

**PERCEPTIONS OF THE APPLICATIONS OF
LEADERSHIP STYLES ACROSS
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA**

GEORGE R. WEST, Ph.D., *Central Philippine University*

TARIKU FUFA GEMECHU, Ph.D., *Regent University*

ABSTRACT

Although some observers have argued that leadership has improved in Africa, since the end of colonial times, others have suggested that leadership problems have remained the root causes of Africa's multifaceted challenges (Adadevoh, 2006; Musekura & Ntamushobora, 2004). Still, others have suggested that any continued leadership problems might actually stem from less than adequate programs in African higher education that have limited the number and types of quality outputs (Haruna, 2009). This has resulted in a subsequent call for university-industry interactions and quality involvement in program development and education management throughout the continent. Based on these, we evaluated the perception of African stakeholders, from 11 different countries, regarding organizational applications, by leaders, of Servant Leadership (Winston & Fields, 2015), Leader Member Exchange (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), Contingent Reward Leadership (Reitz, 1971), and Autocratic Leadership Style (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939). We found that perceptions of students and professionals differ, regarding servant leadership and autocratic leadership. We also evaluated the perceptions of stakeholders, regarding the quantity and quality of professionals' general involvement with universities and in teaching and educational development of university students. In these areas, we found that perceptions

of students and professionals differ, regarding professionals' general involvement with universities.

Key Words: African Leadership, African Management, Servant Leadership, LMX, Contingent Reward, Autocratic Leadership

Perceptions of the Applications of Leadership Styles across Africa

The continent of Africa reflects paradox (Adeyemo, 2009; Mamiru, 2012). It has received blessings that include thousands of lakes and rivers, large amount of mineral resources, a variety of domestic and wild animals, year-round sunshine, and other favorable weather conditions, along with vast amounts of fertile and arable lands (Chazan, Peter, Robert, Donald, & John, 1999; Meredith, 2006; Wangari, 2009). Yet, what has come to the minds of some people, when the word "... Africa is mentioned, is struggle, poverty, under-development, socio-political instability, third world, dark continent, and HIV/AIDS..." (Bilong, 2008, p. 16). Indeed, many African people live in abject poverty (Kiruhi, 2013), unbearable sufferings (Bilong, 2008), enormous pains (Tutu, 1999), and unexplainable brokenness (Chazan et al., 1999), when compared to many other parts of the world.

Some theorists and researchers have argued that the abundance of challenges facing Africans would not exist if only leaders would have applied responsible leadership on the continent (Adadevoh, 2006; Adeyemo, 2009; Kiruhi, 2013; Mamiru, 2012). While some have argued that the behaviors of African leaders, derived from their indigenous cultural values, have served to overcome negative outcomes (Wanasika, Howell, Littrell, & Dorfman, 2011), others have proposed that leadership problems remain the root causes of Africa's multifaceted challenges (Adadevoh, 2006; Musekura & Ntamushobora, 2004); and that these causes have resulted from negative leadership values such as selfishness, greediness, nepotism, tribalism, corruption, embezzlement, favoritism, insecurity, hatred, wickedness, malice, and deception (Addai, 2009; Kiruhi, 2013; Mamiru, 2012).

Arguably, higher education has played an important role in helping to achieve economic and social development in Africa (Adekanmbi, 2015). However, African education might require improvements, in order to achieve the desired outcomes associated with addressing current and potential future challenges (Nkomo, 2015). Specifically, African institutions of higher education have taught contents and learning methods, dependent on sources with non-African contexts and realities (Coyne, 2015; Amadi-Echendu, Phillips, Chodokufa, & Visser, 2016). For example, in a study of the political economy of contemporary Africa, Amin (2014) suggested that the World Bank and similar, allied organizations have programmed social sciences curricula in African universities. Africans have subsequently taught those methods in African universities and applied them in organizations of all types throughout the continent. Some people have subsequently questioned if the African use of Western leadership theories have applied well and can effectively apply within the African paradigm (Haruna, 2009). Similar questions have also persisted, regarding the cultural fit of Western leadership methods, specifically questioning if African agency would result in better fits for African contexts (Oginde, 2013). Regarding African agency, Achieng (2014) especially argued that Africans should seek to continue to develop and maintain their own "... African agency in tackling... economic [and] corporate... deficiencies" (p. 49). Achieng' further suggested that such African agency would necessarily result in "... processes and mechanisms that can well be appreciated as African solutions to Africa's problems" (p. 51).

