

ISRG Journal of Economics, Business & Management (ISRGJEBM)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: Isrg J Econ Bus Manag

ISSN: 2584-0916 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjebm/>

Volume – IV Issue - IV (July – August) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



LEADERSHIP BY MODELLING: APPLYING BANDURA'S SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY TO SOCIETAL RE-AWAKENING AND NATIONAL TRANSFORMATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Ven Dr Marcel Emeh

Department of Psychology UniNiger Umunya Anambra State Nigeria

| **Received:** 15.08.2026 | **Accepted:** 18.08.2026 | **Published:** 19.08.2026

***Corresponding author:** Ven Dr Marcel Emeh

Abstract

Sustainable national development is not achieved solely through economic policies, technological advancement, infrastructural expansion, or political reforms. It also depends significantly on the behaviours, values, attitudes, and psychological orientations that citizens learn and reproduce within society. Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory provides an important psychological framework for understanding this process. Bandura (1977) observed that much human behaviour is acquired observationally through modelling. This suggests that individuals learn not only from formal instruction but also by observing influential persons, interpreting their actions, noticing the consequences of such actions, and reproducing behaviours perceived as rewarding or socially acceptable. Within the context of leadership and national development, political, religious, traditional,

institutional, and community leaders consequently function as powerful behavioural models. Where leaders demonstrate integrity, accountability, justice, empathy, competence, tolerance, patriotism, and respect for institutions, they provide behavioural patterns capable of strengthening responsible citizenship and social cohesion. Conversely, persistent modelling of corruption, impunity, nepotism, violence, ethnic prejudice, and disregard for the rule of law can normalize dysfunctional behaviours and undermine national development. This article applies Bandura's theoretical insights to the challenge of creating an enabling, habitable, inclusive, and socially acceptable society. It argues that sustainable national transformation requires not merely telling citizens what society ought to become but deliberately modelling the values necessary to create that society. Leadership is therefore conceptualized as a psychological instrument of social learning, behavioural reorientation, and national transformation.

Keywords: Bandura, social learning theory, leadership modelling, observational learning, psychological re-awakening, national development, societal transformation.

INTRODUCTION

The development of a nation cannot be adequately measured by the number of roads, bridges, industries, universities, hospitals, airports, or technological innovations she possesses. Although these are important indicators of material progress, genuine development also concerns the quality of human relationships, institutional integrity, public trust, justice, security, social responsibility, and the psychological well-being of citizens.

A society becomes truly habitable when people can reasonably expect safety, dignity, fairness, opportunity, inclusion, accountability, and peaceful coexistence. Consequently, sustainable national development must involve both the transformation of physical environments and the transformation of human behaviour.

This raises an important psychological question: How do societies learn the behaviours that eventually characterize them?

Albert Bandura's work provides a significant theoretical response. His Social Learning Theory emphasizes that human beings acquire considerable aspects of behaviour by observing others. Bandura (1977) explained that much human behaviour is learned observationally through modelling. People observe what significant others do, remember those behavioural patterns, evaluate their consequences, and may reproduce them.

This insight has enormous implications for leadership and national development. Leaders are among the most visible individuals within society. Their behaviour communicates lessons about what society values, tolerates, rewards, and condemns. Leadership therefore extends beyond policy formulation and administration.

Leadership is also modelling.

From this perspective, every leader is consciously or unconsciously teaching society something.

When leaders demonstrate accountability, citizens observe accountability. When leaders respect institutions, citizens learn institutional respect. When leaders demonstrate tolerance across ethnic, religious, political, and cultural differences, they provide models of peaceful coexistence.

Conversely, when corruption produces wealth without consequences, when violence produces political advantage, when nepotism produces access to opportunities, or when dishonesty is rewarded with social recognition, citizens may learn that these behaviours constitute viable pathways to success.

National transformation therefore requires serious attention to the psychological processes through which leadership behaviour becomes social behaviour.

BANDURA'S SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY

Bandura's Social Learning Theory emerged partly as a response to behavioural approaches that placed overwhelming emphasis on direct reinforcement. Bandura demonstrated that individuals do not necessarily need to experience rewards or punishment personally before learning behaviour. They can learn by observing what happens to others.

