Benevolent leadership and its implication for management education in South Africa

A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Public Administration: Peace Studies,
in the Faculty of Management Sciences

DHARMESH NATVARLAL BHAGWAN
Student No.21448886

Durban University of Technology

2021

_____

Supervisor

_____

_____

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

This is to certify that the work is entirely my own and not for any other person, unless explicitly acknowledged (including citation of published and unpublished sources). The work has not previously been submitted in any form to the University of Technology or to any other institution for assessment or for any other purpose.

Candidate's name: Mr Dharmesh Natvarlal Bhagwan

Candidate's signature: _____   Date: 24 June 2021

APPROVED FOR FINAL SUBMISSION

_____   _____

Signature of   Supervisor

Dr S. Kaye   Date of Signature 18/10/2021

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to Sri Sathya Sai Baba who exemplified benevolence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to the following people whose contribution enabled the completion of my study:

- Dr S. Kaye, my supervisor, for giving me immense support and understanding the importance of me completing my degree. I am grateful for your wisdom and your own benevolence.

- The participants who so readily shared their understanding of benevolence and for participating in the study.

- My colleagues and friends who assisted me in the recruitment of participants: Julian, Ronnie, Nischal and Moeti.

- My family for their unwavering support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

x

ABSTRACT

Benevolence is related to strong ethical behaviour, respect for all, trust, kindness, harmony, integrity, justice, interconnectedness with others, and care and concern for the community, corporate social responsibility, and the natural environment. Benevolent leadership has been defined as the process of creating a virtuous cycle of encouraging, initiating, and implementing positive change in organisations through: a) ethical decision making and moral actions, b) developing spiritual awareness and creating a sense of meaning, c) inspiring hope and fostering courage for positive action, and d) leaving a legacy and positive impact for the larger community (Karakas 2009: 1). This study was undertaken to investigate the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of benevolent leaders at business organisations in South Africa; to examine how benevolent leadership impacted organisational performance; to understand the extent to which university education prepared managers for benevolent leadership; and to make recommendations on what content related to benevolent management could be included in management education.

The study was guided by a quantitative research approach, with a cross-sectional survey research design. Purposive and snowball sampling was the strategy used to identify participants for the study. Three hundred and fourteen (314) participants were recruited from the Western Cape, Gauteng, and KwaZulu-Natal. A structured survey instrument adopted from Karakas (2009: 1) was used as the data collection instrument in the study. Data was analysed using SPSS version 2.0.

The study found a high level of benevolent leadership qualities and characteristics amongst the sample. A majority of the participants showed that they are highly ethical, demonstrate care and compassion for their subordinates, and are very open to creating change in their work environments with a belief that through change and innovation they can create positive results. Participants also showed high levels of concern for the community and support for charitable causes. Consequently, this influenced organisational performance in the areas of employee morale, productivity, and corporate social responsibility. The study also found a high level of support for the introduction of benevolent leadership in leadership education.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

"Leaders in world business are the first true planetary citizens. They have worldwide capability and responsibility; their domains transcend national boundaries. Their decisions affect not just economies, but societies; and not just direct concerns of business, but world problems of poverty, environment, and security" (Willis Harman (1998), author of Global Mind Change).

The global financial crisis has magnified the "systemic emergency wherein business malfeasance has been linked to ecological, social, geopolitical and civilizational crises" (de Bettignies 2013: 171). Many crises have besieged the planet in recent decades, requiring leaders and those involved in business education to reconsider their role towards society. The business environment has also become an extremely fluid environment, which stems from the turbulent social and political landscape, together with the increasingly global world of work, which has brought a need to promote an organisational environment that enables well-being and performance (Petchsawang and McLean 2017: 217).

There have been many corporate scandals and the financial and economic crisis globally has challenged leaders to re-think their leadership style. This is evident in the large number of embarrassing and damaging scandals in relation to companies such as Enron, Tyco International, WorldCom, Freddie Mac, American Insurance Group, Lehman Brothers, Bernie Madoff, Volkswagen, and General Motors (GM), which has forced the leadership field to rethink its approaches to interpersonal human aspects of leading instead of acquiring financial success regardless of long-term, inimical consequences. Scholars such as Budhram and Geldenhuys (2018: 24) and Fourie (2018: 726) have highlighted the tremendous ethical and moral issues that are pervasive in organisations, which have been brought on by the high levels of fraud in corporations (Harjoto 2017: 765). In addition, problems such as stress and burnout, low morale, and poor job satisfaction have also increased in organisations (Ashmos and Duchon 2000: 135; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz 2003: 87). In the immediate environment of these corporations, are issues related to global warming, terrorism, corporate

scandals, and the gap between the rich and poor (Karakas 2006: 4). These human and economic crises, and the aftermath thereof, indicate the dysfunction of contemporary models of leadership management practice. The globalised economies and modern technologies have given leaders immense power to develop or destroy humanity's future. A scrutiny of the way organisations function and their processes, reveals a need for transformation both within the organisations and of their leaders. Without wisdom and a compassionate approach, Kriger (2013: 256) stated that leaders will not be able to achieve their full potential as human beings within organisations and as individuals. He added that there is clearly a deep crisis in human affairs that is occurring virtually at all levels of scale, from the individual to the organisational and to the societal (Kriger 2013: 256).

Ineffective leadership has been seen as a source of declining industrial productivity and has been viewed as being destructive and harmful for both employees and organisations (Akca 2017: 285). It is crucial then to research leadership style, because this can help identify important leadership skills required by leaders globally, particularly as effective leadership is important to the success of most organisations (Aalateeg 2017: 35). This dismal atmosphere requires new and creative approaches and models to inform graduate training and the leadership and management education system. Organisations are currently being affected by the deepening global financial crisis, interdependent global economy, and low employee morale. In response to these challenges, organisations are developing innovative teams, social innovation projects, creativity in organising work, more meaningful experiences in the work environment, decentralised structures, flexible structures and procedures, and positive energy relationships amongst work teams (Karakas 2010: 93).

It is within this milieu that *benevolent leadership* has emerged. The word benevolence means goodwill and has been described as individual and holistic concern for the well-being of those at work, their families and society (Li, Rubenstein, Lin, Wang and Chen 2018: 369). It has shown great promise as a relevant and important leadership style in contemporary business organisations (Mercier and Deslandes 2020: 5; Karakas and Sarigollu 2012: 539). Benevolent leadership has been defined "as the process of creating a virtuous cycle of encouraging and initiating positive change in organizations through ethical decision making, creating a sense of depth and meaning, inspiring hope and fostering courage for positive action, and leaving a positive impact for the larger community" (Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil 2013: 803). It

2

has also been viewed as a leadership style that reflects individualised, holistic care for personal, family, and societal well-being (Chan 2017: 897).

A review of literature on benevolence indicates that it focuses on nine themes, namely: ethics, respect, trust, kindness, harmony, integrity, justice, interconnection with others and the natural environment, and corporate social responsibility (Xu, Zhao, Xi and Zhao 2018: 743; Wang, Guo, Ni, Shang and Tang 2019: 1; Viot and Benraiss-Noailles 2019: 888). Hence, in essence, benevolent leaders strive to undertake righteous activities and engage in kind or charitable acts as leaders.

These aforementioned themes are linked to peace and peacebuilding. Dwivedi (2019: 430), made the direct connection between peace and benevolence in his discussion on peace within the context of economic equilibrium. He wrote, "[I]n a world of scarcity, economics as a science of choice making is very close to the idea of peace as peace emanates from satisfaction- the core principle of economic equilibrium". He added that "in this world of chaos and anxieties, where the whole existence of a person is surmounted by turmoil in professional and personal lives" peace becomes important in order to ensure that organizations flourish. Traditional perspectives on peace link it to the absence of violence or harm caused to people through, for example, social injustice, discrimination, and or social or moral exclusion (Verbeek and Peters 2018: 2). These are all interrelated to peace. It was Yan and Zheng (2018: 14) who stated that no peace or prosperity of society can be achieved without benevolence. In terms of Africa, Makoni and Higgs (2016: 192) expressed that the philosophy of Ubuntu gives attention to peace-promoting values such as sympathy, compassion, benevolence, generosity, sharing, kindness, caring, interdependence, and collectivity.

Benevolent leadership has also been found to lead to several positive behaviours and the well-being of employees (Luu 2019: 282). Moreover, the organisational citizenship behaviour of employees benefits the entire organisation. Hence, corporations are encouraged to nurture benevolence amongst their employees, who can be groomed to become leaders in the future and bring positive change in the organisation (Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 284).

1.2 THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

There have been dramatic shifts in the business environment in the 21st century in South Africa (Siddiqi, Chick and Dibben 2017: 63; Makhooane 2011: 9; Bowmen, Edwards and Cattell 2012: 886; Kanyane, Houston and Sausi 2013: 128). Of significance, ethical and moral issues appear to be challenging organisations, as is evident in the escalating levels of fraud and corruption in corporations and the government locally (Budhram and Geldenhuys 2018: 24; Fourie 2018: 726). Mantzaris (2018: 272) described the types of corruption evident in South Africa as being the misuse of office for personal gain; deceit on the part of perpetrators to receive direct or indirect benefit by defrauding their organisation or entity; the acceptance or extortion of material benefits by officials, private groups, or individuals illegally; and corruption as a result of illegitimate collusion between members of the private or public sectors. He added that this manifested in forms of nepotism, abuse of power, extortion, embezzlement, and bribery. Horne, Venter and Lochner (2018: 129) commented particularly on the escalation in procurement fraud in the tender processes within organisations in South Africa. Others discussed the increasing turnover levels, declining levels of employee satisfaction, and increased stress and burnout as being most prevalent in many South African organisations (Makka 2019: 80; Makhooane 2011: 8; Fatoki 2013: 33). Mantzaris (2018: 276) added that employees are also engaging in theft, and presenting with insubordination, negligence, falsification of records, and misappropriation of property – all of which adds to the business woes in South Africa.

These issues make it important to research ways and prepare leaders and managers to practice benevolent leadership. It is within this context that the research problem can be understood. This study sought to investigate the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of benevolent leaders, and how benevolent leadership influences organisational performance. Although many African writers have urged for the implementation of leadership that focuses on harmonious relationships, tolerance, compassion, and communality (commonly referred to as Ubuntu), the financial difficulties experienced by many organisations indicate that leaders and organisations lack the Ubuntu humanitarian philosophy (Makka 2019: 81). This has resulted in the downward spiral which has led to the poor economic climate and widespread corruption and fraud. Leadership in South Africa is still based on top-down models. Such models are led from the centre, are linear in nature, and have predetermined goals, and their approaches are fundamentally flawed (Iszatt-White, Saunders, Botha, Ladzani, Rudansky-Kloppers and Strydom 2017: 243).

1.3 BENEVOLENT LEADERSHIP

Contemporary society is burdened with a great deal of high risks, and leadership and management that is self-oriented and focussed on shareholder profits, which carries with it many disadvantages. This is evident in both South Africa and abroad as discussed in the preceding sections. It is clear that poor leadership has birthed problems in human relationships, from an individual to the organisational and societal levels (Kriger 2013: 256). The near meltdown of the world economy is also indicative of the need to focus on profits, responsibility towards society, and care for the environment (Kriger 2013: 257). A positive triple bottom line then should reflect increased value in the organisation, especially human and societal capital, including its profitability and economic development (Fry 2003: 698).

International scholars such as Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003a: 1405) and Swanson and Frederick (2003: 151) have also criticised management education for failing to emphasise ethical leadership and other aspects of benevolent leadership. This has led to researchers developing new approaches that could be introduced in education that will prepare leaders to look beyond exploiting profits and rampant self-interest to issues of benevolence in management and social and environmental concern (Karakas 2009: 10). Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil (2013: 802) remarked that "at a moment when society demands that corporations and businesses become part of the solution rather than the problem, business school leaders and management educators are thinking hard about redefining the future of management education and developing a new generation of leaders capable of managing the complex challenges faced by business and society".

Benevolent leadership has begun showing promise in the literature as an alternative to developing managers who can lead more ethically and with a commitment to caring for the well-being of their employees and others. Karakas and Sarigollu (2011: 337) described *leaders* as those who create observable benefits, actions, or results for common good, which refers to shared benefits for all or most members in an organisation and the community. This definition is consistent with other definitions in the literature that suggest that benevolent leaders exemplify whole-hearted and genuine actions at work that benefit people around them (Luu 2019: 282; Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 283).

5

According to Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 539), benevolent leadership is linked to ethical sensitivity, integrity, ethical leadership, and positive engagement with authentic leadership. Moreover, benevolent leadership is linked to community responsibility, stewardship, and wisdom, which are characteristics of the servant leadership style. As such, Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 540) contend that benevolent leadership has the potential to bring positive change not only in organisations but can create common good for communities and society as a whole. Much of the international organisational literature and research has already begun to focus on four streams, namely business ethics, corporate social responsibility, positive organisational building, and workplace spirituality as an individual focus of their research (Ng, Yam and Aguinis 2019: 108; Virakul and Russ-Eft 2019: 201; Kokt and Palmer 2019: 2; Sony and Mekoth 2019: 29). However, there has been a call by Karakas (2012: 540) for an integrated approach to leadership that will bring together these four streams, so as to create positive change in organisations. Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 540) therefore suggested that benevolent leadership be adopted as an approach so that graduates may work with ethical and spiritual sensitivity, positive engagement, and community responsiveness. A study by Karakas (2009: 209) found that benevolent leadership was positively linked to organisational performance. In particular, it was found to influence profitability, managerial effectiveness in the organisation, employee morale and productivity, business ethics, and corporate social responsibility. It is against this backdrop that this study seeks to explore benevolent behaviour amongst managers in South Africa and its association with collective performance at the organisational level.

1.3.1 The Benevolent Leadership Model

The current study is linked to the benevolent leadership model (Karakas and Sarigollu 2012: 542). It is based on the integration of the following four paradigms:

- *Morality paradigm,* which is linked to business ethics and leadership values. This suggests that ethical behaviour and peaceful values lend to a more positive organisational climate.
- *Spirituality paradigm,* which is interlinked with spirituality at work. This indicates that the spiritual actions of leaders are based on peace and concern for the well-being of employees and the larger society.

6

- *Positivity paradigm,* which is linked to positive organisational change (how leaders promote positive organisational change). It is also linked to developing a more positive organisational climate, so as to create a sense of peace and well-being amongst employees.

- *Community paradigm,* which emphasises corporate social responsibility and community service. Peace, then, is not just an individual construct but a broader societal concept important for community well-being. Hence, leaders through peaceful initiatives are pivotal in enabling a more positive society.

This model is premised on the belief that benevolence is characterised by all four paradigms mentioned above, and not just one paradigm. Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 542) proposed that, when integrated holistically, these four interrelated areas, namely *ethics, corporate social responsibility, positive organisational building*, and *workplace spirituality* can be regarded as benevolent leadership, and that this model can provide leadership scholars and practitioners with knowledge to create common good in organisations.

1.4 RESEARCH PROBLEM

There has been a huge body of research done abroad related to business ethics and workplace spirituality (Pandey, Gupta and Arora 2009: 318; Milliman, Czaplewski and Ferguson 2003: 438). In South Africa, research has also focussed on business ethics (Kretzschmar and Bentley 2013: 2) and aspects of workplace spirituality (Makka 2019: 80; Labuschagne 2012: 7) as isolated approaches to leadership and management, but not as part of an integrated whole. There has been a slowly growing attention given to benevolent leadership abroad (Karakas and Sarigollu 2012: 541; Gumusluoglu, Karakitapoglu-Aygun and Scandura 2017: 480), which has documented the value of including the four aspects of benevolence in leadership (Ghosh 2015: 593; Shen, Chou, Wei and Zhang 2017: 1101; Tan, Zawawi and Aziz 2016: 343), as mentioned in the previous sub-section. This, however, is in the literature abroad. Moreover, benevolence that not only includes ethics but also care for both employees and others through genuine actions at work, has not been researched in its totality until the groundbreaking work of Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 537). In South Africa there has been minimal research on benevolent leadership, thus further highlighting the importance of the current study.

Given the problems described in the South African context, benevolent leadership therefore shows great promise as an important leadership style of relevance to contemporary business organisations (Mercier and Deslandes 2020: 126; Karakas and Sarigollu 2012: 539). Research has linked positive behaviours and the well-being of employees to benevolent leadership (Luu 2019: 282). Moreover, it has been linked to the organisational citizenship behaviour of employees, which in turn can benefit the entire organisation. Organisations have therefore been advised to develop benevolence amongst their workers who are potential leaders and can bring positive change in the organisation (Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 284). The current study sought to explore benevolence amongst leaders in South Africa and was therefore crucial in documenting its value within the business environment locally.

The interest in benevolent leadership grew from the spiralling business crisis which manifested in corporate layoffs, organisational mismanagement (Vickers 2010: 79) and scandals, and corruption internationally (Sadaghiani, Beikzad, Jafary and Maleki 2012: 392; Karakas 2012: 537). These crises have been exacerbated by the global financial crisis where credit has been overextended, large banks who have become bankrupt, and a downward turn in world stock indexes, which has also led to increased unemployment (Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil 2013: 801). Benevolent leadership was proposed as a way to eradicate much of these issues in management abroad and holds much promise to transforming the business landscape of South Africa.

Research on the positive effects of benevolent leadership has shown that it does not only improve team processes but also enhances organisational performance (Wang and Wang 2018: 688). Hence, a study related to the nature of benevolent leadership, its impact on organisational performance, and what aspects of benevolent leadership are important for consideration in leadership education, is important to address the issues impacting on the business environment of South Africa. The study will shed light on what aspects of benevolence are important and will highlight the areas that are crucial for management education to address, so that business and management students are better prepared to lead ethically and with benevolence.

Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil (2013: 802) said that "at a moment when society demands that corporations and businesses become part of the solution rather than the problem, business school leaders and management educators are thinking hard about redefining the future of

8

management education and developing a new generation of leaders capable of managing the complex challenges faced by business and society". With regard to business education, management models that support profitability, hierarchy and competitiveness still exist at South African universities and, while they may have served organisations in the past, they are insufficient in terms of the current social and economic climate. These models are no longer useful as research has found that a strong business culture, formalised and hierarchical relationships, and competition are characteristics of destructive business managers (Kulik and Alarcon 2016: 247). South Africa has many examples of embezzlement, corruption, and corporate fraud (Iszatt-White *et al.* 2017: 237), and a growing culture where crime or fraud pays (Swanepoel and Meiring 2018: 459). The current study can be deemed as seminal work, as the researcher is unaware of any prior research that has been conducted on benevolent leadership and its relevance to leadership education. Particularly research on benevolent leadership as defined by Karakas and Sarigollu (2013: 535) has not been undertaken locally previously.

1.5. AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study was to investigate the characteristics and behavioural attitudes of benevolent leaders and how it impacts organisational performance, with a view to recommending what aspects can be included in leadership education in South Africa.

1.6 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this study were to:

1) Investigate the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of benevolent leaders in South Africa.
2) Examine the impact of benevolent leadership on organisational performance.
3) Enquire whether university education prepares managers for benevolent leadership.
4) Provide recommendations on what content related to benevolent management can be included in management education.

9

1.7 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions formulated for this study were:

1) What are the characteristics, attitudes and behaviours of benevolent leaders in South Africa?
2) How does benevolent leadership influence organisational performance?
3) How does university education prepare managers for leadership?
4) What recommendations can be provided in relation to content on benevolent leadership in management education?

1.8 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Benevolent leadership has begun showing promise in the literature as an alternative to developing managers who can lead more ethically and with a commitment to caring for the well-being of their employees and others. Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 537) defined *benevolent leaders* as those who create observable benefits, actions, or results for common good, which refers to shared benefits for all or most members in an organisation and the community. This definition is consistent with other definitions in the literature which suggest that benevolent leaders exemplify whole-hearted and genuine actions at work that benefit people around them (Luu 2019: 282; Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 283). Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 538) noted the "disenchantment with leadership", which has become evident through corporate layoffs, economic recession, business leaders who abuse their power and act selfishly. Benevolent leadership, as defined earlier in this chapter, indicates that it holds promise to address these concerns by building an ethical business culture and fostering concern for employee well-being and that of society. Corporate character both in South Africa and globally has been questioned in relation to financial as well as with regard to human resource issues, business ethics, environmental policies, human rights, corporate contributions, community development, and workplace success (Marschke, Preziosi and Harrington 2009; Makka 2019: 80). Hutchins (2019: 40) has detailed the positive organisational effects that benevolent leadership has had on both employee and societal well-being. In particular, her study found that benevolent leadership enhances employee engagement, retention, and well-being. Benevolence has been associated with employee

perceptions that their leader is a warm, caring person who is aware of and concerned with the needs and well-being of others (Stedham and Skaar 2019: 1588).