Similar to what Amin (2014) and Achieng (2014) suggested, regarding transformation to overall African-led

paradigms, Aina (2010) specifically argued for the total transformation of African higher education. Aina suggested that African stakeholders should "... collectively and autonomously own their universities and the higher education sector, and... make them work in their national interests and for the benefit of their countries and their people..." (p. 24); and further suggested that no outside donors or other entities could do this for African countries.

Problem Statement, Research Questions, and Purpose

Barouni and Broecke (2014) suggested that higher education in Africa lacks content relevance, which has continued to impede the efficiency and effectiveness of educational outputs in business management. Additionally, African institutions of higher education have yet to present success stories of meeting continental needs with relevant, solution-oriented outputs (Nell & Cant, 2014). However, members of various sectors of society have begun to consider that higher education has resulted in positive economic results and therefore, they have begun to increasingly invest in it (Tsegaye, 2015). Because of the perceived lack of content relevance, it remains unclear what level of positive contribution African education objectively makes, in developing business leadership and management in Africa (Odhiambo, 2014). These arguments point to the overarching problem of not knowing whether Western leadership methods apply in African contexts and if any of them do, which ones and with whom.

In the area of leadership education, several research questions emerge, including: (a) what leadership styles do Africans, currently in the workforce, perceive that their leaders

use most; (b) what leadership styles do Africans, currently in universities, perceive that leaders in the workforce will use most; (c) do universities design and teach relevant curricula and content that address current African realities; and (d) what perceptions and practices regarding university-industry interactions and stakeholder involvement, in teaching and educational development, across Africa, do stakeholders (students and professionals) in Africa have?

The purpose of this study includes determining the perceptions of stakeholders, regarding the comparative magnitudes of applications and potential applications of leadership styles; and to determine comparative amount and quality of industry and university interactions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, we present an overview of the relevant literature of the factors considered. These factors include servant leadership, contingent reward leadership, leader-member exchange leadership, autocratic leadership, and quantity and quality of industry-university interactions. We also include theoretical foundations of relationships between variables, in order to justify the use of research analyses.

Servant Leadership

Greenleaf (1977) first coined the concept of servant leadership. The distinctive qualities and essential focuses of the servant leadership construct include *agapao* love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service (Bekker, 2007; Greenleaf, 1977; Northouse, 2015; , Patterson, 2003; Winston, 2002). By design, servant leaders

put followers' interests first and servant leaders serve followers to meet the followers' needs (Northouse, 2015). People regard servant leaders as servant first (Greenleaf, 1977). Additionally, many theorists and practitioners have considered servant leaders as ethical. This could reflect one reason why the servant leadership concept has attracted attention from people and organizations (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008).

Theorists have suggested that servant leaders meet long-term organizational goals, as they facilitate the growth, development, and well-being of employees, matters of top priority (Spears, 2002). Servant leadership underscores attentiveness to followers' concerns, empathy of followers, care for followers and nurturing of followers (Northouse, 2015). The stated best test of servant leadership includes realizing that beneficiaries grow, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more able to become servant leaders, themselves, because of the service that they have received from the leader (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002).

Contingent Reward Leadership

Contingent reward leadership applies recognition and rewards for goals as motivating factors for organizational members (Riggio & Bass, 2006). Effective leaders, who use the contingent reward style, encourage the hearts of the people that they lead by providing those followers with justified rewards (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Contingent reward leadership occurs when "someone possesses a resource that another person wants and is willing to exchange that resource in return for certain behavior" (Konopaske, Ivancevich, & Matteson, 2013, p.338). Behavioral conditions that attract contingent rewards include compliance with orders, responding to requests, and following directions (Brown &

Moshavi, 2002). Contingent rewards may come to followers in various forms, such as public recognition, pay, leave, job assignments, pay raises, developmental opportunities, and meeting felt needs (Bass, 1997; Day & Antonakis, 2011; Yukl, 2013).

Contingent reward leadership also reflects some aspect of political leadership. This political leadership involves exchange tactics, designed to gain follower support by pledging something as a reward or benefit, in return for their future compliance or reminding them of continued support for prior favors (Konopaske, Ivancevich & Matteson, 2013).

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

Researchers focused on the dyadic relationships between leaders and followers as the basis of the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory. They did so, because focusing on leaders alone would not provide enough information for them to understand the relational factors in organizations and the impacts of those factors on organizational outcomes (Oz, Derekoylu, Buyukbay & Yildiz, 2013). LMX serves as a relationship-based approach to organizational leadership (Yukl, 2013). LMX displays three dimensions: respect, trust, and obligation. Research has shown that these three constructs trigger the development and maintenance of mature leadership relationships between leaders and followers (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). LMX theorists have further suggested that mutual respect and responsible care on the parts of both leaders and followers influence and guide the interactions and qualities of the associated dyadic relationships (Oz et al., 2013).

