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ABSTRACT
Human capacity building is central to the development of any country. In fact, no country can develop beyond its human capacity pool and utilization. It is therefore not a surprise that the loss of skilled manpower has been a major problem of human capacity building in Africa and Nigeria in particular with implications for sustainable development. Anchored on the elite theory, with heavy reliance on empirical data, the study examines leadership, brain drain and human capacity building. It was discovered through the study that leadership failure is a major cause of brain drain in the continent of Africa and most especially in Nigeria with negative effect on human capacity building and utilization for the needed development. The study therefore, suggests among other things the need for responsible leadership and emphasis on industrialization to curb the menace of brain drain so as to facilitate human capacity building that will guarantee sustainable development.
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INTRODUCTION
The African continent is one of the largest in the world made up of countries blessed with abundance of human and material resources, yet underdeveloped. It is ironic that underdevelopment appears to be the trademark of post-independence Africa. This is not unconnected with the fact that the political elites that took over after independence from the colonial powers have not really applied themselves to the development of the continent, but are poised to milk the continent dry in an unbridled manner for personal aggrandizement. Thus, Omonijo, Nnedum & Ezekokana (2011) argued that the elites of these countries (African countries) have failed in governance. In the language of Bakoji (2006), they seek to control power basically for selfish motive in a way that is detrimental to the interest of the masses, as resources meant to meet the needs of the people are embezzled by the elites. Omonijo et al. (2011) observed that their activities leave their countries impoverished, culminating in economic collapse, low level of industrialization, mass unemployment, and high rate of armed robbery among others. The aforementioned factors facilitate brain drain in developing economies.

Suffice to say that the hope of political freedom and economic prosperity of post-colonial Africa was dashed. Except for the euphoric early years of independence, Africans have been constantly reminded of their desperate socio-economic conditions and their leaders’ inability to come up with a workable recipe to solve or at least mitigate their plight (Malaquias, 2009).

The aftermath of the above scenario has been a great surge of Africans into developed and industrialized economies of North America and Western Europe which is inimical to their home countries. This massive exodus is referred to as brain drain. The subject of brain drain has gained wide currency in political economic literature in recent times (Muyibi, 2005). The mass exodus of highly skilled manpower from developing countries to industrialised Western World has implications on human capacity building in developing countries, most especially in African and Nigeria in particular. No country can experience sustainable development without given adequate attention to human capacity building and utilization. Countries of the world that are classified as developed often make conscious effort to build, retain and utilize their human capacity to keep in line with their development aspirations. They also provide enabling environment for them to put into use their skills. The inability to do the aforementioned appears to be the greatest undoing of the Third World countries, hence the need to address this if the goal of sustainable development would be realised. This study therefore, focuses on Nigeria; this choice is informed by the fact that Nigeria is ranked second in the loss of human capital to brain drain in the continent (“Brain Drain in Africa”, n.d.). Although quite a number of studies have been conducted on brain drain in the Third World, there seems not to be significant studies that use leadership as a connecting rod between brain drain and human capacity building with a focus on Africa in general and Nigeria in particular.

For analytical purposes, the discussion is segmented as follows: following the above introduction is the conceptual framework. The next section presents the argument on gains and losses of brain drain which is followed by an overview of brain drain in Africa. The next section situates brain drain within Nigeria’s context...
and implications of brain drain on human capacity building in Nigeria. The last segment comprises of the conclusion and recommendations.

CONCEPTUAL DISCOURSE
The concepts of leadership, brain drain and human capacity building are defined in this section; the study is also situated within a theoretical construct which serves as an explanatory for this study.

Leadership
Leadership according to Yaqub (1999) initiates and maintains social structure. The social system is programmed through leadership. Leadership is the capacity to allocate scarce resources which determines the locus of power (Audu, 2009). In fact, understanding leadership of a society is tantamount to understanding the larger social system. The reason for this is not far-fetched from the fact that leadership can have far reaching effects on the lives and welfare of members of a society which is why those that are concerned with the practical consequences of human actions must be concerned with leadership (Yaqub, 1999).