This phenomenon is known as observational learning or modelling.

Bandura (1977) identified four important processes involved in observational learning:

Attention – the individual must notice the behaviour of the model.

Retention – the observed behaviour must be mentally remembered.

Reproduction – the observer must possess or develop the ability to reproduce the behaviour.

Motivation – there must be sufficient reason or incentive to perform the observed behaviour.

These processes are particularly important in understanding leadership.

Political leaders, religious leaders, traditional rulers, teachers, parents, celebrities, business executives, community leaders, and influential public personalities attract social attention because of their positions and visibility. Their actions are therefore likely to become objects of observation and interpretation.

The critical implication is that leadership behaviour constitutes a form of informal public education.

LEADERSHIP AS A BEHAVIOURAL MODEL

Leadership is traditionally associated with authority, decision-making, administration, influence, and direction. Bandura's theoretical perspective invites us to add another dimension: **leadership as behavioural modelling.**

A leader does not merely govern people; the leader demonstrates ways of behaving before them.

Citizens observe how leaders respond to criticism, manage public resources, treat political opponents, respect court decisions, relate across ethnic and religious boundaries, respond to failure, accept responsibility, and exercise authority.

These repeated observations gradually communicate what is considered normal within the society.

This leads to an important proposition:

The behavioural character of leadership can gradually become part of the behavioural culture of society.

Leadership should therefore never be understood merely as occupying a position. True leadership involves becoming a behavioural example capable of inspiring desirable conduct in others.

Leadership is traditionally associated with authority, decision-making, administration, influence, and direction. Leaders do not influence society only through policies and speeches; their personal choices and everyday conduct can become visible examples from which citizens learn.

This principle can be applied to the advocacy by

Prof. Charles Chukwuma Soludo for greater patronage of Made-in-Nigeria products, particularly locally produced clothing and materials. From a Bandurian perspective, such advocacy becomes more psychologically powerful when leaders themselves visibly practise what they encourage citizens to do. When political and public leaders consistently wear locally produced fabrics, use indigenous products, and patronize Nigerian enterprises, they provide observable behavioural models capable of influencing citizens' consumption patterns.

The developmental significance extends beyond fashion. Increased patronage of locally produced goods can stimulate demand, encourage entrepreneurship, strengthen local industries, support employment, promote indigenous creativity and skills, and help retain economic value within the domestic economy. Thus, what may appear to be a simple personal choice by a leader can communicate a broader philosophy of productive patriotism and economic self-reliance.

Bandura's concept of observational learning therefore helps us understand that a leader who says, "*patronize Made-in-Nigeria products*," but personally depends almost exclusively on foreign alternatives may weaken the psychological force of the message. Conversely, when the leader visibly uses Nigerian-made products, the message moves from verbal advocacy to behavioural modelling.

This produces a developmental sequence:

Leadership Example → Public Observation → Positive Identification → Behavioural Imitation → Increased Local Patronage → Increased Local Production → Employment and Entrepreneurship → Economic and National Development.

The fundamental lesson is that national transformation becomes more persuasive when leaders personally model the change they demand from citizens. In this regard, promoting locally made products should not merely become another political slogan; it should develop into a behavioural culture demonstrated by leaders and subsequently embraced by citizens.

It may therefore be argued that:

When leaders wear, use, patronize, and proudly identify with what their nation produces, they do more than promote local products; they model economic patriotism and teach citizens, through example, to participate in the productive development of their own society.

Within Bandura's theoretical framework, therefore, leadership by example can become an important psychological instrument for transforming consumer attitudes, strengthening confidence in indigenous production, encouraging local enterprise, and ultimately advancing sustainable national development.

From Leadership Behaviour to Societal Behaviour

Bandura's theory allows us to conceptualize a psychological pathway through which leadership can influence national culture:

Leadership Behaviour → Public Observation → Cognitive Interpretation → Social Learning → Behavioural Imitation → Repeated Behaviour → Social Norms → Institutional Culture → National Development or Decline.

This pathway demonstrates why the private and public character of leadership matters to national development.