In addition, benevolent leadership holds promise in terms of building a more ethical business climate. As indicated in the previous section, fraud and corruption is escalating in South Africa, which in turn will have a detrimental impact not only on the growth of organisations, but the economy and society as well. One such study has documented how corruption affects economic growth negatively, as countries with higher levels of corruption evidence lower GDP (gross domestic product) growth (Pinho 2018: 18). The sagas of Enron in 2000 and MCI in 2001 and Eskom and South African Airways (SAA) indicate a lack of character, arrogance, and immoral values in management that resulted in widespread organisational, financial, and emotional devastation to employees, customers, and stockholders, as well as penalties and imprisonment for their morally bankrupt leadership (Aburdene 2007: 27; Makka 2019: 80). When highly reputable organisations, including small businesses, engage in fraud and corruption, organisational repute is damaged (Kihl, Ndiaye and Fink 2018: 41). Corruption erodes public confidence and destroys the socio-economic elements needed for an ethical, fair, and transparent society. In addition, corruption diverts resources from the poor to the rich (Kim 2018: 52). Most importantly, however, is the fact that benevolent leadership emphasises altruistic non-business relationships between business organisations and diverse community stakeholders (Karakas and Sarigollu 2013: 283). It promotes corporate good citizenship and strategic philanthropy which is crucial to helping uplift poor and disadvantaged communities in South Africa. Given the aforementioned, it is salient to explore further what characteristics, values, and activities underpin benevolent leadership, and to strengthen this type of leadership both in management practice and education so as to address some of the multiple issues presented above. The researcher is unaware of any other prior study carried out in South Africa, which involves a survey with regards to benevolence leadership and its influence on organizational performance. This identifies a research gap in the field and justifies the relevance and importance of the current study.

1.9 DEFINITIONS OF CONCEPTS

1.9.1 Organisation

Organisation is a "as a collection of people, processes, and property that are combined for the completion of the organization's objectives and goal" (Winston 2013: 27).

1.9.2 Leadership

Leadership is a "process where leaders use their skills and knowledge to lead and bring a group of employees, in the desired direction that is relevant to their organizations' goals and objectives" (Domingo and Sa 2017, cited in Deshwal and Ashraf Ali 2020: 38). Similarly, leadership is a process of influencing followers such that they can intentionally achieve organisational objectives. Concomitantly, leadership style can affect organisational commitment, and work satisfaction can further positively affect organisational commitment and work performance (Sharma, Aryan, Singh and Kaur 2019: 3).

1.9.3 Management

The term **management** includes activities such as "strategy, planning, administration and control", whilst leadership has been associated with "concepts, processes and roles" which include notions such as "corporate vision, change-management, stakeholder-dialogue and social and ethical accountability in self-organizing and values-based organizations" (Pruzan 2011: 4).

1.10 BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE METHODOLOGY

This study was guided by a quantitative research approach. Survey research was used to explore benevolent leadership within the South African context. The survey questionnaire study was based largely on the work undertaken by Karakas (2009: 15), but also included aspects related to leadership education.

1.11 STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION

Chapter 1: Introduction
The introductory chapter introduces the topic under investigation and describes the background of the study, along with the research problem, aim and objectives, its value, and key operational definitions.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

A detailed literature review on leadership and benevolent leadership is presented here.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

The research design and methodology used in the study is described in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis

In Chapter 4 the data that was analysed is presented and an interpretation of the findings is made.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter contains a discussion of the conclusions reached and recommendations for further research.

1.12 CONCLUSION

Chapter 1 introduced the topic of the study as well as central concept of benevolent leadership. In addition to providing a background to the study, the value of the research was discussed together with the aim, objectives, and operational definitions. The forthcoming chapters were then outlined to provide the reader with a 'roadmap' of what is to come. This was followed by a brief conclusion to wrap up the chapter.

The literature review of the study is presented next.

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

A literature review constitutes a review of the existing scholarship or available body of knowledge that helps a researcher to consider how other researchers and writers have explored the research problem (Mouton 2001: 8). It can be described as a "comprehensive overview of prior research regarding a specific topic" (Denney and Tewksbury 2013: 218). In accordance with this literature pertaining to benevolent leadership, the various aspects related to it are reviewed. The review begins by contrasting the old business approach with the new contemporary business approach (section 2.2). This is followed by a review of literature on leadership (section 2.3), including definitions of leaders and leadership. An overview is then provided of the different leadership styles and leadership approaches. The literature on workplace spirituality (section 2.4) and benevolent leadership (section 2.5) is then consulted and discussed. Thereafter, attention is given to the impact of benevolent leadership (section 2.6), organisational citizenship behaviour (section 2.7), and organisational benevolence (section 2.8). The penultimate section looks at education, what to include in curricula to prepare future leaders, and also touches on benevolent leadership education (section 2.9). A brief conclusion brings the chapter to a close (section 2.10).

The sub-section that follows is an introduction to old and new business approaches.

2.2 OLD AND NEW BUSINESS APPROACHES

This section begins with a description of old business paradigms, followed by an explanation of the new business paradigms. For simplification, the data is presented in a table form (Table 1) further below.

2.2.1 The Old Business Approach

The theory and practice related to the world of work, management, and organisations evolved significantly in the 1970s with the advent of the quality movement and the move towards greater employee participation and involvement in the workplace (Neal 2013: 4). Researchers

14

and practitioners began to value the psychological, social, and intellectual capabilities of workers and to consider them as being the experts with regards to their jobs. The quality and participation movement led to employees being placed in teams, who were then asked to define and solve work-related problems and implement solutions to improve organisational outcomes in measurable ways (Neal 2013: 5).

The mechanistic view, or "the notion of organization as machine" (Ciancutti and Steding 2000: 105), was found to be irrelevant to 21st century organisations. Instead, there was support for a more holistic approach to managing organisations. The organisational structure of the machine metaphor of the past was hierarchical and consisted of individual compartments that functioned according to command and control. As Ciancutti and Steding (2000: 105) stated, organisations were perceived "as locks and people as cogs". People working in these organisations were expected to be highly mechanistic and leave their feelings, emotions, and sense of curiosity, and creativity out of the organisation.

The notion that qualities that were the most valuable to organisational well-being, were those that could not be "fabricated by a manipulation of behaviour through reward and punishment" (Thompson, J.W. 1992: 217), but instead through the development of the human spirit, began to gain attention. Harman (1992: 13) discussed these different values and the "change of mind" occurring in the business community. This transformation noted Harman (1992: 13), or change of mind, "is characterized by a repudiation of the competitive, exploitive materialism and consumerism of the modern society, with an increased emphasis on alternative values. These values include improved quality of relationships, cooperation, caring and nurturing, oneness of humanity . . . spiritual values".

This was in line with the growing recognition in the West that the conventional scientific view that prevailed over the past few centuries was changing. This became evident in the attention being directed at preserving the environment and to create a different international economic order, in a shift towards "greater collaboration between unlikely business partners, deeper interest in alternative lifestyles and holistic medicine; and in the need for meaningfulness and connection to spirituality" (Thompson 2000: 226). The new global economic order that was developed therefore rested on knowledge, intelligence, and innovation, and the awareness that an organisation's competitive advantage is found in its human capital. There was also the awareness that human qualities of commitment, responsibility, creativity, and energy were

15

required, so that organisations should develop relationships and the human spirit (Thompson 1992: 226). These differences in the old and new business paradigms are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: The old and new business paradigms

Business paradigm	Old Paradigm	New Paradigm
Business environment	Order, predictability, logical sequence of events	Uncertainty, chaotic
Organisational metaphor	Mechanistic, machine	Living beings
Mission/purpose	Profits for stockholders	Importance of human capital: customers, employees, stockholders, and wider society
Organisational structure and leadership	Hierarchical levels of control	Participatory approaches
Type of knowledge	Objective, formal and systematic	Tacit/subjective, intuitive
Assumptions about employees	Compartmentalised People to fit jobs Homogenous Rational	Holistic Jobs to suit people Diverse Consciousness
Major values	Materialistic/consumerism Competitive Individualism Exploitative Efficiency	Spirituality, human relationships Collaborative Community Sustainable, continuous learning, and improvement

(Source: Ashar and Lane-Maher 2004: 251)

2.2.2 The New Business Approach

As is evident in Table 1 above, the new global economic order has been premised on knowledge, intelligence, and innovative behaviour, as opposed to planning, control, and obedience. In the new economy, a competitive advantage was seen to lie within its human capital. More organisations began to recognise that the qualities of commitment, responsibility, creativity, and energy of employees determine its success (Thompson 1992: 13). In addition to developing and strengthening these qualities, the organisation needed to enhance relationships and foster a greater human spirit. To enable this required a move from the competitive, exploitative, materialistic and consumeristic approaches of current modern society, towards alternate values. These values include improved quality of relationships, cooperation, care and compassion, respect for diversity and spiritual values (Law 2016: 5). .

2.3 LEADERSHIP

2.3.1 Defining Leadership

There has been an abundance of literature on leadership in the past three decades (Lazarus, Ijanikin, Adesoji and Jinadu 2019: 53; Aalateeg 2017: 36; Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans and May 2004: 802). The term "leadership" is linked to powerful, dynamic individuals who can direct large corporations from towering buildings or direct the path of countries (Yukl 2002: 401). Interest in leadership stems from the fact that leadership has been seen as the most important factor related to successful organisations (Kaiser, Hogan and Craig 2008: 96). In the sub-sections that follow, definitions of leadership are presented, followed by a discussion on the difference between leadership and management.

Leadership is an integral component of work and business organisations. According to Abbasialiya (cited in Lazarus *et al.* 2019: 53), leadership has become one of the most talked about issues in businesses and organisations. Leadership has been described in relation to traits, behaviour, influence, interactions, and roles (Yukl 2002: 402). Whilst there is no consensual definition of leadership, some representative definitions have emerged in the literature. Bartol and Martin (1998: 415) defined leadership as a way to influence others to achieve organisational goals. Antonakis, Cianciolo and Sternberg (2004: 5) discussed this influence of others and the ensuing outcomes that occur between a leader and followers. They looked at how such influence occurs through a leader's disposition, behaviour patterns, values,

17

the perceptions of followers, as well as the context in which this process of influence occurs. On a similar note, Yukl (2002: 407) defined leadership as "the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives".

Yukl (2012: 66) stated that leadership is a process where there is intentional influence brought by one person over others to guide and direct activities and relationships in organisations. Lynham and Chermack (2006: 75) offered a more comprehensive definition, saying it was "an interactive, interdependent and focused performance system, wherein continuous interaction; influence; dialogue and discussions regarding organizational procedures, performance outcomes, inputs, processes, outputs and feedback takes place within a learning environment". Kouzes and Posner (2007: 64) described leadership as a dynamic relationship between leaders and their followers who are mobilised to accomplish extraordinary things. In order to do these, leaders engage in the following five practices, namely: modelling appropriate behaviours and values, inspire collective vision, challenge the process, and help and encourage others.

2.3.2 Managers and Leaders

Scholars have questioned whether leaders are different from managers. *Leadership* has been described as "purpose-driven, resulting in change based on values, ideals, vision, symbols, and emotional exchanges", whilst *management* is driven by objectives, "resulting in stability based on rationality; bureaucratic means, and the fulfilment of contractual obligations" (Antonakis, Cianciolo and Sternberg 2004: 53). Colvard (cited in Aalateeg 2017: 36) further distinguished between leaders and managers saying that whilst leaders motivate, encourage and work with people, managers establish systems. Leaders develop a vision, create direction, and share with followers, whilst managers are prone to creating rules and operating procedures. Moreover, leaders bring people with similar knowledge, abilities, and personality together, whilst managers are more task driven as opposed to people driven. He concluded, whilst managers provide leadership and leaders perform management functions, managers typically do not perform the unique functions of leaders. Whilst managers focus on planning, budgetary issues, and structuring organisations (Price 2009: 26), leadership extends itself to influencing employees to achieve the long-term goals of the organisation (Bartol, Martin and Kromkowski 2003: 11). Leaders have been described as having soul, passion, and creativity, and as being flexible, innovative, and inspiring, whilst managers consult, analyse, deliberate

and stabilise organisations (Liphadzi, Aigbavboa and Thwala 2017: 481). An organisation, however, requires both managers and leaders to accomplish the goals of the organisation successfully (Liphadzi, Aigbavboa and Thwala 2017: 480). In this study, managers are seen as requiring good leadership behaviours.

There are those who believe that the functions of leadership and management are complementary because sometimes leaders manage and sometimes managers lead (Toor 2011: 311). Both leadership and management can be explained using similar processes and models, as both leaders and managers use a mix of leadership and management behaviours. What has received attention, until recently, are the personal competencies and qualities, which are required by leaders of flexible, dynamic, and reflective organisations. Such competencies and qualities are essential to integrating these new perspectives on leadership and organisational and personal self-reference (Pruzan 2011: 9).

2.3.3 Leadership Styles

Most of the research that has been conducted on leadership includes leadership versus management, traits and skills, power issues, the situational conditions that determine leader behaviour, and how leaders influence organisational effectiveness (Ganguly and RoyBardhan 2020: 185-186). These research studies led to different leadership theories emerging as a response to find solutions to various organisational problems and to providing solutions to diverse organisational issues (Karakas 2009: 24).

Leadership is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon and has been well researched (Badshah 2012: 49). There have been a number of papers published on the topic and numerous theories developed. Trait, style, contingency, situational and behavioural theories first emerged to represent the groups within which leadership has been categorised (Northouse 2018: 23). The importance of "leadership goodness" has dominated the literature in the past decade in relation to both the corporate world and academia (Ghosh 2015: 592). The role of business leaders has received significant attention as scholars argue about the need to move beyond just profit making (Bass and Bass 2008: 24). More importantly, leadership scholars have had to revisit traditional leadership styles and values, and explore how new qualities can reshape organisational contexts. Effective leaders are those who encourage employees to be creative and innovative with regards to solving business challenges and strengthen both the team and

19

organisation (Erkutlu and Chafra 2016: 369). Luthans (2002: 696) added that factors like confidence, hope, and resiliency are crucial to developing positive organisational behaviour. Benevolent leadership has emerged alongside this thinking as an effective way to developing organisational legitimacy and sustainability.

2.3.4 Leadership Approaches

A review of literature indicates the following common approaches to leadership.

2.3.4.1 Trait approach

The *trait theory of leadership*, inspired by the "Great Man theory" put forth by Carlyle, was regarded as one of the first systematic efforts to study the concept of leadership in the early 20th century (Deshwal and Ali 2020: 39). This notion of leadership emerged in the Industrial Revolution and identified leaders as that one great individual (Hunt and Fedynich 2019: 22).

Toh and Ruot (2019: 2) mentioned that the protagonist of this theory believed in the existence of some character trait that promotes effective and successful leadership. Quoting Carlyle, they noted that some traits enable successful leadership qualities because they can raise certain behavioural patterns. Trait theory postulated that qualities such as perseverance, resilience, charisma, adaptability, and intelligence are important to leadership success (Harms and Credé 2010: 4). Kouzes and Posner (2002: 25) added that the four key leadership traits were honesty, future oriented, being inspirational, and competent. Conventional leadership approaches focused on discerning the abilities, traits, and characteristics that differentiate leaders from non-leaders. Although the trait approach emphasised these characteristics, personalities and values, researchers have concluded that there was no particular trait that would guarantee leadership success (Yukl 2002: 12). More recently, there is the view that traits can be developed and are not constrained to personality characteristics. Instead, they should include "motives, values, cognitive abilities, social and problem solving skills, and expertise" (Zaccaro 2007: 8). Hence, due to the unsatisfactory results of trait theory, the focus shifted towards behavioural theories of leadership which focus more on what leaders do than the qualities or traits they possess. The following sub-sections present some of the most popular approaches.

2.3.4.2 Top-down leadership

Traditionally, leadership was described as a top-down influence from leaders with power, who were formally appointed, high up in the organisational hierarchy. This *top-down leadership* was characterised by hierarchical, authoritarian leadership with a command-and-control approach on followers in organisations (Mareus, Firestone, Patterson and Winston 2019: 3; Wankhade and Patnaik 2020: 42). The top-down leadership model received strong support in the industrial era, where there were less demands on the cognitive, emotional, and spiritual qualities of leaders. This differs from the contemporary shared leadership, also referred to as *collective leadership*, where the leadership role is shared amongst team members and which has evolved to serve the needs of contemporary knowledge-based and complex economies (Fransen, Mertens, Cotterill, Vande Broek and Boen 2020: 7).

Top-down leadership has also been described as vertical leadership, as often crucial decisions are made unilaterally by one individual. Vertical leadership, then, is dependent on the wisdom of a single individual leader of an organisation, or from a formal leader of a team. For example, the CEO, as opposed to shared leadership which is a form of distributed leadership stemming from within a team (Ensley, Himieleski and Pearce 2006: 220). Whilst service leadership considers satisfying the needs of the leader and others, vertical leadership theory focuses on the behaviours and mind-sets of only the leaders. This theory has been criticised for ignoring group dynamics and its influences on the environment (Pitelis and Wagner 2018: 234). A longitudinal study which tracked the leadership structure of 27 newly formed teams (n=125), which initially had a vertical leadership structure, found that when team leadership was initiated it strengthened over the 24-week project and leadership began to be distributed amongst team members. They found that the more team members were seen as warm and competent, the higher the level of perceived influence. They concluded that a change from vertical to shared leadership enhanced team performance (Fransen, Delvaux, Mesquita and Van Puyenbroeck 2018: 140). Recently, however, modern theories of leadership have inverted the traditional approaches of vertical leadership to a more flattened form of dynamic leadership (Hunt and Fedynich 2019: 24).

2.3.4.3 Charismatic leadership

Charismatic leadership happens when followers ascribe extraordinary qualities to their leader (Conger 2015 :1). Sy, Horton and Riggio (2018: 58) postulated that emotion was the primary variable in the charismatic process. They identified the elicit-channel model of charismatic

leadership as a way whereby leaders elicit strong emotions from their followers and then direct those emotions to produce action, that if successful contributes positively to affect and trust.

Charismatic leaders are also those who inspire and direct the organisation (Vergauwe, Wille, Hofmans, Kaiser and De Fruyt 2017: 26) and are mostly oriented toward others, and less towards themselves. They have been known to transform organisations by inspiring members to be more committed and to perform through an appealing vision (Fragouli 2018: 298).

With regards to their leadership competencies, charismatic leaders have the ability to read humans, and engage their moral competencies and caring dispositions. In most instances they pull followers without force or authority and are loving, humble and compassionate towards their followers (Toh and Ruot 2019: 7). Charismatic leaders must have related expertise and competence before their followers can accord charisma to them. Morals and values are important as charismatic leaders are expected to have moral conviction and leaders should have care and respect for their followers (Fragouli 2018: 299).

Donald Trump had an overall charismatic appeal which was successful. Despite him being a highly charismatic leader, he, however, repeatedly showed disrespect for presidential culture related to credibility, consistency, and modesty. Joosse and Willey (2020: 20) wrote that his aim was to offend, shock and prescribe how presidents should act. Wagner-Pacifici and Tavory (2017: 308) described his charisma as being "thrown into the unknown", which "was a compelling, seductive, and energizing prospect" for followers.

Many of the great leaders like Churchill, Hitler, Obama, and Trump shared one common style of leadership, namely, charismatic leadership (Brown 2016: 109). DeCelles and Pfarrer (2004: 67) drew attention to the ability of charismatic leaders to create facades and influence followers to participate in, enable, or hide wrongdoing. They examined the implications of the darker side of charismatic leadership, that is a villain charismatic leader rather than the heroic qualities often described in leadership literature. Despite being a charismatic leader, Hitler eventually lost his heroism due to his chronic narcissistic rage (Dreijmanis 2005: 115). Without making reference to charisma, Hahl, Kim and Sivan (2018: 25) used Trump as an example to reflect how the flagrant disrespect for established norms can lead to authentic appeal. As Joosse and Willey (2020: 29) said, "[M]any of us took his arrogance, his ridiculous self-importance, his racism, his misogyny and his unpaid taxes to be self-defeating

22

characteristics, but all of those were frankly thrilling for many who voted for him". This is tied up with previous research which has shown that narcissism is associated with charismatic leadership (Ahmadian, Azarshahi and Paulhus 2017: 49).

