



Open Access Journal Available Online

Transformational Political Leadership and Sustainable Development in Africa: A Comparative Analysis of Rwanda and Botswana

Aaron Ayeta Mulyanyuma

aaronmulyanyuma076@gmail.com

Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Makerere University

Received: 08/03/2025

Accepted: 07/05/2025

Abstract: This study addresses the role of various political leadership approaches to informing sustainable development in Africa using comparative case studies of Rwanda and Botswana. It uses critical comparative case studies of government types—Rwanda's technocratic centralism and Botswana's democratic consensus—to compare core development achievements such as economic growth, social well-being, and resilience of institutions. Rwanda under Paul Kagame has pursued a model of centralized, high-performing governance with high macroeconomic performance as expressed through mean GDP growth rates of 7–8% during the past decade (World Bank, 2023). This has been balanced with improvements in health, education, and gender equality. All have been at the expense of draconian constraints to political freedoms and freedom of the press (Freedom House, 2023). Meanwhile, Botswana's liberal democracy built around free elections and high anti-corruption levels has been followed by high life expectancy and literacy rates (UNDP, 2022), balanced by responsibly managing revenue from the extraction of minerals. Botswana still grapples with income inequality and economic dependence on the extractive sector (Molutsi, 2014). Utilizing qualitative comparative data and secondary data, we examine the role of various leadership patterns and governance modalities in impacting sustainable development pathways. We find that whilst leadership is fundamental, sustainable success is ultimately contingent on institutional maturity, vision-oriented policy-making, and adaptive governance. This study contributes to the existing literature in the area of African development by creating a nuanced understanding of the complex relationship between political leadership frameworks and sustainable development outcomes, with policy reform implications for the continent at large.

Introduction

Transformational political leadership is central to driving sustainable

development, particularly for African countries that have had various post-colonial and socio-economic failures.

Even though the continent has seen contrasted development trajectories, Rwanda and Botswana are viable examples of how states can change based on leadership. Despite the contrast in history, political governance, and development models, the countries have recorded commendable developments in health, education, and governance. This article examines the ways in which transformational political leadership has influenced sustainable development in these two contexts.

The Rwanda record under President Kagame exemplifies a state-led, technocratic model of development that was forged in the aftermath of the 1994 genocide. The state concentrated on national reconciliation, institutional building, and human capital investments. Important milestones are notable in gender parity in politics, whereby notable increases were registered with over 60% of parliamentary representatives being women (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2023), and in areas of healthcare through policies such as the Mutuelles de Santé community-based health insurance program, which aided individuals in increasing life expectancy from 48 years in the year 2000 to over 69 years in 2022 (World Health Organization, 2022). These outcomes exhibit a vision-driven leadership strategy emphasizing centralized planning, social justice, and management of performance.

Botswana is a democratic, market economy that has fostered relative political stability and resource prudent management following independence in 1966. Its leadership invested diamond revenues to finance education, health, and infrastructure while maintaining strong institutions as well as retaining a relatively low rate of corruption. Botswana reversed the devastating impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic on its

head with courageous policy responses and is today a beacon of good governance on the continent. It still, though, has to struggle with problems of unemployment among youth, income inequalities, and economic diversification beyond mining. This study seeks to analyze how transformational political leadership helped shape sustainable development in Rwanda and Botswana. Specifically, it seeks to: (i) examine the effect of leadership styles on human capital development, institutional governance, and social well-being; (ii) compare and contrast the performance of Rwanda's state-led and Botswana's democratic government systems; and (iii) explore how policy choice and institutional designs mediate the influence of leadership on sustainable development. The research is guided by the following inquiry: How has transformational political leadership impacted development outcomes in Rwanda and Botswana? What are the key similarities and differences in leadership and governance in the two countries? How do institutional frameworks and policy instruments enable or constrain leadership effectiveness in the quest for sustainable development?

The study utilizes comparative qualitative case study method grounded in theme content analysis and secondary data. The study seeks to advance the larger literature on leadership, governance, and development through analyzing two divergent yet effective African models. The study provides useful insights to African policymakers, academics, and global development stakeholders looking for replicable solutions towards sustainable and inclusive development.