Suppose young people repeatedly observe individuals acquiring political influence through violence, accumulating wealth through corruption, obtaining employment through connections rather than competence, or avoiding accountability because of political status. Even without anyone formally teaching them these behaviours, society may unintentionally be educating them through observation.

A dangerous psychological message can emerge:

This is how society works.

Once dysfunctional behaviour becomes normalized, citizens may cease to perceive it as abnormal. Corruption can become "smartness"; nepotism can become "helping our people"; electoral manipulation can become "political strategy"; and intolerance can be disguised as loyalty.

The danger of bad leadership is therefore not limited to the immediate consequences of poor decisions. Bad leadership can reproduce itself psychologically.

Vicarious Reinforcement and the Normalization of Corruption

One of Bandura's particularly useful concepts for understanding society is vicarious reinforcement.

People observe not merely what others do but also what happens to them afterward. When unethical behaviour is consistently rewarded, observers may become motivated to reproduce it. It has important implications for political leadership and international justice. However, the reverse is equally significant: when society visibly demonstrates that destructive and unethical behaviour attracts serious consequences, observers may learn that power, wealth, political position, or social influence does not necessarily provide permanent immunity from accountability.

The prosecution and conviction of former Liberian President Charles Ghankay Taylor provides an important African illustration of this principle. Taylor was tried by the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL), a United Nations-backed tribunal. In 2012, he was convicted on 11 counts for planning, aiding and abetting war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other serious violations of international humanitarian law committed by rebel forces during Sierra Leone's civil war. He was subsequently sentenced to 50 years' imprisonment, and the conviction and sentence were upheld on appeal in 2013.

From a Bandurian perspective, the significance of the Taylor case extends beyond the punishment of one former political leader. It communicated an observable behavioural consequence to other leaders and citizens: political authority does not place an individual permanently above accountability. Indeed, the United Nations described the judgment as sending a strong signal that leaders can be held accountable for their actions.

The psychological lesson is particularly important. Just as observing corrupt or violent leaders enjoying wealth, prestige, and immunity may normalize wrongdoing through vicarious reinforcement, observing a former Head of State being subjected to due process and held accountable for serious crimes can communicate the opposite lesson. It demonstrates that the exercise of political power carries responsibility and that grave abuses of authority can attract consequences even after an individual has left office.

The developmental sequence may therefore be conceptualized as:

Abuse of Power → Investigation → Impartial Judicial Process → Accountability → Visible Consequences → Vicarious Learning → Behavioural Caution → Respect for Law and Human Dignity.

This does not imply that punishment alone can transform society. Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory recognizes the interaction of behaviour, personal factors, and environmental conditions. Sustainable behavioural transformation therefore requires credible institutions, consistent enforcement of law, ethical leadership, civic

education, and social environments that reward responsible conduct.

Nevertheless, the Charles Taylor case demonstrates an important principle for national and societal transformation: the consequences society attaches to behaviour are themselves educational. When wrongdoing is rewarded, society may learn impunity; when serious wrongdoing is addressed through fair and credible legal processes, society learns accountability.

This lesson should resonate particularly with political and institutional leadership across Africa. Public office should never become a protective shield behind which leaders violate human dignity, misuse authority, promote violence, or disregard the rule of law. Neither should accountability become an instrument of political revenge. For its behavioural lesson to remain credible, justice must be independent, impartial, evidence-based, and consistent.

The principle may therefore be summarized thus:

“When society holds even the powerful accountable through impartial justice, it does more than punish an offender; it teaches present and future leaders that authority carries responsibility, power has limits, and no office places its occupant permanently above the law.”

Within Bandura’s theoretical framework, the Charles Taylor case can therefore be interpreted as an illustration of vicarious consequences in leadership behaviour. Citizens and leaders observe not only how power is exercised but also what ultimately happens when that power is grossly abused. Such visible accountability can contribute to the psychological re-awakening necessary for responsible leadership, institutional integrity, respect for human dignity, and sustainable national development.

Conversely, when ethical behaviour receives recognition and wrongdoing receives appropriate consequences, society communicates a different behavioural lesson.

Consider corruption. If an individual misappropriates public resources but subsequently receives political appointments, prestigious titles, social recognition, and admiration because of accumulated wealth, society may unintentionally reinforce the behaviour.