Within organizational work units, followers become part of "in-groups" or "out-groups" based on how well they and

their leaders work with each other (Northouse, 2016). Determinants for working together include the quality of the exchange relationship, typically based on followers' competence levels and their display of values and attitudes similar to those of their associated leaders (Yukl, 2013). By design, LMX addresses dyadic relationships associated with work, as opposed to those typically associated with friendship or other personal relationships (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Autocratic Leadership

Autocratic leaders often make decisions alone, with little or no input from the rest of their teams (Belias & Koustelios, 2014). Sometimes, autocratic leaders act to secure inputs from other leaders or their followers, but then they make the decisions alone (Konopaske, Ivancevich & Matteson, 2013). Similarly, autocratic leaders usually discourage the participation of followers in organizational decision-making processes (Day & Antonakis, 2011). An environment of fear and culture of tyranny may prevail in the organization where an "...autocratic executive team" drives things their way (Konopaske, Ivancevich, & Matteson, 2013, p.239).

Autocratic leadership has proven useful in circumstances where urgency existed in decision-making efforts (Bhatti, Maitlo, Shaikh, Hashmi, & Shaikh, 2012). It has also proven beneficial in times of confusion and chaos, wherein people have generally lost control. In those times, researchers have shown that people "...look for decisive leaders" and find comfort in the leaders' decisiveness (Day & Antonakis, 2011, p.514). Similarly, in extreme conflict situations that include followers' perceptions of imminent threat or danger, followers appreciate autocratic leaders who can provide authoritative direction (Konopaske, Ivancevich &

Matteson, 2013). Hofstede (1991) also suggested that autocratic leadership works well (normatively) in Sub-Saharan African culture, as people in high power distance cultural dimensions prefer that style. Legitimacy represents the source of power for autocratic leaders (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939). Therefore, autocratic leadership relies heavily on formalized structure and position in given organizations (Howell & Costley, 2001). Notwithstanding Hofstede's position, though, other researchers have suggested that regardless of power distance, the autocratic leadership style often represents controlling, bossy, and dictatorial behaviors, across all cultures (Belias & Koustelios, 2014).

University-Industry Relationships

University-industry relationships have proven measurable, by standards of quantity and quality of interactions (Steinmo, 2015). Both quantity and quality of those relationships can prove weak. Specifically, Steinmo also noted that differences in goals and approaches have often differed between universities and organizations in industry. Furthermore, Williams, Moser, Youngblood & Singer (2015) made the prediction that "without systemic and relevant changes to traditional methods instruction and workplace readiness, higher education may lose its viability as an educational partner to industry" (p. 50). Similarly, regarding Sub-Saharan Africa, Thamae, Thamae, & Thamae (2016) implied that fundamental differences exist between what universities provide and what potential industry partners can absorb. Additionally, in a study in Spain, D'Este, Llopis, Rentocchini, and Yegros (2016) also found that providing particular academic solutions, without having pre-existing relationships with industry partners, resulted in little positive

impact regarding the associated projects.

That said, both quantity and quality of university-industry relationships can improve, through goal alignment and relationship building. Steinmo (2015) suggested that "... common goals and understandings regarding the collaboration and the creation of personal relationships between the employees of firms and universities... " (p. 597) can help to overcome associated challenges. Similarly, D'Este, et al. (2016) also found that "... interdisciplinary research has a strong positive impact on the two entrepreneurial-related modes: firm creation and technology transfer" (p. 1). Thamae, Thamae, and Thamae (2016) further suggested that universities must take the initiative to implement strategic projects that will develop the interests of people in industry, in order to begin to build university-industry relationships.

Hypotheses

In this section, we present eight hypotheses, based on the theoretical support, as follows:

- H1a. Students' perceptions of their likely workforce leader's servant leadership differ from professionals' (including pastors') perceptions of their actual workforce leader's servant leadership.
- H1b. Students' perceptions of their likely workforce leader's contingent reward leadership differ from professionals' (including pastors') perceptions of their actual workforce leader's contingent reward leadership.

- H1c. Students' perceptions of their likely workforce leader's leader member exchange leadership differ from professionals' (including pastors') perceptions of their actual workforce leader's leader member exchange leadership.
- H1d. Students' perceptions of their likely workforce leader's autocratic leadership differ from professionals' (including pastors') perceptions of their workforce leader's actual autocratic leadership.
- H2a. Students consider the quantity of professionals' university interactions of a different value than professionals and pastors do.
- H2b. Students consider the quality of professionals' university interactions of a different value than professionals and pastors do.
- H2c. Students consider the quantity of professionals' involvement in teaching and educational development of university students of a different value than professionals and pastors do.
- H2d. Students consider the quality of professionals' involvement in teaching and educational development of university students of a different value than professionals and pastors do.

