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The present paper explores the relationship between leader behaviors and perceived leader effectiveness in Rwanda. In particular, servant leader behaviors and leader behaviors related to the African concept of *ubuntu* are studied in relation to perceived leader effectiveness in order to determine which set of behaviors most significantly relate with effectiveness. In order to achieve this purpose, a scale for measuring *ubuntu* among organizational leaders is developed. A non-probability convenience sample is used from among a population defined as Rwandan adults working in non-government sectors. All survey items are translated into Kinyarwanda. Findings show that (a) servant leadership is positively and significantly related to leader effectiveness; (b) *ubuntu*-related leadership is positively and significantly related to leader effectiveness; (c) servant leadership and *ubuntu* are not significantly different in the strength of their relationships with leader effectiveness; and (d) there is mixed evidence for the discriminant validity of *ubuntu*-related leadership as a construct distinct from servant leadership.

As times change, so does the need for different kinds of leadership (Hill & Stephens, 2003). Many contemporary leadership theories are concerned with addressing globally chronic problems such as abuse of power, bullying, unethical behavior, and workplace alienation (Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008). One theory that seeks to respond to these problems and that is rapidly gaining momentum among leadership theorists and practitioners is servant leadership theory, first introduced by Greenleaf (1977/2010) in an essay entitled “The Servant as Leader.” According to Greenleaf, servant leaders are concerned with building better societies and institutions by addressing contemporary problems from the fundamental predisposition of concern for the growth, well being, and benefits of the led.

Servant leadership models have been primarily developed and discussed in the American context (Hale & Fields, 2007). Accordingly, critics have accused it of being a primarily Western construct (Winston & Ryan, 2008), and researchers have suggested that differences in cultures may limit the effectiveness of the servant leadership model (Hale & Fields). Nonetheless, Winston and Ryan delineate unique parallels between the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program’s (GLOBE) humane orientation and cultural conceptions of servant leadership from
around the world, suggesting that servant leadership is “a global leadership style” (p. 212).

Servant leadership studies have begun to explore the uniqueness of the model’s conceptualization in various global cultures, including those in Africa (e.g. Nelson, 2003; Danhausser & Boshoff, 2007; Hale & Fields, 2007; Koshal, 2006), Asia (e.g. Han, Kakabadse, & Kakabadse, 2009; Bardeh & Shaemi, 2011), and Latin America (Irving & McIntosh, 2006). However, most of these are qualitative studies, which cannot be generalized beyond their respective samples (Willig, 2008). For example, in the African context, Nelson (2003) studied servant leadership in South Africa, and Koshal (2006) studied the service construct of servant leadership in Kenya. Although both reported the acceptability and applicability of servant leadership among their samples, representativeness is a concern because qualitative studies do not produce generalizable findings; it is difficult to know how many people share the same characteristics of the sample even though the results of the qualitative study demonstrate that the phenomenon is present in at least a portion of the society (Willig, p. 17).

Notwithstanding the suggestion that servant leadership is a globally endorsed leadership style (Winston & Ryan, 2008), it is important to recognize that different cultural groups will vary in their conceptualizations of effective leadership (Den Hartog, et al., 1999). Studies of implicit leadership theories suggest that people hold beliefs about how leaders should behave that are consistent with super-ordinate leadership prototypes, which are highly influenced by societal-level culture (Hunt, Boal, & Sorenson, 1990; Den Hartog, et al.) Similarly, cognitive categorization theory proposes that an individual’s inundation of information and experiences leads to the slow development of cognitive structures that help people to process information with efficiency; these cognitive structures (or schema) are highly influenced by culture such that conceptualizations of good and bad in organizational contexts “may be dramatically different across cultures” (Shaw, 1990, p. 635). Accordingly, it is likely that cultural conceptions of appropriate leader behaviors will be strongly related to leader effectiveness among the people of that culture.

One such conception of culturally appropriate leadership behaviors has emerged in recent years within organizational studies in South, East, and Central Africa. Citing problems of post-colonial discrimination, leadership scandals, and extensive corruption, African leadership theorists suggest that the philosophy of ubuntu “holds promise for progressive and ethical change for Africa” (Ncube, 2001, p. 77). Ubuntu is a cultural worldview common among the Bantu tribes of Africa that emphasizes the interconnectedness of self within society and the extension of humanness within shared community (Le Grange, 2011; Murithi, 2009). Ubuntu has been held up as an African worldview that has the potential to counteract the continent’s plague of genocide, patriarchy, autocratic leadership, corruption, and human suffering (Le Grange). For these reasons, organizational researchers have begun to explore the importance of
ubuntu in leadership contexts (e.g. Nelson, 2003; Koshal, 2006; Mangaliso, 2001; Bekker, 2008; Muchiri, 2011; Pouvan, du Toit, & Engelbrecht, 2006; Sigger, Polak, & Pennink, 2010).

The purpose of the present study is to build on the bodies of literature related to both servant and ubuntu-related leadership by studying and comparing the relationship of each of these leadership styles with perceived leader effectiveness. Given that ubuntu is a philosophy that extends throughout East, Southern, and Central Africa, studying its implications for leader effectiveness holds tremendous potential for influencing underdeveloped leadership studies across the continent.

The state of the research related to ubuntu suffers from four challenges: (a) very little research has been performed outside of South Africa; (b) no valid scale exists to measure the phenomenon; (c) the phenomenon has been primarily explored qualitatively and conceptually rather than quantitatively; and (d) there is still disagreement within the literature about the conceptual nature of ubuntu within organizational contexts. This study uniquely contributes to the field of organizational research by providing a quantitative study of both servant leadership and ubuntu-related leadership in Rwanda, a small Central African country that is currently drawing international attention because of its unusual growth and development in its post-genocide recovery (Rice, 2011). For the purposes of this study, it also provides a scale for measuring ubuntu-related leadership.