2.3.4.4 Transformational and transactional leadership

Transformational leadership has emerged as an influential leadership theory which has highlighted how leaders may directly impact individual followers (Zwingmann, Wegge, Wolf, Rudolf, Schmidt and Richter 2014: 25; Yusuf and Kurniady 2020: 330). Consequently, much of the research has focused on the relationship between transformational leadership and leader effectiveness in terms of the attitudinal changes of followers; changes in organisational climate; individual, group and organisational performance; job satisfaction; and lower employee turnover (Wang, Oh, Courtright and Colbert 2011: 224-225; Judge and Piccolo 2004: 756).

It was Burns (1978: 20) who introduced transformational leadership, saying that it was a dynamic process where "leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation beyond self-interest to serve collective interests". He made the distinction between *transformational* and *transactional leadership*, saying that the latter was based mainly on the short-term goals of leaders and their own self-interest. Toh and Ruot (2019: 8) commented that transactional leadership aims to use reward and punishments to promote the compliance of subordinates. They add that it also uses the leadership function of supervision, organisation, and target performance to meet the daily progress needs of an institution.

Transformational leadership, however, has been described as a "style of leadership that transforms followers to rise above their self-interest by altering their morale, ideals, interests, and values, motivating them to perform better than initially expected" (Pieterse, van Knippenberg, Schippers and Stam 2009: 610). It has a positive effect on employee's service performance as it enhances commitment from them. By transforming the intellectual side of followers, leaders can stimulate creativity, innovation, and improve productivity (Toh and Ruot 2019: 8).

Transactional leadership is linked to short-term objectives as opposed to long-term objectives, especially when organisations go through big changes. Conversely, transformational leadership is linked to long-term outcomes and therefore motivates followers by convincing

23

them that organisational goals are more important. Hence, transformational leadership is based on motivating followers to exert more effort than is generally required. Through heightened capacity and commitment there is improvement in followers' performance as it leads to additional effort and greater productivity (Bass 1999: 10).

Transformational leadership theory also highlights the ability of leaders to effect positive follower outcomes by identifying and addressing their needs and transforming them by inspiring trust, instilling pride, communicating vision, and motivating them to perform at higher levels (Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn and Wu 2018: 503). Transformational leadership, then, is leadership which spans a broad continuum of efforts that influence followers individually as well as collectively throughout the entire organisation (Yusuf and Kurniady, 2020: 330). Transformational leaders possess strong integrity and character, and focus on communication, strong sense of purpose, behaviour that brings respect, inclusivity in terms of solving problems amongst employees, and motivation to focus on followers' development and growth (Northouse 2018: 52). Khatri, Ng and Lee (2001: 373) opine that transformational and charismatic leadership styles are seen as similar styles that create the notion that leaders are placing themselves before those of the needs of followers. This primary focus on the leaders as opposed to the followers has led to the notion that leaders are placing themselves above the needs of followers.

According to Deichmann and Stam (2015: 206), transformational and transactional approaches influence the creativity of employees and enables motivating them. A meta-analysis of more than 87 studies which examined the link between transformational and transactional leadership and its associated performance outcomes found that transformational leadership produces employees who perform best when they take ownership of their work (Judge and Piccolo 2004: 755). Leaders use positional power for followers to achieve organisational goals.

Suresh and Rajini (2013: 156) described Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr as examples of popular transformational leaders. They viewed the weaknesses of transformational leaders as having the potential to be abused as the leaders' purpose remains unchallenged. Transformational leadership has been categorised into five broad components, namely: 1). Idealised influence, which is linked to whether a leader is seen as ethical, confident, trustworthy and charismatic; 2). The charismatic actions of leaders which focus on

24

collective beliefs and values; intellectual stimulation which focuses on thinking critically about problems and stimulating creativity; 3). Providing a supportive climate for individual development; 4) Growth and consideration of the unique needs of followers; and 5) Inspirational motivation, which focuses on a shared vision amongst followers. Carey (1992: 218) postulated that transformational leaders are likely to promote fairness and justice, while Bass and Steidlmeier (1999: 182) propounded that transformational leaders generally focus on the need for ethical practice and good ethical conduct.

Transformational leadership has been strongly researched and widely supported in the leadership literature (Antonakis and House 2014: 746; Yadav, Choudhary and Jain 2019). Transformational leadership is achieved through idealised influence, inspiration, motivation, intellectual stimulation, or personal consideration for each individual (Bass, cited in Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn and Wu 2018: 3). Although these leaders aim at improving organisational performance by motivating and inspiring them, their main focus is on moral development by urging them to keep high moral standards and values (Bass, Avolio, Jung and Berson. 2003:207).

Whilst service leadership is premised on service for both leaders and followers, transformational leadership concerns itself with the interests of the collective. In addition, whilst transactional leadership is based on meeting expectations, transformational leadership is premised on influencing followers to perform above and beyond their capabilities (Alegbeleye and Kaufman 2020). The past three decades has seen considerable research on transformational leadership that provides evidence for a relationship between transformational leadership and the efficacy of the leader in relation to follower attitudinal outcomes, organisational environment, individual and organisational performance, work satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, and reduced turnover (Hoch *et al.* 2018: 5).

According to Shek, Chung and Leung (2015: 217), transformational leadership theory is not based on leadership competencies or having a caring disposition as its core elements, as does service leadership. It focuses on a leader's charisma and his or her ability to motivate others, with morality being a key characteristic. Since transformational strategic leadership is focussed on inspiring followers, it enables them to bring about significant change (Nahavandi 2009: 242). As Post (cited in Stead and Stead, 2013: 275) remarked, this leadership focuses

on whether "the future of the corporation will be one of transition, transformation, or revolution".

Scholars, however, believe that ethical behaviour is the basis of transformational leadership, as they consider ethics and morals to be important in formulating an ideal vision for the organisation (Mendonca and Kanungo 2007: 6). It has been posited that when transformational leaders display ethical conduct, their followers will also behave ethically (Yasir, Imran, Irshad, Mohamad and Khan 2016: 311-312).

2.3.4.5 The full range leadership (FRL) model

The *full range leadership (FRL) model* was conceptualised by Avolio and Bass (cited in Mathieu, Neumann, Babiak and Hare 2015: 2680). Their model incorporates three leadership styles, namely: transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership (Hasson, von Thiele Schwarz and Tafvelin 2020: 380. There are nine variables which are linked to these three styles. The *transformational leadership style* focuses on inspiring and motivating followers through individualised consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealised influence. The *transactional leadership style* consists of initiating and developing contracts to achieve goals; it specifies rewards for achieving goals successfully; and is a corrective form of leadership behaviour that focuses on promoting good standards and tracking mistakes. Leaders using this style focus more on mistakes and use disciplinary threats to enable employees to reach organisational goals (Mathieu *et al.* 2015: 268). The *laissez-faire leadership style*, which is the third part of the full range leadership model, is viewed as the absence of leadership, the avoidance of intervention, or the presence of both. Those using this style are generally indecisive and do not provide feedback to their employees. They do not provide incentives or rewards, and they place little effort on motivating employees or recognising their work (Mathieu *et al.* 2015: 268). The laissez-faire leadership style is viewed as the absence of leadership and implies that the needs and expectations of subordinates are not met (Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland and Hetland 2007: 81; Bjekić, Jelača and Marić 2019: 483). It has been described as a leadership style in which leaders are hands off, allowing members to make their own decisions, which leads to the lowest productivity amongst members (Lazarus *et al.* 2019: 54.). In fact, passive-aggressive leadership behaviours have been described as those who fail to protect employees in a high-risk environment. Research done by Mathieu *et al.* (2015: 268) found that the descriptors manipulative/unethical, insensitive, unreliable/unfocussed, and

26

intimidating/aggressive were associated with the laissez-faire leadership style. Organisations led by leaders with a laissez-faire style of leadership often have unsatisfied minorities, have tolerance destroyed between group members, misuse rules, and there is no initiative with weaker members who are held back (Khan, Khan, Qureshi Ismail, Rauf, Latif and Tahir, 2015: 90).

2.3.4.6 Service leadership

Proponents of the *service leadership model* believe that all followers have the potential to become a leader (Chung 2010: 3). Service leadership theory focuses on fulfilling the needs of both leaders and followers. It adopts a systemic approach to leadership that considers the influences of leaders, their followers, human systems, and that of the environment. Service leadership also assumes that leadership competencies are acquired through formal education, participation in workshops and other educational activities intended to enhance leadership skills, or through life experiences. Hence, leadership growth can be deemed a life-long journey where knowledge, competencies, and experiences are brought together to perpetuate service leadership (Brungardt 1997:85; Spears 2010: 27-30).

Decisions made by service leaders are often linked to deliberate and conscious self-reflection and dialogue, and growth is fostered through intrinsic self-motivation. Service leadership is also about satisfying the needs of others by providing personalised service to all people the leader encounters, particularly followers, other people, groups, and communities. A service leader has therefore been described as "a ready, willing and able, on-the-spot entrepreneur who possesses relevant task competencies and is judged by superiors, peers, subordinates, and followers to exhibit appropriate character strengths and a caring social disposition" (Shek, Chung and Leung 2015: 217). Service leadership is also predicated on having strong moral character, competency in leading, and a caring disposition.

Shek, Chung and Leung (2015: 217) identified the following dimensions as the key characteristics of the service leadership model:

1. It is based on the notion that "true leadership is a service aimed at ethically satisfying the needs of oneself, others, groups, communities, systems, and environments".
2. There are interrelationships amongst the different systems, which is inclusive of the individual, followers, group, and community systems. Service leaders are also

responsible for their immediate environment and the culture of the service organisation, and should therefore maintain its good health.

3. It is dependent on service leaders' competencies and their ability to apply knowledge and skills in a competent and productive manner.

4. Moral character is crucial to this leadership. Service leaders must discern right from wrong and reflect positive ethical traits, such as honesty, being reliable, having integrity, respect, and the willingness to work with others.

5. A caring disposition is demonstrated through sincerity, consideration, empathy to those being served, and by listening attentively to their needs.

6. "The server is the service" – this implies that the personal qualities and traits of leaders influence the success of their leadership service. Hence, the leaders' personal qualities are at the "core" of their service.

7. Everyone has leadership potential and has the ability to improve their leadership effectiveness.

8. There is a focus on self-development and a continual effort to improve one's competencies and abilities in order to willingly satisfy the needs of others.

9. Service leadership is predicated on providing the highest quality service to everyone one encounters and whose lives are affected by one's actions or leadership. Service leaders engage in continuous reflection related to improving their character and the provision of service provision to ensure continuous professional and personal improvement.

10. Followers are mentored, and mutual learning and sharing of experiences is encouraged so that followers master knowledge and skills.

11. Service leadership embraces Eastern approaches, especially those related to self-control, inner peace, recognising and avoiding bad habits, and having concern for others and the bigger systems within which one is located.

12. The service leadership model is comprehensive and integrates the physical, emotional, behavioural, cognitive, and spiritual dimensions of the leader.

2.3.4.7 Servant leadership

According to Greenleaf (1970: 13), the *servant leader* is servant first, "which indicates their intention to serve". In so doing he made the distinction between who is leader first and who is servant first. One distinct characteristic of servant leadership is the proposition that servant leaders develop followers who also engage in serving behaviours (Wu, Liden, Liao and Wayne

2020: 1). Servant leadership therefore emphasises the importance of meeting the needs of followers. This resembles the service leadership's service orientation towards others. The servant leadership theory has, however, been criticised for its huge emphasis on the needs of followers to the detriment of the needs of leaders, which may be non-beneficial to the organisation (Fry, Matherly, Whittington and Winston 2007: 77). While the core defining characteristic of servant leadership remains going beyond personal self-interest, service leadership does not neglect followers' needs at the expense of leaders' own needs, but focuses on the mutual satisfaction of needs in the co-created service process (Ciulla 1998: 20-30). It is only when the leaders' needs are also satisfied through the service process that development is achieved.

Byron (2006: 89) criticised other leadership approaches which reduce employees to mere instruments in pursuit of organisational goals. Servant leadership, in comparison, "sees human growth and organisational effectiveness as two symbiotic manifestations of the same pursuit" (Giambatista, McKeage and Brees 2020: 3). Eva, Robin, Sendjaya, Dierendock and Liden (2019: 114) offered a different definition of servant leadership, saying that it was "an other-oriented approach to leadership, manifested through one-on-one prioritizing of follower individual needs and interests; and outward reorienting of their concern for self, towards concern for others within the organization and the larger community". Poutiatine (2009: 200) argued that while transformational leaders focus on the well-being of the organisation, servant leaders focus on the well-being of followers or employees. Servant leadership may benefit the organisation indirectly, as illustrated by Winston (2004: 600) whose case study found that commitment to the leader resulted in follower orientation benefitting the organisation.

Spears (2010: 26) added that servant leadership has its roots in ethical and caring behaviour. Van Dierendonck (2011: 1232) wrote that "six characteristics that give a good understanding of servant leadership, includes empowering and developing people, being humble, authentic, having good stewardship and providing direction".

A meta-analysis done by Eva *et al*. (2019: 111) of current literature documented that servant leadership has the potential to stimulate employees' positive behaviours, such as organisational citizenship behaviour, innovative behaviour, and helping behaviour. Franco and Antunes (2020: 1) found through case studies of six Portuguese organisations that servant leadership was associated with the following nine dimensions, namely: empowering others,

29

helping subordinates grow and succeed, placing the needs of subordinates first, ethical behaviour, altruistic calling, wisdom or vision, organisational stewardship, creating a family atmosphere, and identifying positively with the leader.

A case study of servant leadership undertaken by Mareus *et al.* (2019: 13) found that there were several themes that characterised this this type of leadership. These included: a) building community, which compromised of a sense of community, being productive, and enabling development; b) commitment to the growth of people, which comprised of assisting, empowering, and supporting the growth of others; c) displaying servant leadership, which consists of demonstrating servant leadership, becoming wiser, and spirituality; d) altruism, which comprised of focusing on others and their well-being; e) stewardship, which comprised of effective leadership, credibility, and citizen modelling; and f) empathy, which comprised of understanding the needs of others, compassion, responsiveness, and hope.

The research on servant leadership supports the view that servant leaders must adopt the universal values embedded in the spiritual leadership paradigm (Fry 2005: 619). Studies undertaken by Page and Wong (2000: 69) revealed that servant leaders and servant followers have characteristics of moral love for others, humility, altruism, and a deep commitment to the leader. A number of scholars and studies have found that servant leaders place a high value on the following values, principles, and behaviours:

1. Community, helping followers to grow and succeed, and ethical behaviours (Gandolfi, Stone and Deno 2017: 357).
2. Wisdom, organisational stewardship, and altruistic behaviours (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006: 300).
3. Service to others, hope, integrity, and accountability (Gandolfi, Stone and Deno 2017: 357).
4. Trust and empowerment (Dennis and Bocarnea 2005: 600).
5. Behaving ethically by interacting honestly, openly, and fairly with followers (Yasir *et al.* 2016: 312).

Very recently a spiritual leadership model emerged which extends the notion of servant leadership (Fry and Whittington 2005: 23). Describing it as legacy leadership or a model of spiritual leadership, Whittington, Pitts, Kageler and Goodwin (2005: 764) said that legacy leadership is premised on the view that legacy leaders must exhibit the values and attitudes of

30

spiritual leadership. The legacy leaders framework posits that followers of such leaders internalise the values exhibited by the latter, which results in a shift from egotistical to altruistic values or developing the latter. They added that these internal values will create a shift in attitudes toward the organisation, such as job satisfaction, commitment, and other positive organisational behaviours such as increased performance, organisational citizenship behaviours, and other pro-social behaviours. Thus, this type of spiritual leadership, which will be explained further below, results in organisational transformation that influences the well-being of both the employee and brings positive organisational outcomes.

Abraham Lincoln, Nelson Mandela, Mahatma Gandhi, and Mother Teresa have been described as servant leaders. Lincoln's actions during the American Civil War, particularly the freeing of the Southern slaves, and Martin Luther King Jr.'s leadership in the civil rights movement and his fight for social justice (Miller and Hubbard 2018: 383), make them good examples of servant leaders. Closer to home, Mandela's own selfless struggle against apartheid which led to South Africa's democracy is another example of servant leadership. Servant leadership, therefore, brings a set of moral and inspirational models of leadership (Graham 1991: 105).

One example of servant leadership is TD Industries who experienced profit growth, and who sustained the business and created satisfied employees who were regarded as partners (Fry *et al.* 2007: 10). TD Industries commitment to servant leadership was based on founder Lowe's dedication to a leadership style based on his religious beliefs. Servant leadership and the process of building congruent values in the organisation is embedded in spiritual leadership as well (Fry 2003: 718) and is evident within TD Industries philosophy. Hence, the similarities between servant and spiritual leadership.

According to Whittington and Maellaro (2006: 130), servant leadership is reflected in TD Industries in the following ways:
> * Being a servant first, such that the needs of other people are placed first;
> * serving by listening to others;
> * serving through people building; and
> * serving through leadership creation.

This practice of listening actually began in the Lowe family home, when Jack Lowe Sr invited employees to discuss critical issues and brainstorm ideas to solve business-related problems and opportunities. Open communication resonated through TD Industries as there was open communication with employees, managers who participated in breakfast and lunch meetings almost every other week, and through these forums 1,400 employees had the opportunity to share their views and suggestions with other senior managers in the organisation.

Servant leadership and transformational leadership theories are popular leadership theories in the leadership literature (Smith, Montagno and Kuzmenko 2004: 82). Although they are focussed on transformation and service, they are guided by ethics as the primary characteristic of leadership behaviour (Northouse 2018: 7). It is therefore not surprising that servant leadership is guided by an ethical orientation to leadership. Barling, Christie and Turner (2008: 852) noted that "transformational leaders may behave as authentic (ethical) transformational and pseudo (unethical) transformational leaders". Whilst authentic transformational leaders work with a high level of morality and focus on serving the organisation, pseudo-transformational leaders' intentions are more egotistic. Hence, transformational leaders may behave unethically if they misuse their power, if their values don't match their behaviour, or their motivations are selfish (Yasir *et al.* 2016: 312). Ethical leadership is discussed in the next sub-section.

2.3.4.8 Ethical leadership

Ethical leadership has been defined as "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making" (Brown, Trevino and Harrison 2005: 120). It consists of two facets, namely: "moral persons" and "moral managers". Ethical leaders are "moral persons" who are concerned with reflecting on and managing personal ethics whilst demonstrating appropriate conduct. "Moral managers" are those activities that leaders implement to encourage ethical values amongst followers; for example, by engaging in open ethical dialogue with them, and urging them to behave in a moral way (Shakeel, Kruyen and Van Thiel 2019: 614).

Ethical leaders have been described "as honest, caring, and principled individuals who make fair and balanced decisions" (Shakeel, Kruyen and Van Thiel 2019: 597). Brown, Trevino and Harrison (2005: 120) identified characteristics such as being agreeable, conscientious,

32

motivated, and having a high moral reasoning level as those that build the credibility of ethical leaders. A more recent alternative conceptualisation of ethical leadership was proposed by Shakeel, Kruyen and Van Thiel (2019: 615). They listed the following six leadership styles as reflecting contemporary ethical leadership theories, viz. "virtuous leadership, authentic and positive leadership, moral management, professionally grounded leadership, social responsibility leadership and transformational leadership" (Shakeel, Kruyen and Van Thiel 2019: 615). Virtuous leadership is linked to honesty and fairness, the acceptance of mistakes by the leader, the opposition of unethical practices and holding followers accountable. The attributes of authentic and positive leaders relevant to ethical leaders include self-awareness, self-improvement, positive influence on self and others, and being non-defensive. The moral manager guides followers towards ethical outcomes based on rules. Professionally based leadership is similar to the moral manager, but differs in that moral leaders do not focus on rules and regulations to build ethical behaviour amongst followers, but focus on legal and organisational principles. The socially responsible leader is one who shares the characteristics of servant leaders, spiritual leaders, and corporate social responsibility. He or she focuses on the development of employees and aspects beyond the organisation such as society and environment. Hence, the focus is larger than the organisation. Finally, transformational leadership, from the ethical leaders point, focuses on undertaking actual changes within organisations to adapt to the growing needs of the organisation and society, for example, the transition to environmentally friendly methods of doing business sustainably (Shakeel, Kruyen and Van Thiel 2019: 617).

A broader definition was presented by Shakeel, Kruyen and Van Thiel (2019: 615). They said that ethical leadership is focussed on pursuing "desired ethical behaviour for self and followers governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duties towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability".