METHODS

In this section, we present the quantitative research methods that we used in data collection and analyses. Specifically, in this section, we describe the research design, target population, sampling procedures, instrumentation used, and the procedures of data analyses.

Research Design

In this research project, we conducted a cross-sectional, non-experimental study, wherein we intentionally sampled a particular population using the questionnaire method (Creswell, 2008). In research that employs the cross-sectional method, researchers sample members of a greater population and study them "... at only one point in time" (Cozby & Bates, 2014, p.234). As with typical forms of research, we used a research problem to dictate the choice of the design (Creswell, 2008). In this case, we selected the survey design, as it appeared to best apply in answering the research question.

Population and Sample

For our sample, we chose to survey members of Campus Crusade for Christ. Members of this organization, in Southern and Eastern Africa, serve as faith-based representatives of this Christian organization. The organization exists to fulfill the Great Commission, as mandated by Jesus Christ in Matthew 28:16-20 (SEA, 2010). The Campus Crusade for Christ works in 24 countries of the southern and eastern Africa. Its members include students of Christian, private, and state-run institutions of education,

marketplace leaders (professionals) and church representatives (SEA, 2010). The 2015 ministry report showed that the organization had a population of over 10,000 engaged disciples, representing multiple, industry-related vocational categories, with whom the organization works to accomplish organizational goals. We used a stratified probability sampling technique to give equal chances to students, professionals, and pastors to participate in this research. This technique facilitates improved accuracy of results over convenience sampling (Cozby & Bates, 2014). To achieve a representative cross-section of responses, we invited 750 potential respondents from ten countries to participate.

Instrumentation

For this study, we used a 5-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1= strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree, to record all responses of participants. The instruments for servant leadership, contingent reward leadership, leader member exchange leadership, autocratic leadership, included:

Servant Leadership: measured using the 10-item New Parsimonious Measure of Servant Leadership Behaviors (Winston & Fields, 2015) to assess servant leadership perceptions of followers. Fields and Winston (2010) previously reported an internal reliability Cronbach coefficient alpha, for the scale, of 0.96.

Contingent reward leadership: measured using the 20-item Contingency Questionnaire (Reitz, 1971) to assess contingent reward leadership perceptions of followers.

Leader Member Exchange (LMX): measured using the 7-item LMX7 Questionnaire (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) to assess LMX leadership perceptions of followers.

Autocratic leadership: measured using the 18-item Leadership Styles Questionnaire (Sagepub.com). The leadership style chosen for this study is authoritarian leadership. The items for authoritarian leadership include items 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 (Sagepub.com).

Interaction quantity and quality: measured by four items that asked students to rate professionals (including pastors) and professionals to rate themselves, regarding the quantity and quality of interactions with their universities and their involvement in teaching and educational development of university students.

Data Collection Procedures

We sent questionnaires, via email and in English, to 750 students, professionals, and pastors who work with Campus Crusade for Christ in ten countries of Africa. These countries include Malawi, Mauritius, Lesotho, Swaziland, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Ethiopia, Rwanda, and Kenya. Research teams of three people per country assisted in printing, disseminating, proctoring, collecting, and returning hard copy versions of the questionnaires.

Analysis Plan

We recorded the raw data directly into *SPSS* (v. 24) and performed all analyses therewith. We first ran *Cronbach's alpha* tests to determine the internal reliability of the listed variables. We next conducted a *Pearson's Product Moment Correlation* between the leadership variables, in order to

determine if any relationships exist between the followers' perceptions of those variables. We then conducted independent variables *t*-tests to compare perceptions of leadership styles and university-industry interactions and involvement among students, professionals and pastors. Finally, we conducted a multiple ANOVA, in order to understand the variances of interactions and involvement among the stakeholders (Girden & Kabacoff, 2011; Green & Salkind, 2013; Pallant, 2016; Williams & Monge, 2001).

RESULTS

This section displays the results of the study, including descriptive statistics, correlations, and *t*-tests.