**Theoretical Background**

**Servant Leadership**

Servant Leadership Behaviors. As an extension of transformational leadership theory, servant leadership theory draws attention to the social responsibility of leaders to address the needs of followers (Patterson, 2003). Greenleaf (1977/2010) described the servant leader as servant rather than leader first, the difference being the “care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people’s highest priority needs are being served” (p. 90). Accordingly, much research and theorizing about servant leadership has focused on characteristics and behaviors (e.g. Patterson, 2003; Hale & Fields, 2007; Washington, Sutton, & Feild, 2006) as opposed to pragmatic concerns of organizational effectiveness and financial success (van Dierendonck, 2011).

Researchers have presented multiple models of servant leadership within which are proposed various behaviors and virtues of the leader (see Table 1). These models are based on competing definitions, emphasizing different aspects of the phenomenon (van Dierendonck, 2011). For example, Wong and Davey (2007) approach servant leadership as a spiritual and humanistic approach to leadership that puts employees at the center and seeks to create supportive workplace environments in which employees will
respond positively to organizational leadership (p. 3). Sendjaya, et al. (2008) extend servant leadership conceptualizations by considering the importance of spirituality and morality. Sendjaya and Cooper (2011) define servant leadership as “a holistic, multidimensional approach to leadership that encompasses the rational, emotional, ethical, and spiritual sides of both leaders and followers” (p. 418).

Table 1
Models of Servant Leadership Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>A servant's heart</td>
<td>Altruistic calling</td>
<td>Conceptual skills</td>
<td>Voluntary subordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Serving and developing others</td>
<td>Emotional healing</td>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>Authentic self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>Consulting and involving others</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Helping subordinates grow and succeed</td>
<td>Covenantal relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Inspiring and influencing others</td>
<td>Persuasive mapping</td>
<td>Putting subordinates first</td>
<td>Responsible morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Modeling integrity and authenticity</td>
<td>Organizational stewardship</td>
<td>Behaving ethically</td>
<td>Transcendental spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional healing</td>
<td>Transforming influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creating value for the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Societal-level culture is an important factor that influences the understanding and enactment of servant leadership (Pekerti & Sendjaya, 2010). Winston and Ryan (2008) suggest that the close similarity between servant leadership conceptualizations in the West and the GLOBE Program’s humane orientation demonstrates the appropriateness of servant leadership in cultures around the world. The authors examine a sample of cultural concepts that have been used to illustrate the unique cultural nuances of servant leadership. Among the cultural concepts that have been suggested to influence the formulation of servant leadership are Confucianism, Daoism, and communism in China (Han, et al., 2009); harambee in Kenya (Koshal, 2006); Islamic traditions in Iran (Bardeh & Shaemi, 2011); and ubuntu in South Africa (Nelson, 2003).

Servant Leadership in Africa. Three important studies begin to shed light on the phenomenon of servant leadership in Africa. First, Nelson (2003) studied the
acceptability of Patterson’s (2003) theory of servant leadership among 27 black South African leaders in government and business contexts in order to test the cross-cultural applicability of the model. Nelson posited that the effects of ubuntu, an African “metaphor that embodies the significance of group solidarity in many African cultures,” (p. 8) would predispose South African leaders to respond favorably to Patterson’s servant leadership model. Nelson used a qualitative case study approach, utilizing interviews, archival documents, and observation. After coding and analyzing the data, Nelson found that Patterson’s servant leadership model is a good fit with black South African leaders, particularly in light of the cultural concept of ubuntu.

Second, Koshal (2005) studied the acceptability of Patterson’s (2003) theory of servant leadership among 25 Kenyan leaders and managers from four sectors of society (government, non-government organizations, business, and education) in order to further test the model in cross-cultural settings and expand understanding of the model from within another African culture. In particular, Koshal focused on the applicability of Patterson’s construct of service. Based on the concept of harambee, a Kenyan culture of pulling together as a community, Koshal suggested that Kenyan leaders would be likely to accept and apply Patterson’s service construct. After using qualitative in-depth interviews to collect data, Koshal coded and analyzed the manuscript data, ultimately finding that according to the interviewees, the servant leadership concept of service is comprised of six factors: (a) role modeling; (b) sacrificing for others; (c) meeting others’ needs and developing them; (d) primary function of service; (e) recognition and reward of employees; (f) humility and respect for employees; and (g) involving employees in decision-making (p. 131).

Third, in a quantitative study, Hale and Fields (2007) examined and compared the extent to which employees in Ghana and the United States experience three dimensions of servant leadership as adapted from Dennis (2004). They surveyed 60 people from Ghana and 97 people from the United States in order to examine the relationship between the servant leadership dimensions of service, humility, and vision and leader effectiveness. Both samples were comprised of students studying in Christian seminaries. The Ghanaian sample reported experiencing significantly less servant leadership behaviors than the sample in the United States. Accordingly, Hale and Fields propose that the collectivism and large power distance of Ghana account for these differences, since humility and development of followers “may [not] be consistent with leadership behavior norms in cultures that are comfortable with greater distance between leaders and followers” (p. 410). Additionally, Hale and Fields show that a higher correlation was found between vision and leader effectiveness among their Ghanaian sample than their sample in the United States. Again, this discrepancy is attributed to larger power distance in Ghanaian culture, where followers may have higher expectations for leaders to be significantly visionary. Hale and Fields conclude
that differences in Ghanaians’ experiences of servant leadership behaviors may be attributable to differences in culture.

Although there seems to be a general acceptability of servant leadership behaviors across cultures, the preceding literature review shows that there are also differences, which are likely to be attributable to culture. Hunt, et al. (1990) explain that societal-level culture has a strong impact on the formation of leadership prototypes. Likewise, Den Hartog, et al. (1999) note that the perception of effective leadership differs across cultures. Whereas some studies have proposed that culture has a moderating effect on servant leadership, the current study suggests that culture may provide prototypes that account for competing conceptualizations of effective leadership. In particular, given the theoretical suggestions that ubuntu is an African virtue that has implications for leader behaviors, this study examines the strength of the relationships between servant leadership behaviors and ubuntu-related leadership behaviors with leader effectiveness in Rwanda.