There are several examples in the literature of corporate scandals which mirror unethical behaviour amongst its leaders. Enron was once the seventh largest company in terms of revenue in the United States and was seen as a major marketer of natural gas and electricity. At the end of 2000, Enron's market value was $75.2 billion, while its carrying value only 11.5 billion dollars. In 2001, the company produced figures with glaring accounting malpractices.

In 2002, the auditor of Enron notified the US Department of Justice that certain personnel had got rid of a salient number of electronic and paper documents and correspondence which reflected Enron's engagements. In Europe, the Parmalat corporate scandal was larger and more brazen than most other corporate financial frauds in history. This was done by the organisation over-reflecting its assets and underreporting its liabilities in the region of 14.5 billion euros (Soltani 2014: 261). Unethical leadership is related to what Bozeman, Molina and Kaufman (2018: 7) described as extensive corruption in a significant number of developed nations where public officials have used the states institutional mechanisms to systematically destroy the public values upheld by society, by creating barriers that would prevent immigrants and minorities to apply their voting rights and thereby gain access to public services. South Africa has also fallen prey to concerns over the magnitude and unhealthy impact of illicit financial flows on the nation's governance and developmental agenda (Rapanyane and Ngoepe 2020: 2). *Enemy of the People*, written by Basson and Du Toit (2017: 1), provides a detailed account of Zuma's catastrophic misrule which led to the economy faltering, the birth of the *tenderpreneur* and those endeavouring to capture the state. As Basson and Du Toit (2017: 1) articulated, his unethical leadership led to "industrial-scale levels of corruption", which had massive impacts on state enterprises, institutions of democracy and the ANC itself.

2.3.4.9 Spiritual leadership

Spiritual leadership emerged in the year 2000 due to the transition being made from a leadership-driven work environment to a human-driven workplace, and was heralded as one of the most powerful management paradigms for the 21st century (Samul 2020: 267). One of the first definitions of spiritual leadership was offered by Fry (2003: 14), who said that spiritual leaders have "the values, attitudes, and behaviours that are necessary to intrinsically motivate one's self and others so they have a sense of spiritual survival/well-being through calling and membership". It has also been described as "an intimate leadership approach" that seeks to create a workplace where meaningful and close relationships exist among employees (Aslan and Korkut 2015: 125). Fry (2003: 693) discussed three aspects of spiritual leadership, namely, vision, hope or faith and altruistic love. Spiritual leadership is achieved by building an organisational environment that is based on altruistic love and by encouraging the hope and faith of followers. Samul (2020: 267) argued that a leader who demonstrates such values at work is able to inspire followers with regard to meaning and purpose. Quoting Fry, he added

that spiritual leaders seek to understand the values most required to support and grow both organisations and society as a whole.

Reave (2005: 655), who reviewed over 150 studies, reported that demonstrating care and showing support and individual concern for followers are the common features embraced by spiritual leaders. Listening responsively, respecting, and appreciating others' contributions were found to be crucial in spiritual leadership, as well as having inner qualities of his/her human spirit, such as love, patience, tolerance, a sense of responsibility, and harmony.

Spiritual leadership is one approach to management that includes vision, faith, hope and altruistic love to motivate both the leader and follower (Chen and Li 2013: 420). Spiritual leadership is characterised by upholding integrity, goodness, teamwork, and a strong interconnectedness with all (Aydin and Ceylan 2009: 184-186), so that followers can mutually solve problems and share valuable knowledge when encountering complex problems (Wang *et al.* 2019: 3).

Spiritual leadership theory was developed to build an intrinsically motivated organisation that fosters significant levels of organisational productivity and creativity amongst team members, as well as learning related to the organisation (Jurkiewicz and Giacalone 2004: 132; Hassan, Nadeem and Akhter 2016: 8). Spiritual leaders show interest in actively engaging others in the work environment so that people experience meaning in life, which consequently fosters their growth and development (Wang *et al*. 2019: 2). Moreover, spiritual leadership has been described as delivering faith and hope in a spirituality embedded vision and through a process of developing vision for followers (Wang *et al*. 2019: 3). It includes spiritual values and management practices that inspire people to engage in meaningful work; and through creating contexts that are characterised by a sense of warmth and caring (Deci and Ryan 2000: 75-76). Hence, through the practice of spiritual values and exhibiting altruistic love in the workplace, higher level productivity is fostered (Samul 2020: 269). One of the earliest models on spiritual leadership emphasised a corporate philosophy emphasising development, mutual trust and concern for others, group-orientedness and inner integrity (Fairholm 1996: 14). Fairholm (1996: 11), a major proponent of spirituality and spiritual leadership, as a contemporary leading leadership paradigm argued for its inclusion as a holistic way to work and life. He recognised that a leaders' spiritual core, namely his or her spirit, was the primary agent of guidance, and developed a model of spiritual leadership that promoted cooperation, trust,

35

mutual care, and a deep commitment to team and organisational effectiveness (Al Arkoubi 2013: 105).

Samul (2019: 844) asserted that all spiritual leadership models embrace a stakeholder approach through their explanation of organisations as structures that are composed of different layers, all of which have significance in the overall productivity of the organisation. Barett (cited in Law 2016: 444) proclaimed that spiritual leaders generally establish value-based organisations that are highly successful, profitable, and more productive because the nature of their commitment with employees brings about greater commitment amongst them.

A primary aspect of spiritual leadership is altruistic love, which reflects genuine care and concern for oneself and others, demonstrating qualities of empathy, compassion, patience, and kindness. Oh and Wang (2020: 19) described spiritual leadership as a promising approach to enabling a positive work environment, to inspiring and engaging followers of an organisation, and building individual well-being.

Spiritual leadership focuses on developing strategic initiatives that create profits by first contributing to the greater good and ensuring that the larger community is taken care of (Fry 2009: 80). Studies have shown that spiritual leadership has a positive effect on strategic leader effectiveness, particularly with regards to relationships with employees and relationships with stakeholders outside the organisation (Fry 2003: 694-695; Stead and Stead 2013: 275). Reave (2005: 657) affirmed that spiritual leadership is closely linked to ethical leadership as both require strong moral character and an ethical environment, particularly when spiritual motives have a hand in nurturing ethical leaders.

Research undertaken by Pruzan and Pruzan-Mikkelsen (2007: 96) reflected seven broad themes of spiritual leadership, namely: (1) The first theme of *love* was reflected in interviews with executives that tough love helped employees to enhance their personal growth and the ability to understand how unconditional love and care for others developed trustworthy relationships. (2) The second theme of *looking and listening within* was reflected in executives expressing the salience of having a clear conscience; the need to have awareness of their own motives; the need to be humble before acting from humility; and the need to trust their intuition. (3) The third theme was *live it and serve*. Pruzan and Pruzan-Mikkelsen (2007: 96) described "spiritual-based leaders … [as] really doers, people who appear to be fearless and

unattached to the fruits of their deeds. Yet they are also characterized by their deep concern for contributing to society in general and, in particular, to serving those who are affected to their leadership". (4) The fourth theme of *compassion* was reflected in interviews where executives discussed the need to be empathic; to demonstrate love for their neighbours in their business transactions; to show responsibility towards the earth and its human and non-human dwellers; and to care for those who are disadvantaged (Stead and Stead 2013: 278). (5) The fifth spiritual leadership theme that emerged amongst the executives during the interviews was the notion of *divinity*. In this regard, the executives spoke of surrendering their difficulties to a Divine power and viewing employees and other organisational stakeholders as being divine beings. (6) The sixth theme of *purpose* was reflected in the executives' belief that employees should reach their fullest potential and share their spiritual paths with their stakeholders and business associates. (7) Finally, the last theme of *balance and grace* emerged in an executive interview with Amber Chand, the co-founder of Vision of Eziba, an Internet-based business which focuses on the sales of crafts from around the world. She said that her companies were an expression of her love and her desire to serve others, and were a pathway for her spiritual practice. Being able to serve others and live out her spirituality through the companies she owns provided her with the sense of balance she pursued from life (Pruzan and Pruzan-Mikkelsen 2007: 269).

Most recently, Law (2016: 446) proposed an Integrated Spiritual Leadership Model which incorporates the attributes and features of ten spiritual leadership models. This model is based on the following foundational principles: developing spiritual intelligence; developing leadership from the inside out; holistic leadership; selfless leaders who display exemplary moral behaviour and who are committed to stewardship and service; a values driven focus allowing employees to personally explore and express their spirituality; encouraging them to become involved in communities through an emphasis on service to others; and through aligning their personal values with that of the organisation; as well as cultivating faith, vision, and altruistic love so as to improve organisational performance and spiritual transformation.

There are a few good examples of spiritually-based leadership in the literature. Olson, the leader of Storberg AS, a sports clothing company, indicated that the organisation ascribes to four values, namely: honesty, courage, inclusivity, and sustainability. In a personal interview he said that his sense of caring is deeply related to his notions of ethical and social responsibility. He said, "[M]y employees and I don't believe we can change the world. … we

37

know we can change a small part of it. We know that through our caring, several hundred workers in Chinese factories have a better day at work" (Kriger 2013: 264).

The Whole Foods case involves John Mackey who is also a Buddhist. He drew his inspiration from The Theory of Moral Sentiment and is driven by empathy, friendship, love, and the need to do good for others. He said that at Whole Foods success is measured by how much value is created for the following six stakeholders, namely: "customers, team members (employees), investors, vendors, communities and the environment … our potential as human beings, is to take joy in the flourishing of people everywhere" (Kriger 2013: 265).

Spiritual leadership is a salient aspect of workplace spirituality. Hence, the sub-section that follows covers workplace spirituality.

Table 2 below summarises the key features of the major leadership theories.

Table 2: Summary of key features of leadership styles

Leadership theory or approach	Major components and propositions
1) Trait approach	• Leaders and non-leaders are differentiated based on a set of identified abilities, traits, and characteristics. • Based on view that leaders are born and not made. (Deshwal and Ali 2020: 39)
2) Top-down leadership theory	• Hierarchical, authoritarian leadership style with a command-and-control approach. • Also described as vertical leadership, where leaders are appointed in a formal way and have power and authority. • There is a top-down approach and unilateral decision making. (Hunt and Fedynich 2019: 24)
3) Charismatic leadership	• Followers view leaders as people who have extraordinary qualities or exceptional qualities.

	• Inspire and direct organisations using charisma. These leaders influence followers by presenting compelling idealised visions, portraying unconventional behaviours, and taking personal risks. (Vergauwe *et al.* 2018: 26; Fragouli 2018)
4) Service leadership	• Leadership is based on providing service to all individual followers, systems, organisations, and communities. • About providing quality personalised service to all through a caring social disposition. • Based on moral character with leaders exhibiting ethical traits such as honesty, morality, reliability, integrity, respect, and ability to work willingly with others. (Shek, Chung and Leung 2015: 217)
5) Servant leadership	• Leaders take on the role of servants in their relationship with followers. • Leaders are motivated by a personal drive to serve. • The needs of employees take precedence over a leaders' own personal needs. • Based on virtuous constructs, for example, empathy, healing, listening attentively, being persuasive, having awareness, stewardship, foresight, a drive to enhance community, and a deep commitment to growing people. • Also based on ethical and caring behaviour. (Spears 2010; Page and Wong 2000)
6) Transformational leadership	• Premised on four broad aspects, namely: charisma, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and communication.

	• Leadership is seen as an influential process that helps and strengthens followers to perform in ways that surpass expectations and become leaders themselves. • It is achieved through idealised influence, inspiring others, intellectual stimulation, and a personal demonstration of showing individual care for others.
7) Spiritual leadership	• Based on altruism, faith and care. • Achieved through a leader's creation of vision. • Leaders have inner qualities of human spirit, such as love, patience, tolerance, a sense of responsibility, and harmony. • Includes spiritual values and management practices that inspire followers to engage in meaningful work; and through creating contexts that have warmth and care. (Deci and Ryan 2000:227; Aslan and Korkut 2015: 123; Chen and Yang 2012:107)
8) Ethical leadership	• It is built on moral management and ethical standards. • Leaders must demonstrate behaviours that ensure that high ethical standards are continuously maintained. • The ethical leader's role is to enable and encourage followers to be just and behave in a strong moral way. • Focus on integrity, behaviour that is people oriented, demonstrate concern for environment, clarify roles, share power, and demonstrate fairness. (Kalshoven, Den Hartog and De Hoogh 2011: 349; Shakeel, Kruyen and Van Thiel 2019: 5)
9) Benevolent leadership	• Based on the morality perspective which is linked to business ethics and ethical values.

	- Benevolent leaders are concerned with psychological well-being of employees and organisations. - Focus on corporate social responsibility, organisational citizenship behaviour, sustainability, and society. - Premised on collective spirituality, which is coupled with virtuous or righteous action, compassion, and leaving a positive legacy. (Karakas, 2009: 48; Karakas, Sarigollu and Kavas 2014).

2.4 WORKPLACE SPIRITUALITY

Particular attention is given in this section to workplace spirituality. The topics discussed include the growth of workplace spirituality; understanding workplace spirituality; understanding individual spirituality; defining workplace spirituality; organisational spirituality; and the link between organisational spirituality and other paradigms. The final section looks at the benefits of workplace spirituality.

2.4.1 Growth of Workplace Spirituality

Discussions about the role of spirituality in leadership practice and management education abounds in the literature (Bento 2000: 1; Delbecq 2009: 5). Organisational spirituality began to receive more acceptance amongst academics as an important aspect of research (Gotsis and Kortezi 2009: 576; Poole 2009: 579). This was evident in the special editions dedicated to this topic, for instance, in the Journal of Organizational Change Management Vol. 16, No. 4 (2003), and the Leadership Quarterly Vol. 15, No. 5 (2005). The University of New Delhi, in India, also convened a few international conferences that focussed on spirituality and organisational leadership, which resulted in two volumes of published work (Singh-Sengupta and Fields 2007: 259; Singh-Sengupta 2009: 1-204) in the Macmillan Advanced Research Series that was specific to organisational spirituality.

2.4.2 Understanding Workplace Spirituality

Spirituality appears in management studies through three lenses, namely: *individual spirituality, spirituality in the workplace*, and *organisational spirituality*. Following a systematic review of the literature, Rocha and Pinheiro (2020: 1) found two clusters, namely, *organisational* and *workplace spirituality*. Organisational spirituality in the literature has been seen as organisational identity which stems from its values and practices that are made up of workplace and individual spirituality, which is guided by the leader and other members, and is influenced by the environment and culture of the organisation. This spirituality then gives rise to value and social good, which is reflected in the organisation's image, mission, vision, and its organisational values.

Individual spirituality is discussed next, followed by a more detailed discussion of *workplace spirituality* in the sub-section further below.

2.4.3 Understanding Individual Spirituality

Personal spirituality has been defined as a deep search for self-understanding and meaning in life and living life in harmony with one's core identity (Pruzan 2011: 35). Dent and Wharff (2005: 633) found that most scholars include in their conceptualisation of spirituality "a search for meaning, reflection, inner connectedness, creativity, transformation, sacredness, and energy". Similarly, Puchalski and colleagues (2009: 887) defined it as that "aspect of humanity that refers to the way individuals seek and express meaning and purpose, and the way they experience their connectedness to the moment, to self, to others, to nature, and to the significant or sacred". Others have said that whilst spirituality means varied things to different people, it involves "deeply-held values" that guide a person's life and their work practices (Milliman, Ferguson, Trickett and Condemi 1999: 221).

Despite its increasing popularity, organisational researchers have struggled to define individual spirituality as it relates to work (Harlos 2000: 614). A study undertaken by Pruzan and Pruzan-Mikkelsen (2007: 22) with 40 international spiritually-based leaders found that they defined spirituality as including a deep connection with a Divine force. It is a very individualised and deeply lived experience that incorporates the need for belonging, love, and compassion.

Pruzan (2013: 36) explained that within organisations this individual spiritual search can be expanded to include a search for community, collective purpose, meaning, and responsibility. Others like Sheep (2006: 358), for example, have defined it as a "contextualised phenomenon that examines questions, of how spirituality relates to one's work organization and can be conceptualised as a lived experience and expression of one's spirituality in the context of work and workplace". Definitions of workplace spirituality are presented in the following sub-section.

2.4.4 Defining Workplace Spirituality

There have been arguments that placing religion or spirituality within the context of work can be potentially divisive, as religion is linked with spirituality and has the potential to create divisions when religious differences surface (Neal 2013: 5). Scholars have taken care to distinguish "workplace spirituality" as a unique expression of spirituality at work that is distinct from religious connotations (Phipps and Benefiel 2013: 33). Afsar and Rehman (2015: 329-353) and Pourmola, Bagheri, Alinezhad and Nejad (2019: 123-132) clarified that it does not entail converting people to a particular religious worldview.

Duchon and Plowman (2005: 816) defined workplace spirituality as "a particular kind of psychological climate in which people view themselves as having an inner life that is nourished by meaningful work and takes place in the context of a community". This definition allowed for spirituality to be seen as a distinct construct within the workplace that is unrelated to any form of religious expression. Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003a: 30) added that workplace spirituality is "a framework of organizational values evidenced in the culture that promotes an employees' experience of transcendence through the work process, facilitating their sense of being connected to others in a way that provides feelings of completeness". According to Afsar and Rehman (2015: 330), workplace spirituality encompasses tolerance, and feeling a sense of interconnectivity and identification with the norms of organisations. It also includes kindness and trust (Hassan, Nadeem and Akhter 2016: 1-15).

In the Eastern context, Shrestha, Luitel and Petchsawang (2020: 1) endeavoured to construct the meaning of workplace spirituality using a grounded theory approach. Their study revealed that workplace spirituality was a complex multidimensional construct that had nine distinct dimensions. These included altruistic motives, interpersonal positivity, compassion, inner

calmness, duty orientation, sense of collaboration, interconnectedness, self-regulation, and higher consciousness. Rathee and Rajain (2020: 28) concluded that workplace spirituality was merely having a sense of interconnection between one's personal self and the organisation. Workplace spirituality was defined in the section above. Attention now shifts to the concept of organisational spirituality which is defined next.

2.4.5 Organisational Spirituality

Fry (2003: 717-718) described organisational spirituality as including the workplace values of benevolence, generativity, humanism, integrity, justice, mutuality, receptivity, respect, responsibility, and trust. He suggested that when adopting these values, commitment to an organisation increases and goals are more easily attained by both the leader and their followers (Fry, Nisieiwcz, Vitucci and Cedillo 2007: 5). Following a review of literature related to organisational research, Jurkiewicz and Giacalone (2004: 131) pooled together a list of values and proposed a framework of organisational spirituality (see Table 3). They argued that organisations that ascribe to values on the left-hand side of the table reflect greater positive organisational spirituality than those organisations which ascribe to values presented on the right-hand side of the table.

Table 3: Values framework of organisational spirituality

(+)	Values	(-)
Kindness toward others and an orientation to promote the happiness and prosperity of employees and other stakeholders within the work context.	Benevolence	Employee feelings have no relevance in the work environment; their happiness and prosperity are their own concern.
Long-term focus, showing a concern for the consequences of one's actions into the future; respectful of future generations.	Generativity	Concerned with immediate reward without regard for long-term consequences.
Practices and policies that assert the essential dignity	Humanism	Lacking mercy and kindness; cruel; impersonal,

and worth of each employee; provides an opportunity for personal growth in conjunction with organisational goals.		cold; unconcerned with the needs of employees as human beings; lacking warm or geniality.
Uncompromising adherences to a code of conduct; sincerity, honesty, candour; exercising unforced power.	Integrity	Organisational members an act deceptive, expedient, artificial, shallow, politically manipulative, and are inconsistent in following a code of conduct.
Even-handed treatment and judgment of employees; impartial, fair, honest; unbiased assignment of rewards and punishments.	Justice	Dishonest and faithless; wrongful or biased in judgements
All employees are interconnected and mutually dependent, each contributes to the final output by working in conjunction with others.	Mutuality	Employees are separate and distinct free agents responsible for their own output irrespective of others' efforts, time spent interacting with others is dictated by necessity.
Open-minded, flexible thinking, orientation toward calculated risk-taking, rewards creativity.	Receptivity	Enforces one right way to do things, discourages questioning and innovation; punishes behaviour outside the norm.
Regard and treat employees with esteem and value; showing consideration and concern for others.	Respect	Demonstrates disesteem and contempt for employees; uncivil, discourteous to others.

45

Independently follows through on goal attainment irrespective of difficulty or obstacles; concerned with doing what's right rather than the right thing.	Responsibility	Shirks work and follows through only insofar as forced to do so. Does not exert effort independent of external controls.
Being able to confidently depend on the character and truth of the organisation and its representatives	Trust	Character, truth, maintenance of obligations and promises is at the discretion of individual organisational members as predicated by their personal gain.

(Source: Jurkiewicz and Giacalone 2004: 131)

2.4.6 Link Between Organisational Spirituality and Other Paradigms

The moralist paradigm suggests that spirituality was a wellspring of ethics, corporate social responsibility, and the well-being of employees. Its purpose was to strengthen humanitarian issues and outcomes, and promote virtues and moral principles, for example, humility, courage, altruistic love, compassion, patience, and forgiveness (Al Arkoubi 2013: 105). Spirituality brings forth and provides a sense of satisfaction for the deepest needs of leaders and their followers by developing a culture of hope, faith, and altruistic love (Fry 2003: 695).

The eco-humanist paradigm emphasises spiritual connectedness with other human beings and extends itself towards a stronger relationship with nature and that of the environment. Those who ascribe to this, see the individual as a holistic being, wherein the body, mind, heart, and spirit are in reciprocal harmonious interaction with each other (Al Arkoubi 2013: 105). Ashmos and Duchon (2000: 136) stated that those employees who view themselves as spiritual beings, require a greater spiritual sustenance which comes from their relatedness to one another and their workplace community.

The postmodern paradigm was pioneered by those who advocated for workplace spirituality by publishing both articles and books. Boje (2008: 8), for example, reported that The *Journal*

of Organizational Change Management had 68 articles between 1992 and 1999 that spoke of spirituality/spirit or mentioned workplace spirituality in it. He coined the term "critical spirituality" to advocate for a spiritually diverse organisation where pluralism and diversity are promoted, and where leaders are expected to have meaningful relationships with their followers and create "the right" atmosphere for them to connect with each other.

Small entrepreneurial firms with a spiritually oriented focus have been acquired by large multinationals. Those which have been purchased by multinationals include Honest Tea by Coca-Cola, Stonyfield Farm by Groupe Danone, and Ben and Jerry's by Unilever (Bayle-Cordier, Moingeon and Mirvis 2012: 5). The Ben and Jerry story exemplifies the relationship between two people in the sixties who started an ice cream business. The founders expressed an uplifting philosophy with the intention of their company to "give back to the community" (Bayle-Cordier, Moingeon and Mirvis 2012: 8). Ben Cohen described the vision of his business as being spiritual, saying "there is a spiritual dimension to business just as there is a spiritual dimension to the lives of individuals … the activities of business should reflect spiritual commitment to solving problems" (Bayle-Cordier, Moingeon and Mirvis 2012: 13). In another communication, he said, it "makes no sense to compartmentalize our lives, to be cutthroat in business, and then volunteer some time or donate some charity to money". These communications reflect the interrelationship of the three elements of the mission, namely: product, social, and economic (Bayle-Cordier, Moingeon and Mirvis 2012: 13). As the company progressed, the focus changed to the economic mission, and particularly financial progress and the acquisition of the organisation by Unilever. Moreover, despite the three-part mission orientation under Ben's original vision, the focus began to become totally economic under Odak whose sole focus was economic. Accordingly, the company became a business unit within Unilever, a North American company. Despite negative financial trends, layoffs, and plant closings, "Ben and Jerry's have never wavered from its funding principles of helping make the world a better place, and employees have made it their business to integrate progressive programs" (Bayle-Cordier, Moingeon and Mirvis 2012: 15). Despite economic overhauls, and the severance of jobs, the intent of the CEO was to continue the Ben and Jerry's story or legacy of a values-driven organisation (Bayle-Cordier, Moingeon and Mirvis 2012: 15).

Freese who took over as CEO, in 2005, described the spiritual dimension of the organisation as occurring not solely through motivated employees and exemplary leadership skills, but

47

through a higher order. Ben and Jerry's journey over the years with different CEO's reflects the challenges associated with balancing economic growth with spiritual values. The stance taken by various CEO's reflects how the organisation's priorities changed and varied over the years, which suggests the importance of spiritually-based leadership values by the CEO (Bayle-Cordier, Moingeon and Mirvis 2012: 16). Bayle-Cordier, Mirvis and Moingeon (2015: 337) concluded from a longitudinal study of Ben and Jerry's ice-cream that organisational identity was key to preserving its mission, despite its adoption by Unilever. They provided other evidence of companies reinvigorating their founding values, such as General Electric who revived their identity of innovation after years under Jack Welsh and the re-invocation of its founder Watson. Another example is that of Job's departure from Apple and return to it. This was also evident in Schultz's return to Starbucks to re-instate the authenticity of the barista experience. Bayle-Cordier, Mirvis and Moingeon's (2015: 337) study highlighted how a CEO's make-up, values, thoughts, and emotions influence the directions and identity of an organisation. They further argued that in the midst of a financial crisis, some CEO's highlighted the importance of family, whilst others spoke about increasing market value, particularly profits and market share. Their quest to nurture more benevolent and spiritual leaders can be seen in the following excerpt from one of their CEO's, as follows "with a vision for improved financial health and expanded social and environmental purpose, we've collaborated, day in and day out, to rework and upgrade our road map" (Bayle-Cordier, Mirvis and Moingeon 2015: 356). Although through economic overhauls and structural simplifications, jobs were severed, resources reallocated, [and] many dedicated people left(Bayle-Cordier, Mirvis and Moingeon 2015: 337). Freese, CEO of the company, said "[W]e must keep examining our own practices, assessing our impacts, and pursuing honest dialogue to find new ways to make Ben and Jerry's a better company – and the world a better place" (Bayle-Cordier, Mirvis and Moingeon 2015: 359).

Another good example of the revitalisation of a company was that of Denny's restaurant chain. Adamson (2000: 55-68) detailed how after falling victim to claims of racism and discrimination, the company had to engage in deep reflection regarding its suppliers and board of directors who were primarily white. They found that issues of race and ethnicity were absent in their training programmes. Following rigorous workshops under the consent decree, "the nuts and bolts of fairness", Denny's employees began to be conscientised about what was expected of them, sensitivity towards others, and the penalties they face for not living up to the company's expectations (Adamson 2000: 55-56). Through a radical change its culture and

functioning, the company went onto winning the Council of Economic Priorities' six Corporate Conscience Awards (Adamson 2000: 55-56). Discussed next are the benefits of workplace spirituality.

2.4.7 Benefits of Workplace Spirituality

The benefits of spirituality in the work environment have been categorised into three levels, namely: the *individual, organisational* and *societal* levels (Albuquerque, Cunha, Martins and Brito Sá 2014: 59). Workplace spirituality is believed to nourish the inner life of employees in the context of their individual self, the group, and organisation (Yusof, Yaacob and Rahman 2018: 31). At an individual level, anecdotal evidence exists highlighting the personal benefits of workplace spirituality programmes. These include greater levels of joy, a sense of peace and serenity, job satisfaction, commitment to the organisation, improved productivity, and lower rates of absenteeism and turnover in the workplace (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz 2003: 86).

Spirituality in the workplace has been premised on the following principles:
- It reduces stress, burnout, and exhaustion amongst employees;
- It creates a desire to work from one's personal faith and spiritual values (regardless of whether such values emanate from a specific religion);
- It brings about a desire to work with a sense of purpose or integrity;
- It also fosters a desire to work cooperatively, respectfully, and compassionately with others in the workplace (Sullivan 2013: 26).

Research has found that workplace spirituality is positively linked to employee work attitudes and employee engagement (Roof 2015: 585); organisational citizenship behaviour (Saks 2011: 320); trust and fulfilment of personal needs (Krishnakumar and Neck 2002: 154); and satisfaction with one's job (Lee, Lovelace and Manz 2014: 5; Mydin, Kanesan and Pitchay 2018: 1). Studies have found that workplace spirituality encourages employees to engage in pro-social behaviours, helps create unity amongst employees, reduces absenteeism, and decreases turnover (Gatling, Kim and Milliman 2016: 480). Similarly, Jena and Pradhan (2018: 452) asserted that it increases positive feelings towards others, and therefore acts as tool to attract and retain employees within the organisation. Organisations who began to adopt spirituality in the workplace, began to see the benefits from improved customer service, higher

levels of creativity and innovation, increased productivity and profits and a decrease in turnover and other costs. Moreover, research has found that organisations that embrace spiritually-based principles and values outperform organisations that do not (Jurkiewicz and Giacalone 2004: 130).

This increase in interconnectedness amongst employees creates a more motivated and organised working environment (Ranasinghe and Samarasinghe 2019: 31). Weitz, Vardi and Setter 2012: 260-262) reported the beneficial effect it has on decision-making and problem-solving abilities, and that it fosters greater creativity. A holistic model of workplace spirituality within service organisations was also found to bring a more positive relationship between workplace spirituality and ethical climate (Lee, Lovelace and Manz 2014: 5). Moreover, it was reported to increase work productivity because it enables a more pleasant work experience (Janfeshan, Panahy, Veiseh and Kamari 2011: 5).

The following section provides a review of literature on benevolent leadership. The preceding section on spirituality was important as it is one of the pillars upon which benevolent leadership is built.

2.5 BENEVOLENT LEADERSHIP

The next pertinent topic to be reviewed in this chapter is benevolent leadership. After the brief introduction below, the characteristics of benevolent leaders will be delineated, and the four streams of benevolent leadership described.

2.5.1 Introduction to Benevolent Leadership

There have been two strands of benevolent leadership in the literature, one from the East and the other from the West. It has therefore been defined differently by Chinese and Western scholars (Wang and Cheng 2010: 106). In the Chinese context, it emerged alongside Confucian teachings (Niu, Wang and Cheng 2009: 320), the central doctrine within Confucian cultural values being the virtue of goodness or benevolence (Li *et al*. 2018: 370). Benevolent leadership has been researched in the Chinese context as a facet of paternalistic leadership (Niu, Wang and Chen 2009: 32; Farh, Liang, Chou and Cheng 2008: 172), and has entrenched itself as the preferred leadership style in comparison to its other two counterparts under

50

paternalistic leadership, namely, morale leadership and authoritarianism (Tan, Zawawi and Aziz 2016: 344).

In a Chinese context, benevolent leadership has been defined as a leadership style that emphasises personal holistic concerns related to both the individual and familial well-being of subordinates (Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang and Farh 2004: 90; Wang and Cheng 2010: 107; Chen, Eberly, Chiang, Farh and Cheng 2014: 800; Chan and Mak 2012: 1). It has also been described as a form of individualised coaching and mentoring care within a work domain that enables employees to rectify their mistakes, prevents subordinates from experiencing humiliation, endeavouring to solve subordinates' work issues, and demonstrating concern for their career development. At a more personalised level of care, it focuses on treating subordinates as family members, helping them when they experience personal emergencies, and showing genuine concern that extends beyond the formal work relationship (Wang and Cheng 2010: 111; Pellegrini and Scandura 2008: 570). Hence, it has been argued that subordinates who have benevolent leaders experience positive feelings, such as being inspired and feeling happy, as benevolent leaders focus on their subordinates' personal needs and devote their attention towards them (Xu *et al.* 2018: 742).

In the West, benevolence has been defined as a philosophical belief in the potential goodness of humankind and the belief that humans should naturally use themselves as instruments to perform good, kind, or charitable acts (Bryson and Crosby 1992: 200). Benevolent leaders have also been described as those who express benevolence, goodwill, positive intentions, and take action for the greater good of humankind (Karakas and Sarigollu 2012: 538; Ghosh 2015: 292). Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 537), who conducted research related to benevolent leadership research, defined it as "the process of creating a virtuous cycle of encouraging and initiating positive change in organisations through (a) ethical decision making; (b) creating a sense of meaning; (c) inspiring hope and fostering courage for positive action; and (d) leaving a positive impact for the larger community". It focuses strongly on creating benefits, actions, and results that support the "common good" in terms of ensuring shared benefits or positive outcomes for people. The four components of benevolent leadership proposed are ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, positive engagement, and community. These four components are evident in the four scales used to explore benevolent leadership in the current study (see Chapter 4). Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 540-542) argued that these four threads will enable leaders to overcome challenges and crises within the business context and lead subordinates

51

to adapt and react proactively to organisational changes. As is evident, Karakas and Sarigollu's (2012: 539) definition is more comprehensive and holistic than that of Chinese researchers.

2.5.2 Characteristics of Benevolent Leaders

Erkutlu and Chafra (2016: 372) stated that benevolent leaders, firstly, display a greater sense of personal integrity and heightened self-awareness, which together with their commitment to truthful relationships leads to unconditional trust amongst subordinates and influences their ability to personally identify with their leader. Secondly, they added that benevolent leaders influence their employee's well-being through emotions and by deliberately creating an atmosphere that is enabling of their experience of positive emotions, which consequently affects their employee's experiences. Thirdly, they act as positive behavioural models for personally expressive and benevolent behaviours. Benevolent leaders also enable the self determination of their subordinates and create opportunities for their skill development. Finally, they influence and elevate followers through social exchanges (Erkutlu and Chafra 2016: 371).

2.5.3 The Four Streams of Benevolent Leadership

The four streams of benevolent leadership proposed by Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 537) include *morality, spirituality, vitality*, and *community responsiveness*. These are described in more detail below under their respective headings.

2.5.3.1 Morality

The *morality* perspective emerges from business ethics and is related to the ethical values and decision making of leaders (Brown and Trevino 2006: 596). It is also related to the ethical sensitivity of leaders which refers to their "process of moral reflection and consideration of what is right and wrong conduct at work" (Ghosh 2015: 594). It is synonymous with morality, integrity, honesty, virtuousness, and trust (Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 285), and therefore has relevance in terms of positively influencing the current corporate climate of corporate scandals, unethical practices, corruption and decay of moral values and human character (Ghosh 2015: 594). A leader's stance on morality by making ethical decisions, dealing with ethical dilemmas with integrity, and adhering to virtuousness and practising such

behaviours are therefore key features of benevolent leadership (Ghosh 2015: 594). The attributes of ethical leaders are discussed in more detail under section 2.5.3.3.

2.5.3.2 Vitality stream

The *vitality stream* is made up of four core concepts and relate to those aspects of leadership that bring positive change in the organisation (Karakas, 2009; Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 285). These are described in more detail below:

(a) The first concept embraces *positive psychology*, which focuses on shifting the weaknesses of people to strengths (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi 2000: 7). The focus of leaders is also to reduce resistance to change, initiate and lead positive change, and control negativity amongst subordinates (Ghosh 2015: 595). Positive influence in this way strengthens the organisation and helps to provide better focus and direction to its members in a way that can coalesce to make the whole organisation a hub of positive energy, such that organisational sustainability is achieved during tumultuous times.

(b) The second concept is based on *positive organisational scholarship* which is related to constructs such as authentic leadership, empowerment, and resilience (Cameron, Dutton and Quinn 2003: 5-30). Positive organisational scholarship is also interrelated with psychological well-being, which is significant for both employees and organisations. As such, leaders should search for mechanisms that positively influence the physical and psychological health and well-being of employees and their sense of adequacy (Kara, Uysal, Sirgy and Lee 2013: 10). Social support and psychological safety have been seen as valuable to psychological well-being, and is linked to the notion that individuals who perceive higher levels of social support and psychological safety also experience higher levels of psychological well-being in organisations as well (Erkutlu and Chafra 2016: 370). This can be linked to the third concept under the vitality stream, which is *appreciative inquiry*. This is described next.

(c) The concept of *appreciative inquiry* is linked to five strategies, namely: inquiry, inclusion, inspiration, illumination, and integrity. The appreciative leader also needs to have certain characteristics such as optimism, compassion, innovation, and respect for all (Ganguly and RoyBardhan 2020: 182).

53

(d) The fourth concept in the vitality stream is that of *positive engagement,* which focuses on creating change by providing courage and hope to subordinates by inspiring them (Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 285). Psychological safety refers to the perception of being comfortable with oneself (Edmondson 1999: 354). It enables employees to feel a greater level of comfort, hence they are more likely to articulate themselves, trust their leader, take risks, and acquire alternative ways of thinking, which collectively fosters psychological well-being (Edmondson 2003: 1422). In such work contexts, the impact of benevolent leadership on well-being is inevitably stronger as managers can use benevolent leadership to achieve greater personal and organisational well-being. This consequently leads employees to feel stronger levels of psychological well-being (Singh, Winkel and Selvarajan 2013: 249). The vitality stream of benevolent leadership does not only induce positive change in the organisation (Karakas and Sarigollu 2012: 539), but also strengthens positive citizenship behaviours in employees, such as "responsibility, altruism, civility, moderation, tolerance, and a strong work ethic" (Luthans 2002: 670).

The vitality perspective, then, is linked to positive organisational behaviour and strength-based approaches in terms of how leaders can bring about a positive difference in their organisations and the surrounding contexts (Cameron, Dutton and Quinn 2003: 55). The drive for change and the enduring pursuit of creative and innovative solutions are the hallmarks of organisational achievements through which such leadership manifests itself (Ghosh 2015: 595).

2.5.3.3 Ethical sensitivity

Ethical sensitivity is interlinked with morality, the first stream of benevolent leadership. Victor and Cullen (1987: 51-52) defined organisational ethical climate as the "shared perceptions of what is ethically correct behaviour and how ethical issues should be handled". The ethical climate of organisations contains cues that guide an employee's behaviour and reflects the ethical character of the organisation (Cullen, Parboteeah and Victor 2003: 127). The creation of an ethical climate is part of benevolent leadership. Ethical sensitivity may also be reflected in the type of work climate that reflects organisational policies, procedures, and practices that have moral consequences (Mulki, Jaramillo and Locander 2008: 147), which suggests that this is part of the benevolent leaders' role as well.

2.5.3.4 Community responsiveness stream

The *community responsiveness stream* focuses on issues of corporate social responsibility, organisational citizenship behaviour, sustainability, and society (Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 285). Its attention is directed towards the leader's contribution to their organisations and society. Karakas (2009: 41) emphasised the importance of the leader's role in creating benefits for all stakeholders within society and the global context. Given that benevolent leaders focus on the community, and the welfare of all stakeholders and society collectively, they should also support such values amongst their followers (Capece, cited in Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 286).

This stream also grew from the awareness that the environment was becoming increasingly important (Antwi, Fan, Aboagye, Brobbey, Jababu, Affum-Osei and Avornyo 2019: 250) and that the traditional, hierarchical, and authoritarian models of leadership were currently unsuitable to deal with the complex challenges of present times (Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 290).

The aforementioned four aspects of benevolent leadership are linked to ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, community responsiveness, and positivity within the current study.

2.6 IMPACT OF BENEVOLENT LEADERSHIP

Benevolent leadership has shown its effectiveness in developing a productive workforce, particularly in the Chinese work environment (Farh and Cheng 2000: 85; Farh, Cheng, Chou and Chu 2006: 232). Studies have shown the influence of benevolent leaders on followers' affective trust (Wu, Huang, Li and Liu 2012: 97), which results in a higher frequency of them taking charge. Research has also shown that benevolent leadership is positively associated consistently with workplace outcomes such as organisational commitment, loyalty, and trust in leaders (Karakas and Sarigollu 2012: 547; Pellegrini and Scandura 2006: 264; 2008: 566). Studies have found that when subordinates of benevolent leaders feel valued (Wang and Cheng 2010: 106), they have higher levels of trust which enables more innovative behaviour (Farh and Cheng 2000: 85). A study undertaken by Xu, Zhao, Xi and Zhao (2018: 750) found that followers of benevolent leaders were more likely to experience positive emotions and have enhanced energy, which resulted in constructive efforts to bring about functional change.

Their study builds on the work of Zhang, Huai and Xie (2015: 25) which showed that by developing sound positive relationships and increasing their status, positive emotions were enhanced amongst followers. Benevolent leaders also often offer task related resources and recognition (Farh and Cheng 2000: 87; Wang and Cheng 2010: 115). As such, subordinates may feel incentivised to reciprocate this by taking steps to improve work performance. Those who perceive higher levels of benevolent leadership have also been shown to exhibit stronger gratitude (Cheng *et al.* 2004: 95-96).

Moreover, benevolent leaders not only direct their subordinates but also strive to create a family feeling amongst them. In doing so, their identification with team members and across departments enables collaboration across teams (Gumusluoglu, Karakitapoglu-Aygun and Scandura 2017: 480). This fosters a close relationship between employees and their subordinates (Erben and Guneser 2008: 965), where employers show greater concern for employees and their family well-being. These leaders exhibit greater interest in their employees' personal lives and jointly celebrate special occasions, such as birthdays and weddings, as well as provide support during stressful experiences, such as death and funerals (Gumusluoglu, Karakitapoglu-Aygun and Scandura 2017: 480).

A longitudinal study with a sample of 132 employees in a manufacturing organisation in China found that benevolent leadership increased subordinates' performance (Chan 2017: 897). He concluded that benevolence influenced supporting employees in their work life which consequently helped employees develop a more intimate relationship with their leaders. Other writers such as Cheng *et al.* (2004: 89) and Cheng, Shieh and Chou (2002: 105) concurred saying that benevolent leadership increased subordinates' belief that they were being supported by their leader, which enhanced their attitude towards work and their performance.

Studies have shown that benevolent leadership promotes subordinates' gratitude towards such leaders and identification with benevolent leaders (Cheng *et al.* 2004: 90; Farh *et al.* 2006: 235). Evidence exists to support the positive effect of benevolent leadership on subordinates, with outcomes that include respect and being satisfied with the leader, organisational commitment, job performance, and organisational citizenship behaviour (Wang and Cheng 2010: 110). Other studies related to the leadership effect of benevolence have shown the potential of benevolent leadership to positively affect subordinates' performance (Pellegrini and Scandura 2006: 264; Pellegrini and Scandura 2008: 566; Pellegrini, Scandura and

56

Jaidyanathan 2010: 391), particularly through psychological empowerment (Schriesheim, Castro and Cogliser 1999: 63; Pieterse, Knippenberg, Schippers and Stam 2009: 615). Benevolent leadership, then, has been shown to have positive outcomes where employees experience support and psychologically empowering opportunities and relationships (Chan 2017: 906). Empowerment, particularly within the context of the leader-subordinate relationship, creates outcomes that include work performance, job satisfaction, and lower turnover rates (Harris, Wheeler and Kacmar 2009: 371).

Chan and Mak (2012: 287) further asserted that benevolent leaders gain greater support when their managers provide social support, exhibit kindness, and respect their subordinates' decisions. Chan (2017: 906) explained that when managers demonstrate individualised care and sincere gratitude towards employees, they become more willing to accept job related tasks and increased responsibilities due to the high levels of social bonds manifesting within the organisation. Moreover, benevolent leaders may help subordinates to share their opinions more easily, as well as enable them to devote extra effort towards their work due to there being an open environment. Research has documented that benevolence enabled these positive outcomes with subordinates, whilst authoritarian approaches were found to be negatively related to such outcomes (Pellegrini and Scandura 2008: 570).

Benevolent leadership has also been found to improve team performance. In a study by Gumusluoglu, Karakitapoglu-Aygun and Scandura (2017: 1), it was found that individuals with benevolent leaders tended to display more innovative behaviour within their teams, particularly where employees identify strongly with team members. Using a sample of 397 employees which consisted of 68 teams, they found that benevolent leadership was beneficial in terms of enhancing innovative behaviours in an organisation which relied on large scale, complex, multi-team projects. Markham and Lee (2014: 1291) made similar findings in an earlier study, which found that through family like relationships with subordinates with staff, there is increased opportunity to share knowledge within and across teams. Team innovative behaviour refers to the application of innovative ideas, products, and processes in work units or organisations (West 2002: 355). Furthermore, a qualitative study in Turkey revealed that positive change and innovation was linked to benevolent leadership (Karakitapoğlu-Aygün and Gumusluoglu 2013: 110).

57

There have been studies on how benevolent leadership contributes to greater well-being. A number of small and medium enterprises (SME) in Turkey, such as Bereket, have been exploring new ways to include care and compassion at work, particularly benevolent leadership (Karakas and Sarigollu 2013: 663). These enterprises, also referred to as "The Anatolian Tigers", have made a significant contribution to the dispersal of employment, wealth, production, growth, and local democracy in several Anatolian cities (Karakas and Sarigollu 2013: 664). The term "Bereket" is a Turkish word that means "blessing or abundance", and is an example of a compassionate company that reflects such care and compassion for its employees (Karakas and Sarigollu 2013: 663).

In an interview with one benevolent leader, he said,

"I established this company to enrich the lives of people – not only materially; but more importantly spiritually and emotionally. We have 'bereket,' (abundance and blessing here); like the rain. Bereket implies positive movement. It reminds us of God's constant help and gifts for us. God is pouring us bounties, opportunities and resources. I am just a custodian here. It is my duty to share all these with the amazing people here. I am just thankful to have such a wonderful team around me … people are the real richness" (Karakas and Sarigollu 2013: 665).

In another study on benevolent leadership in Turkey, Karakas, Sarigollu and Kavas (2015: 815) found that *Bereket* is practised by exhibiting great care for its employees. It does this by providing employees complimentary breakfasts and lunches, free tickets for cultural shows and music concerts, a library, and an eatery where employees can meet, connect, intermingle, and relax. Bereket also supports the education of its employees, such that they can pursue further learning opportunities based on what they are passionate about. The company also prioritises the health of its employees and their family members, and provides educational scholarships for their children. These benefits increase employees' belonging and job satisfaction at work. Employees also take pride in working in such environments. One participant said,

> "[If I] would describe the organizational culture of this company I would say it is a culture of benevolence and transcendence. Everyone must constantly strive and search

for the best of their own-more tolerant, considerate, sincere, and compassionate" (Karakas, Sarigollu and Kavas 2015: 814).

Another said,

"[W]hat characterizes organizational culture here is that employees have a special bonding with one another at work. Employees feel responsibility and show genuine concern for customers. Our customers are impressed by our sense of empathy and problem-solving. This sense of dedication sets ups apart from the competition" (Karakas, Sarigollu and Kavas 2015: 815).

When Bereket managers were asked about their ethical code, they referred to a system called "the Ahilik code", which is made visible on the worktables of senior managers at Bereket. It reads as follows: "keep your hands open (generosity, benevolence, and charity,) keep your dining table open (sharing, hospitality and generosity), keep your door open (helping, altruism and benevolence), keep your eyes tied (focus on spirituality and the hereafter instead of materialism), control your waist (decency, morality and self-restrain), hold your tongue (dignity, silence and wisdom)" (Karakas and Sarigollu 2013: 663).

Their ethic of compassion is based on the need to act ethically, to reach the ideal, to be responsible, to live life the right way, and to improve the world. This ethic is also devoted towards a larger cause, especially contributing to the common good for all. One participant said, "I established this company to enrich the lives of people, not only materially but more importantly spiritually and emotionally". Community responsiveness is evident in the number of corporate social responsibility projects undertaken at the organisation. Bereket employees also volunteer time at a Turkish NGO (non-governmental organisation) to implement projects. For example, "the children shall not feel cold" (sharing coats for the winter), "1001 children, 1001 wishes" (online matching service for the wishes of children and donors who realise these wishes), "water is civilization" (providing sustainable water sources for villagers), are some examples of the projects undertaken at these organisations.

The preceding sub-sections reviewed literature on benevolence. The sub-sections that follow explore organisational citizenship behaviour and organisational benevolence.

2.7 ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000: 513) defined *organisational citizenship behaviour* as voluntary behaviours or "organizationally beneficial behaviours that cannot be enforced on the basis of formal role obligations". Organisational citizenship behaviour can also be defined as extra-role behaviours (Yusof, Yaacob and Rahman 2019: 50), particularly those behaviours that move beyond role requirements and are therefore not formally rewarded (Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 286). Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar (2019: 286) described organisational citizenship behaviour within organisations as cooperation with upholding organisational procedures, being loyal to the organisation, and putting greater effort into achieving the goals of the organisation.

Organisational citizenship behaviours are multifaceted and can be targeted at individual persons, groups, or the organisation itself (Gupta, Shaheen and Reddy 2017: 974). Podsakoff *et al.* (2000: 513) identified five dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour, namely: (1) *altruism*, or helping behaviours that include assisting others voluntarily with organisationally relevant tasks; (2) *conscientiousness*; (3) *going beyond* the usual levels of punctuality, housekeeping, safeguarding resources, and attending at work above the norm, and being tolerant of inevitable inconveniences that may arise at work without complaining; (4) behaving *courteously* to prevent conflict with others; and (5) *civic virtue* which relates to being responsive and constructively involved in the organisation by keeping ahead of changes at work. Organisational citizenship behaviour can also include working co-operatively with co-workers and helping them with various tasks (Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 286). Podsakoff *et al.* (2000: 514) posited that organisations flourish when employees help each other in their roles. Ghosh (2015: 597) argued that benevolent leaders can influence follower behaviour, which in turn can become effective organisational citizenship behaviour.

Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000: 513) described the threads of organisational citizenship behaviour as 1) helping behaviours; 2) sportsmanship, 3) organisational loyalty, 4) organisational compliance, 5) individual initiative, 6) civic virtue, and 7) self-development. The impact of such citizenship behaviour patterns in contributing to organisational success has been documented in several prior studies (Podsakoff *et al.* 2000: 514). Research undertaken by Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar (2019: 287) in Pakistan explored the association

between benevolent leadership and the organisational citizenship behaviour of employees who were their subordinates. Their study emphasised the importance of the leadership style of executive managers as it was discovered that benevolent leadership enhanced employees' organisational citizenship behaviour. Chan and Mak (2012: 289) argued that subordinates will reciprocate the personal care given to them by leaders, by providing extra benefits to the organisation. Research has documented that benevolent leadership is positively correlated with organisational citizenship behaviour (Karakas and Sarigollu 2012: 550). Chu and Hung 2009: 65) also found in their study that the aspect of benevolent leadership embedded within paternalistic leadership is positively linked with organisational citizenship behaviour. Similarly, Chen and Hsieh (2011: 46) reported that benevolence, which is a thread of paternalistic leadership, is positively related to in-role and extra-role performance.

Whilst there are not many studies related to the impact and outcomes of benevolent leadership, there are many studies which show that its individual streams have beneficial effects. For example, some studies have shown the positive relationship between ethical leaders and their followers organisational citizenship behaviour (Avey, Palanski and Walumbwa 2011: 582; Kacmar, Andrews, Harris and Tepper 2013: 35). There have been other studies which demonstrate how the spiritual stream of benevolent leadership (Karakas and Sarigollu 2012: 539) influences employees organisational citizenship behaviour (Chen and Yang 2012: 114; Ahmadi, Nami and Barvarz 2014: 264). Positive engagement, which is part of the vitality stream of benevolent leadership, has also been found to affect organisational citizenship behaviour directly (Ghosh 2015: 593; Karakas and Sarigollu 2012: 539). This finding was supported in various studies (Chan and Mak 2012: 300; Ghosh 2015: 593; Lin, Lyau, Tsai, Chen and Chiu 2010: 357; Tan, Zawawi and Aziz 2016: 343). More recently, Kanwal *et al*. (2019: 298) found with a sample of 202 information technology companies operating in Pakistan that benevolent leadership significantly influences employees' organisational citizenship behaviour. The topic of organisational benevolence is discussed next.

2.8 ORGANISATIONAL BENEVOLENCE

Perceived organisational support has been conceptualised as "the belief of employees about the extent to which their organization cares about their well-being and values their contribution". It is also seen as an employee's understanding of their organisation's commitment to their well-being (Kanwal, Rathore and Qaisar 2019: 287). The manner in

which organisations value their employees and their well-being was found to be an important factor influencing organisational success (Guerrero and Herrbach 2019: 1548). It is therefore the role of benevolent leaders to create benevolent organisations.

Viot and Benraiss-Noailles (2019: 10) identified several indicators of organisational benevolence embedded within their configuration of four levels of benevolence. These four levels are described in more detail below:

a. The first level focuses on *working conditions* that encompasses everything that can be undertaken by an organisation to make employees lives easier.

b. The second level relates to *company rules*, such that the abuse of staff time is avoided. Viot and Benraiss-Noailles (2019: 10) cited the example of KPMG who has two benevolence charters in place, namely: (i) The first is regarded as the "no stress" charter, which encompasses ten managerial behaviours to combat stress. It includes aspects such as courtesy and respect, recognising success stories, and a clear understanding of each subordinate's role functions. (ii) The second principle is more family-oriented and relates to the relationship between home and work. It sets ground rules for no meetings after work, greater support for new mothers who return to work once their maternity leave is over, and no emails over weekends. Bentein, Vandenberghe, Vandenberg and Stinglhamber (2005: 468) also recognised that organisations that provide employee benefits, for example, flexible working conditions as well as onsite day care for children, were those who have genuine consideration for the well-being of their employees.

Often excessive work demands create forced choices between the organisation and worker's private life. O'Reilly and Pfeffer (2000: 107-108) reported on how SAS Institute, which is located in the US and is the largest globally owned software company with profits that exceed 2 billion dollars, is generous with its family-related benefits and in-house care facilities for their children. This allows workers to visit their children during the day; share lunch time meals with them in the company's cafeterias; coach them during sport activities; and be more engaged in their education. The large work field provides space for picnics on weekends, and other facilities such as the company's swimming pool and athletic amenities are accessible to both families and employees. They have a simple philosophy that "the best way to produce the best and get the best results is to behave as if the people who are creating those things for

62

you are important to you. … It just means you take care of the folks who are taking care of you". Hence, SAS Institute realises that their family is valuable to each employee. Through this recognition, they obviate family stressors by providing benefits and services that enable them cope with family demands and ensuring that they can honour family-related obligations beyond work time (O'Reilly and Pfeffer 2000: 107-108). KPMG's other list of good practices include the "the ten commandments of benevolence", namely: being polite, having empathy, being available, punctual, having a smile, being trustworthy, positive, optimistic, keeping calm, and spreading the word on benevolence (Viot and Benraiss-Noailles 2019: 11).

(c) The third of Viot and Benraiss-Noailles' (2019: 11) levels of organisational benevolence focussed on the *quality of the interrelationship* between the employee and their leader. They said that benevolence focuses on reconstructing old managerial patterns by shifting away from a prescriptive style that gives orders to subordinates. Instead, it focuses on respect and kindness towards employees, listening sensitively to their needs and problems, providing encouragement, being respectful, and being generous with praise when they do well. According to them, this constitutes a set of indicators that displays organisational benevolence. Hence, when subordinates can see and experience the benevolence of their leader, it indicates the extent to which the organisation recognises and appreciates their contribution and demonstrates concern for their well-being (Aselage and Eisenberger 2003: 508).

(d) The fourth level of organisational benevolence is linked to *governance and how profits are distributed* such that the interests of all stakeholders are considered in the organisation. Employees are also regarded as stakeholders and jointly share in profits through the creation of incentives, profit sharing, and joint ownership. This in turn can be extended to social responsibility, when organisations start to take into consideration the needs of communities (Maak and Pless 2006: 101).

The following section looks at management education, the gaps in education, and what to include in curricula to adequately equip and prepare future leaders and managers. The topic of benevolent leadership education is also discussed.

63

2.9 EDUCATION

Business schools have a critical role to play in in shaping the minds of future managers in the world of business and, in addition to training future managers, they exert a huge influence over boardrooms through top executive forums, colloquiums, seminars, and workshops (de Bettignies 2013: 169). Old management models which are predicated upon competitiveness, profits and hierarchy, however, have created many organisational and societal challenges, as evidenced within the literature reviewed. Of significance is the work of the Globally Responsible Leadership Initiative, which indicates that management education should have three fundamental roles, namely: educating and developing globally responsible leaders; enabling business organisations to serve the common good; and engaging in the transformation of business and the economy (Haertle, Parkes, Murray and Hayes 2017: 67). De Bettignies (2013) expressed that, in order to achieve this paradigm shift, it is crucial that management education moves away from the neo-liberal model to creating new, innovative institutions that prioritise the development of individuals who are well equipped to cope with a more complex world, to see their role as serving society, and to having a more holistic and balanced responsibility towards all stakeholders. Accordingly, academics and students must be committed to playing a role in curriculum development, and although corporate managers and corporate employers of graduates are not directly in the midst of universities, they could support the move towards change. As de Bettignies (2013: 178) said, these stakeholders should work towards a society model that is based on cooperation rather than competition, equity rather than growth, frugality instead of consumption, harmony rather than conflict, and the development of social entrepreneurs who are concerned with society.

The shift from contemporary neo-liberalism imperialism will ensure a strong bridge between the worlds of academia and practice. Those management schools willing to take this lead should be eager to develop and share knowledge for an issues-based learning module that is concerned with the planet and population. Management education will be tasked with re-developing the capacities of leadership and entrepreneurship that will be required from executives and managers who can ensure corporate social responsibility and sustainability (de Bettignies 2013: 178). Whilst there is little literature on benevolent leadership education, within this context, the literature has given attention to how various aspects of benevolent leadership can bring about a change. Thus far it has been Karakas (2010: 2) who advocated for positive management education, and Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil (2013: 801) who

asserted that benevolent leadership could be used to advance the principles of responsible management education.

Studies on contemporary leadership and management education have therefore increasingly reflected on whether management education will enable students to deal with the ethical and social challenges they face (Herremans and Murch 2021: 92; Haertle *et al.* 2017: 67-68). What has emerged is the large divide between management academics, corporations and business schools in terms of the gap between theory and practice, which has resulted in many managers and leaders being unprepared for the aspects related to business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and benevolence (Edwards and Gallagher 2018: 4; Maloni, Palmer, Cohen, Gligor, Grout and Myers 2021: 1).

Almost two decades ago, de Bettignies (2013: 171) mentioned that management schools had distanced themselves from criticisms regarding the mind-set they were adopting and the managerial attitudes and behaviour their education had promoted. In fact, the then dominant management education paradigm had refused to accept the failures of the neo-liberal model (de Bettignies 2013: 169). However, through more in-depth reflection on dominant teaching paradigms, by reconstructing models that are being taught and redesigning curricula, therein lies greater opportunity for developing a new cadre of leaders who can develop better organisations and communities, and a more sustainable environment (Kemper, Ballantine and Hall 2019: 1751-1752). Accordingly, Viot and Benraiss-Noailles (2019: 11) argued that leaders require training in benevolence, and therefore, relevant courses should be made available to help them develop better relationships with staff.

In line with this, business schools began to consider redefining their curriculum so as to make a change in the mind-set of future leaders or managers. To enable this, the formation of the Principles of Responsible Management Education (PRME) body identified six principles to guide higher education institutions. Whilst relevant to higher education institutions, they constitute important principles within the context of management education. The six principles of PRME are as follows:

1. "Purpose: developing the capabilities of students to be future generators of sustainable value for business and society at large and to work for an inclusive and sustainable global economy.

2. Values: incorporating into our academic activities and curricula the values of global social responsibility as portrayed in international initiatives such as the United Nations Global Compact.

3. Method: Creating educational frameworks, materials, processes and environments that enable effective learning experiences for responsible leadership.

4. Research: Engaging in conceptual and empirical research that advances our understanding about the role, dynamics, and impact of corporations in the creation of sustainable social, environmental and economic value.

5. Partnership: Interacting with managers of business corporations to extend our knowledge of their challenges in meeting social and environmental responsibilities and to explore jointly effective approaches to meeting these challenges.

6. Dialogue: Facilitating and supporting dialogue and debate among educators, students, business, government, consumers, media, civil society organisations and other interested groups and stakeholders on critical issues related to global social responsibility and sustainability" (UNPRME, cited in Singh and Gupta 2021: 36-37).

Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil (2013: 801) argued that benevolent leadership has the potential to advance the aforementioned principles of responsible management education. They argued that the four paradigms of benevolent leadership, namely *ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, positive engagement* and *community responsiveness,* could easily contribute to achieving the principles of responsible management education. For example, the focus of benevolent leadership on sustainable development through the community paradigm ensures a shift from economic focus to a balance of profits, spirituality, and social responsibility concerns, as well as service and stewardship. This community perspective also creates a focus on corporate social responsibility and corporate citizenship aspects of a leader's behaviour, particularly in terms of understanding the leader's contribution to society and community (Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil 2013: 803).

It enables the benevolent leader to extend his/her boundaries beyond the formal organisational context, and focuses on the prevailing socio-economic context as a part of social responsiveness (Ghosh 2015: 595). According to Ghosh (2015: 595), the social responsiveness aspect of leadership concerns itself with addressing environmental, social, and community issues that exist around an organisation's environment. It is the "common good" aspect of benevolent leadership that can be used to extend organisational boundaries such that

they can spill over into the operating environment in a way that builds meaningful relationships and partnerships with communities. Ghosh (2015: 595) argued that this prepares leaders to begin social transformation and change beyond organisational territory, and is the way that benevolent leadership is achieved.

Moreover, spirituality, which is a part of benevolent leadership, has also begun to receive earnest consideration in management education. To date, literature has grown exponentially which has made a case for executive MBA programmes to incorporate spirituality, self-awareness, and reflection into their leadership development programmes (Roglio and Light 2009: 156) and for educators to introduce it into management curricula (Burton, Culham and Vu 2021: 207). In fact, Hertz and Friedman (2015: 2158) reported that since 80% of first-year college students were interested in spirituality, it was appropriate to include spiritual values such as making work meaningful, respect for the creativity of employees, and improving the world for all into business courses. Illes and Zsolnai (2015:68) added that there is an imbalance in business education, and that by introducing spirituality in business education, students could be prepared to deal with the complexities of the workplace and engage their true self to uncover spiritual values that can be transferred to the workplace. To this end, Mayrhofer and Steinbereithner (2016: 303) stated that spirituality had been a blind spot for the goals and values of major business schools in their daily routines and infrastructure, as well as their leadership curricula. Ghosh and Mukherjee (2020: 469) concurred, saying that deeper issues such as spirituality and corporate social responsibility are neglected in management education, and that students must have exposure to these facets during their educational preparedness. Siddiqi, Chick and Dibben (2017: 1) asserted that spirituality was crucial to influencing ethical decision making, and hence, was relevant when teaching ethics.

The literature includes several examples of how academics have begun to integrate spiritual topics into their leadership or management classes (Allen and Williams 2020: 38-40). To this end, Friedland and Jain (2020: 4) argued the need for business schools to reframe the purpose of business, reframe the meaning of professional success, and reframe the ethos of business education. Relating to the impact, increasing frequency, and the identified need for spirituality in Business Schools, Alsop (cited in Marques, Dhiman and Biberman 2014: 200) described an MBA course taught at Stanford University's Graduate School of Business, titled 'The Business World: Moral and Spiritual Inquiry Through Literature', and the University of Notre Dame in Indiana where a similar course is taught, to challenge students "to look beyond

67

prestige and salary and ask whether a potential employer is a good fit morally and spiritually". Pielstick (2005: 153), through his review of a business leadership course, argued that "students as prospective leaders, need to understand issues of reasonable accommodation, religious holidays, display of religious objects, religious practices at work, and so forth". To support spiritual content in business education, several books, such as, *A Spiritual Audit of Corporate America: A hard look at Spirituality, Religion and Values in the Workplace,* by Ian Mitroff and Elizabeth Denton; *Awakening the Corporate Soul: Four Paths to Unleash the power of people at work,* by Eric Klein; *and The Tao of Leadership*, by John Heider (cited in Marques, Dhiman and Biberman 2014: 200), were published.

Positive organisational scholarship, which undergirds the positive management education model proposed by Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil (2013: 803), uses varied theoretical constructs, including virtuousness, resilience, authentic leadership, meaningfulness, and empowerment to explain and enable top performance, excellence, and vitality in organisations. This too, coupled with the teaching of spirituality, ethics, and community responsiveness, may create a foundation for benevolent leadership education. The teaching of these aforementioned constructs can enable and empower the potential of management students. As Jayakumar and Joshi (2017: 52) argued, management education's role lies in developing the right values amongst management students.

Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil (2013: 805) contended that when integrating the four dimensions of benevolent leadership they form a holistic, multidimensional model of positive management education that can be used as the basis of course design and instructional methods.

There has also been a focus on the importance of teaching management student's ethical awareness, which has resulted in the growth of business ethics education in university curricula (Tormo-Carbó, Segui-Mas and Oltra 2016: 162). Mladenovic and Martinov-Bennie (2019: 275), for example, conducted a study that examined students' reflections on how their understanding of ethics was challenged and/or changed, and what facilitated the development of ethical decision-making approaches in a first-year accounting course. They found that students had developed a more contextualised view of ethical issues in business, government, and social contexts, including the need to consider their impact on various stakeholders through such a course. They attributed this to their course design which included real cases

68

from newspaper articles, an ethical decision-making framework with various ethical perspectives, a reflective journal component, and the ability to work in groups. Tormo-Carbó, Oltra, Klimkiewicz and Seguí-Mas (2019: 508) concurred saying that students must be taught business ethics using case-based approaches that focus on ethical rules, principles, guidelines, and strategies.

To date, management education has focussed on including discrete elements of benevolent leadership as stand-alone courses on ethics, social responsibility, or spirituality, as opposed to merging its four strands together. This was only until the work of Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil (2013: 804) argued that all must be taught in an interrelated way under the umbrella of benevolent leadership. In order to teach the same, they proposed a positive management education model that is based on the following six dimensions: a). fostering integrative and holistic thinking; b). building sense of community through high quality relationships; c). creative brainstorming and skill building through innovative projects; d). integrating spirituality into the classroom; e). fostering flexibility and empowerment through individualised attention; and f). creating enabling and nurturing learning environments.

In terms of the benevolent leadership course they proposed, they argued that the following learning objectives could be aligned with each pillar of benevolent leadership, as follows:

1. To increase ethical sensitivity and awareness of students and to enable them to reflect on management values and business ethics (ethical sensitivity);
2. To develop reflective capacities and self-awareness leading to a sense of personal responsibility for humankind (spiritual depth);
3. To learn about positive change methods in human systems and implement them through a shared vision, inspiration, hope and courage (positive engagement); and
4. To develop a sense of social responsibility through involvement in community organisations and service-learning projects at diverse work placements (community responsiveness).

They further suggested the following activities or projects be linked to these learning outcomes in a benevolent leadership course, namely: moral reflection exercises and guest speakers; reflection journals; executive book club; organisational development and change blog; community service projects; experiential learning; and community service projects

69

(Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil 2013: 804). According to Marques and Dhiman and Biberman (2014: 201), the major thrust of courses on spirituality include assessments such as critiquing an existing business entity on its perceived level of compliance with workplace spirituality, or developing a report on the primary components of a spiritually-oriented organisation.

Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil (2013: 804) believed that the leadership strengths and skills that could emerge from a course on benevolent leadership includes a greater sense of moral responsibility, honesty, integrity, self-awareness, a sense of meaning and purpose, inspiring and mobilising people, creativity and innovativeness, and social responsibility. They added that this course has been offered to professionals, managers, and university students in Turkey and Canada, and were designed as intensive leadership development modules pitched at enhancing social responsibility and global awareness. The following comments were made by students involved in this course:

"Personally I learned so much about managing change and the endless possibilities that I can use in managing a team, creating innovative solutions or creating a business".

"The reflection exercises have provided me with a deeper sense of meaning regarding my work and I have now begun viewing my career as a calling. The reflective elements of the spiritual depth module have enabled me to gain a better understanding of my deepest values, what they mean, and how I can use them for improving the quality of life around me".

"We have been provided with a great variety of organizational change projects and the flexibility to choose our organizations and projects that best fit us".
"We were able to establish dialog with diverse stakeholders while we were designing our service learning projects. We learned how everyone and everything in social systems are interconnected and this has provided us with a holistic view while were designing our projects to advance social innovation" (Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil 2013: 813-815).

In light of the above review, some concluding remarks follow next to wrap up the chapter.

2.10 CONCLUSION

The literature reviewed highlighted different leadership styles and approaches as they have emerged in the literature. Particular emphasis was placed on workplace spirituality and benevolent leadership as they are related to the focus of this study.

The following chapter contains a discussion of the methodology used to guide the study.

CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter presented the literature review of the study. Attention now shifts to the methodology that was employed to conduct this research. Research can be described as an original investigation undertaken to develop knowledge and understand concepts in an area of specialisation. It includes generating new ideas and information that contributes to improved scientific insights (Balakumar, Inamdar and Jagadeesh 2013: 130). It provides a way of systematically analysing and interpreting data so that a researcher can understand a particular phenomenon (Williams 2007: 65). The research undertaken in the current study was to understand benevolent leadership in greater depth.

The structure of this chapter is as follows: The first section following the introduction (section 3.1) describes the research design and methodology used to conduct the study (section 3.2). This is followed by identifying the study population (section 3.3) and sample used, as well as the sampling strategies (section 3.4), the recruitment process (section 3.5), and how the data was collected and analysed (sections 3.6 to 3.10). In addition to confirming the validity and reliability of the instrument (section 3.11), the limitations of the study (section 3.12) and ethical issues (section 3.13) also summarised. A brief conclusion wraps up the chapter (section 3.14).

To recap: The aim of the study was to investigate the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of benevolent leaders and how benevolence influenced organisational performance and their views on what aspects of benevolent education needed to be integrated into leadership education in South Africa. The objectives were as follows: to investigate the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of benevolent leaders in South Africa; to examine the impact of benevolent leadership on organisational performance; to enquire whether university education prepared managers for benevolent leadership; and to provide recommendations on what content related to benevolent management could be included in management education.

The quantitative research approach and survey research is discussed next.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

A research design constitutes a blueprint or guide that can be used for the planning, implementation, and analysis of a study (Sousa, Driessnack and Mendes 2007: 1). Similarly, Babbie and Mouton (2001: 74) described the research design as a plan or blueprint that stipulates how the research study will be conducted. It provides a plan regarding the selection of the research population, methods for sampling, measurement, data collection and analysis (Burns and Grove 2007: 38). Kerlinger (1986: 279) elucidated further that a research design is "a plan, structure and strategy of investigation so conceived as to obtain answers to research questions or problems". A research design then provides a suitable framework for the implementation of a study; it also enables researchers to make an important choice regarding the research approach, as it helps decide how the relevant data for the study will be acquired (Sileyew, 2019: 2). The primary function of a research design, then, is to develop an operational plan for implementing the various data collection processes and tasks needed to complete the study, and to ensure that these processes are adequate enough to secure valid, objective, and precise information related to one's research objectives (Kumar 2014: 123). This study adopted a quantitative research design that was exploratory in nature. The study was descriptive in nature as it presented an accurate reflection of the characteristics of individuals, situations, or groups, and the frequency with which certain phenomena occurred, using statistics to describe, reflect, and summarise the data (Polit and Hungler 2013: 158). In addition, survey research was used to guide the study design. Quantitative research methodology, which used an exploratory descriptive survey was deemed most appropriate for this study in accordance with the objectives of the study.

3.2.1 Quantitative Research Methodology

Quantitative research has been defined as a "process that is systematic and objective in its ways of using numerical data from only a selected subgroup of a universe to generalise the findings to the universe that is being studied" (Pietersen and Maree 2016: 162). This study used a quantitative research design that adopted an objective, rigorous, and systematic approach to generate and refine knowledge (Creswell 2003: 53). Quantitative research methodology is based on the philosophy of rationalism and follows a rigid, structured, and pre-determined set of procedures to explore and quantify the extent of variation in a

73

phenomenon. It also emphasises the measurement of variables and the objectivity of the process, and communicates the findings in an analytical way (Kumar 2014: 14). In the case of the present study, quantitative research methodology was seen to be the best methodological approach to measure or quantify the characteristics and attitudes of benevolent leaders, the effect of benevolence on organisational performance, and to quantify the important aspects required to be integrated into tertiary curricula in South Africa.

Quantitative research has also been described as a "formal, objective, rigorous and systematic process for generating events, or concepts in the world" (Burns and Grove 2007: 24). In this study, it was used to describe benevolent leadership. In order to ensure scientific rigour, quantitative research requires the use of accurate measuring instruments, a representative sample, and a rigidly controlled study design (Burns and Grove 2007: 28). In the present study, the use of two scales (Benevolent Leadership Scale and Organisational Performance Scale) served as the measuring instruments to meet the first two objectives of the study, namely: *to investigate the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of benevolent leaders* (Objective 1) and *how benevolence influenced organisational performance* (Objective 2). The *extent to which university education prepared them for benevolent leadership* was also quantified using closed-ended questions (Objective 3). The latter constituted the third objective of the study. Given that the main aim of the study was to conduct a survey on benevolent leadership, quantitative research methodology in conjunction with a survey research design was therefore viewed as the most suitable approach. Quantitative research designs are most appropriate so that the research can follow a logical order, and the findings generalised as numerical data would be more meaningful (Polit and Beck 2013: 739).

3.2.2 Descriptive or Exploratory Design

This study fits within a non-experimental, descriptive or exploratory approach, which is used when little is known about a particular phenomenon (Walker 2005: 580). In this approach, the researcher observes, describes, and documents various aspects of a phenomenon (Burns and Grove 2007: 249). In this case, little was known about the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of benevolent leaders. Furthermore, little was known about its impact on organisational performance and whether benevolence was a feature of university education. Through the use of a descriptive exploratory survey, these three objectives were met. In a non-experimental study, the researcher is an observer and collects information from participants

without intervening (Polit and Beck 2012: 55). Variables are also not manipulated and there is no search for cause or effect relationships. Instead, descriptive designs describe what actually exists, determines the frequency with which things happen, and categorises the information (Sousa, Driessnack and Mendes 2007: 3). This design allows researchers to describe concepts, such as benevolent leadership, as in the case of this study, and provides a grounding for further quantitative research studies (Burns and Grove 2007: 249).

3.2.3 Survey Research

Survey research was seen as an appropriate approach as it provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by researching what occurs in a subset or sample of a given population (Creswell and Creswell 2018: 12). It is the best method available to measure attitudes and orientations in a population (Babbie 2016: 2480. It can use cross-sectional approaches that utilise survey questionnaires for the collection of data, with the intention of generalising from a sample to a population (Creswell and Creswell 2018: 12). It has been described as "the collection of information from a sample of individuals through their responses to questions" (Check and Schutt 2012: 160). In addition, survey research permits a variety of methods to recruit participants and collect data, and also utilises diverse instrumentation methods (Ponto 2015: 168). Survey research often uses quantitative research approaches such as questionnaires, as in the case of the present study, to understand human behaviour.

Having described the methodology and research design above, the research population is delineated next, along with the sample of the study in the section further below.

3.3 POPULATION

A population can be defined as all individuals who possess specific characteristics, or the totality of people that the researcher wishes to study (Kumar 2014: 82). In this study, the population consists of all managers who display characteristics of benevolent leadership and who implement it at their organisations.

A population can be regarded as individuals that meet a similar selected criteria that would be included in a research study (Burns and Grove 2007: 40). The number of businesses who adopt

a benevolent approach to leadership and the exact number of benevolent leaders are unknown. Hence, it was impossible to provide a number for the population as the exact number of benevolent managers are unknown.

The study sample and sampling strategy are described in more detail below. Also stipulated are the inclusion and exclusion criteria used to guide participant selection.

3.4 SAMPLE

A sample can be regarded as a smaller selection of the research participants from the relevant population. The "key characteristics" of a sample must resemble that of the population (Polit and Beck 2012: 275). The purpose of sampling in survey research is to secure an appropriate number of participants, representatives of the population of interest (Ponto 2015: 169), as it is not always possible to collect data from the entire population being studied. Hence a subset or sample is sourced to capture responses of the population. As Ponto (2015: 169) said, the sample must include characteristics similar to that of the population; hence, it is crucial to identify the population of interest, so that the sample includes individuals who reflect the characteristics of the population. The intention was to reach 150 managers in South Africa. This was the number recommended by Karakas (2009: 54) who studied benevolent leadership in Turkey.

The sample for the study were benevolent leaders or managers at organisations in the Western Cape, Gauteng, and KwaZulu-Natal (KZN). The need for a survey that extended beyond KZN was justified, as it was not possible to locate 150 benevolent managers in KZN. The researcher resides in KZN.

3.4.1 Sampling Strategy

The study used a non-probability sampling design. *Non-probability* sampling strategies "are used when either the number of elements in a population is unknown or the elements cannot be individually identified" (Kumar 2014: 242). As the number of benevolent leaders in South Africa was unknown, this was seen as the appropriate strategy. *Judgemental or purposive* sampling refers to the researcher's judgement in deciding "who can provide the best information to achieve the objectives" of the study (Kumar 2014: 244). Kumar (2014: 244)

76

noted that although this strategy is more commonly used in qualitative research, it can also be employed in quantitative research, as the researcher will select a predetermined number of people who, in their judgement, are best able to provide the researcher with the information that is specifically needed for his or her study.

It was impossible to specify the population, as the number of those who practice the principles of benevolent leadership are unknown. As this was an exploratory study, judgemental sampling was utilised to recruit managers or leaders from profit and non-profit organisations, small and medium enterprises, and medium to large enterprises in three major provinces, viz. Western Cape, KZN, and Gauteng. According to Hinkin (1995), a sample size of 150 is sufficient to obtain accurate data in exploratory studies. Firstly, telephone calls were made to several professional contacts explaining the nature and objectives of the study to them. Their help as volunteers in snowballing the survey questionnaires to benevolent leaders was requested and secured. These professional contacts were requested to distribute survey questionnaires, given the poor response rates to surveys. Three hundred and fifty (350) questionnaires were printed and given to several professional contacts in the three different provinces identified to distribute. A larger number was printed as response rates to surveys are poor. Three hundred and fourteen (314) completed surveys however were eventually secured and were utilised. The final response rate was deemed acceptable in light of Karakas' stipulation of 150 for exploratory studies.

As this is an exploratory study, judgement sampling to recruit these participants was considered adequate. Judgement or purposive sampling allowed for flexibility, convenience, and insight in selecting the managers to participate in the survey. Although it could limit generalisation, the key aim was to provide recommendations for what aspects could be included into a course on benevolent leadership. This allowed for the inclusion of participants, based on the judgement of the researcher, that reflected the most characteristic, representative, or typical attributes of the population that best suited the purposes of the study (Strydom 2011: 232). In this case, it was benevolent leadership.

This choice of strategy, however, to a degree, limited generalisability across all the managers in the population. Nevertheless, the intention of this study was not to generalise the findings made, but rather to explore the characteristics, values, and principles of benevolent leaders. It was also to ascertain the potential influence of benevolent leadership on organisational

performance and to explore whether management education prepared leaders to use a benevolent leadership approach. Hence, judgement sampling was used as a sampling strategy because it allowed for the use of convenience and insight when identifying and recruiting participants.

The researcher heeded Karakas' (2009: 55) suggestion of seeking a diverse sample in terms of demographics, background, and attitudes towards benevolence. This was to ensure diversity in terms of sectors, positions, and job experiences. After identifying a few participants through professional contacts, the researcher recruited volunteers (benevolent leaders), as per Karakas' (2009: 55) suggestion, to recruit participants in this way. They in turn agreed to assist in distributing the surveys to other professional contacts in all of the three provinces. Hence, a *snowball sampling* method was used in conjunction with purposive sampling.

Given that the number of elements in the population were unknown, they could not be selected individually. Although there are six non-random designs for the purpose of this study, only two were used, viz. judgemental or purposive sampling, and snowball sampling. According to Kumar (2014: 244), judgemental sampling is used when you select participants who can provide the best information suitable to the objectives of the study. In purposive sampling, a researcher approaches participants most likely to possess the information required for the study. Although this sampling approach is more commonly used in qualitative research, when used in quantitative research the researcher can select a predetermined number of participants who can best contribute to meeting the objectives of the study. The researcher also used snowball sampling, which is the method used to select participants using networks. Kumar (2014: 244) suggested that once key people are identified and information is obtained from them, then they are asked to identify other suitable members of the group, who in turn can identify other relevant people for data collection. However, those who were ultimately selected were nonetheless chosen on the basis of them being deemed as benevolent leaders. This allowed for the inclusion of participants, not only based on the judgement of the researcher, but also in relation to the fact that they contained the most characteristic, representative, or typical attributes of the population that best suits the purpose of the study (Strydom 2011: 232). The specific inclusion and exclusion criteria are detailed further below.

Karakas (2009: 94) wrote that a sample size of 150 was sufficient in exploratory studies. This was the targeted number for this study. This was supported by Hinkin (1995: 204) who stated

that a sample size of 150 was adequate to obtain accurate data in exploratory studies, which could reflect the diversity in terms of demographics, background, and attitudes towards benevolence across South Africa. In this way, the sample would include a cross-section of managers.

3.4.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

According to Burns and Grove (2007: 325), inclusion and exclusion criteria are used to ensure accuracy in sampling and the actual research study. A sample requires that certain eligibility criteria are met. Hence, the researcher applied inclusion criteria to carefully select appropriate participants for the study. Exclusion criteria, in contrast, refer to those who would be excluded from the study. The following inclusion and exclusion criteria were used in the study.

3.4.2.1 Inclusion criteria
1) Leaders who were willing to participate voluntarily in the study.
2) Leaders who practised the principles of benevolent leadership. As per the operational definition of benevolent leadership, managers who worked with compassion and concern for those in the workplace and society were included in the study.
3) Managers/leaders who worked in the Western Cape, KZN, and Gauteng.