Descriptive Statistics

A total of 619 respondents participated in the study and 617 responses met the criteria for inclusion in the study. The demographics of these 617 included: 316 students, 143 pastors, and 158 other professionals; 281 women and 336 men; and numbers of participants, by country, included: (a) Botswana – 23, (b) Ethiopia – 84, (c) Kenya – 60, (d) Lesotho – 97, (e) Malawi – 34, (f) Mauritius – 24, (g) Rwanda – 41, (h) Swaziland – 89, (i) Zambia – 82; and (j) Zimbabwe – 83. The majority of respondents reported having 1 to 5 years of tenure, while 143 respondents reported having 6 or more years of tenure.

Comparative Analyses

Table 1 shows the Cronbach alphas, means, and standard deviations for each of the several leadership constructs.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistic for Leadership Factors.

Leadership Style	Cronbach α	Mean	SD
Servant Leadership	0.82	3.72	0.66
LMX Leadership	0.70	3.35	0.73
Contingent Reward Leadership	0.76	3.49	0.46
Autocratic Leadership	0.58	3.35	0.64

The results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlations, shown in Table 2, indicate that significant, positive relationships exist between the various leadership constructs, with one exception.

Table 2. Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Leadership Factors.

	SL	CRL	LMXL
CRL	.51**		
LMXL	.53**	.53**	
AL	.03	.33**	.15**

Note: ** represents $p < .001$, two-tailed, N = 617.

The next step in the study included conducting independent samples *t*-tests, to determine if significant differences exist between perceptions regarding the potential applications of leadership, by students, and the actual applications of leadership, by professionals. Regarding the comparison of results of projected leader ratings by students

and actual leader ratings by professionals, including pastors, the two-tailed results indicated: $t(613) = 4.05, p = .00 < .05$ for servant leadership; $t(615) = 1.15, p = .25 > .05$ for LMX leadership; $t(605) = -0.10, p = .92 > .05$ for contingent reward leadership; and $t(615) = -4.05, p = .00 < .05$ for autocratic leadership. Thus, the results indicate support for the acceptance of hypotheses H1a and H1d. Significant differences do exist between perceptions of potential applications of servant leadership and autocratic leadership, by students, and the perceptions of actual applications of those styles of leadership, by professionals. Additionally, the negative t -value associated with autocratic leadership, represents the existence of a significantly higher perception of the potential use of autocratic leadership, as perceived by university students, than the actual use of autocratic leadership, as perceived by professionals. In fact, professionals rated autocratic leadership the lowest among all of the styles investigated, as noted in Table 3. Furthermore, the results indicate no support for the acceptance of hypotheses H1b and H1c. Therefore, we reject them and accept the null.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistic for Leadership Factors, by Group.

Leadership Style		Mean	SD
Servant Leadership	Students	3.61	0.65
	Professionals	3.83	0.65
LMX Leadership	Students	3.31	0.63
	Professionals	3.38	0.82
Contingent Reward Leadership	Students	3.49	0.45
	Professionals	3.49	0.48
Autocratic Leadership	Students	3.45	0.59
	Professionals	3.24	0.68

We also conducted independent samples *t*-tests to determine if significant differences exist between perceptions of students and professionals, regarding the quantity and quality of general interactions of professionals with universities and the quantity and quality of teaching and educational development of university students by professionals. Regarding the comparison of results of general interactions of professionals, by students and professionals, including pastors, the two-tailed results indicated: $t(615) = 3.27, p = .00 < .05$ for quantity $t(615) = 2.82, p = .01 < .05$ for quality. Thus, the results indicate support for the acceptance of hypotheses H2a and H2b. Significant differences do exist between perceptions the quantity and quality of professionals' general interactions in universities. In both quantity and quality, professionals rated themselves higher than the university students rated them, as noted in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistic for Professional-University Interactions, by Group.

Interaction Type		Mean	SD
Quantity of General Interactions	Students	3.22	0.85
	Professionals	3.46	0.93
Quality of General Interactions	Students	3.08	0.84
	Professionals	3.28	0.90
Quantity of Development Efforts	Students	3.06	0.94
	Professionals	3.01	1.11
Quality of Development Efforts	Students	3.06	0.78
	Professionals	3.05	1.01

Regarding the comparison of results of professionals teaching and providing educational development of university students, by students and professionals, including pastors, the two-tailed results indicated: $t(615) = -0.69, p = .49 > .05$ for quantity and $t(615) = -0.15, p = .89 > .05$ for quality. These

results indicate no support for the acceptance of hypotheses H2c and H2d. Therefore, we reject them and accept the null.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study included investigating students and professionals' perceptions of leadership styles in Africa and how university-industry relations in Africa might contribute to those perceptions. This section provides insights into the findings and global implications regarding the relationships between the various associated factors, limitations of the study, and proposed opportunities for future research.