Ubuntu and Rwandan Culture

Definition of Ubuntu. Ubuntu is a term commonly used within Bantu languages in East, Southern, and Central Africa to refer to a worldview or philosophical approach to human relationships that elevates the importance of humanness and shared community (Le Grange, 2011; Murithi, 2009). The behavioral expression of ubuntu demonstrates compassion, dignity, respect, and a humanistic concern for relationships (Muchiri, 2011). For example, Mhlaba (2001) recalls living conditions under apartheid in South Africa, noting that marginalized families only survived on account of ubuntu, as the community responded by sharing with those in need. Ubuntu also accounts for the transformation of atrocities into humanizing events (Haws, 2009). Based on this conception of ubuntu, Desmond Tutu upheld reconciliation (restoration of the humanness of perpetrators and victims) as more significant than retributive justice in the reconstruction of post-apartheid South Africa (Graybill, 2004).

Mbiti (1989) describes the worldview of the individual within the community that is implicit within ubuntu:

Only in terms of other people does the individual become conscious of his own being, his own duties, his privileges and responsibilities towards himself and towards other people... Whatever happens to the individual happens to the whole group, and whatever happens to the whole group happens to the individual. The individual can only say: “I am, because we are; and since we are, therefore I am”. This is a cardinal point in the understanding of the African view of man. (p. 106)
In sum, *ubuntu* is a fundamental predisposition by which people express and extend humanness within community (Nussbaum, 2003).

**Ubuntu and African Management.** Researchers have suggested that *ubuntu* is a worldview that holds promise for defining effective African leadership that counteracts the negative effects of corruption, discrimination, and scandals (Ncube, 2001). Indeed, *ubuntu* is a prime example of African virtues that are being recovered in a post-colonial renaissance and held up as a model for authentically African leadership (van Hensbroek, 2001). Within management literature, *ubuntu* is often conceptualized based on five social values (survival, spirit of solidarity, compassion, respect, and dignity) proposed by Mbigi (1997), although most studies combine respect and dignity into a single value (e.g. Sigger, et al., 2010; Pouvan, et al., 2006). The present study employs the following fourfold model.

First, survival is central to *ubuntu* and presupposes the sharing of resources based on mutual concern for existence (Pouvan, et al., 2006). Unlike individualistic cultures, survival in African cultures is achieved through brotherly care and concern in light of and in spite of difficulties. In business contexts, this value may be expressed through open-handedness and concern for the needs and interests of others in the organization (Broodryk, 2006).

Second, solidarity entails valuing collectivity according to a community-based understanding of self. This is similar to Bekker’s (2008) distinction of *ubuntu* as “more than mere interdependence, as the identity of the self is defined in finding the other in community” (p. 19). In management contexts, this means that the organization is viewed as a body (not simply a collection of individuals) that exists “to benefit the community, as well as the larger communities of which it is a part” (Lutz, 2009, p. 318).

Third, compassion involves understanding others’ dilemmas and seeking to help on account of the deep conviction of the interconnectedness of people (Pouvan, et al., 2006). Accordingly, individuals express generosity out of concern and “a willingness to sacrifice one’s own self-interest to help others” (Muchiri, 2011, p. 433). In business contexts, this value may express itself by the leader’s physical presence and willingness to suffer with organizational members during hardship and sorrow (Broodryk, 2006).

Fourth, respect and dignity within *ubuntu* is explained as valuing the worth of others and showing deference to others’ potential to make a contribution (Mangaliso, 2001). In African cultures, human dignity and respect stem from the individual’s connectedness to others; therefore, connectedness is significantly related to morality and rationality (Prinsloo, 2000). In business contexts, this value may manifest itself in management’s commitment to developing employees (van der Colff, 2003), respect for age and experience, and a general helpfulness toward others (Mangaliso, 2001).
Although the majority of writing on ubuntu in management contexts is conceptual (e.g. Mangaliso, 2001; Bekker, 2008; Muchiri, 2011; Ncube, 2011), researchers have used qualitative studies to examine the relationship between ubuntu and team effectiveness (Poovan, et al., 2006) as well as its likely impact upon the acceptability of servant leadership among South African business and government leaders (Nelson, 2003). Additionally, although Sigger, et al. (2010) developed a 4-dimension, 42-item scale to measure ubuntu among managers in Tanzania, face validity is a concern with this scale, as it is not clear how the list of items is uniquely related to measuring the concept of ubuntu. For example, Sigger, et al. include among the items measuring the survival value of ubuntu the following statement: “Many of my relatives work in the organization” (p. 51). Their rationale for including the item is based on Mangaliso’s (2001) explanation that ubuntu affects one’s relationship with others such that individuals within the organization are treated like family (p. 25). Yet, Mangaliso does not state that individuals are family members, rather that they are like family members. In addition to face validity concerns, Sigger, et al.’s scale does not measure leader behaviors, but the presence of ubuntu within organizations.

Literature on ubuntu in management contexts demonstrates that researchers are still unclear about the nature of its function. Some describe ubuntu as an organizational culture (e.g. van der Colff, 2003); others describe ubuntu as a mediating variable that accounts for the acceptability of other leadership constructs (e.g. Nelson, 2003); others describe ubuntu as a potential ethically and culturally based leadership model without defining its specific behaviors (e.g. Ncube, 2001; Lutz, 2009; Bekker, 2008; Muchiri, 2011); others describe ubuntu as a set of African values implemented within managerial behaviors that can be used to create more indigenous (i.e. culturally appropriate) organizations (e.g. Mangaliso, 2001; Prinsloo, 2000; Mbigi, 1997). Although this categorization may be simplistic, it highlights the fact that there is still a need for discussion on the precise nature of ubuntu within organizations and whether or not ubuntu can be conceptualized as a distinct model of leader behaviors with discriminant validity.

