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ABSTRACT
Since the 6th of August 2009 when the implementation of the amnesty initiative started, there have been reported cases of politicisation of the programme, loss of faith in the regime’s leadership style to drive real change, doubts about the presidency’s intentions and further militarisation of the region’s public space among other contentious issues. The Amnesty deal reached between the Nigerian federal government and the oil producing states, which was brokered by President Yar ‘Adua has been considered a mere ruse, a charade rather than a commitment to changing the culture of business as usual in the region. This paper argues that to experience paradigm shift in the region, leadership style enshrined in transformational leadership is necessary. The concept of paradigm shift deals with a radical change that is characterised by achieving unusual and progressive state of affairs. In the context of the Niger delta amnesty deal, this translates into the ability of the government to bring to fruition the ideals of the amnesty deal that promises justice, good governance, development and environmental rehabilitation, which have eluded the inhabitants of this region of Nigeria.
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INTRODUCTION
“‘If a general is ignorant of the principles of adaptability, he must not be trusted with a position of authority’.

--- Sun Tzu.
Leading change is one of the most complex activities the world over, this is fundamentally true especially when it involves human beings. This is a contested phenomenon in managing people and leadership practice. In the context of the amnesty initiative that promises a vent out of the protracted impasse in the Niger delta region of Nigeria, change is crucial for transformational leadership. Thus, the people’s attitude towards the reality of the amnesty deal is that it could be a mere process of putting new wine in old skin, which is very characteristic of postcolonial Nigerian politics. If the people’s feelings are eventually justified, this could be another business-as-usual approach in finding alternative paradigm to change the leadership formation in the Niger delta and Nigeria by extension for transformational leadership to hold sway. The emerging atmosphere
in the post amnesty deal in the Niger delta could be another variant of privation, injustice and repression that the inhabitants of this region had been subjected.

According to Soyinka (2010), the region seriously needs structural change in leadership, a synonym for transformational leadership. Thus:

Let me begin by saying it was a marvellous initiative, it (amnesty deal) was a great initiative on the part of Yar‘Adua, no doubt about that. But it was ill-organised, ill-thought out. Preparations were not made for it, preparations were not made to accommodate those who were coming out of the creek, the militants … The sense of injustice is reflected throughout the entire nation, the delta problem should be solved holistically by transforming the structural relationship of the whole nation and deal very seriously with the revenue deprivation problem (Soyinka 2010: 1).

It is within these parameters that it has been argued that change without significant radicalisation and alteration in character and operation is rather cosmetic and ephemeral and should therefore have no desired results (Kanter, Stein and Jick, 1992: 11). Since change is essentially about “shift in behaviour” (Kanter, Stein and Jick, 1992: 11), it therefore behoves the powers that be to meddle the leadership structure in the Niger delta with sincerity of purpose in order to bring about real, populist-oriented and developmental change in the wake of the amnesty deal, which seemingly promises to ferry the people in this region of Nigeria from extreme poverty, political marginalisation, environmental/ecological despoliation, ethnic violence, socio-economic dissonance and mass killings, among other reverses.

The contradictions in this region have been considered as sheer paradox of plenty. This paradox of blessing is what Richard Auty (1993) has tagged ‘resource curse thesis”, a situation where the deposition of natural resources in a particular place becomes reason for dispute and the like. The plight of the people in this region has been poignantly captured in this statement by one of Nigeria’s foremost journalists, Ray Ekpu:

The story of the Niger delta is the story of a paradox, grinding poverty in the midst of vulgar opulence. It is the case of a man who lives on the bank of a river and washes his hands with spittle. It is the case of people who live on the farm and die of hunger (Ekpu 2004: 10).