Findings

In this study, the foci included: (a) determining perceptions of four leadership styles (Servant Leadership, LMX Leadership, Contingent Reward Leadership, and Autocratic Leadership), by students and professionals, including pastors and (b) determining the perceptions of quantity and quality of interactions of professionals with universities and in the educational development of university students. Through tests of internal reliability and correlation, and through *t*-tests, our analyses supported the acceptance of four of the hypotheses: *H1a, H1d, H2a, and H2b; and the rejection of the other four hypotheses: H1b, H1c, H2c, and H2d. These results serve to indicate several things.*

In this study, students ranked the four leadership styles investigated, from highest to lowest, in this order: servant leadership, contingent reward leadership, autocratic leadership, and LMX leadership. Professionals ranked the four leadership styles in this order: servant leadership, contingent reward leadership, LMX leadership, and autocratic leadership. From this, we first conclude that notwithstanding the outcomes of previous research (Hofstede, 1991; House,

Hanges, Javidian, Dorfman & Gupta 2004), either power distance has decreased in Africa, between leaders and followers, or it no longer necessarily presents as the previously observed predictor of autocratic leadership, in African contexts. Power distance reflects the "... degree to which members of a collective expect power to be distributed equally" (Gemechu, 2015, p. 8). The greater the amount of power distance, the greater the amount of gap between the perceived or felt power between leaders and followers. Gemechu (2015) further suggested that in high power distance cultures, people generally expect followers to adhere to the instructions of their leaders, in most cases, without question. Both students and professionals in this current study cited servant leadership as the style of greater predicted use and actual use, respectively, and by significant margins. In fact, *post hoc t*-tests of the data revealed differences between servant leadership and autocratic leadership of: $t(315) = 3.50$, $p = .00 < .05$ for students and $t(300) = 11.20$, $p = .00 < .05$ for professionals. This clearly indicates that, by some measures, leaders in African organizations have adopted the use of servant leadership, in praxis, and students have come to expect that their future leaders will gravitate toward the use of that style, as well.

Next, the results of this study suggest that perceptions differ between the levels of servant leadership and autocratic leadership that students anticipate that their leaders will use and the levels of those styles that professionals actually experience in businesses and other organizations. On average, students anticipate experiencing more autocratic leadership and less servant leadership, in the workforce, than what professionals perceive that they actually experience. These differences suggest that, at least to some degree, the leadership preparations provided by university programs do not correlate with real-world dynamics, in African contexts. This also parallels with the findings of Kolk and Rivera-Santos (in press) that: "... scholars need to better understand the opportunities of Africa as a context for Africa-bound, Africa-

specific, and universal research not only in areas related to business and society issues but also for the broader management literature" (p. 14).

Finally, the results of this study suggest that students and professionals generally agree on the nominal quantity and quality of professional engagement in teaching and development efforts of university students. However, they do not agree in their perceptions regarding the quantity and quality of general interactions that professionals have with universities. In both quantity and quality, professionals consider that they generally interact with universities significantly more than students perceive that they do. Of course, students do not necessarily have access to or knowledge of all of the interactions in which professionals and universities engage. However, if perceptions serve as peoples' realities, university graduates will likely enter the workforce with relatively lower expectations of maintaining university-industry relations than the level that currently exists. Researchers from several countries have argued the need for more and higher quality interactions between industry and universities, in order to meet global demands, into the remainder of the 21st century (Culkin & Mallick, 2011; Williams et al., 2015). Undoubtedly, some responsibility lies with university leadership educators and administrators, to perform needs assessments and to tailor their programs to industry needs. However, we posit that professionals in industry and other organizations also have vested interests in ensuring that graduating university students, at all levels, receive the knowledge and develop the skills that they will need, upon entering the workforce. To that end Velasco (2016) concluded that: "business schools must work hand in hand with local... industries to equip students with more recent industry trends and practical, realistic approaches to business ventures" (p. 81). Arguably, both members of universities and professionals in industry and other organizations should take opportunities to initiate visible working relationships, in order to accomplish the ends that both groups seek.

Limitations of the Study

Several potential limitations exist within this study. First, the test of the autocratic leadership variable, for internal reliability, scored well below the standard rule of thumb (Girden & Kabacoff, 2011; Williams & Monge, 2001) Cronbach's alpha of .70. This proved consistent among the results for both students and professionals. Neither would removing any items have significantly raised this Cronbach's alpha score. This causes us to conclude that differences likely exist between the generally accepted theory of autocratic leadership (arguably, the oldest theory tested in this study) and the perceptions of the actual applications of autocratic leadership, in African contexts. If these differences prove to exist, it further confirms that at least some standard Western leadership theories do not and likely cannot apply, as written, in African contexts. Next, the population considered, might not well represent all Africans. Some theorists and researchers have suggested that a relationship exists between Christianity and servant leadership (Dearth & West, 2014; Hale & Fields, 2007). If this relationship proves to exist, then, as the population sampled in this study mainly consisted of professing Christians, biases may have existed toward employment and participation in organizations predisposed to exercising servant leadership, over the use of other forms of leadership. Finally, we recognize that students, professionals, and pastors, although arguably serving as principals, do not represent all of the stakeholders involved in university-industry relationships.