Ubuntu in Rwanda. In spite of the fact that the majority of the philosophical and theoretical literature related to ubuntu originates from South Africa, ubuntu is a word that is commonly used in the day-to-day lives of Rwandans (author’s personal experience). In religious contexts, ubuntu is the word used for grace (Bibiliya Yera, 2001), whereas in non-religious contexts it translated as “the quality of being kind and generous” (Niyomugabo, 2009). Despite these simple glosses, the philosophical and cultural connotations of ubuntu (as conceptualized in previously examined literature) are also present and relevant within the Rwandan worldview (Broodryk, 2006). For example, when a group of Rwandans were asked to explain the philosophical implications of ubuntu, they explained that ubuntu is primarily expressed by acts wherein the recipient of ubuntu is shown that he/she is as human as the giver and...
deserves the same quality of humanness as the giver (author’s personal communication). Yet, although *ubuntu* is held up as a cardinal and aspirational virtue among Rwandans, it is regularly acknowledged that notable acts demonstrating *ubuntu* are infrequent and rare (author’s personal communication). Accordingly, based on the high value ascribed to possessing and demonstrating *ubuntu* in Rwandan culture, this study suggests that *ubuntu*-related leadership will be strongly related to perceived leader effectiveness.

**Study Hypotheses**

Management theories developed in Western countries may have moderate applicability in non-Western contexts such as Africa (Lutz, 2009). For this reason, Muchiri (2011) suggests that management concepts such as servant leadership be studied in sub-Saharan Africa in order to investigate “the impact of context on the relationship between leadership behaviors, followers’ responses, and organizational effectiveness” (p. 448). The present study pursues this line of research by comparing the relationship between servant leadership behaviors and organizational effectiveness with *ubuntu*-related leadership behaviors and organizational effectiveness (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1](image-url)  
*Figure 1. Model of the predictive roles of servant leadership and ubuntu-related leadership with perceived leader effectiveness.*

Previous studies suggest that servant leadership is positively related with leader effectiveness in Africa (Hale & Fields, 2007; Koshal, 2006; Nelson, 2003). Although respondents may report infrequent experience of servant leadership (Hale & Fields), it will generally relate strongly to perceptions of effective leadership. For this reason, it was hypothesized that servant leadership would be positively and significantly related to leader effectiveness (Hypothesis 1).

*Ubuntu* is an African concept that reflects a worldview and philosophical approach to life commonly held within East, Central, and South Africa, if not the entirety of sub-Saharan Africa (Broodryk, 2006). Given that the demonstration of *ubuntu* within
relationships is highly regarded in Rwanda, it is probable that managerial behaviors consistent with *ubuntu* will also be highly valued. Accordingly, it was hypothesized that *ubuntu*-related leadership would be positively and significantly related to leader effectiveness (Hypothesis 2).

Implicit leadership theory explains that prototypes of effective leadership are highly influenced by culture (Den Hartog, et al., 1999). In other words, ideal leadership behaviors are strongly related to cultural values. Given that *ubuntu* is a strongly held cultural value, it is likely that managerial behaviors reflecting *ubuntu* will more strongly relate with leader effectiveness than servant leadership behaviors. Additionally, although servant leadership is surmised to have universal applicability (Winston & Ryan, 2007), cultural differences (e.g. power distance and collectivism) between sub-Saharan Africa and Western cultures may account for the differentiation between the applicability of servant leadership and *ubuntu*-related leader behaviors (Hale & Fields, 2007). Therefore, it was hypothesized that *ubuntu*-related leadership would have a stronger relationship with leader effectiveness than servant leadership (Hypothesis 3).

Previous research suggests that the acceptability of servant leadership in sub-Saharan Africa is based on cultural values such as *ubuntu* (Nelson, 2003; Koshal, 2005). However, they are philosophically different concepts. Whereas servant leadership is fundamentally concerned with a leader’s predisposition toward putting subordinate’s needs, interests, and development first (Winston & Fields, in press), *ubuntu* prioritizes the importance of community, solidarity, and shared humanness (Mangaliso, 2001). Whereas servant leaders assume a posture of follower-focused leadership (Russell & Stone, 2002), *ubuntu* results in leaders affirming the dignity, humanity, and mutuality of all within shared community. In light of these fundamental differences, theoreticians have argued that *ubuntu* is a distant management concept unique to Africa (Lutz, 2009; Ncube, 2001). Therefore, it was hypothesized that in analysis of *ubuntu* and servant leadership behaviors, *ubuntu* would demonstrate discriminant validity as a unique construct distinct from servant leadership (Hypothesis 4).

### Data Collection

**Sample and Procedure**

Surveys were distributed to a convenience sample of approximately 120 adult Rwandans working under leadership in non-government employment settings. A convenience sample was used to enable the researcher to utilize personal connections to satisfy the need for usable responses (Blaxter, Hughes, & Tight, 2010). The Human Subjects Review Board of Regent University approved this study’s sampling and data collection procedures on June 8, 2012. Surveys were distributed using an online tool (www.surveymonkey.com), with paper copies available for those without Internet...
access. A total of 103 usable surveys were returned. Demographic details of respondents are described in the data analysis section below.

**Measures**

Leader effectiveness was measured using a six-item scale developed by Ehrhart and Klein (2001). Ehrhart and Klein developed the scale for the purpose of studying subordinates’ preferences for various types of leader behaviors. Respondents are asked to respond on a five-point Likert scale, where 1 = definitely no, and 5 = definitely yes. A sample item from this scale is the following: “I work at a high level of performance under my leader.” In a study of servant leadership in Ghana and the United States, Hale and Fields (2007) reported a reliability coefficient of .92 for the Ghanaian sample. The alpha coefficient for the six-item leader effectiveness scale in the current study was .87.