Brain Drain
The term, “Brain Drain” was coined by the British Royal Society to describe the outflow of scientists and technicians to the United States and Canada in the 1950s and early 1960s (Carrington, 1999). By the 1970s brain drain came to be associated with the flow of skilled individuals from the developing world to Western Europe and North America. Since this period, the phenomenon has been a contentious issue in the north-south debate (Carrington, 1999). Brain drain, also known as capital flight, simply connotes “large-scale emigration of individuals with technical skills or knowledge” (Idahosa & Akpomera, 2012, p. 17). To Stenman (2006), brain drain can be defined as a large emigration of individuals with technical skills or knowledge from one country to another in order to enjoy better conditions of service and a better living environment. It is also defined as the movement of high-level experts from developing countries to industrialised nations (Odhiambo, 2004). In the same vein, Kegley (2007) sees brain drain as the exodus of the most educated people from their home country to a more prosperous foreign country where the opportunities for high incomes are better. This deprives the homeland of the emigrants’ ability to contribute to its economic development. The place of leadership in brain drain cannot be over-emphasized. It is important to stress that the function of allocating resources which determine the well-being of a society is paramount to leadership. If leaders allocate resources judiciously to the benefit of the larger society, it can translate to development that will permeate all facets of the economy. If resources are allocated by leaders disproportionately to benefit their selfish end, then social problems that give impetus to brain drain will begin to play out.

Human Capacity Building
According to Groot and Molen (2000) capacity refers to the development of knowledge, skills and attitudes in individuals and groups of people relevant in design, development, management and maintenance of institutional and operational infrastructures and processes that are locally meaningful. Similarly, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1998) defined capacity as the ability of individuals and organizations or organizational units to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably. Capacity is also seen as the ability of individuals, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems, set and achieve objectives in a sustainable manner (UNDP/DAC, 2006). Thus, “human capacity building relates to the provision of trained work force, to the promotion of knowledge and skills that are required by a society to acquire greater prosperity through the raising of productive capabilities” (Saasas, n.d., p. 2). Anya (2010) sees human capacity development as:

Building an appropriate balance and critical mass of human resource base and providing an enabling environment for all individuals to be fully engaged to contribute to national development efforts. It involves providing opportunities for all citizens to develop to their fullest potential through education, training and motivation while creating the enabling environment for everyone to participate fully in national development. Any effort to increase human knowledge, enhance skills and productivity and stimulate the initiative, creativity and resourcefulness of citizens is an effort in human capital development (p. 9).

It can be deduced from the above that when leaders of a country are not development oriented and are self-focused, then the social, economic and political ills that precipitate brain drain will be common place with implications of inability to build human capacity that can galvanise economic prosperity and development.

This study adopts the elite theory in analyzing leadership, brain drain and human capacity building with a focus on Nigeria. Proponents of elite theory include Viliafre Paredo (1848-1923), Gaetano Mosca (1858-1941), Roberto Michels (1876-1936), Ortega Y. Gasset (1883-1955) among others. The elite theory is based on the idea that every society consists of two broad categories: (1) the selected few, who are capable and, therefore, have right to supreme leadership, and (2) the vast masses of people destined to be ruled (Varma, 1999). Such elites make decisions that govern the affairs of the society which have far reaching implications on the masses. The application of this theory to the study is seen in the sense that the survival, sustainability and the quality of life in any country is a function of leadership. Poor leadership by the elite class can lead to the prevalence of poor education facilities, mass unemployment, poverty, poor salaries and condition of service, poor health care
Brain drain is over-dramatised and not as critical as it is precipitate and escalate brain drain with implications on human capacity building resulting in reduction of economic prosperity of a country.