Problem Statement

Despite decades of independence and massive inflows of foreign aid and

development cooperation, the majority of African nations remain mired in underdevelopment, inequality, and institutional fragility. Poor political leadership—frequently characterized by corruption, indigenism, short-termism, and a lack of visionary governance (van de Walle, 2001)—is one fundamental reason for this stagnation. 60% of African states perform below par in key areas of leadership accountability, transparency, and public service delivery, according to the Mo Ibrahim Index (2023). This leadership gap has slowed down achievement of both the African Union's Agenda 2063 and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. In contrast, despite very different political structures—Botswana as a stable multi-party democracy, and Rwanda as a dominant-party state with a centralized government—countries like Rwanda and Botswana have made notable strides in their development over the past three decades. Because of its strong institutions and effective diamond revenue management, Botswana has had one of Africa's lowest rates of corruption and highest per capita incomes since the 1980s, while Rwanda has experienced average GDP growth rates of over 7% annually since 2000 (World Bank, 2023). These outliers challenge conventional wisdom that democracy alone guarantees development or that authoritarian regimes automatically choke off growth. The paramount questions this study addresses are: what leadership qualities and governance styles have enabled Rwanda and Botswana to succeed where most others have failed? Neither political ideology alone nor economic endowment—Botswana's diamond wealth and Rwanda's post-genocide starting collapse point to different initial conditions—can explain this divergence. Both countries exhibit transformational

political leadership that binds state capacity to long-term national agendas. President Paul Kagame of Rwanda employs performance contracts (Imihigo) and centralized planning (Vision 2050), while Botswana's leadership has historically emphasized institutional integrity, elite consensus, and technocratic decision-making (Samatar, 1999). Critics decry, however, that Rwanda's model sacrifices political freedoms for developmental benefits, challenging authoritarian developmentalism (Matfess, 2015). Likewise, Botswana's economic success has more recently been strained by inequality and youth unemployment (UNDP, 2022). Thus, the problem is not simply the presence or absence of democracy, but how leadership—visionary, ethical, and effective—translates institutional arrangements into sustainable development outcomes. This study seeks to uncover the transferable elements of such models of leadership across the continent.

Comparative Methodology

This study is based on developmental state theory, transformational leadership theory, and the critiques of neopatrimonialism, to form the foundation for comparative analysis of Botswana and Rwanda. The literature review explains key concepts—such as transformational leadership as having the ability to inspire and to mobilize followers towards a common vision (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), and sustainable development as growth that is inclusive and meets current needs without compromising future generations (Brundtland Commission, 1987). It also critically intersects with African-focused scholarly work on institutional capacity, political settlements, and developmental governance (Mkandawire, 2001;

Leftwich, 2005; Chabal & Daloz, 1999). The theoretical orientation assumes a revamped developmental state perspective, with an emphasis on the intersection of institutional integrity, state capacity, and visionary leadership as determinants of developmental outcomes across various political settings. While the developmental state model has been credited with East Asian achievements, its applicability to Africa is debatable, since neopatrimonial practices have not vanished (van de Walle, 2001). Rwanda and Botswana, however, demonstrate that African versions of the developmental state, aided by visionary leadership and strong institutions, can achieve important developmental benefits. Methodologically, the study utilizes a comparative case study design based on the Most Similar Systems Design that allows for analysis of political and institutional comparison between Rwanda and Botswana, while holding constant the varying models of leadership and governance. A comparative analysis is facilitated through thematic comparison of relevant features such as leadership style, policy implementation, institutional structures, and success in health, education, and economic development. The case choice is warranted by the nations' substantial but contrasting development trajectories—Botswana via its liberal democratic institutions and open governance, and Rwanda via its technocratic, centralized leadership and extended national planning. In order to better ease the analysis, a comparative the most significant indicators, such as the Human Development Index, life expectancy, governance rankings, and economic growth rates, were used to provide empirical comparison of the outcomes of these two governance systems (Booth & Golooba-Mutebi, 2012; Reyntjens,

2011). This enables an in-depth view of how different governance systems create sustainable development outcomes.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Transformational leadership is a type of leadership that motivates and involves followers to produce outstanding performance outcomes as well as develop a shared vision, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985). In the African political arena, transformational leadership has to do with leaders leading their nations during crises or underdevelopment towards reform and reconstruction (Rotberg, 2004). It is also different from transactional leadership that focuses on short-term goals, compliance, and reward.