Servant leadership behaviors were measured using a 10-item, single dimension scale developed by Winston and Fields (2012). This scale was developed to clarify the nature and distinct behaviors of servant leadership. The items use a five-point Likert scale, where 1 = definitely no, and 5 = definitely yes. A sample item from this scale is the following: “My leader practices what he/she preaches.” Winston and Fields reported a reliability coefficient of .96. In the current study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be .93.

**Ubuntu**-related leadership was measured using a 12-item scale developed by the researcher for this study. Steps for developing this scale were adapted from DeVellis (2012). First, a pool of items was generated from a careful review of the literature. This pool was based on the fourfold value structure of ubuntu commonly found within management literature (Sigger, et al., 2010; Pouvan, et al., 2006). Second, these items were conceptualized and formatted as items for measuring leader behaviors. Third, the list of twelve items (three items per value) was sent to seven experts in the field for review. Of the seven experts, six responded. Four are educators, three have PhDs, and three have master’s degrees. Additionally, four are Rwandan, one is South African, and one is an American with over 30 years of experience training leaders in Rwanda. These experts were asked to rank items based on theoretical conceptualizations of each of the values of ubuntu and were encouraged to delete, modify, add, or comment on items comprising the scale. Based on their feedback, one item was deleted, one was added, and wording was changed to clarify the intended meaning. The resulting scale consists of 12 items (see Table 2) for ranking ubuntu-related leadership behaviors using a five-point Likert scale, where 1 = definitely no, and 5 = definitely yes. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for this scale was found to be .91.
Table 2

Scale Items for Measuring Ubuntu-Related Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.  My leader provides me with counsel to succeed in my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  My leader provides me with resources to fulfill my responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  My leader treats me as if I were a member of his/her family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.  My leader is a meaningful part of our work community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.  My leader sees himself as one of us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.  My leader makes decisions based on the consensus of the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.  My leader is sensitive to employees’ problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.  My leader shares in my suffering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.  My leader is willing to reach out and help others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My leader is concerned about fairness in our organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My leader respects me and my contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My leader shows respect for those with age and experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these three variables, four individual respondent control items were included to enhance the internal validity of the study and preempt the confounding effects of extraneous variables. Controlling for age, gender, and education is based on previous findings that differences in these demographic indicators are related to differences in perceptions of servant leadership behaviors (McCuddy & Cavin, 2009; Parolini, 2005). Controlling for a respondent’s tenure under the leader about whom he/she is reporting is based on Ehrhart and Klein’s (2001) supposition that a respondent’s work experience may affect ratings of leader effectiveness.

In order to facilitate respondents’ comprehension, the 30-item survey was translated from English (Appendix A) into Kinyarwanda (Appendix B) following Brislin (1970). First, a bilingual translator translated the survey into Kinyarwanda; second, another bilingual translator back-translated the Kinyarwanda version into English without using the original English version; third, the second translator and the primary researcher (also bilingual) examined the three versions (original, translated, and back-translated) for errors that would lead to differences in meaning; finally, the survey was distributed to five individuals for pilot testing. After each of these steps, minor changes were made to the survey to enhance clarity and congruency of meaning. The instrument includes a brief explanation of the research project, assurance of anonymity, and provision for non-obligatory consent to participate. Respondents are asked to think of their current leader and respond to subsequent items with this leader in mind. The referent leader was the respondent’s immediate supervisor or boss.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted in five phases: (a) descriptive statistics were run in order to determine the representativeness of the study’s sample; (b) frequency distributions
were analyzed in order to check for outliers and possible data entry errors; (c) multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the statistical significance of the relationships between the independent and dependent variables; (d) differences between the regression coefficients were explored to determine which independent variable had the strongest predictive relationship with leader effectiveness; and (e) alternative regression models were used to assess the discriminant validity of the ubuntu-related leadership scale. Each of these steps is described in the following section. Means, standard deviations, and correlations among study variables are presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Effect</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubuntu</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant Lead</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>39.26</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01 (2-tailed).

Representativeness of Sample

Representativeness of the sample was ascertained by comparing the control variables from this study (age, gender, and education) with published demographic data about Rwanda. With respect to gender, the United Nations Statistics Division (2012) reported that in 2000 approximately 33% of non-agricultural wage earners in Rwanda were female. Concerning education, the World Bank (2010) reported a 70% primary school completion (up from 23% in 2000). However, only 17% of eligible students are enrolled in the upper grades of secondary school (UNICEF, n.d.), and 5% of the eligible population is enrolled in tertiary level education (UNESCO, 2010). With respect to age, the United Nations Statistics Division reported that the population of Rwanda was approximately 9,998,000 in 2009, over 40% of which was less than 14 years old, and 4% were more than 60 years old.

According to these statistics, a representative sample of the adult working population would be about two-thirds male, almost entirely less than 60 years old, and largely educated at the primary school level. Although the sample utilized in the current study was consistent with the expected age of working adults, it was predominantly male and educated above the national norm (see Table 4). Discrepancies in these frequencies are most likely attributable to the nature of the organizations that consented to participate.
in the study. Of the three organizations, two have staffs that are highly educated, and the third trains only male students.

Table 4
Population Sample Demographics and Control Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (percentage)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (highest level; percentage)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>21.00-58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (years)</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1.00-20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 102.

Frequency Distributions

Frequency distributions were analyzed to check for outliers and possible data entry errors. After review of histograms and boxplots, it was determined that all data were reasonably distributed. No data points were found to sit on their own at the extremes, thereby eliminating the potential confounding effects of outliers.