Opportunities for Future Research

The results of this current study cause us to suggest the need for further research. One of the first questions to answer includes whether the results regarding the preferences shown for servant leadership, over the other styles, remains constant when considering African populations with representative ratios of various religious

beliefs (and non-beliefs) found throughout African society. Next, because we only studied the perceptions of students, professionals, and pastors in this present study, we recommend that researchers similarly investigate the perspectives of university administrators and faculty members, as well as any other relevant stakeholders (e.g., affiliated representatives from various governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations, etc.).

Conclusion

Even though Africa possesses rich natural resources and has made great strides in development since the colonial period, some people still note Africa for and as: "... struggle, poverty, under-development, socio-political instability, third world, dark continent, and HIV/AIDS..." (Bilong, 2008, p.16). Education can perform a significant role in helping to further improve economic and social developments (Adekanmbi, 2015). However, especially in the subject area of leadership, higher education in Africa lacks content relevancy. This lack of content relevancy impedes efficiency and effectiveness of educational outputs, regarding leadership, both in businesses and in other organizations (Barouni & Broecke, 2014). This suggests the need for better university-industry interactions and more quality involvement in higher education processes, by professionals, in Africa.

Specifically, in order to better align theory with reality, university faculty should modify their leadership curricula. Additionally, theorists, researchers, curriculum developers and faculty members should focus more on stressing the applicable, increased uses of servant leadership behaviors. They should also further investigate the actual dynamics associated with autocratic leadership and then determine the appropriate levels and constructs of that style to use, in African contexts.

REFERENCES

- Adadevoh, D. (2006). *Leading transformation in Africa*. Orlando, FL: International Leadership Foundation.
- Addai, J. W. (2009). *Reforming leadership across Africa*. Fontana, CA.
- Adekanmbi, G. (2015). Tackling inequalities through tertiary distance education in sub-Saharan Africa: A general overview. *International Journal of Continuing Education & Lifelong Learning*, 8(1), 1-23.
- Adeyemo, T. (2009). *Is Africa cursed? A vision for the radical transformation of an ailing continent*. Nairobi, Kenya: Word Alive.
- Amadi-Echendu, A. P., Phillips, M., Chodokufa, K., & Visser, T. (2016). Entrepreneurial Education in a Tertiary Context: A Perspective of the University of South Africa. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(4), 21-35.
- Barouni, M., & Broecke, S. (2014). The Returns to Education in Africa: Some New Estimates. *Journal of Development Studies*, 50(12), 1593-1613.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional/ transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52, 130– 139.
- Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). Leadership and job satisfaction – a review . *European Scientific Journal* , 10(8), 24-46.

- Bhatti, N., Maitlo, G. M., Shaikh, N., Hashmi, M. A., & Shaikh, F. M. (2012). The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style on job satisfaction . *International Business Research*, 5(2), 192-201, doi:10.5539/ibr.v5n2p192.
- Bilong, B. E. (2008). *The key to Africa's true independence*. Bophirima print & marketing.
- Brown, F. W., & Moshavi, D. (2002). Herding academic cats: Faculty reactions to transformational and contingent reward leadership by department chairs. *Montana State University. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 83 (3), 79-93.
- Chazan, N., Peter, L., Robert, M., Donald, R., & John, S.S., (1999). *Politics and society in contemporary Africa*. (3rd ed.). Colorado: Lynne Rienner.
- Cozby, P. C., & Bates, S. C. (2014). *Methods in behavioral research* (12th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Coyne, G. (2015). Language Education Policies and Inequality in Africa: Cross-National Empirical Evidence. *Comparative Education Review*, 59(4), 619-637.
- Culkin, N., & Mallick, S. (2011). Producing work-ready graduates. *International Journal of Market Research*, 53(3), 347-368. doi: 10.2501/ijmr-53-3-347-368.
- Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (2011). *The nature of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CL: SAGE.