Sustainable development, in the words of the Brundtland Commission (1987), is "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." Sustainable development, in the case of Africa, is not merely environmental sustainability but also economic change, inclusive social services, and good governance (UNECA, 2016).

Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) originated Transformational Leadership Theory, emphasizing leaders transforming their followers by attempting to inspire their greater ideals and moral principles. Theorists in the African context argue that leaders such as Kagame in Rwanda and Khama in Botswana exhibit different but similar transformational leadership styles—Kagame's more centralized and military, while Khama's was institution-based and democratic (Hope, 2001; Rotberg, 2012).

Developmental State Theory explains how some states—typically in East

Asia—drives economic growth through a strong bureaucracy, planned guidance, and state-business collaboration (Johnson, 1982; Evans, 1995). In Africa, Botswana and Rwanda are among the few typically described as developmental states (Taylor, 2016; Booth & Golooba-Mutebi, 2012). However, others argue that Rwanda's example is actually a "developmental authoritarianism," raising political inclusivity and human rights issues (Golooba-Mutebi & Booth, 2013).

Institutional theory, which was created by Acemoglu and Robinson (2012), states that inclusive governance and economic institutions promote prosperity, while extractive institutions promote poverty. Botswana is frequently used as an example of inclusive institutions due to checks and balances on the executive, rule of law, and professional public service (Robinson, 2009). Rwanda's centralised system of government, though effective in policy implementation, is questionable regarding institutional inclusiveness and accountability.

Neopatrimonialism is employed to describe hybrid political regimes in which there is a mix of formal bureaucratic institutions and informal patron-client networks. The theory has been widely applied to describe the politics of much of Sub-Saharan Africa, in which political power is personalized and state property is being used for political loyalty (Bratton & van de Walle, 1997; Erdmann & Engel, 2007). While Botswana is seen as a neopatrimonial exception, political centralization and elite networks along the lines of loyalty in Rwanda invite questions on whether it too sports neopatrimonial characteristics under the garb of technocracy (Kelsall, 2011).

There has long been a controversy in African political economy concerning

whether or not to borrow Asian-type models of developmental state for Africa. Academics like Mkandawire (2001) urge a "reconfigured developmental state" that would be locally accepted, socially entrenched, and democratic. Others cautions that development states that happen to be authoritarian, like the one in Rwanda, can realize growth at the expense of political freedoms (Booth & Golooba-Mutebi, 2012). Similarly, while transformational leadership is commonly championed, writers like Cheeseman (2015) issue a warning against "Big Man" politics disguised as transformation and flag the erosion of institutional autonomy.

Secondly, the sustainable development theory in African countries cannot be divorced from questions of equity, environmental justice, and intergenerational accountability, which are often off the agenda in technocratic close-minded discourse. Rwanda's case, for instance, has been praised for attaining health and education results but condemned for having high levels of repression, restricted press freedom, and stifled civil society (Reyntjens, 2013). Botswana, on the other hand, boasts a stronger judiciary and civil society but is hampered by rising inequality and youth unemployment that taints its credentials as sustainable (Leith, 2005; Taylor, 2016).

Among the theories considered, Developmental State Theory offers the most robust framework for undertaking this comparative assessment. Rwanda and Botswana, in turn, pursued state-directed approaches to development based on strategic planning, elite consensus, and centrally directed policies. The theory allows for the consideration of how the ability of states, professionalism of bureaucrats, and the unity of the elite affect outcomes in

sustainable development. But to respond to the failings of the traditional East Asia-centred paradigm, this work adopts a nuanced developmental state model that learns lessons from institutional theory and is cognizant of neopatrimonialist critiques. Such an eclectic viewpoint recognizes that development in Africa does not merely lie in formal institutions or leadership, but also with the limiting elements of historical legacies, legitimacy dynamics, and informal political networks.

Thus, the study is guided by the following question: To what degree can developmental state features be achieved and sustained in African political systems with different democratic and authoritarian structures?

Results and Discussion

This comparative analysis of governance outcomes in Botswana and Rwanda offers several crucial insights into the ways in which different governance models have impacted their trajectories of development. The findings emphasize the role of political systems in economic growth, social development, institutional capacity, and leadership styles in both countries.