Regression Analyses of Study Variables

Two multiple regression analyses were performed to study the relationships between the two independent variables and leader effectiveness. The purpose of the first regression analysis was to test Hypothesis 1 by examining the relationship between servant leadership and leader effectiveness (see Table 5). Age, gender, tenure, and education were entered in Step 1 and were found to account for an insignificant amount of the variance in perceived leader effectiveness: R² = .02, F (4, 90) = .44, p = .78. Servant leadership was entered in Step 2 and was found to account for an additional 79% of the variance in perceived leader effectiveness when controlling for age, gender, tenure, and
education: R2 change = .79, F (1, 89) = 372.82, p = .00. The results of the regression indicate that servant leadership significantly and positively predicts leader effectiveness (unstandardized b = .93; standard error = .05), thereby supporting Hypothesis 1.

Table 5
Regression Analysis of Servant Leadership with Leader Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.90*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 95; R2 = .02 (p > .05) for Step 1; ΔR2 = .79 (p < .05) for Step 2.
* p < .05.

The purpose of the second regression analysis (see Table 6) was to test Hypothesis 2 by examining the relationship between ubuntu-related leadership and perceived leader effectiveness. Once again, age, gender, tenure, and education were entered in Step 1 and were found to account for an insignificant amount of the variance in leader effectiveness (R2 = .02, F (4, 90) = .44, p = .78). Ubuntu-related leadership was entered in Step 2 and was found to account for an additional 73% of the variance in perceived leader effectiveness (R2 change = .73, F (1, 89) = 252.91, p = .00). The results of the regression indicate that ubuntu-related leadership significantly and positively predicts leader effectiveness (unstandardized b = .92; standard error = .06), thereby supporting Hypothesis 2.

Table 6
Regression Analysis of Ubuntu with Leader Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Regression Coefficients

Hypothesis 3 was tested by comparison of the unstandardized b coefficients and standard errors of difference from the regressions in the previous step. The formula used for this procedure is a refined z-test equation provided by Paternoster, Brame, Mazerolle, and Piquero (1998):

\[ z = \frac{b_1 - b_2}{\sqrt{SEb_1^2 + SEb_2^2}} \]

Using this equation with the unstandardized b coefficients and standard errors from the previous regression models shows that the difference between these regression coefficients is insignificant:

\[ z = \frac{.93 - .92}{\sqrt{(.05)^2 + (.06)^2}} \]

\[ z = .12 \]

This comparison of regression coefficients shows that there is no significant difference between the predictive strength of the independent variables in this study. The relationship between servant leadership and leader effectiveness is not statistically different than the relationship between ubuntu-related leadership and leader effectiveness (\( z = .12; p = .91 \)). Accordingly, Hypothesis 3 is not supported.

Discriminant Validity of Ubuntu-Related Leadership

In order to test Hypothesis 4, alternative regression models were used to examine whether each leadership style explained statistically significant variance of leader effectiveness while controlling for the other leadership style. In the first regression (see Table 7), control variables were entered in Step 1, servant leadership was entered in Step 2, and ubuntu was entered in Step 3. In this regression, ubuntu was found to explain significant variance above and beyond servant leadership and the control variables (\( R^2 = .82, F[1, 88] = 5.71, p = .02 \)).
Table 7
Regression Analysis of Ubuntu with Leader Effectiveness Controlling for Servant Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubuntu</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 95; R² = .02 (p > .05) for Step 1; ΔR² = .79 (p < .05) for Step 2; ΔR² = .01 (p < .05) for Step 3.

*p < .05.

In the second regression (see Table 8), the control variables were entered in Step 1, ubuntu was entered in Step 2, and servant leadership was entered in Step 3. Servant leadership was found to account for a significant amount of the variance in leader effectiveness above and beyond ubuntu while controlling for age, gender, education, and tenure (R² = .82, F [1, 88] = 29.27, p = .00).

Accordingly, these regression models show that ubuntu and servant leadership are constructs that explain variance in leader effectiveness above and beyond each other, as ubuntu explained a significant amount of variance in leader effectiveness beyond servant leadership, and servant leadership explained a significant amount of variance in leader effectiveness beyond ubuntu. Although these findings provide support for Hypothesis 4, the strong correlation of servant leadership and ubuntu (r = .93) suggests that this support is potentially weak. Therefore, there is mixed evidence for support of Hypothesis 4.
Table 8

| Regression Analysis of Servant Leadership with Leader Effectiveness Controlling for Ubuntu |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Step 1  | Unstandardized b | Standard error | Beta  |
| Constant | 4.24 | 0.44 | -0.03 |
| Age | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Gender | 0.01 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| Education | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.03 |
| Tenure | -0.02 | 0.02 | -0.12 |
| Step 2  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.48 | 0.31 |  |
| Age | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.03 |
| Gender | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.01 |
| Education | -0.04 | 0.03 | -0.06 |
| Tenure | 0.00 | 0.01 | -0.01 |
| Ubuntu | 0.92 | 0.06 | 0.88* |
| Step 3  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.07 | 0.28 |  |
| Age | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.01 |
| Gender | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.07 |
| Education | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.01 |
| Tenure | -0.00 | 0.01 | -0.02 |
| Ubuntu | 0.30 | 0.13 | 0.28 |
| Servant Leadership | 0.66 | 0.12 | 0.64 |

Note. N = 95; R² = .02 (p > .05) for Step 1; ΔR² = .76 (p < .05) for Step 2; ΔR² = .06 (p < .05) for Step 3.
* p < .05

Discussion

This study compares the relationships of servant leadership and ubuntu-related leadership with leader effectiveness. Although it has been contended that servant leadership is a global leadership style (Winston & Ryan, 2008), the burden of this study is to demonstrate the unique influence of the African cultural concept of ubuntu in explaining perceived leader effectiveness in the Rwandan context. The study surveys a sample of non-government sector working adults in Rwanda in order to better understand the relationships between these variables.