The observer may conclude:

If wrongdoing produces wealth, power, and prestige rather than consequences, why should I behave differently?

This demonstrates why national anti-corruption campaigns cannot depend solely upon slogans. Institutions must create visible connections between behaviour and consequences.

Bandura’s concept of vicarious reinforcement provides an important psychological foundation for understanding the role of anti-corruption institutions in national development. Citizens do not merely observe the behaviour of public officials; they also observe what happens to those officials after engaging in either ethical or unethical conduct. Where corruption, abuse of office, and misappropriation of public resources appear to attract little consequence—or where enforcement is perceived as selective—society may unintentionally learn that wrongdoing can be tolerated under certain political or social circumstances.

This demonstrates why national anti-corruption campaigns cannot depend solely upon slogans, public enlightenment programmes, or

periodic arrests. Institutions must establish a visible, credible, impartial, and consistent relationship between behaviour and consequences.

From a Bandurian perspective, when citizens repeatedly observe that misconduct attracts lawful consequences irrespective of the offender’s political affiliation, ethnicity, religion, status, or relationship with those in power, such consequences can function as vicarious deterrence, encouraging both leaders and citizens to regulate their behaviour.

Nigeria’s anti-corruption agencies should therefore continually strengthen their institutional independence, professionalism, transparency, and fidelity to the legal mandates for which they were established. They must guard against both the reality and public perception of being instruments for settling political scores or pursuing opposition figures selectively. Anti-corruption enforcement achieves its greatest psychological and institutional value when the same ethical and legal standards are applied consistently to government officials, opposition politicians, public servants, private individuals, and institutions alike.

Selective accountability can weaken public confidence; consistent accountability can strengthen it. When citizens perceive that some individuals are punished while politically connected persons committing comparable offences appear protected, the behavioural lesson communicated to society may become destructive. Rather than learning that *corruption is wrong*, people may learn that *corruption becomes dangerous only when one lacks political protection*. Such a perception undermines both the rule of law and the psychological deterrent effect of anti-corruption institutions.

Accordingly, the developmental objective should be to create a social environment in which every leader and citizen understands that public responsibility carries accountability and misconduct carries predictable legal consequences. This can encourage greater caution, self-regulation, ethical decision-making, and responsible leadership.

The principle may therefore be summarized as:

A credible anti-corruption system does more than punish wrongdoing; it teaches society, through visible and impartial consequences, that integrity is expected, public trust is sacred, and no individual stands above the law.

From Bandura’s perspective, therefore, anti-corruption institutions are not merely investigative and prosecutorial bodies; they can also function as powerful agents of social learning and behavioural reorientation. When justice is consistent, transparent, and impartial, citizens learn accountability. When integrity is recognized and wrongdoing predictably attracts lawful consequences, society gradually develops the behavioural consciousness necessary for ethical leadership, responsible citizenship, and sustainable national transformation.

Integrity should produce trust and recognition, while misconduct should produce fair and lawful accountability.

Psychological Re-awakening Through Exemplary Leadership

National transformation requires what may be described as psychological re-awakening: a deliberate reconstruction of societal attitudes, values, expectations, behavioural standards, and collective consciousness toward responsible citizenship and national development.

Bandura's theory suggests that this re-awakening can be facilitated through positive modelling.

Imagine leaders who consistently demonstrate that public office is service rather than personal enrichment; appointments are based on competence rather than ethnicity, religious or political loyalty; public resources belong to citizens; political opponents remain fellow citizens; laws apply to both rulers and the ruled; and leadership positions require accountability.

Such behaviours provide alternative models for citizens, particularly younger generations.

Psychological re-awakening therefore cannot depend exclusively upon asking citizens to change.

Those occupying influential positions must model the transformation they expect from society.

From Ethnic Consciousness to National Consciousness

Bandura's insights are equally relevant to societies characterized by ethnic, religious, regional, or political divisions.

Citizens can learn prejudice, but they can also learn tolerance.

They can learn hatred, but they can equally learn peaceful coexistence.

They can learn sectionalism, but they can also learn patriotism.