- Dearth, J., & West, G. R. (2014). The use of servant leadership in the United Methodist Church. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion*, 10(5), 1-26. Retrieved from http://www.religjournal.com/articles/article_view.php?id=86.
- Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Gemechu, T. F. (2015). *Leading across cultures: Studying, comparing and contrasting the application of charismatic, team-oriented, and self-protective leadership within the power distance, humane orientation and gender egalitarianism cultures*. Unpublished manuscript. School of Business and Leadership, Regent University. Virginia Beach, VA.
- Girden, E. R., Kabacoff, R. I. (2011). *Evaluating research articles from start to finish* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Green, S., & Salkind, N. J. (2013). *Using SPSS for Windows and Mac analyzing and understanding data*. Pearson.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. & Spears, L. C. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership*, 3(4), 397-417. doi: 10.1177/1742715007082964

- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- House, J. R., Hanges, J. P., Javidian, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Howell, J. P., & Costley, D. L. (2001). *Understanding behaviors for effective leadership* (1st edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kiruhi, T. M. (2013). *Towards holistic leadership development in Africa: Insights from exemplary Kenyan public leaders* (Order No. 3578592). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ Regent University. (1499825397). Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.regent.edu/docview/1499825397?accountid=13479>
- Kolk, A., & Rivera-Santos, M. (in press). The state of research on Africa in business and management: Insights from a systematic review of key international journals. *Business and Society*. doi: 10.1177/0007650316629129.
- Mamiru, B. S. (2012). Emerging Leaders Initiative (Eli): A manual for developing transformational leaders in the Ethiopian context. *PhD Thesis, Bakke Graduate University*. Retrieved from <http://www.mediafire.com/file/4cj4hbo9mb9spjv/Shank-o-Dissertation.pdf>.
- Meredith, M. (2006). *The state of Africa: a history of fifty years of independence*. Simon & Schuster.

- Musekura, C., & Ntamushobora, F. (2004). *Mentoring: A remedy for the leadership crisis in Africa*. Nairobi, Kenya: ALARM.
- Nell, C. E., & Cant, M. C. (2014). Determining Student Perceptions regarding the Most Important Service Features and Overall Satisfaction with the Service Quality of a Higher Education Institution. *Management, 19*(2), 63-87.
- Nkomo, S. M. (2015). Challenges for Management and Business Education in a "Developmental" State: The Case of South Africa. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 14*(2), 242-258.
doi:10.5465/amle.2014.0323.
- Northouse, P. G. (2015). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Odhiambo, G. (2014). The Challenges and Future of Public Higher Education Leadership in Kenya. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 36*(2), 183-195.
- Oz, E., Derekoylu, T., Buyukbay, S., & Yildiz, D. (2013). What has job satisfaction got to do with employee commitment? A research study on LMX and work attitudes. *Journal of Global Strategic Management, 7*(1), 79-94, doi:10.20460/JGSM.2013715677.
- Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS Survival Manual*. Open University Press.
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Order No. 3082719). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ Regent University. (305234239). Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.regent.edu/docview/305234239?accountid=13479>.

- Reitz, H. J. (1971). Managerial attitudes and perceived contingencies between performance and organizational response. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 227. doi:10.5465/AMBPP.1971.4981020.
- Riggio, R. E., & Bass, B. M. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Taylor and Francis.
- SEA. (2010). SEA 2020: Strategic direction. *Campus Crusade for Christ Southern and Eastern Africa*. An internal document. Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Spears, L. C. (2002). Tracing the past, present, and future of servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21st century* (Loc. 116– 152). New York: Wiley.
- Tsegaye, K. K. (2015). The Place of Private Higher Education in Regional Institutions in Africa: The Case of the OAU/AU and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 8(7), 74-89.
- Tutu, D. (1999). *No future without forgiveness*. Rider an imprint of Ebury Press, Random House.
- Velasco, R. M. (2016). The making of an entrepreneur: Aligning institutional paradigm to the industry needs. *Journal of Business & Retail Management Research*, 10(3), 81-92.
- Wangari, M. (2009). *The challenge for Africa: A new vision*. London: William Heinemann.

- West, G. R., & Bocarnea, M. (2008). Servant leadership and organizational outcomes: Relationships in United States and Filipino higher educational settings. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Regent University.
- Williams, M., Moser, T., Youngblood II, J., & Singer, M. (2015). Competency-based learning: Proof of professionalism. *Academy of Business Journal*, 1, 50-61.
- Williams, F., & Monge, P. (2001). *Reasoning with statistics: How to read quantitative research* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Earl McPeck.
- Winston, B. E., & Fields, D. (2015). Seeking and measuring the essential behaviors of servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(4), 413-434. doi:10.1108/LODJ-10-2013-0135.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson.