Nigeria's leadership crisis is sustained by intertwined forces such as the misuse of cultural relativism, the logic of political opportunism, the normalization of prebendal expectations, and the widening gap between ethical ideals and political practice. Structural weakness alone does not explain the persistence of governance failure. Ethical disorientation plays a central role. The erosion of moral responsibility does not remain confined to individual conduct; it becomes institutionalized and ultimately generates a crisis of governance legitimacy.

Recognizing this moral dimension is essential. Without ethical reorientation, institutional reform risks becoming procedural rather than transformative. Leadership must be reconnected to duty, virtue, justice, and accountability if governance is to regain legitimacy and public trust.

Reconstruction of Moral Responsibility in Nigerian Leadership

If the leadership crisis in Nigeria is fundamentally moral, then its resolution must extend beyond institutional redesign. Laws can be amended, agencies restructured, and electoral procedures revised, yet such measures remain incomplete if the ethical orientation of leadership remains unchanged. Governance ultimately depends on how power is understood and exercised. Where



authority is seen as entitlement, reform becomes fragile. Where it is understood as stewardship, accountability becomes meaningful. The reconstruction of moral responsibility therefore requires a redefinition of political authority itself.

One starting point is ethical formation. Moral responsibility is not an automatic feature of public office. It is cultivated over time through education, practice, and social expectation. Aristotle (2004) reminds us that virtue develops through habituation. Individuals become just by practicing justice and honest by acting honestly. In systems where corruption has become normalized, reversing the pattern demands deliberate moral reorientation. Ethical education must therefore extend beyond abstract moral instruction. It should cultivate civic consciousness, emphasize public trust, and reinforce the idea that leadership is service rather than privilege. Universities, professional training institutions, religious communities, families and civil society organizations all play roles in shaping the moral imagination of future leaders. When public office is consistently presented as a trust, not a reward, expectations gradually shift.

Yet moral formation alone cannot sustain ethical leadership. Institutions must reinforce virtue rather than undermine it. Rawls (1971) argues that just institutions create conditions in which fairness can endure beyond individual goodwill. Where accountability mechanisms are weak or selectively enforced, even well-intentioned leaders may operate within systems that reward opportunism. On this note, it is essential to strengthen the institutional independence of the courts, electoral bodies, and anti-corruption agencies. Enforcement must be impartial. If accountability appears politically motivated, it deepens distrust rather than restoring legitimacy. Responsibility becomes credible only when ethical violations produce consistent consequences.

Transparency also plays a central role in moral reconstruction. Governance that operates behind closed doors invites suspicion and abuse. By contrast, open processes allow citizens to evaluate leadership decisions and demand justification. Sen (1999) emphasizes that public reasoning is foundational to development. Citizens require access to information in order to participate meaningfully in political life. Transparent budgeting, public audits, and open legislative deliberation are not merely administrative improvements but moral commitments to treat citizens as capable participants rather than passive observers. When leaders act transparently, they affirm the equal dignity of those they govern.

Reconstruction must also address the psychological dimension of political opportunism. In many political environments, success is measured by the accumulation of wealth or the consolidation of influence. Such standards distort incentives and weaken ethical restraint. Kant's (1997) insistence that persons be treated as ends in themselves challenges this logic directly. Political



office cannot be justified as a platform for self-preservation or enrichment. It carries a duty to promote justice impartially. Leaders must internalize the understanding that legitimacy rests not on dominance but on moral credibility. This shift cannot be legislated alone. It requires cultural change within political communities.

Citizens themselves are not exempted from responsibility in this process. Civic disengagement reinforces unethical leadership. When corruption is tolerated as inevitable, moral expectations decline. Smith (2007) observes that corruption in Nigeria has shaped everyday social interactions and public assumptions. Reversing this normalization requires active citizenship. Voter participation, public advocacy, independent journalism, and grassroots accountability movements create external pressure for ethical governance. Public apathy weakens democratic culture and sustained civic engagement strengthens it. Reconstruction of moral responsibility therefore involves both leaders and citizens.

Another dimension of reform concerns how political achievement is evaluated. In systems where leadership success is defined by personal accumulation or control of patronage networks, moral responsibility is sidelined. Development-oriented governance, by contrast, measures achievement through public welfare indicators such as improvements in education, healthcare, infrastructure, employment, and security. Sen's (1999) capability approach provides a useful framework here. Development should expand the substantive freedoms of citizens. When leadership performance is judged by the expansion of human opportunity rather than by elite enrichment, moral responsibility aligns more closely with political success.

Finally, reconstruction requires a renewed commitment to inclusive citizenship. Nigeria's diversity in terms of ethnic, religious or regional, has often been politicized in ways that fragment national solidarity. Yet diversity need not undermine moral community. Rawls (1971) argues that political principles must be justifiable to all citizens as free and equal persons. Leadership that privileges one group at the expense of others weakens social cohesion and fuels resentment. Ethical reconstruction therefore demands a commitment to fairness that transcends sectional interests. National identity must be anchored in shared moral principles rather than competitive patronage.

Rebuilding moral responsibility will not produce immediate transformation. This stems from the fact that cultural change unfolds gradually. Institutional reform requires persistence. Yet political culture is not static. It evolves through collective practice and deliberate effort. The history of governance in Nigeria shows patterns of ethical erosion, but it does not foreclose renewal.



Reform becomes possible when leadership is re-grounded in duty, virtue, justice, and accountability.

Without moral renewal, institutional reforms will remain procedural and vulnerable to capture. With moral renewal, governance can regain legitimacy and function as an instrument of justice and development. The reconstruction of moral responsibility is therefore not merely desirable. It is necessary for the survival and flourishing of democratic governance in Nigeria.

Conclusion

This study has argued that Nigeria's leadership crisis is not simply a matter of administrative inefficiency or institutional fragility. At its core, it reflects a sustained erosion of moral responsibility within political leadership. Historical legacies, structural incentives, and economic distortions have certainly shaped governance outcomes. Yet beneath these factors lies a deeper ethical deficit. Leadership has too often shifted from stewardship to entitlement, from public trust to private accumulation. The result is visible in weakened institutions, declining public confidence, and persistent developmental stagnation.

Philosophical analysis helps illuminate why this erosion matters. Deontological ethics reminds us that leadership carries duties that cannot be suspended for convenience or political survival (Kant, 1997). Virtue ethics emphasizes that institutions ultimately reflect the moral character of those who govern them (Aristotle, 2004). Rawlsian justice requires that political arrangements protect citizens fairly and treat them as equals (Rawls, 1971). Sen's account of development further clarifies that ethical governance is inseparable from the expansion of human freedom (Sen, 1999). These perspectives converge on a common insight. That is, leadership without moral responsibility cannot sustain legitimacy, justice, or development.

The Nigerian experience demonstrates how moral erosion translates into structural consequences. When corruption becomes normalized, institutional capacity deteriorates. When political opportunism overrides fairness, legitimacy weakens. When cultural explanations are used to excuse injustice, accountability becomes negotiable. Over time, citizens withdraw trust and participation declines. Democracy may continue procedurally, but its moral substance erodes. Governance becomes transactional rather than principled.

The contribution of this study lies in repositioning Nigeria's governance crisis within a normative philosophical framework. While much scholarship emphasizes institutional design,



electoral reform, or economic restructuring, this analysis highlights the moral dimension of leadership. Institutional reform remains necessary. However, reform without ethical orientation risks becoming superficial. Moral responsibility must be internalized by leaders and reinforced through institutional practice. Without such grounding, anti-corruption measures and structural adjustments will struggle to achieve durable transformation.

Reconstruction therefore demands both ethical renewal and institutional strengthening. Leadership must be redefined as stewardship rather than possession. Accountability mechanisms must operate consistently and impartially. Citizens must sustain engagement rather than retreat into resignation. Public office must be evaluated not by the wealth it generates for elites but by the freedoms it expands for citizens. Only when moral responsibility becomes embedded in both character and structure can governance regain legitimacy.

The question raised by Nigeria's leadership crisis is a broader one about political authority itself. Authority is not justified by electoral victory alone, nor by control of resources, nor by force. It is justified by moral credibility. A state that fails to uphold justice cannot command enduring loyalty. Sustainable development, democratic stability, and national cohesion depend upon ethical leadership.

The erosion of moral responsibility does not remain a private failing confined to individual actors. It becomes institutionalized and produces a crisis of governance legitimacy. Restoring moral responsibility is therefore not optional. It is indispensable. Without it, reform efforts will remain fragile and reversible. With it, governance can recover its moral foundation and function as an instrument of justice, dignity, and collective progress. The future of Nigeria depends, in no small measure, on whether leadership can rediscover this ethical grounding.

References

Achebe, C. (1983). *The trouble with Nigeria*. Heinemann.

Agbibo, D. E. (2012). Between corruption and development: The political economy of state robbery in Nigeria. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108(3), 325–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1093-5>

Akinola, A. O. (2018). *Globalization, democracy and oil sector reform in Nigeria*. Palgrave Macmillan.



Aristotle. (2004). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published ca. 4th century BCE)

Diamond, L. (1988). *Class, ethnicity and democracy in Nigeria: The failure of the First Republic*. Syracuse University Press.

Etebong, A. U., Ibanga, I. J., & Ebong, I. B. (2025). *Elites dominance and weak institutions in Nigeria: A front row account of the Nigerian judiciary (2019–2024)*. International Journal of Humanities, Social Science and Management, 5(1), 777–789.

Falola, T., & Heaton, M. M. (2008). *A history of Nigeria*. Cambridge University Press.

Gewirth, A. (1978). *Reason and morality*. University of Chicago Press.

Joseph, R. A. (1987). *Democracy and prebendal politics in Nigeria*. Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (1997). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1785)

Nagel, T. (1979). *Mortal questions*. Cambridge University Press.

Osaghae, E. E. (1998). *Crippled giant: Nigeria since independence*. Indiana University Press.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Smith, D. J. (2007). *A culture of corruption: Everyday deception and popular discontent in Nigeria*. Princeton University Press.

Suberu, R. T. (2007). Nigeria's muddled elections. *Journal of Democracy*, 18(4), 95–110.

Williams, B. (1981). *Moral luck*. Cambridge University Press.