Botswana and Rwanda both have recorded impressive economic growth, but their trajectories are distinctly different. Rwanda's rapid economic growth, 7.5% average per annum between 2000 and 2019, is the result of a top-down, state-driven development model that prioritizes infrastructure development, foreign investment, and technological progress (Booth & Golooba-Mutebi, 2012). However, this model is attained at the expense of political freedom and suppressing opposition (Reyntjens, 2011). While so, Botswana's more democratic governance structure has resulted in continued, albeit

slower (4.5% average for the period 2000-2020), economic growth and was supported by the stable exploitation of diamond resources (Acemoglu, Johnson & Robinson, 2003). However, there are challenges to come for Botswana in terms of overreliance on its diamond industry and rising social inequality, supporting eventual long-term unreliability in its economy (Molutsi, 2014).

The Rwanda government model, described as "developmental authoritarianism," has permitted rapid development of institutions and in particular, placed an emphasis on merit-based civil service and economic planning over the long term (Booth & Golooba-Mutebi, 2012). Rwanda Development Board, for example, oversees foreign investment promotion and national development project management. However, this extreme centralization of power has proven problematic with regard to the lack of political competition and accountability that has minimized democratic checks on governmental actions (Reyntjens, 2011). In contrast, Botswana's "democratic developmentalism" model has consolidated democratic institutions, such as an independent judiciary and anti-corruption commission, resulting in political stability (Acemoglu et al., 2003). Yet, rising political complacency and social inequality imperil Botswana's institutional resilience, particularly in how it addresses the needs of marginalized communities (Molutsi, 2014).

Both countries have made dramatic improvements in social development, particularly in education and health. Rwanda has dramatically improved health outcomes, such as a 60% reduction in maternal mortality since the early 2000s and a 10-year increase in life expectancy (UNDP, 2022). In addition,

Rwanda has also made significant advances in education, with over 90% of primary school enrollment and rising literacy rates. Political suppression of freedom of expression and political participation is still a central issue, however, limiting broader social freedoms (Freedom House, 2023). Botswana has also achieved striking improvements in health and education, with high levels of literacy and one of the highest life expectancies on the African continent. Yet, inequalities of rising inequality, particularly in rural young people, threaten Botswana's social development sustainability (UNDP, 2022).

President Kagame leadership in Rwanda is highly directive and centralized with a focus on quick decision-making and policy implementation. The framework has worked well in sectors such as Information Communication Technology, healthcare, and education (Kagame, 2022). However, it is often criticized for limiting political freedoms and suppressing opposition (Reyntjens, 2011). This is a subjective opinion since no scholar comes out to explain how democracy in Africa has translated into meaningful development. The East Asian Economic Tigers adopted benevolent leadership style to transcend poverty and underdevelopment. President Kagame can be criticized but development models that have worked especially in economically struggling countries have adopted strict leadership styles with strong institutions to change their economic landscape. Leadership in Botswana, by contrast, is consultative, with political pluralism and public participation (Samatar, 1999). This has helped to achieve political legitimacy and stability but is argued to be slow in responding to high-priority national issues, particularly those related to

economic diversification and social inequality (Taylor, 2005).

Both countries' development paradigms have been criticized. The Rwanda authoritarian approach has brought high growth but has been criticized for stifling political freedoms, undermining democratic principles, and curtailing political competition (Reyntjens, 2011). However, it is important to note that democracy does not guarantee development and such a critique is subject to scholar debate. Botswana's democratic developmentalism is politically stable and inclusive but plagued by severe issues in economic diversification and rising inequality (World Bank, 2023). These dichotomous governance models accentuate the trade-offs between democratic participation and authoritarian effectiveness and raise issues about the long-term viability of development in the face of increasing economic and social challenges.

From this analysis, it is evident that governance systems have profound impacts on national developments. Rwanda's state-led, authoritarian model has encouraged high economic growth and institutional growth but at the expense of political freedom and democratic processes. On the other hand, Botswana's democratic model has provided political stability and people-oriented development but is facing problems of inequality and economy diversification. Both countries are showing challenges of balancing good governance with participatory democracy and thereby pointing to the need for additional research being undertaken on long-term sustainability of their respective development models.