Leaders therefore carry an enormous responsibility in multicultural societies. When influential personalities repeatedly frame political and economic questions through ethnic hostility, religious suspicion, or regional antagonism, these attitudes can spread through observational learning.

Conversely, when leaders visibly demonstrate fairness across social identities and consistently emphasize shared humanity and citizenship, they provide behavioural models for national integration.

National unity must therefore be demonstrated as well as preached.

Bandura, Self-Efficacy and National Transformation

Bandura's later Social Cognitive Theory gave considerable prominence to self-efficacy, referring broadly to people's beliefs concerning their capabilities to organize and execute actions necessary to achieve desired outcomes (Bandura, 1986, 1997).

This concept has profound developmental implications.

Citizens who repeatedly witness institutional failure, corruption, insecurity, abandoned projects, and unfulfilled political promises may gradually develop collective pessimism. Expressions such as *"nothing can change," "the system will always remain the same,"* or *"there is no point trying"* may indicate a weakening sense of collective efficacy.

Transformational leadership should reverse this psychological condition.

When citizens observe competent institutions solving problems, transparent governments completing projects, communities resolving conflicts, and honest officials being rewarded, they acquire evidence that positive change is possible.

Thus, developmental leadership should produce not only infrastructure but also hope, confidence, agency, and collective efficacy.

Creating an Enabling and Habitable Society

An enabling and habitable society is more than a geographically livable environment. It is a psychological, social, economic, political, and moral environment in which people can flourish.

Such a society should provide reasonable conditions for:

- security of life and property;
- justice and equality before the law;
- economic opportunity;
- quality education and healthcare;
- freedom accompanied by responsibility;
- peaceful coexistence;
- institutional accountability;
- respect for human dignity;
- environmental responsibility;
- inclusion and social belonging; and
- confidence in the future.

Bandura's contribution is particularly important because institutions ultimately depend upon human behaviour. Good constitutions can be undermined by bad behaviour. Excellent policies can fail through corruption. Strong institutions can become weak when those responsible for them repeatedly disregard ethical standards.

Therefore, institution-building must be accompanied by character-building and behavioural transformation.

Implications for Political Leadership

Bandura's theory suggests that political leaders should understand themselves as national behavioural models.

Political leadership should therefore demonstrate transparency, emotional maturity, tolerance, accountability, discipline, respect for constitutional institutions, prudent management of public resources, and willingness to accept responsibility.

The psychological question citizens continually ask—consciously or unconsciously—is not merely *"What is my leader saying?"* but also *"What does my leader's behaviour teach me about how society actually works?"*

This distinction is fundamental.

Leadership speeches communicate ideals; leadership behaviour communicates reality.

Implications for Religious, Educational and Community Leadership

The responsibility for societal modelling does not belong to political leaders alone.

Religious leaders influence moral consciousness. Teachers influence intellectual and behavioural development. Parents provide children's earliest behavioural models. Traditional rules influence communal values. Media personalities influence popular culture. Business leaders influence workplace ethics.

National transformation must therefore involve an interconnected network of positive models. The home, school, religious institution, workplace, media environment, community, and government should reinforce compatible values such as honesty, dignity, responsibility, tolerance, diligence, justice, and service.

These institutions are not merely administrative structures; they are powerful agencies of socialization and character modelling. Through their decisions and practices, they continually teach citizens what behaviours society actually values.

Viewed through Bandura's Social Learning Theory, religious, educational, governmental, corporate, and other national institutions must therefore recognize that their methods of recruitment, selection, promotion, appointment, discipline, and reward constitute observable behavioural models. When appointments are transparently based on competence, character, qualification, experience, integrity, and merit, institutions communicate that diligence and excellence are worthwhile. Conversely, where favouritism, nepotism, corruption, ethnicity, kinship, friendship, denominational affiliation, political patronage, or other personal relationships override merit, a dangerous behavioural lesson is communicated: success depends less on competence and character than on whom one knows or to whom one belongs.

Such practices can gradually produce institutional and national demoralization. A qualified person who repeatedly watches less-qualified individuals receive opportunities because of privileged relationships may begin to question the value of hard work, education, integrity, and professional excellence. In Bandurian terms, the individual is observing not merely behaviour but also its consequences. If favouritism is repeatedly rewarded while merit is neglected, the institution may inadvertently model and reinforce the very behaviour it publicly condemns. This is particularly significant for religious and educational institutions, which occupy important positions in society as custodians of moral formation, knowledge, character, and social values. A religious institution that preaches justice but practises favouritism creates a contradiction between its proclaimed values and observable conduct. Similarly, an educational institution that teaches students integrity, excellence, and fairness but allows appointments, admissions, promotions, assessments, or opportunities to be determined by improper personal influence weakens the moral credibility of the values it seeks to impart.

The principle is straightforward: institutions cannot sustainably teach what they consistently fail to model. Religious bodies, universities, schools, government agencies, corporate organizations, traditional institutions, and civil society should therefore deliberately establish transparent and merit-based systems of selection and appointment. This does not imply ignoring legitimate considerations of inclusion, representation, or social diversity. Rather, such considerations should operate within clearly defined, transparent, lawful, and competence-based standards so that inclusion does not become a disguise for favouritism or mediocrity.

Institutional leaders must particularly resist the temptation to transform public or organizational positions into rewards for relatives, friends, ethnic associates, political supporters, religious affiliates, or personal loyalists. Leadership positions carry responsibilities that ultimately affect the welfare of others. Consequently, the fundamental question in appointment should not primarily be "Who is this person to me?" but "Does this person possess the competence, character, integrity, and capacity required to serve effectively?"

From a national-development perspective, merit-based institutional culture can create a positive psychological chain:

Fair Selection → Public Observation → Confidence in Merit → Motivation for Excellence → Institutional Trust → Increased Productivity → Stronger Institutions → Sustainable National Development.

The opposite is equally consequential:

Favouritism → Perceived Injustice → Loss of Motivation → Cynicism → Declining Institutional Trust → Mediocrity → Institutional Weakness → National Underdevelopment.

Bandura's theoretical perspective therefore calls institutions to become living models of the values they demand from citizens. If society desires honest citizens, its institutions must model honesty. If it desires justice, institutions must practise fairness. If it seeks excellence, merit must be recognized. If it desires national unity, opportunities must not be unjustly restricted by ethnicity, kinship, religion, political affiliation, or personal relationships.

The challenge to institutions may consequently be summarized in this proposition:

"Character formation begins where institutional preaching and institutional practice become one: when merit is rewarded, justice is visible, integrity is protected, and personal relationships never become substitutes for competence and fairness." Thus, societal psychological re-awakening requires more than changing individual attitudes. It requires transforming the behavioural culture of institutions themselves. When religious, educational, governmental, and other national institutions model fairness, merit, accountability, and integrity, they become powerful schools of character from which citizens can learn the behavioural foundations of a just, habitable, productive, and sustainably developed nation.

When these institutions communicate contradictory behavioural lessons, national moral development becomes difficult.

Towards a Bandurian Model of Transformational Development

Drawing from Bandura, this article proposes a simple **Model–Learn–Reproduce–Transform (MLRT) Framework**:

Stage One – Model:

Leaders and institutions visibly demonstrate desirable developmental values.

Stage Two – Learn:

Citizens observe, interpret, internalize, and cognitively retain these behavioural patterns.

Stage Three – Reproduce:

Individuals reproduce positively reinforced behaviours within families, workplaces, communities, and institutions.

Stage Four – Transform:

Repeated desirable behaviours gradually develop into social norms, institutional cultures, and sustainable developmental practices.

The model may be summarized as:

Exemplary Leadership → Observational Learning → Positive Reinforcement → Responsible Citizenship → Healthy Institutions → Social Cohesion → Sustainable National Transformation.

This framework recognizes that societal transformation moves both ways. Leaders influence citizens, while citizens also influence leadership and institutions. Bandura (1986) conceptualized human functioning through reciprocal determinism, emphasizing interactions among personal factors, behaviour, and environment.