In corroborating this, Victor Ojakorotu in his piece, “The Dynamics of Oil and Social Movements in the Niger Delta of Nigeria” argues the following about the Niger delta’s state of misery occasioned by oil paradox:

The region has been the epicentre of numerous overlapping conflicts: between oil bearing/host communities and oil companies (mainly over land rights or compensation for ecological damage); between oil producing communities and the government (over increased access to oil wealth); and between and among ethnic groups (over claims to land ownership
and sharing of amenities). The long-standing Niger delta crisis has had serious consequences, including the loss of lives, wanton destruction of property, and disruption of oil activities (Ojakorotu 2006: 1).

The characteristics above, which underpin the atrocious drama unfolding in the Niger delta on the heels of oil exploration by the multinationals in cahoots with the Nigerian political class have plunged this region into a very complicated crisis of development, paralytic nation-building and insecurity of lives and properties. The foregoing shows the level of dissonance and contradictions in this region, attempts to delve into the history, causes and consequences of this political inanities in the Niger delta is not the remit of this study. The main thrust here is to locate how to lead transformational leadership, as well as to sustain it in the context of the amnesty initiative recently brokered by President Umaru Musa Yar’Adua.

The political stalemate in the Niger delta is the rationale for the advocacy about effective leadership change that will bring about transformational leadership in the region, as well as a paradigm shift from what previous administrations have done regarding the question of peace and sustainable development. Evidently, there have been serious failures of attempts in the past to bring wholesome change in this region. It is against this backdrop that the present debate about changing the leadership formation in place in this region has to be taken very seriously especially in relation to the urgency of the amnesty deal and lack of sincerity of purpose that characterised previous attempts in this regard. It is to this end that Faucon (2009) in his article in The Wall Street Journal offers this illumination:

It is too early to say whether the amnesty deals will translate into lasting peace in the mangrove swamps of the Niger delta, the source of most of Nigeria’s oil wealth… The amnesty offer was initially met by widespread scepticism, including from many of the oil-rich region’s brash militants (Faucon 2009: 13).

Thus, it is too early to declare victory in the ongoing vitriolic deadlock in the Niger delta concerning real, concrete leadership change that will transform the scrapes of the inhabitants of this region as well as rebuild their environment.

The original theorising of transformational leadership was fathered by James MacGregor Burns in his avant-garde work, Leadership (1978). At the core of his formulation of transformational leadership is the concept of transformation, a change with modification in performance, which brings about renewal, as well as lasting, and progressive transformational leadership. It also brings about motivation amongst the people in a manner that produces leadership by consent rather than coercion. The type of motivation that comes with transformational leadership in the time of change in society and organisations is what John Kotter as identified in his important work, A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management (1990) as ‘energy surge’ (Kotter, 1990: 64), a step that enable ‘leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of
morality and motivation”, as Burns (1978: 20), also considers it. Unfortunately, this seems to be lacking in the leadership equation in the pre-amnesty deal in the Niger delta. This development has given rise to what has been characterised as leadership deficit, the main cause of the problems in the Niger delta. And to reverse the trend, the region needs transformational leadership that will guarantee genuine and progressive change. Thus,

Leadership deficit is the root of the paradox… No Nigerian is desirous of a corrupt society with poor infrastructure that stifles innovation and limits capabilities without ensuring peace and Security. We all desire a system that works. What we desire is Transformational leadership with shared purpose and vision(Babalola 2010: 5).

The above addresses the urgency of transformational leadership, which is anchored in redistributive economy, sustainable development, environmental friendly policies, and above all real change of paradigm that will alleviate the level of poverty, marginalisation and privation in the region.

THEORETICAL CLARIFICATION AND HYPOTHESIS

The theoretical framework of this study is predicated upon two factors: transformational leadership and paradigm shift; both are concepts that foreground change in the right direction for societal renaissance. First, the concept of “paradigm shift”, a theory that was first given serious consideration in Thomas Kuhn’s seminal book, The Structure of Scientific Revolution (1962) is about shift from business-as-usual to palpable radicalisation of situations and mindsets. The gist of this book is annealed on the anvils of finding a way out of the tried and the old in human development and progression particularly in the scientific world. Though a scientific heritage, the concept of paradigm shift has been appropriated by diverse disciplines to address significant and revolutionary break from prescriptive and constricting “norm” in society.

To this end, as Kuhn avers, the constraining, normative position of textbooks and science limit our knowledge of revolutionary tendencies in human world, and therefore advocates a paradigm shift, a movement that engenders fresh, innovative and transformational landscape in our world as well as organisations. It is in this respect that it has been viewed in the Kuhnian approach that “paradigm shift is revolutionary in the fullest sense of the word” (Sosteric 2005: 37). In order to ensure transformational leadership in the Niger delta on the heels of the change of guard – a transition from war to peace – as indicated by the amnesty deal, the present experimentation on paradigm shift should be developmental and transformational in perspective. It is only when the present wave of change in the Niger delta is nuanced with transformational leadership as well as genuine change which impacts on people’s welfare (that is a move from business-as-usual) can Nigeria experience lasting peace in the Niger delta region.

Transformational leadership in the Kuhnian sense (Everman 2006: 132), that is with its ontological distinctiveness borders on finding alternative leadership style or model in the present experimentation with
consolidating the nascent democratic culture in Nigeria with particular emphasis on harnessing the promises of the amnesty deal in the Niger delta region. To achieve paradigm shift in the leadership permutation in the Niger delta, we shall be adopting Burns’ model of leadership as fitting in this very instance for a lasting, progressive change in the region. Interestingly, we have to make a distinction between transactional leadership and transformational leadership, which is largely the meat of Burns’ analysis. In the past, the failure of previous administrations to make this clear-cut distinction was instrumental in systemic failure as well as operational incapacity to drive the needed change in the region. Transactional leadership is about give and take, where leaders and followers are gratified – the essence here is verged on what one could get for leading, rather than collective welfare. The sense of gratification here reduces leadership to business enterprise, rather than the capacity of the leader to “… inspire confidence, communicate a positive vision, and emphasise their followers’ strengths” (Peterson, Walumbwa, Byron, and Myrowitz, 2009: 348) without seeing reward as the driver. This is essentially what the whole debate about leading change in the region encapsulates: a paradigm that will put into context genuinely the key areas of the amnesty deal thereby making the welfare of deltans the epicentre of this new wind of change.

Making the Deltans “Change Ready”: Strategies for Institutionalising Change

Commenting on the factors that hamper transformational leadership and change in human society as well as in organisations, John Kotter in his landmark piece on leadership and change management, Leading Change (1996) reduces these factors to the following:

Inwardly focused cultures, paralysing bureaucracy, parochial politics, a low level of trust, lack of teamwork … a lack of leadership in the middle management and the general human fear of the unknown (Kotter, 1996: 46).

The import of Kotter’s declaration above is based on primordial, perennial difficulties encountered in bringing change to fruition. These difficulties are traditionally characterised as resistance to change in leadership and management studies. This is the landscape in the Niger delta – and Nigerian by extension.

The question of leadership transformation for a paradigm shift in the Niger delta is crucial and it is a potent tool for rebirth. The hallmark of the urgency of leadership as being universalised is represented here:

Leadership is a universal phenomenon. The roles of both leaders and followers have become more complex and elaborate and multiple perspectives exist on how leadership is conceptualised (Stewart, 2006: 1).

In consonance with Kotter’s position above, the new leadership in the Niger delta has to realise that desperate times call for desperate action. So, the present administration, the Technical Committee appointed by President Umaru Musa Yar’Adua, the movement for the emancipation of the Niger delta (MEND), Joint Task Force (JTF), the Niger Delta Civil Society Coalition (NDCSC), Nigerian Maritime Administration, and the
proposed US-Nigeria Bi-national Commission among other outfits involved in the Niger delta peace process have to ensure that the ongoing process is urgent. This dovetails with Kotter’s ‘‘sense of urgency’’ model. In this regard, all the stakeholders involved in this process of leadership change for re-invented Niger delta need to identify and discuss crises and potential crises as well as key opportunity options for the inhabitants of this region. This sense of urgency finds expression in a policy briefing document by the International Crisis Group Working to Prevent Conflict World Wide. It says: ‘‘the urgency is underscored by the grim security situation in the region and the risk that instability may spread…’’ (ICGWPCWW, 2009: 1). The corollary of this urgency has been taken further in an article by Sabella Abidde entitled ‘‘Niger Delta: The Complexities of the Post-Amnesty Environment (Part1)’’. In furtherance of this debate,

Within the Niger Delta, and since the conclusion of the amnesty, three phenomenons (sic) have come to the fore. First, some Niger Deltans have been betraying their people… Second, we also see the formation of several powerhouses within the region, all lobbying the presidency for political profit… Third, there is irony – an irony one first noticed some years back: The same people who incite youths to take up arms (as legitimate as arm taking against the Nigerian government is/was), never allowed their children or grandchildren to join the struggle (Abidde, 2009: 3).

In order to stem the tide of business-as-usual, in which case post-amnesty Niger delta could be plunged back into politicisation, restiveness and militancy that did characterise the region before, the amnesty deal and all the packages that come with it have to be taken as an emergency situation. This is what Kotter means when he asked: ‘‘when is the urgency rate high?’’ (Kotter, 2007: 4).

In addition, on the heels of the anxiety, fear and trepidation that previous administrations had instilled in the minds of the inhabitants of this region, the current leadership style has to be anchored in hope and the belief that it will not fail in its bid to drive change. Snyder (1994) commented on the question of instilling hope in the people and said that it is fundamental to leadership. They also articulated that hope has two inveterate variables: pathway and agency. Agency is the motivational facet that drives people along their envisioned pathway in order to achieve their goal or what is at stake. For pathway, it means people’s observation of events as well as themselves as being able to produce plausible, credible routes to desired objectives (Peterson, Walumbwa, Byron, and Myrowitz, 2009: 350). This same perspective is further deepened in Bill Clinton’s analysis in his book, Between Hope and History (Clinton, 1996). As Clinton contends,

History has a way of testing us – as individuals and as a nation – a habit of demanding that we choose between our hopes and fears, between our vision of how things ought to be and an acceptance of things as they are (Clinton 1996: 3).

Understandably, the amnesty deal is another opportunity for the Niger delta dilemma to be resolved; history is testing the Nigerian nation in this regard. The deal is a harbinger of hope and the making of history. It is to
In ensuring that people’s welfare and well-being are guaranteed in the amnesty deal era, a shift from how the multinationals and the political class do business in the region, there has to be re-engineered corporate social responsibility aimed at ensuring the well-being of the region’s biodiversity, ecology, environment and the like. It will also factor in political and socio-economic measures aimed at alleviating the misery of the people in this region. The concept of corporate social responsibility is cardinal in business transactions the world over. It is even more important in assessing the impacts of multinationals’ operation in the developing world. The research available shows that the multinationals’ presence in the region has brought untold hardship, underdevelopment, destruction of environment and attendant political and socio-economic dissonance. In order to reverse this trend given the urgency of the amnesty deal, this has to change. It is well known that corporate social responsibility is about fairness regarding how corporate organisations do business so as to link their actions to people’s empowerment. The impact of this concept on how the multinationals do business in the region is abundantly made clear here:

One of humankind’s greatest challenges this century will be to ensure sustainable development, just and balanced development. The needs of current and future generations cannot be met unless there is respect for natural systems and standards protecting core social and environmental values (Hohnen 2007: viii).

The above is the task the present leadership framework in the Niger delta should be engaging for conflict-free, developmental landscape in the region.

Also, in leading change in the region, the new leadership strategy has to be proactive so as to elicit sense of optimism as well as resiliency in the deltans. In their piece “Resilient Individuals Use Positive Emotions to Bounce Back from Negative Emotional Experience”, Tugade and Fredrickson advocate that resiliency is “the capacity to modify responses to changing situational demands, especially frustrating or stressful encounters” (2004: 322). Resilient people are given to positive emotionality, a harbinger for people to rebound from negative state of affairs to positive ones when they are confronted with danger, hostility and the like. This factor will go a long way in making the amnesty deal a success, hence, it will serve as an antidote to what the people had been offered by previous dispensations that rather kept them oppressed and marginalised. Therefore, transformational leadership in the region has to guarantee a robust coalition between the inhabitants of the area and the other party – that is the representatives of the federal government. These parties have to have same vision in this transformation project. This will help foster strategies that will remove obstacles to concretising corporate and social culture, which will empower the people.
In order to drive transformational leadership in the region, there should be transitional justice framework. In ensuring transitional justice, which has been defined as being ‘‘made up of the process of trials, purges, and reparations that take place after the transition from one political regime to another’’ (Elster 2004: 1), there should be no victor and no vanquished. Examples abound in history where the approach to arrive at justice via the route of vindictiveness rather than true reconciliation has produced counter results on the question of peace and transformational leadership. To this end, the federal government’s pardon of the fighting militants, particularly their leader, Henry Okah, who was standing trial for treason as well as other sub-groups of MEND, signalled a commitment on the present government to be different in approach. Thus the Niger Delta Technical Committee (NDTC) should be an instrument to recommend to the presidency appropriate measures that will enhance the objective of transitional justice.

The coalescence of the stakeholder engagement and corporate social responsibility thesis brings about a synergy that will impact on the transformational leadership debate in the Niger delta. In his landmark book, Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach (1984), Edward Freeman coined the term stakeholder theory to designate the stakeholders of a company or corporation as ‘‘individuals and constituencies that contribute, either voluntarily or involuntarily, to its wealth-creating capacity and activities, and who are therefore its potential beneficiaries and/or risk bearers’’ (Post, Preston and Sachs, 2002: 8). In the same vein, the overarching idea about the concept of corporate social responsibility is verged on a clarion call to companies, corporations and business communities to meddle business operations and profitability with some measure of social considerations (Valor 2005: 199). This is what I call doing business with conscience. For a lasting, successful transformation in leadership equation in the Niger delta, there should be a combination of these two concepts. It has been argued that stakeholder management mechanism is more valuable to the evaluation of corporate social performance than paradigms that hinge essentially on social responsibilities and responsiveness alone, as both impacts on the larger society in the final analysis. Thus,

From a stakeholder theory perspective, corporate social performance can thus be assessed in terms of a company meeting the demands of its multiple stakeholder groups, and companies must seek to satisfy their demands… corporate social responsibility is understood as a two-way relationship which involves recognition on the part of ‘‘society’’ both of its significance and of the efforts made by companies to gain ‘‘society’s’’ approval of its behaviour (Branco and Rodrigues 2007: 11).

The above is crucial in the transformation process in the Niger delta for a cordial, conflict-free relationship between the multinationals represented by Shell, Agip, Texaco, Elf and Halliburton, among others and the their host community, the Niger delta. The imbalance in their relationship has always been one of the root causes of agitation for resource control, marginalisation, neglect, militancy and other forms of inhumanity in the region.
Towards the Dialectics of Transformational Leadership: Imperatives for Paradigm Shift

In articulating how leaders develop the bonds necessary to make transformational leadership possible, Bernard Bass has four interrelated components that he views as vital for leaders to move followers into transformational leadership. Building on James McGregor Burns’s theory of transformational leadership, which was initially verged on political leadership, Bernard M. Bass deepened the depth of this research by identifying four indispensable elements in making people change ready. These approaches have been identified in his Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations (1985). In the book, Bass offered the following factors as pertinent for transformational leadership to hold sway. These factors are necessary in order to drive change in the Niger delta.

*Intellectual stimulation*

In Bass’ concept, this means the ability of a leader to stir and change his followers’ perception to issues, awareness of them and solutions through the instrumentality of their intellectual involvement. Intellectual stimulation is also materially reflective of Professor Wole Soyinka’s “intellectual militancy” (Nwagbara 2009: 136) advocacy in the region. As Soyinka asserts,

> The route to the mind is not the path of the bullet nor the path of the blade, but the invisible, yet palpable path of discourse that may be arduous but ultimately guarantees the enlargement of our private social beings (Soyinka 2002: 6).

In this regard, intellectual stimulation provokes followers to think of new methods and means to bring about transformation by getting them involved in the process of decision-making as well as problem solving that will impact on their social, economic, environmental and political wellbeing. In this case, the leadership process makes room for participative leadership. The effort towards engaging all and sundry in the peace process in the region, whereby all the stakeholders, particularly the ex-militants get involved in articulating what they want within the confines of the amnesty deal is participatory. As these ex-militants and their people get involved in the process of decision-making and solution, they will not feel alienated or marginalised as was the case before the emergence of the amnesty deal. This is what Wagner (1994) considers being participatory decision-making. The sinew of this facet of Bass’ espousal in relation to the Niger delta question is making the inhabitants of this region intellectually and professionally poised in order to be self-reliant and less restive.

*Inspirational Motivation*

Leaders explore inspirational motivation appeal to stimulate the people and to raise their awareness concerning the fallout of not doing the right thing. Such leaders should be able to have the ability to inspire the people to have a vision of how they want things to be in the future. The dimension of motivation here connotes a style of leadership in the Niger delta that will articulate a strong, formidable vision of the future.
through visualising how to translate the present core elements of the amnesty deal into reality that will be a
departure from the ritual of managing as well as leading change in this region, which is known habitually as a
fault-line. In this regard, the leadership in place has to clarify the direction in which the people are going as
well as be able to build a sense of coalition through the mechanism of this vision – which would have inputs
from the people. And it has to be in tandem with the Disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR)
programme, which is the bedrock of the amnesty initiative. This is very crucial in transformational leadership.

Thus, as John Kotter avers

> Vision plays a key role in producing useful change by helping to direct, align, and inspire
> actions on the part of large numbers of people. Without an appropriate vision, a
> transformation effort can easily dissolve into a list of confusing, incompatible, and time-
> consuming projects that go in the wrong direction or nowhere at all (Kotter, 1996: 7).

To this end, the vision of the amnesty deal that has to be upheld for peace and genuine transformation to come
in the Niger delta is enshrined here in the policy briefing of the International Crisis Group Working to Prevent
Conflict Worldwide:

> The report of the government-constituted Technical Committee on the Niger Delta
> submitted to Nigeria’s President Umaru Musa Yar’Adua on 1 December 2008 offers an
> opportunity to reduce violent conflict significantly and begin long-term regional
development in the oil-rich region… (ICGWPCW, 2009: 1).

**Idealised influence**

This factor brings into perspective transformational leaders serving as role models for followers. In the
Kotterian sense, if leaders are transparent (a quality lacking in previous leaders in the Niger delta), followers
will be inspired and they will in the final analysis emulate such leader as well as internalise their ideals and
mode of operation for society’s renewal. In idealised influence, Burns maintains that genuine trust must be
built between leaders and followers. If the leadership is truly transformational, its charisma or idealized
influence is characterized by high moral and ethical standards. Trust for both leader and follower is built on a
solid moral and ethical foundation, without which genuine transformational leadership will be elusive. This
essentially has to do with charismatic leadership. As the deltans are already sceptical about the realisation of
the amnesty deal, it is crucial to rework the leadership framework in place to instil sense of purpose,
fellowship and trust in the people. Charismatic leadership will enhance the process of leadership change.

Charismatic leadership constitutes engaging in extraordinary acts and deeds capable of provoking
determination and confidence in the followers to be involved in bringing to fruition the leaders’ dreams and
aspirations. Nadler and Tushman (1989) consider idealised influence or charismatic leadership as having three
indispensable facets, which are based on such leadership style being envisioning, enabling and energising.
And the drama unfolding in the region at the moment, questions this pattern. In a press release by the Niger
Delta Civil Society Coalition (NDCSC), there is a palpable indication of the people’s disenchantment with the state of affairs following the amnesty deal:

For the umpteenth time, the Niger Delta Civil Society Coalition wishes to call on the federal executive, national assembly and the entire stakeholders of the region, to see the present opportunity as the ripest moment for a just peace in the Niger delta, and sustainable stability in Nigeria. The failure to capture this moment, in preference for Mr. President’s defective policy of cunning, shall not only spell doom, perhaps the destruction of Nigeria as we know it (NDCSC, 2009: 1).

The ‘‘present opportunity’’ above means the amnesty deal, which promises to better the livelihood of the people. From the foregoing, it is clear that already the people of the Niger delta region are smelling the federal government idea of the amnesty deal a rat, and to combat this atmosphere in the once combustible air of the region, care should be taken to institute a leadership style that will restore confidence in the people regarding the amnesty initiative being able to drive genuine change as well as transformational leadership.

**Individualised consideration**

This point is also in sync with the ethos of the amnesty deal proposal, which recognises ‘‘reintegration’’ as an ensemble of its triadic developmental approach enveloped in ‘‘DDR – disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration’’. Intellectual stimulation stresses ‘‘the leader’s ability to expand the followers’ use of their potential’’ (Peterson, Walumbwa, Byron and Myrowitz, 2009: 351). In a United States Institute for Peace (USIP) peace briefing paper titled ‘‘Crisis in the Niger Delta’’, the author David Smock brings to light the haphazard formation and constitution of the amnesty deal programme:

The existing process in the Niger delta makes no careful planned provision for reintegration, which should include resettlement, training, alternative employment, etc. One potential resource that has remained untapped is the preparedness of some oil companies to assist with technical training to enhance the employability of those given amnesty (Smock, 2009: 2).

In the wake of the above, it is evident that there were no proper arrangement made in the cause of the amnesty deal process to get the militants who had to surrender their guns and weapons to engage their mind in the right direction. This is already causing a problem in the region at the moment.

As Bass contends regarding this segment of his espousal, leaders consider each follower as an individual and provide coaching, mentoring, sense of mission, vision and growth opportunities. This approach not only educates the next generation of leaders, but also accomplishes the individuals need for self-actualization, self-fulfilment, and self-worth. It also naturally propels followers to further achievement and growth in the line of self-development. This is in congruence with the whole attempt to develop the ex-militants’ entrepreneurial
skills, apprenticeship quest, leadership skills and technical know-how. And it includes building schools, establishment of apprenticeship schemes and other measures to help them engage their minds creatively rather than being violent as the case was before the amnesty deal. Bass (1985) sees this process as tantamount to leader-member-exchange theory, which its hub is within the frontiers of leadership success created to ensure positive relations between leaders and followers or subordinates. This thesis also advances the ideas of role-taking, role-making, and routine making. Also, individualised consideration sheds light on Leader-Member Exchange theory (LMX). In the postulation of (Dansereau, Graen, Haga, 1975), this has been referred to Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory (VDLT). The VDLT is about how leaders maintain their positions in a given set of people through a sequence of implicit exchange agreement with their subordinates or the led.

CONCLUSION

It has been argued that effective management of leadership change in the post amnesty era in the restive and violence prone Niger delta region of Nigeria will bring about paradigm shift, as well as transformation, a change of gear anchored in transformational leadership. And to bring this idea to fruition, strategies and approaches to manage this novel state of affairs in the region have been analysed. Also, it has been discussed that the political operators in Nigeria have been cosmetic and political in their leadership style in the Niger delta region, so in order to engender confidence and motivation in the inhabitants of this region and Nigerian in general regarding politics in Nigeria, a leadership model which guarantees sustainable development as well as rebirth of the area following the environmental depredation, human wastage, cultural deracination, ethnic tension/violence and political uprising has to be the focal point. Managing change is not an easy task, especially when it is transformational in scope; it has to be purpose-driven and a true representation of the blueprint of the amnesty deal so as to drive lasting peace in the region.
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