Policy and Practical Implications

The development experiences of Rwanda and Botswana offer important lessons

about how transformational political leadership can drive sustainable development. Despite differing political systems—Rwanda's state-centered, centralized management and Botswana's democratic-founded consensus-building—the two countries have important lessons that can be applied to policy formulation, institutional reform, and grassroots empowerment in the African context.

Rwanda and Botswana have managed to embed long-term national visions—Rwanda's Vision 2050 and Botswana's Vision 2036—into the governing framework, guiding sectoral strategies as well as resource allocation. This helps to reinforce the requirement for regular and rational planning frameworks that transcend electoral cycles. This is in contrast to many African states whose development agendas are politicized or short-term, yet they have demonstrated that enduring, visionary leadership can encourage policy consistency and draw development partners (Booth & Golooba-Mutebi, 2012; World Bank, 2023).

Rwanda reforms in the public service, such as the establishment of performance contracts (Imihigo), have succeeded in building a professional and accountable bureaucracy. Similarly, Botswana traditionally has had a merit-based civil service shielded from partisan meddling. These experiences show the benefits of investing in human capital, promotion of ethical leadership, and safeguarding the public sector against clientelism (Reyntjens, 2011; Acemoglu, Johnson, & Robinson, 2003). African governments should prioritize civil service training, develop autonomous public service commissions, and offer incentives to performance to help improve governance performance.

While Rwanda centralised model has yielded breathtaking socio-economic

dividends, there are still tensions between limited political space and constricted civic space. On the other hand, Botswana flawed but democratic institutions teach a lesson in accommodating policy-making and tolerating opposition. African leaders should endeavor to balance state effectiveness with citizen participation to ensure that economic growth does not come at the cost of human rights and political freedoms (Freedom House, 2023; Cheeseman, 2015). Politics of inclusion creates legitimacy and timelessness.

Botswana over-reliance on diamond mining has made it vulnerable to external commodity shocks, despite prudent macroeconomic management. Rwanda, by contrast, has pursued conscious strategies for economic diversification through investments in Information Communication Technology, tourism, and light manufacturing. These examples show the need for African countries to shift away from extractive-based economies to knowledge-based and value-added sectors. Governments need to develop industrial policies, promote agro-processing, and invest in entrepreneur-friendly infrastructure (UNECA, 2020; World Bank, 2023).

Rwanda and Botswana have both been actively engaged in regional institutions like the African Union and the Southern African Development Community, employing these forums to harmonize national policies with continental blueprints such as Agenda 2063. Other African nations should utilize regional integration to exchange best practices, standardize standards, and enhance bargaining power in global forums. Cross-border knowledge exchanges and capacity building can be facilitated by international development actors to support these efforts (African Union, 2015; UNECA, 2020).

Decentralization, particularly in Rwanda, has enabled local governments to pursue development projects responsive to community needs. Decentralization to be effective, however, must move beyond administrative devolution to include fiscal and political empowerment. Local governments should control budgets, personnel, and development priorities. When local governments are empowered in the two countries, service delivery is improved and trust in citizens rises (Smoke, 2003; Chemouni, 2014).

The Botswana kgotla system—a public forum where citizens discuss policies—has promoted a culture of open discussion and public monitoring. Civic education programs can enable citizens to know their rights, hold the leadership accountable, and engage effectively in governance processes. Non-Governmental Organizations, civil society, and schools can contribute to the development of active citizenship and democratic values (Somolekae, 1998; Logan, 2015).

African governments, with an enormous youth base, must draw on the vigor and ingenuity of the young people. Rwanda's investments in Information Communication Technology, start-up incubators, and vocational training are the way to go. Governments must provide young entrepreneurs with access to finance, digital infrastructure, and mentorship. Moreover, youth involvement in decision-making forums, e.g., national youth councils or innovation centers, can promote inclusive development (UNDP, 2021).

Social accountability tools—such as participatory budgeting, citizen scorecards, and community monitoring—are more responsive and transparent. Umuganda (monthly community work) has been used by Rwanda not just to provide services but also as a system of

feedback between public officials and citizens. Social accountability mechanisms must be institutionalized and supported by legal mechanisms and capacity-building (Bjorkdahl & Hoglund, 2013; World Bank, 2019).

Botswana illustrates that traditional leadership is compatible with democratic institutions. Chiefs and customary institutions tend to enjoy legitimacy and facilitate conflict resolution, mobilization, and local by-law enforcement. If well-integrated, they can augment contemporary governance through promoting trust and cultural relevance. The governments of African countries need to institutionalize the position of traditional leaders in ways that secure their compliance with international human rights standards and domestic law (Logan, 2009; EISA, 2012).

Conclusion

In conclusion, this comparative analysis of Rwanda and Botswana shows that transformational political leadership—centralized and technocratic in Rwanda's case or democratic and consultative in Botswana's case—can drive sustainable development when it is grounded in visionary planning, strong institutions, and good governance. Both cases affirm the leadership supremacy of determining development trajectories while offering different paths to success. The research adds to the theoretical understanding of developmental states in Africa through a focus on how diverse political contexts can yield the same socio-economic outcomes with effective leadership. It also reiterates the importance of policy coherence, integrity in the public sector, and inclusive governance as drivers of transformation. Future research should examine how the models can be utilized in African fragile or conflict-affected states, whether such leadership is

sustainable in the long run, and explore the role of regional integration in multiplying national development efforts.

References

- Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J. A. (2003). An African success story: Botswana. In D. Rodrik (Ed.), *In search of prosperity: Analytic narratives on economic growth* (pp. 80–119). Princeton University Press.
- Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J. A. (2003). Institutions, governance, and economic development: Theory and evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank.
- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Publishing Group.
- African Union. (2015). *Agenda 2063: The Africa we want*.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology Press.
- Bjorkdahl, A., & Hoglund, K. (2013). *Peacebuilding and friction: Global and local encounters in post-conflict societies*. Routledge.
- Booth, D., & Golooba-Mutebi, F. (2012). Developmental patrimonialism? The case of Rwanda. *African Affairs*, 111(444), 379–403.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/ads026>
- Booth, D., & Golooba-Mutebi, F. (2012). Developmental states in Africa: The case of Rwanda. *Journal of International Development*, 24(6), 750–764.
- Booth, D., & Golooba-Mutebi, F. (2013). Bilateral cooperation and local ownership: Rwanda's story. OECD Development Centre Working Papers.
- Bratton, M., & van de Walle, N. (1997). *Democratic experiments in Africa: Regime transitions in comparative perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brundtland Commission. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.
- Burnet, J. E. (2011). Rwanda's women: The key to reconstruction. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 36(1), 16–21.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Chabal, P., & Daloz, J. P. (1999). *Africa works: Disorder as political instrument*. Indiana University Press.
- Cheeseman, N. (2015). *Democracy in Africa: Successes, failures, and the struggle for political reform*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chemouni, B. (2014). Explaining the design of the Rwandan decentralization: Elite vulnerability and the territorial repartition of power. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 8(2), 246–262.
- Clapham, C. (2018). The Ethiopian developmental state. *Third World Quarterly*, 39(6), 1151–1165.
- Electoral Institute for Sustainable Democracy in Africa. (2012). *The role of traditional leaders in local governance*.
- Erdmann, G., & Engel, U. (2007). Neopatrimonialism revisited: Beyond a catch-all concept. *GIGA Working Papers*, 16.
- Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformation*. Princeton University Press.
- Freedom House. (2023). *Freedom in the world 2023: Rwanda*.
<https://freedomhouse.org/country/rwanda/freedom-world/2023>
- Freedom House. (2023). *Freedom in the world 2023: Botswana*.
<https://freedomhouse.org/country/botswana/freedom-world/2023>
- Golooba-Mutebi, F., & Booth, D. (2012). Bilateral cooperation and local leadership

- in Rwanda: Lessons from CDAs. Overseas Development Institute.
- Golooba-Mutebi, F., & Booth, D. (2012). Rwanda's leadership and the role of political culture in development. *Africa Spectrum*, 47(2), 7–31.
- Hope, K. R. (2001). The new public management: Context and practice in Africa. *International Public Management Journal*, 4(2), 119–134.
- IMF. (2020). Rwanda: Staff report for the 2020 Article IV consultation. International Monetary Fund. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/CR/Issues/2020/01/27/Rwanda-Staff-Report-for-the-2020-Article-IV-Consultation-48958>
- Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2023). Women in national parliaments: Situation as of 1st January 2023. <https://data.ipu.org/women-ranking>
- Johnson, C. (1982). MITI and the Japanese miracle: The growth of industrial policy, 1925–1975. Stanford University Press.
- Kagamé, P. (2022). Rwanda's vision for the future: Transformation through technology and education. *The New York Times*.
- Kelsall, T. (2011). Rethinking the relation between neopatrimonialism and economic development in Africa. *IDS Bulletin*, 42(2), 76–87.
- Leith, J. C. (2005). Why Botswana prospered. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Logan, C. (2009). Selected chiefs, elected councillors and hybrid democrats: Popular perspectives on the co-existence of democracy and traditional authority. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 47(1), 101–128.
- Logan, C. (2015). Citizens and the state in Africa: New results from Afrobarometer Round 6. Afrobarometer Policy Paper No. 29.
- Matfess, H. (2015). Rwanda and Ethiopia: Developmental authoritarianism and the new politics of African strong men. *African Studies Review*, 58(2), 181–204.
- Mkandawire, T. (2001). Thinking about developmental states in Africa. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 25(3), 289–314.
- Mo Ibrahim Foundation. (2023). Ibrahim Index of African Governance. <https://mo.ibrahim.foundation>
- Molutsi, P. (2014). Botswana: From diamonds to democracy? *African Studies Quarterly*, 15(2), 23–38.
- Molutsi, P. (2014). Paradox of democratic consolidation in Botswana. *African Journal*, 9(2), 23–37.
- Reyntjens, F. (2011). Constructing the truth, dealing with dissent, domesticating the world: Governance in post-genocide Rwanda. *African Affairs*, 110(438), 1–34.
- Reyntjens, F. (2011). Rwanda: The political economy of state building. *African Affairs*, 110(439), 589–607.
- Reyntjens, F. (2013). Political governance in post-genocide Rwanda. Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, J. A. (2009). Botswana as a role model for country success. In N. van de Walle, N. Ball, & V. Ramachandran (Eds.), *Beyond structural adjustment: The institutional context of African development* (pp. 45–67). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rotberg, R. I. (2004). Strengthening African leadership. Council on Foreign Relations.
- Samatar, A. I. (1999). Botswana: A developmental state in Africa. *African Studies Review*, 42(2), 99–122.
- Smoke, P. (2003). Decentralisation in Africa: Goals, dimensions, myths and challenges. *Public Administration and Development*, 23(1), 7–16.
- Somolekae, G. (1998). Democracy, civil society and governance in Africa: The

case of Botswana. *African Development*, 23(3-4), 89-110.

Taylor, I. (2005). Botswana and the politics of development. *African Affairs*, 104(415), 179-202.

Taylor, I. (2016). Botswana and the developmental state illusion. In A. Oqubay (Ed.), *Made in Africa: Industrial policy in Ethiopia* (pp. 214-237). Oxford University Press.

Transparency International. (2023). *Corruption perceptions index 2023*. <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2023>

UNDP. (2021). *Africa human development report*. United Nations Development Programme.

UNDP. (2022). *Human development report 2022: Rethinking human development*. United Nations Development Programme.

UNDP. (2022). *Botswana human development report: Addressing youth unemployment and inequality*. United Nations Development Programme.

UNECA. (2016). *Africa sustainable development report 2016*. United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.

UNECA. (2020). *Economic report on Africa: Innovative finance for private sector development in Africa*. United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.

UNAIDS. (2023). *Country factsheets: Botswana*. <https://www.unaids.org>

WHO. (2022). *Global health observatory*. <https://www.who.int/data/gho>

WHO. (2022). *Life expectancy in Rwanda: Trends and statistics*. <https://www.who.int/countries/rwa/>

World Bank. (2019). *Enhancing social accountability in African governance*.

World Bank. (2023). *World development indicators*. <https://data.worldbank.org>

World Bank. (2023). *Ease of doing business and economic transparency rankings*.

World Bank. (2023). *Botswana country economic memorandum: Diversifying beyond diamonds*.

World Bank. (2023). *Botswana economic update*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/botswana>

World Bank. (2023). *Rwanda economic update*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/rwanda/publication/rwanda-economic-update>