**BRAIN DRAIN- GAIN OR LOSS: A DEBATE**

Opinions are divided as regards the gains or losses associated with brain drain with reference to developing economies, where skilled workers and professionals migrate to the developed economies. While some focus on the positive returns from brain drain, others emphasize the negative effects, calling it the new slave trade. For instance Adepoju (2003) believes that the problem of brain drain is over-dramatised and not as critical as it is often portrayed. Scholars like Mountford (1997), Docquier & Rapoport (2004), Manning (2007), Clemens (2007) among others have shown the benefits of brain drain to the home countries were brain are drained. In fact, Hanson (2008) argues that “it will be impossible to achieve an African renaissance without the contributions of the talented Africans residing outside Africa” (p. 1).

Easterly & Nyarko (2008) contend that: Many of the independence leaders in Africa were themselves part of a brain drain in the early 20th century. Hastings Banda, Jomo Kenyata, and many other African independence leaders were all part of an initial brain drain who met and strategised in the UK and USA and then returned to fight for independence. Azikiwe, the Nigerian independence leader studied at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, and was instrumental in bringing to the US Kwame Nkrumah, Ghana’s independence leader to the same institution where the latter received Bachelors’ degree in Economics and Sociology, and subsequently a Master’s degree in Philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania. Without that brain drain, independence may have occurred much later, if at all, in many African Countries. (These independence leaders were also in contact with and in some cases contributing to the dialogue within the American civil rights movement) (p. 4).

These authors went ahead to enumerate the losses and gains of brain drain but from their perspective, the gains seem to outstrip the losses. The losses are as follows:

- Skills are necessary for long-run development of the source country; therefore, skilled workers should stay at home;
- The human capital of the migrants may have had a positive effect on the income or the growth of income of those left behind if they had stayed;
- The human capital of the migrants may have had a positive effect on institutions or political leadership of the home society if they had stayed; and
- Family separation due to migration may cause both the migrants and those left behind to suffer in non-monetary ways.

However, they listed nine (9) benefits accruable from brain drain. They are:

1. Since migration is voluntary, migrants run abroad after a calculated choice of destination is made;
2. Family members left behind may derive indirect utility from the greater well-being of the migrants (and if the migration decision was made by the family as a whole, the family is also better off by revealed preference);
3. The migrants may send remittances back to boost the incomes of those left behind;
4. The home country population may have stronger incentives to invest in human capital if they have opportunity to migrate;
5. The threat of migration may serve as a check on the behaviour of rulers at home (one specific example: it may change government’s behaviour in excessively taxing or paying low salaries to professionals);
6. The migrants may have a positive effect on politics or institutions from abroad;
7. The migrants may return home permanently or temporarily, bringing back technology, (thereby triggering a phenomenon called brain circulation).
8. The migrants may facilitate trading networks that increase source country exports to the destination country; and
9. Individual freedom is enhanced by giving individuals opportunities to migrate.

If brain drain is that beneficial, why is it that the emigration rate of the skilled and professionals from developed countries like the United States of America and the United Kingdom is low? Omonijo et al. (2011) noted that migration of professionals and skilled manpower from developed countries to other countries is not rampant. And that when manpower move from developed countries to other countries, especially to underdeveloped countries, it is for some of these reasons: to work in their nation’s companies operating in underdeveloped countries, for examples oil companies like Texaco, Shell Petroleum Development Company limited, construction companies like the Julius Berger among others. It could also be to render selfless services in international bodies set up to address specific social problems like war, deluge and famine threatening the existence of mankind in underdeveloped countries. Such bodies include the United Nations Peace Keeping Force, World Health Organization (WHO) and International Labour Organization (ILO). They can as well migrate to underdeveloped countries to work as expatriates so as to tackle technological, leadership, scientific, education and economic problems of such underdeveloped countries. From the above, it is clear that manpower does not migrate to underdeveloped or developing countries as a result of joblessness, poor conditions of service, poor
salaries, better quality of life, access to advanced technology and more stable political conditions as such issues have already been addressed in developed countries. Scholars like Tebeje (2005), Dodani & LaPorte (2005), Fadayomi (2009), Adefusika (2010), Omonijo et al. (2011) among others focus on the problems associated with brain drain in Africa and see them as obstacles to sustainable development of the continent. This is because the flight of the brightest minds from the continent of Africa especially among the health workers, scientists and teachers weakens further development of capacity in the continent.

**BRAIN DRAIN IN AFRICA: AN OVERVIEW**

Brain drain is seen as a global problem but varies from country to country (Anekwe, 2009). However, the phenomenon has reached an alarming proportion in Africa (Vosyamj, Kindiki & Kalai, 2012). In fact, among the continents of the world Africa is the major victim of brain drain, as it is surprising to note that brain drain in the continent started as far back as in the 1700s when some Africans started travelling abroad to acquire Western education (Easterly & Nyarko, 2008). Statistics have shown that 13 percent of African skilled workers reside outside Africa (Easterly & Nyarko, 2008).

Although there is paucity of data on brain drain in Africa and some of the existing data are inconsistent, available statistics show that the continent is losing the very people it needs most for economic, social, scientific and technological progress (Idahosa & Akpomera, 2012). According to “Brain Drain in Africa” (n.d.), one third of Africa’s human capital have already been lost to brain drain and the continent continues to lose its skilled personnel at an increasing rate. In short, an estimated 20,000 doctors, university lecturers, engineers and other professionals have been leaving the continent annually since 1990. There are over 300,000 of highly qualified Africans in the Diaspora, among which not less than 30,000 of them have PhDs. It is disturbing to also discover that with the number of highly skilled workers abroad, Africa still spend US$4 billion annually to employ about 100,000 Western experts to perform functions described as technical assistance (Marindi, 2006). Similarly, while African countries are responsible for funding the education of their nationals, they end up contributing to the growth and development of the already developed countries with Africans having little or no return on their investment (“African Brain Drain in Africa”, n.d.).

It has also been observed that the frequent migration of skilled manpower from the African continent to developed countries is partly responsible for the wide gap in science and technology between the continent and other continents as Africa’s share of global scientific output has fallen from 0.5 per cent to 0.3 per cent (Tebeje, 2005). The high rate of emigration most especially among health professionals has incapacitated medical and social services in many African countries in delivering essential health services, thereby, exacerbating the already precarious public health conditions in the continent. According to the report of European Commission for Africa (2003), 14 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa were losing over 15 percent of their skilled manpower to Europe and America (as cited in Idahosa & Akpomera, 2012). Also, as documented by Idahosa & Akpomera (2012, p. 20) by mid-2000, there were more Malawian medical doctors practising in the mid-Eastland city of Manchester than in the whole of Malawi, and only 50 out of the 600 doctors trained in Zambia since independence are still practising in that country. In 1999, Ghana certified 320 new nursing personnel who graduated from their training schools, and lost the same number to emigration. The following year, the country lost twice as many and official records indicate that more than half of Ghana’s nursing positions are unfilled.

Brain drain in Africa is attributable to leadership problem with implication for capacity building as portrayed above. For instance, Chacha (2007) argues that:

The brain drain in Africa is as a result of the greed and maladministration of African leaders. Africa has enough to sustain all Africans; we actually don’t have need to go abroad. The professionals’ impulse to depart their native countries is very much that of man’s primitive instinct for security: physical security, economic security and the assurance that one can age in a safe environment where food security and “social security” are not luxuries. Africans leaving Africa are not happy to be leaving. The brain drain is a result corrupted governments leading African nations. African government don’t care much about their own professional citizens as they pay big salaries to foreign expatriates for the same job their citizens can do (pp. 1-2).

From the above quotation, one can see the linkage between leadership, brain drain and capacity building in Africa. The implications of brain drain on capacity building in Africa is clearer when one ponderers on the following quotations, all cited from “Brain Drain in Africa” (n.d.): “The emigration of African professionals to the West is one of the greatest obstacles to Africa’s development” by the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA). “African governments have a great responsibility to ensure that brains remain in the continent; otherwise, in 25 years’ time, Africa will be empty of brains” by Lalla Ben Barka. “(By) failing to offer greener pastures for its own intelligentsia, (Africa) is committing suicide” Edward Ofotari-Sarpong. The next section focused on Nigeria as a case study.

**LEADERSHIP, BRAIN DRAIN AND CAPACITY BUILDING: A FOCUS ON NIGERIA**

The picture of brain drain in Nigeria and its implications for human capacity building is quite alarming. For instance, Adenuga (2010), as mentioned before, averred...
that the mass departure of Africa’s intellectual and skilled population to the developed economies is one of the greatest obstacles to the development of the continent. The author specifically stated that Nigeria in particular is suffering from the lack of professionals and skilled individuals necessary for the advancement of the country’s capital. As far back as 1996, Oyewo (as cited in Idahosa & Akpomera, 2012) conducted a study and came up with the findings that more than 21,000 Nigerian Medical Doctors are practicing in the United States alone. And it is chagrin to discover that Nigeria could not even meet up with the minimum requirement of the World Health Organization (WHO) of 20 physicians to 100,000 people. It is estimated that it costs the Federal Government of Nigeria two thousand, one hundred and eighty-eight dollars ($2,188) per session to successfully train a medical doctor in a federal university in light of the unit cost per medical student and the subvention to cushion the tuition fees (Idahosa & Akpomera, 2012). The figures quoted by Ngatia (as cited in Omonijo et al., 2011) are even much higher. The author is of the view that while it takes $15,000 to train a university student in Africa, it cost $150,000 to train a doctor. Indeed, when they leave their country after their education to the developed economies, the loss to countries from where they migrated is not only the money expended in training them but everything that goes with them. Emegwali, (2009) is of the view that an African professional working in the United States contributes about $150,000 annually to the U.S economy. The author went further to state that, in terms of money remittance to Nigeria, for every $300 per month that an African professional sends home, such a professional would have contributed $12,000 per month to the U.S economy.

Similarly, Chacha (2007) is of the view that there are about 300,000 Nigerian professionals in the U.S alone. Myburgh (2004) gives a graphic picture of the unquantifiable financial losses the home country incurs in training these professionals all to the gains of the receiving countries. Commenting on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the author said, for each developing country’s professionals between the age of 25 and 35 years, developed countries saved $184,000 as cost of training. The author added that the 27 members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) with a workforce estimated at 3 million professionals educated in developing countries, had saved a huge sum of $552 billion for the OECD.

According to Carrington (2013), former U.S ambassador to Nigeria, over three million Nigerians are in the United States and Canada. Carrington further stated that people rather than commodities constitute the greatest export of Nigeria from which U.S. and other countries of the world profit. He acknowledged Nigerians in the U.S. as accomplished immigrant group due to the fact that they excellently contribute to all sectors of the U.S. economy. He added that Nigerians are the most educated and most talented black people to be found anywhere on earth and that they choose to remain in the U.S because of the fear of the omni-presence of corruption and insecurity in their country. More recently, in September 2013, it was noted that Nigeria’s brain drain increased so much that the country lost 227 doctors in 2012, in addition to 637 who left the nation in 2010 (Weekly Travel News, 2014). Oshahon Enabulele, the president of Nigeria Medical Association said Nigeria has 71,740 medical and dental practitioners listed on the register of the Medical and Dental Health Council of Nigeria, with about 27,000 currently in Nigeria. The resultant effect of this is that, the country has a ratio of 1:6,187 of doctor-population in juxtaposition with a population of 167, 000,000. This scenario is taking toll on the effectiveness and efficiency of the health care delivery system of the country (Suleiman, 2013). It is therefore not a surprise that Obasanjo (2000) in a speech given at a gathering of Diaspora Nigerians said:

Many of our best men and women for lack of opportunity and challenge at home have had to work outside our shores. We should challenge them to return by putting in place the enabling environment and the tools, with which they will be able to give this country the full benefit of their education, training and experience. I recognize that just as there are good and bright Nigerians abroad, there have remained many at home who have persevered. I salute them and assure them that their sacrifice, perseverance and tenacity will be recognized and rewarded by a grateful nation (as cited in Ibietan & Joshua, 2013, p. 62).

The Nigerian elites that constitute the ruling class can be blamed for not providing an enabling environment for Nigerians to utilise their skills, causing them to seek greener pastures in the developed economies. The Nigerian elite in power empty the treasury to the detriment of the poor masses. They see access to political power as opportunity to share the spoils of political office (Omonijo et al., 2011). Little wonder that the late Achebe (1983) said “the trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely a failure of leadership” (p. 1). In the same vein, Adebayo (2000) said Nigeria’s major problem is its visionless and irresponsible political elite manipulating politics, economy and religion to serve their selfish interests. In fact, while they stash away billion of dollars in foreign accounts, they urge the masses to endure decades of austerity and structural adjustment programme. In addition, the country has not been able to reap what it has expended on the education of its nationals who have migrated to developed countries because of the inability of the government to provide an enabling environment for them to utilize their God-given potentials. This is in line with the statement credited to Anya (2010) that “Nigeria’s predicament can be squarely placed on poor human capital development and poor utilization policies which have not encouraged balanced and progressive educational development nor the creation of an enabling
African countries should get the data of Africans working abroad and see how those that possess the skills for which they were trained. The various governments in Africa should introduce high-tech jobs that will attract Africans in Diaspora. Or better still, the various governments in African countries should get the data of Africans working abroad and see how those that possess the skills for which expatriates are employed can be brought back home to occupy such positions. Government should improve infrastructural facilities in the country to attract Nigerians in Diaspora that fled the country due to inadequate infrastructural facilities. There is need to improve on government policies in which students that made first class are given scholarship and then made to sign bonds so that they will return upon completion of their studies to work in the country.
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In Nigeria, the process of capacity building is not complete as human resources developed via education are not given the enabling environment needed for them to use their potentials for the development of the country. The highly skilled manpower leaving the shores of Nigeria would have been the engine room for the development of the economy but this is not happening. Suffice to say that the mass exodus of the professionals and highly skilled manpower has grave implications for human capacity building in Nigeria. The manpower leaving the country cannot contribute to building human capacity in their home country. It is therefore, not a surprise that most Nigerian universities do not have competent lecturers to teach.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It can be concluded from the above that although brain drain seems to be a universal phenomenon, the case of Africa and Nigeria in particular is worrisome. Bad leadership has been pointed out as a major factor responsible for brain drain with implications for underdevelopment ultimately taking toll on human capacity building; retention and utilization needed to guarantee sustainable development. In view of the above, some suggestions were therefore made to curb the menace of brain drain in Africa and Nigeria in particular. They include the need for African and Nigerian leaders to come up with proven strategies aimed at building, retaining and utilizing their available human resource for sustainable development. Africans and Nigerians should hold their leaders accountable so as to bring responsible leadership to the front burners of governance. This will reduce corruption and lead to good governance. The political elite should put their selfish interest aside and cooperate to tackle the problem of insecurity in the country. The government should embark on industrialization that will address the problem of mass unemployment, and also pay salaries commensurate to qualifications and skills of manpower. Nigerians abroad should know that staying abroad cannot solve the problem of underdevelopment in their home country; they should rather be patriotic enough to come home and see how they can contribute towards human capacity building and the development of their country. The various governments in Africa should introduce high-tech jobs that will attract Africans in Diaspora. Or better still, the various governments in African countries should get the data of Africans working abroad and see how those that possess the skills for which expatriates are employed can be brought back home to occupy such positions. Government should improve infrastructural facilities in the country to attract Nigerians in Diaspora that fled the country due to inadequate infrastructural facilities. There is need to improve on government policies in which students that made first