Development of Ubuntu Scale

In preparation for measuring ubuntu as a leader-behavior construct, a scale was developed based on theoretical literature. The fourfold value structure upon which the scale was based stems from Mbigi’s (1997) conceptualization of ubuntu: survival, spirit of solidarity, compassion, and respect and dignity. Although it has little empirical support, this model is commonly utilized within organizational literature as a
foundation for discussing *ubuntu* as a leadership construct. Therefore, using Mbigi’s model as a framework, *ubuntu*-related literature was used to compile a list of 12 items to measure *ubuntu* as a leadership construct. A panel of professionals with knowledge of the concept and the African context was utilized in order to refine the list.

**Testing of Study Hypotheses**

Findings related to the study hypotheses are mixed. First, multiple regression analyses demonstrated that both servant leadership and *ubuntu*-related leadership are strongly and positively related to leader effectiveness, supporting Hypotheses 1 and 2. However, comparison of the coefficients from each of these regressions showed that neither of these leadership styles was a stronger predictor of leader effectiveness. Therefore, Hypothesis 3, which surmised that *ubuntu*-related leadership would have a stronger relationship with leader effectiveness than servant leadership, was not supported. Finally, regression analyses were used to demonstrate the discriminant validity of *ubuntu*-related leadership from servant leadership. Regression analyses showed that both constructs demonstrated statistically significant variance above and beyond the other. However, the constructs are highly correlated, suggesting that there is significant overlap between them. Therefore, there is mixed evidence to support the discriminant validity of *ubuntu* as proposed in Hypothesis 4.

**Study Contributions**

This study makes significant contributions to research on organizational leadership. First, although *ubuntu* has been described as the management concept that holds the potential for emancipating businesses in Africa’s post-colonial renaissance (Mbigi, 2000), very little empirical research has been done on the concept. Indeed, if the theoretical claims are true, then acceptable empirical research is overdue. Additionally, in light of the fact that most treatises on *ubuntu* have been written in South Africa, this study expands the scope of conversation on the concept by extending it to another relevant part of Africa.

Second, this study contributes to the growing body of literature that demonstrates the acceptability of servant leadership within cultures across the globe. Studying the cross-cultural acceptability of servant leadership in non-Western contexts allows theoreticians and practitioners to make strides in offering leadership development programs that respond to contextual needs with a globally endorsed leadership style (Winston & Ryan, 2008). In the African context, this is very significant, as it has been suggested that servant leadership does not exist. For example, Agulanna (2006) laments, “It is this understanding that leadership is service that is completely lacking in most African societies” (p. 259). Although this statement may be exaggerated, it has also been suggested that the concept of servanthood conjures within the minds of many Africans images of slavery and servitude (Kretzschmar, 2002). However, in spite of the failings of
leadership or negative connotations of servanthood, the present study suggests that servant leadership is strongly related to perceived leader effectiveness in Rwanda.

Third, in general, this study makes an important contribution to a much-needed pool of literature that specifically addresses leadership models in Africa. Agulanna (2006) laments that the failure of African organizations and political systems is largely due to “the absence of virile and responsible leaders” (p. 264). Accordingly, this study responds to the call for research that captures “the impact of contextual factors on the relationship between leadership and criterion variables... in sub-Saharan Africa” (Muchiri, 2011).

Study Limitations

Although convenience sampling is acceptable, using a probability sampling technique and selecting a sample from a narrower population group could have improved the findings of this study. As it is, the findings of this study may be influenced by the bias used in obtaining the sample (Cozby, 2009). Additionally, variables other than those studied here may influence the observed relationships; or perhaps the variables are related in different ways (e.g. mediation or moderation). Lastly, it was noted during the data collection process that many participants (particularly those with less exposure to formal education) were not familiar with Likert scales and needed significant explanation and illustration regarding how to respond to survey items. Thus, the nature of using a survey design may have been a limitation in itself.

Suggestions for Future Research

While the present scale for measuring ubuntu as a leadership construct is an important step toward quantitatively measuring what has often been a vague and nebulous concept in African leadership literature, future research should continue to develop and refine the scale, seeking to establish clearer support for its construct validity, and exploring its relationship with other variables. Also, additional studies should be employed to explore the multidimensionality of ubuntu as a leadership construct. Second, additional research should consider other ways in which servant leadership and ubuntu may be related (e.g. moderation and mediation). Third, alternative scales (including multidimensional scales) for measuring servant leadership should be used in order to further elaborate the nature of servant leadership in the African context. Finally, more quantitative studies of servant leadership in sub-Saharan Africa should be performed in order to build a stronger base of literature from which to understand its enactment in this context.
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Appendix

Appendix A

English Translation of Research Survey

CONFIDENTIAL RESEARCH SURVEY

Thank you for your participation in this study. The purpose of this research project is to better understand the relationship between a leader’s characteristics and the leader’s effectiveness in the Rwandan context. This survey is comprised of 30 statements. We want to know how true each of these statements is for you. The survey should take you 10-15 minutes to complete. All responses are anonymous, so you should feel complete freedom in responding. You are free to refuse to complete the survey, and your participation will not affect your relationship with any of the individuals and organizations involved in the survey. However, your return of the survey implies your consent to participate in this research.