Consequently, national transformation should not place responsibility exclusively upon leaders. Citizens also possess agency. They can refuse to imitate dysfunctional models, reward ethical leadership through democratic and social mechanisms, educate younger generations differently, and collectively demand institutional accountability.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Governments, educational institutions, religious organizations, families, media organizations, civil society, and communities should deliberately promote ethical and developmental behavioural models. Leadership selection and development should give greater attention to psychological competencies such as emotional intelligence, empathy, resilience, self-regulation, integrity, ethical reasoning, and social responsibility.

Civic and leadership education should move beyond theoretical instruction toward visible behavioural modelling. Institutions should also ensure that ethical behaviour receives meaningful reinforcement while corruption, violence, discrimination, and abuse of authority attract fair and lawful consequences.

Schools should deliberately teach observational learning, civic responsibility, peaceful coexistence, critical thinking, and ethical citizenship. Media organizations should recognize their modelling influence, particularly upon younger generations.

Above all, national leaders should understand that every public action carries an educational consequence. A leader is simultaneously governing the present generation and modelling behaviour for the next.

CONCLUSION

Albert Bandura's contribution to psychology extends far beyond the laboratory study of learning. His theoretical insights provide a powerful framework for understanding leadership, citizenship, institutional culture, and national transformation.

If human beings learn significantly through observation and modelling, then societies must pay serious attention to the behaviours being modelled by their most influential members.

National transformation cannot therefore depend solely upon asking citizens to become patriotic, honest, peaceful, hardworking, tolerant, and accountable. The institutions and leaders calling for these values must visibly demonstrate them.

The central argument of this article may consequently be summarized in one proposition:

A society gradually learns the character repeatedly modelled before it.

The psychological re-awakening required for sustainable national development must therefore begin with a transformation of the models society presents to its citizens. Leadership must become an embodiment of the society it seeks to create.

Thus, the pathway toward an enabling, habitable, peaceful, inclusive, and acceptable society can be expressed as:

Transform the Model → Transform the Learning → Transform the Behaviour → Transform the Institution → Transform the Nation.

In this sense, Bandura's theory gives national development a deeply psychological dimension. The future of society depends not only upon what citizens are told to believe but also upon what they repeatedly see being practised, rewarded, celebrated, and reproduced around them.

REFERENCES

1. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
2. Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.
3. Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
4. Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Prentice-Hall.
5. Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall.
6. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
7. Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, 44(9), 1175–1184. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.9.1175>
8. Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development: Vol. 1. Theory* (pp. 45–103). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
9. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
10. Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 193–209. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0303_3
11. Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(3), 75–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00064>
12. Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1>
13. Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology*, 51(2), 269–290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00092>
14. Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1(2), 164–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x>
15. Bandura, A. (2016). Moral disengagement: How people do harm and live with themselves. *Worth Publishers*.
16. Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(2), 364–374. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364>

17. Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961).
18. Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 575–582. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0045925>
19. Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1963). Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66(1), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0048687>
20. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
21. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
22. Brown, M. E., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: Exploring new avenues for future research. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20(4), 583–616. <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201020439>
23. Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595–616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
24. Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002>
25. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
26. Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L. (2018). Advances in subjective well-being research. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2, 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0307-6>
27. Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7(2), 117–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675400700202>
28. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
29. Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. Bantam Books.
30. Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
31. Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(3), 184–200. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957SPR0503_1
32. House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage Publications.
33. Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. Harper & Row.
34. Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674700100103>
35. Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers* (D. Cartwright, Ed.). Harper & Brothers.
36. Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press.
37. Northouse, P. G. (2022). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.
38. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2017). *Trust and public policy: How better governance can help rebuild public trust*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264268920-en>
39. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7)
40. Rotberg, R. I. (2004). Strengthening governance: Ranking countries would help. *The Washington Quarterly*, 28(1), 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0163660042518188>
41. Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>
42. Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Free Press.
43. Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and co-operation: Their social psychology*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
44. Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. Academic Press.
45. Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
46. Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.
47. Treviño, L. K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L. P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations*, 56(1), 5–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726703056001448>
48. Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Basil Blackwell.
49. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations.
50. United Nations Development Programme. (1997). *Governance for sustainable human development*. UNDP.
51. World Bank. (2017). *World development report 2017: Governance and the law*. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0950-7>
52. Yukl, G., & Gardner, W. L. (2020). *Leadership in organizations* (9th ed.). Pearson.