1. Information about you:

   Age: __________________  Gender: __________________
   Nationality: _______________  Highest level of education: _______________

Please think of your current leader and respond to the following statements with that one person in mind. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following statements is true of your relationship with your leader:

2. How many years have you been working with the leader about whom you will be reporting?

   ____________ Years

3. My leader provides me with counsel to succeed in my job

   [_____ definitely no]  [_____ no]  [_____ neutral]  [_____ yes]  [_____ definitely yes]

4. My leader practices what he/she preaches

   [_____ definitely no]  [_____ no]  [_____ neutral]  [_____ yes]  [_____ definitely yes]

5. My leader provides me with resources to fulfill my responsibilities

   [_____ definitely no]  [_____ no]  [_____ neutral]  [_____ yes]  [_____ definitely yes]
6. I work at a high level of performance under my leader

7. My leader serves people without regard to their nationality, gender, or race

8. My leader treats me as if I were a member of his/her family

9. I enjoy working with my leader

10. My leader is a meaningful part of our work community

11. My leader sees serving as a mission of responsibility to others

12. My leader sees himself as one of us

13. My leader is genuinely interested in employees as people

14. I get along with my leader
15. My leader makes decisions based on the consensus of the group

[________ definitely no]  [________ no]  [________ neutral]  [________ yes]  [________ definitely yes]

16. My leader understands that serving others is most important

[________ definitely no]  [________ no]  [________ neutral]  [________ yes]  [________ definitely yes]

17. My leader is sensitive to employees' problems

[________ definitely no]  [________ no]  [________ neutral]  [________ yes]  [________ definitely yes]

18. My leader is willing to make sacrifices to help others

[________ definitely no]  [________ no]  [________ neutral]  [________ yes]  [________ definitely yes]

19. I admire my leader

[________ definitely no]  [________ no]  [________ neutral]  [________ yes]  [________ definitely yes]

20. My leader shares in my suffering

[________ definitely no]  [________ no]  [________ neutral]  [________ yes]  [________ definitely yes]

21. My leader seeks to instill trust rather than fear or insecurity

[________ definitely no]  [________ no]  [________ neutral]  [________ yes]  [________ definitely yes]

22. My leader is willing to reach out and help others

[________ definitely no]  [________ no]  [________ neutral]  [________ yes]  [________ definitely yes]

23. My leader is always honest

[________ definitely no]  [________ no]  [________ neutral]  [________ yes]  [________ definitely yes]
24. My leader's style is compatible with my style

[_____ definitely no] [_____ no] [_____ neutral] [_____ yes] [_____ definitely yes]

25. My leader is concerned about fairness in our organization

[_____ definitely no] [_____ no] [_____ neutral] [_____ yes] [_____ definitely yes]

26. My leader is driven by a sense of higher calling

[_____ definitely no] [_____ no] [_____ neutral] [_____ yes] [_____ definitely yes]

27. My leader respects me and my contributions

[_____ definitely no] [_____ no] [_____ neutral] [_____ yes] [_____ definitely yes]

28. My leader promotes values that transcend self-interest and material success

[_____ definitely no] [_____ no] [_____ neutral] [_____ yes] [_____ definitely yes]

29. My leader shows respect for those with age and experience

[_____ definitely no] [_____ no] [_____ neutral] [_____ yes] [_____ definitely yes]

30. I think of my leader like an ideal leader

[_____ definitely no] [_____ no] [_____ neutral] [_____ yes] [_____ definitely yes]
Appendix B

Kinyarwanda Translation of Research Survey

INYIGO KU BUSHAKASHATSI


1. Ibyerekeye wowe:

   Imyaka y’amavuko: _________________
   Igitsina: ________________________

   Ubwenegihugu: _________________
   Urwego rw’amashuri: _________________

Tekereza ku muyobozi wawe, noneho ugiye icyo uvuga ku nteruro zikurikira nkaho bimwerekeyehe. Hitamo igisobanuro kanye cyonyine cy’agaciro kuri buri nteruro uha imibanire yawe n’ukuyobora:

2. Umaze imyaka ingahe ukorana n’umuyobozi ibisubizo byawe byibandaho?

   _________________
   Imyaka

3. Umuyobozi wanjye angira inama mu buryo nakora akazi kanjye neza


4. Ku muyobozi wanjye, imvugo niyo ngiro


5. Umuyobozi wanjye ampa ibikenewe ngo nuzuze inshingano zanjye
6. Nkora akazi kanjye neza cyane bitewe n’umuyobozi wanjye

7. Umuyobozi wanjye akorera bose atitaye ku bwenegihugu, igitsina , cyangwa ubwoko

8. Umuyobozi wanjye anyitaho nk’umwe mu bavandimwe be

9. Nezezwa no gukorana n’umuyobozi wanjye

10. Umuyobozi wanjye agira uruhare rufatika aho dukorera

11. Umuyobozi wanjye abona gukorera abandi nk’ishingano abafitiye

12. Umuyobozi wanjye yibona nk’umwe muri twe

13. Umuyobozi wanjye yita ku bakoreshwa nk’abantu aha agaciro

14. Mpuza n’umuyobozi wanjye
15. Umuyobozi wanjye afata ibyemego akurikije ibyemewe na bose


16. Umuyobozi wanjye asobanukiwe ko gukorera abandi ari icy’ingenzi cyane


17. Umuyobozi wanjye yita ku bibazo by’abakoreshwa


18. Umuyobozi wanjye yemera kwigomwa ngo afashe abandi


19. Nemera, nubaha, nkunda umuyobozi wanjye


20. Umuyobozi wanjye amba hafi mu mubabaro


21. Umuyobozi wanjye agerageza kuturemamo icyizere aho kudutera ubwoba cyangwa

imidugararo


22. Umuyobozi wanjye yitangira gufasha abandi


23. Umuyobozi wanjye ni umunyakuri ibihe byose
24. Imikorere y’umuyobozi wanjye ihuza n’iyanjye

25. Umuyobozi wanjye agenzura ko nta busumbane bugaragara aho dukorera

26. Umuyobozi wanjye akora nkaho ari umuhamagaro we

27. Umuyobozi wanjye aranyubaha n’umusanzu ntanga

28. Umuyobozi wanjye ateza imbere indangagaciro zisumba kwikunda no kwigwizaho ibintu

29. Umuyobozi wanjye aha icyubahiro abakuru n’abafite inararibonye

30. Ntekereza ko umuyobozi wanjye ari nkuko umuyobozi nyakuri yagombye kuba