3.4.2.2 Exclusion criteria
1) Leaders who did not show a willingness to participate voluntarily in the study.
2) Leaders who did not practise the principles of benevolent leadership.
3) Managers/leaders working outside of the Western Cape, KZN, and Gauteng.

The following section describes the recruitment process of finding and selecting suitable respondents to participate in this study and complete the survey.

3.5 RECRUITMENT PROCESS

Participants were recruited through professional contacts, specifically those who reflected a tendency to practice benevolent leadership. Snowball sampling was used from these initial contacts to identify other managers. Hence, the few professional contacts assisted in identifying participants and distributing the survey to them to fill in. This was the same process

adopted by Karakas (2009: 55). Even though snowball sampling was used, judgement was still used to select those who would participate in the study. The initial participants that were recruited voluntarily helped to snowball the distribution of copies (of surveys) to others. All participants were informed that participation in the study was completely voluntary.

The essential process of collecting the data for this study is described next, followed by a description of the instrument used.

3.6 DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

According to Burns and Grove (2007: 536), the process of data collection involves the acquisition of relevant information from participants. The actual steps in the data collection process are specific to each study and are dependent on the research design. Participants may be selected at the onset of data collection or may be recruited throughout the data collection process. This was followed in the current study. Burns and Grove (2007: 563) emphasised that before data collection occurs, the researcher must ensure that consent has been received from the participants (see Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 for the letter of information and consent used in the study, respectively). Hence, before each participant completed the survey questionnaires, they had to read the letter of information in the aforementioned appendices and sign the consent form as well.

3.7 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

A structured survey questionnaire was utilised as the instrument to collect data. The quantitative research approach suggests the use of a predetermined instrument. The instrument was a self-administered questionnaire, which each participant had to complete at their own leisure, in the absence of the researcher, as it ensured that objectivity was maintained, and bias was minimised.

A letter of information (Appendix 1) was attached to every questionnaire. It provided relevant information regarding the researcher, the aim of the study, and the importance of the findings to be made. It also provided the participant with clear guidelines on how to respond to the questions on the survey instrument.

Quantitative data collection instruments often include questionnaires and, in the case of the present study, it included survey questionnaires (Ponto 2015: 170). Questionnaires often include demographic questionnaires, as well as valid and reliable research instruments (Costanzo, Stawski, Ryff, Coe and Almeida 2012: 22). See Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 for the letter of information and consent, respectively. There was no remuneration for participation in the survey. Participants were not obliged to fill in their identifying details; hence, anonymity in terms of participation was guaranteed. The letter of information (Appendix 1) indicated that participants were permitted to skip any questions they did not wish to answer or that made them feel uncomfortable in any way. Moreover, it was not necessary for them to identify the names of the businesses or organisations that they worked at. This was important to protect these organisations within the context of ethics, as gatekeeper permission was not sought from these businesses but rather from individual leaders or managers who practiced benevolent leadership.

3.7.1 Data Collection Process

Data was collected using a survey questionnaire. The survey questionnaire is attached as Appendix 3. Survey questionnaires were distributed to the selected sample using two methods. Firstly, the survey questionnaires were emailed to a few professional contacts who were requested to fill it in and distribute it to others whom they knew to be benevolent leaders. No coercion was used. Secondly, the questionnaires were printed and also distributed to professional contacts. These initial contacts served as volunteers to snowball the process and further distribute it to other benevolent leaders through a process of snowball sampling. However, it was explained to each volunteer contact that only those who practiced benevolent leadership could participate. A total of 314 completed surveys were returned. The data collection process was then stopped at this point, as this was more than the 150 required questionnaires as suggested by Karakas (2009: 56).

3.8 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire refers to a "written list of questions, the answers to which are recorded by respondents" (Kumar 2014: 178). The design of a questionnaire is influenced by what the researcher seeks to investigate, the data generated by the questions, and the statistical techniques that will be used to analyse it (Pietersen and Maree 2016: 177).

81

Most of the questions and scales used in the survey questionnaire were taken from the instrument designed by Karakas (2009: 56). The questionnaire comprised the following parts:

Part 1: Demographic details;
Part 2: The Benevolent Leadership Scale, which comprises four sub-scales, namely: Ethical Sensitivity, Spiritual Depth, Positive Engagement, and Community Responsiveness.
Part 3: The Organisational Performance Scale; and
Part 4: A range of questions pertaining to education.

Written permission was obtained to use the four aforementioned sub-scales (that formed part of benevolent leadership) and the Organisational Performance Scale from the questionnaire developed in Karakas' (2009: 54-63) study. (Permission letter received from Dr Karakas to use the questionnaire).

To elaborate further, Part 1 of the survey focussed on questions such as demographic information. These questions focused on age, gender, racial background, and marital status, number of children, number of years employed in current organisation, and number of subordinates reporting to them. Most of these questions mirrored those in Karakas' (2009: 232) survey instrument.

In terms of the Benevolent Leadership Scale, there were four sub-scales embedded in it. The first sub-scale, referred to as the Ethical Sensitivity Scale, contained 10 items. Participants were asked using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree", and they were asked to write the response that most accurately described their level of agreement with several statements. These statements explored leaders' ethical principles and values at work, such as "when I make a managerial decision at work, I reflect on the ethical consequences of my decision"; "I challenge my colleagues when they depart from ethical values at work"; or "I believe that my work is guided by high ethical standards".

The second sub-scale, Spiritual Depth, contained 10 items that captured leaders' search for spiritual behaviours and practices, as well as spirituality at work. It was also measured using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree", and participants were also asked to write the response that most accurately described their level of

82

agreement with several statements. This sub-scale contained items or statements such as: "I feel vitally alive and passionate when I bring my soul into work"; "I spend my time on self-reflection, meditation, or prayer at work"; and "I believe that we are all interconnected and part of a meaningful whole".

The third sub-scale, Positive Engagement, also had 10 items and focussed on how leader's initiate and encourage positive change in the organisation. It was also measured using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree", and participants were also asked to write the response that most accurately described their level of agreement with several statements. It included items such as: "I try to provide hope and courage for people around me to take positive action", and "I have a fundamental belief in our abilities to produce desired results or positive outcomes in this organization".

The fourth sub-scale, Community Responsiveness, contained 10 items that focussed on leaders' sensitivity and aspirations in leaving a social legacy and contribution to the community. It was also measured using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree", and participants were also asked to write the response that most accurately described their level of agreement with several statements. It included items such as: "I go beyond my job definition to contribute to my own community and to the world", and "I am active, and do some kind of work involved in social responsibility projects for community benefit". Benevolent leadership or the Benevolent Leadership Scale was thus an additive index that comprised of all four sub-scales. According to Karakas (2009: 61), using an additive index suggests that these four dimensions complement each other, and collectively form the construct of "benevolent leadership". These four sub-scales, which were collectively the Benevolent Leadership Scale, then answered Objective 1, which was *to investigate the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of benevolent leaders in South Africa.*

Part 3 of the survey questionnaire included a multidimensional scale of perceived organisational performance which Karakas (2009:61) had also used. This consisted of 14 dimensions. Participants were asked to rate key areas of organisational performance using the following questions, such as: "how would you compare the organization's performance over the past three years to that of other organizations that do the same kind of work?" Responses were made on a 5-point Likert-type scale: 1 ("much worse"), 2 ("worse"), 3 ("equal"), and 4 ("better"), and 5 ("much better"). Some of the following dimensions of organisational

performance that were rated on this scale included, namely: financial performance indicators; managerial effectiveness in the organisation; employee morale; employee productivity; business ethics; and long-term organisational health. Karakas (2009: 62) included the dimensions in the Organisational Performance Scale to determine whether benevolent leadership attitudes and behaviours at the individual leader's level, were also perceived at the organisational level. In effect, he sought to understand if the individual leader's benevolent characteristics (namely, their *ethical sensitivity; spiritual depth, positive engagement*, and *community responsiveness*) accrue in relation to perceived organisational performance in areas such as business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and innovation, amongst others. This relationship was also explored in the current study and meets Objective 2, namely, *to examine the impact of benevolent leadership on organisational performance.*

Part 4 of the survey focussed on education and explored whether their education prepared them for benevolent leadership or aspects of it. It also investigated what aspects of benevolent leadership required more attention in education and participants were requested to comment on whether they believed themes such as corporate social responsibility, business philosophy, ethics, work and family, and intercultural relations should be included in a course on benevolent leadership. This section of the questionnaire was developed through a perusal of the literature. It met the last two objectives of the study, namely, *to enquire whether university education prepared managers for benevolent leadership* (Objective 3) and *to provide recommendations on what content related to benevolent management could be included in management education* (Objective 4).

With regards to the questions in the questionnaire, most were closed or structured questions. Closed-ended questions allowed the participants to select an answer from among a list created by the researcher. It created a set of responses from which the respondent had to choose (Neuman 2014: 332). They are popular in survey research as they "provide uniformity of responses and are more easily processed than open-ended ones" (Babbie 2016: 248). Close-ended questions are also used more frequently in surveys as they are faster and easier for both the researcher and the participants, as they put an individual's beliefs and feelings into fixed, predetermined categories (Neuman 2014: 332).

The questionnaire consisted of several types of closed-ended questions, namely, list questions. One type are dichotomous questions for which there are only two possible answers. For

example, when asking about gender, only "male" or "female" can be the possible response. There were also multiple-choice questions, primarily in the education section, which had three or more response categories for participants to choose from (Pietersen and Maree 2016: 181-183). There were also two scales used in the questionnaire. According to Pietersen and Maree (2016: 186), scales are a common and useful way in survey research of measuring how participants feel or think about a particular issue. Scales are often used to quantify specific information, such as the reliability and validity of the instrument, which is essential. Validity refers to the degree to which the instrument measures the phenomenon or reflects the construct being examined (Burns and Grove 2009: 479).

The Likert-type scale was also used extensively in the questionnaire. This was used primarily in relation to the four sub-scales that constituted the overall Benevolent Leadership Scale. According to Kumar (2014: 204), it is "a summated rating scale which is based on the assumption that each statement/item on the scale has equal attitudinal value, importance or weight in terms of reflecting an attitude towards the issue in question". Likert scales provide specific choices, for example, "strongly agree", "agree", "not sure", "disagree", and "strongly disagree". The two scales used in the questionnaire utilised a five-point categorical scale that was three-directional. Kumar (2014: 204-205) noted this is used when the researcher wants to determine positive, negative, and neutral positions in the study sample, with respect to their attitude towards the issue under study.

3.9 PILOT TESTING OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Prior to implementation of the survey, the survey questionnaire was pilot tested for face validity with seven managers in the eThekwini region in KZN. Those involved in this process were not included in the current sample. Suggestions made were effected and resulted in the design of the final questionnaire. Issues pertaining to validity and reliability are discussed in sub-section 3.11.

The process of capturing and processing the raw data to make sense of it is described in the next section.

3.10 DATA CAPTURING AND ANALYSIS

The processes followed in this study were adopted from Burns and Grove (2007: 402). They described data analysis as consisting of the following stages, namely: preparing the data for analysis, describing the sample, testing the validity of the instruments, and then the analysis. Quantitative data cannot be reported in its raw state. As Polit and Beck (2012: 54) clarified, data analysis is undertaken to reduce this raw data into an intelligible form, to organise it and present it in an interpretable form. The data was first encoded and captured on an Excel spreadsheet in preparation for analysis using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 2.0). A systematic plan was used for the entry of the data onto a spreadsheet to reduce the possibility of errors, and then rechecked. Missing data points were also captured. The responses received were encoded and captured accordingly. Quantitative data analysis is the process of analysing numerical data using statistical methods (Quinlan, Zikmund, Babin, Carr, Griffin,2015: 321). The software package developed specifically for the analysis of quantitative data is SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and has been widely used in the analysis of survey data (Quinlan *et al.* 2015: 321).

Raw data was entered onto a spreadsheet and then analysed using SPSS version 2.0. The techniques used for data analysis in quantitative research include descriptive and inferential analysis. According to Polit and Beck (2012: 54), data analysis can be described as the categorisation, ordering, manipulation, and summarising of data to obtain answers to the research objectives. It involves the manipulation of numerical data using statistical procedures for the purpose of describing given phenomena or assessing the magnitude and reliability of relationships among them (Polit and Beck 2012: 54).

Standard descriptive statistics were computed for all variables, including the frequency, mean, and standard deviation (de Vos, Strydom, Fouché and Delport 2005: 218). As Neuman (1997: 297) indicated, descriptive statistics describe numerical data. Categorisation is guided by the number of variables involved and can be univariate, bivariate, and multivariate. As a first step, the initial frequencies of the descriptive data in relation to the sample was obtained. The estimates of central tendencies such as the mean and dispersion, linked to the standard deviation of variables relevant to the sample, were also calculated. The variables relevant to the current sample included the age, gender, and level of occupation of the current sample.

Means as computed in this study refer to an average score, that is, the sum of the scores divided by the total number of scores being summed. A *standard deviation* refers to the square root of the variance; it refers to the average distance value (Burns and Grove 2007: 418). Univariate and bivariate analyses were applied to the data for the current study. Data was graphically presented in the form of frequency tables.

The two essential elements of validity and reliability form the topic of the next section. These two concepts determine the quality of the study and indicate how well the instrument measures what it is meant to.

3.11 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Any quantitative instrument used in a research study must show reliability and validity. *Reliability* has been defined as the degree of consistency or accuracy with which a data collection tool measures the attribute it has been designed to measure (Heale and Twycross (2015: 66). In other words, the extent to which the research tool consistently has the same results if it is used in the same situation, in repeated instances (Heale and Twycross 2015: 66). The data that is secured may appear to be authoritative, but it could be insufficient or inaccurate or insufficiently reliable to be of value in generalising to the larger population (Ingham-Broomfield 2014: 34).

Validity refers to the degree to which the data collection tool measures the phenomena in the first place or reflects the abstract construct being examined (Burns and Grove 2009: 479). Heale and Twycross (2015: 66) similarly described validity as the extent to which a concept is accurately measured in a quantitative study. One of the categories considered in validity is *content validity*, which explores whether the instrument covers all the content that it should, with regards to a certain variable. A subset of content validity is *face validity*, which entails experts being asked their opinion as to whether an instrument measures the concept as intended (Heale and Twycross 2015: 66). This was achieved through pilot-testing the survey questionnaire.

The instrument has shown good reliability and validity. The Benevolent Leadership Scale was validated in the study by Karakas (2009: 93), who constructed this scale. To determine the

87

construct validity of the 40-item Benevolent Leadership Scale, he performed a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), using the four sub-scales. The analysis revealed an overall adequate fit. The chi-square was significant, namely 1.69, which is below the maximum recommended value of 2.00. The convergent validity was supported in each of the four sub-scales, the lowest parameter estimate was .69 and all the parameter estimates were significant at the 0.05 level. Composite reliability scores for each of the sub-scales varied between 0.85, which are higher than the recommended value of 0.6. This shows validity (Karakas 2009: 129). Moreover, the same questionnaire was further validated and used by Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 551) in another study.

As with all research, there are limitations. The following section acknowledges the limitations of this study.

3.12 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This section acknowledges the limitations of this study. Firstly, the study was confined to a small sample and recruitment was based on judgemental sampling and snowball sampling. Hence, generalisation may be limited. The aim of the study, however, was to explore what characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours are evident amongst benevolent leaders and how these impact on organisational performance. As this was a descriptive exploratory study, the study sample was able to meet these two objectives.

Secondly, response rates to surveys are generally poor, and although this was a challenge in the initial stage of data collection, through the use of volunteer professional contacts who snowballed the questionnaires further to benevolent leaders, this challenge was fortunately overcome.

Thirdly, the questionnaire is a self-report research instrument and the potential for bias, whereby participants exaggerate responses or present themselves in a more favourable light was high. Hence, the lack of self-introspection and honesty are potential limiting factors within this study.

Ethics is an integral part of all research conducted with human participants. In light of this, the ethical issues adhered to in this study are described below.

3.13 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The DUT Research Ethics Policy and guidelines were used to ensure that ethical issues were addressed at all times. The following ethical considerations were adhered to throughout this research:

3.13.1 Avoidance of harm

According to Creswell (2003: 64), researchers have an ethical obligation to protect participants from any form of physical and or emotional harm during the study. None of the procedures or questions in the study will cause any harm to the participants.

3.13.2 Voluntary participation

One fundamental principle of ethical research is not forcing a person to participate in a study (Neuman 1997: 264). None of the participants were compelled to participate in the study. Rubin and Babbie (2008: 71) emphasised that participation in a study should be voluntary, and no one should be forced to participate. None of the participants were coerced to participate. They were invited to participate, and if they declined, this was respected. Kumar (2014: 286) stipulated that it is important that the information that is collected be kept confidential. This means not disclosing the details of the source of the information. In this study, the confidentiality and anonymity of the information gathered was safeguarded, as no identifying details were reported on. This is what Babbie (2001: 472) referred to as anonymity, meaning that no one should be able to identify any subjects thereafter. The privacy of the respondents was respected at all times, and their views will not reflect those of the organisations they work at but their own personal views.

3.13.3 Informed consent

According to Kumar (2014: 85), informed consent refers to ensuring that participants are made aware of the type of information required of them, why the information is being sought, the type of information required, what purpose it will serve, how participants are expected to participate in the study, and how it will directly or indirectly affect them. According to

Neuman (1997: 264), issues of anonymity, confidentiality, voluntary participation, and the right to withdraw from the study without consequences, should also be included in the study. The letter of information is included as Appendix 2, and covers all of these aspects, and the consent form, which was used to indicate that participation was totally voluntary, is included as Appendix 3.

Obtaining informed consent implies that all possible or adequate information with regards to the study and its objectives are provided to participants. In addition, information about the procedures to be followed during the study, the possible advantages and any risks related to participation are also provided. The letter of information which covers these aspects is included as Appendix 2.

3.13.4 Confidentiality

This implies that the identity of participants was anonymised. This was ensured and no names were used during the reporting of the findings. This is what Babbie (2001: 472) referred to as anonymity, meaning that no one should be able to identify any subjects thereafter. The privacy of subjects was also respected at all times, as they were not asked to disclose the names of the organisations they work at, but their own personal views.

3.13.5 Deception of subjects

According to Strudwig and Stead (2001: 69), deception involves withholding information, or offering incorrect information, to ensure participation. There was no deception used in the study.

Some final remarks follow next to conclude the chapter.

3.14 CONCLUSION

This chapter discussed the research methodology used in this study. Particular attention was given to the quantitative research approach, survey research, the procedure for sampling, data collection, and analysis. The ethical issues were also highlighted. In summary, the design selected was most appropriate to meet the objectives. Given that the overall aim was to investigate the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of benevolent leaders and how benevolence influenced organisational performance, the choice of a descriptive, exploratory

survey design aligned with a quantitative approach was most suitable for the current study. A qualitative approach would not have allowed the researcher to measure or quantify benevolent leadership, its impact on organisational performance, and establish the extent to which university education prepared managers for benevolent leadership. Quantifying what leaders considered to be important aspects of management education enabled the researcher to provide recommendations on what should be included in leadership and management education, with respect to benevolent leadership. Hence, the choice of design enabled the researcher to meet the objectives of the study. The following chapter presents an analysis of the data.

CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Following the review of the literature on the topic under study in Chapter 2, and description of the methodology in Chapter 3, the current chapter presents the data collected from the survey and an analysis of the findings made. The data and discussion of the findings made are organised into four broad sections, namely: **Section A** presents the demographic data related to the sample, including age, level of education, gender, marital situation, number of children, number of years in current organisation, place of employment, current position and job sector, and number of subordinates reporting to the respondents. **Section B** presents data in relation to the four sub-scales that make up *benevolent leadership*. Data from the Ethical Sensitivity Scale, the Spiritual Depth Scale, Positive Engagement Scale, and Community Responsiveness Scale are presented and discussed. **Section C** focusses on a discussion of data from the Perceived Organisational Performance Scale. **Section D**, the final section of this chapter, focuses on education. Here, data related to whether aspects of benevolent leadership were covered in education and if they required greater attention in education are presented and discussed. Respondents' views were also sought on several aspects that could be included in a course on benevolent leadership. Finally, data related to whether students would benefit from a course on benevolent leadership is presented.

The data from the research and its analysis thereof is presented holistically in this chapter. For simplicity, the data for each section is presented in table format, followed by a description of the data and its analysis. Wherever possible, the findings made are compared with those made in other relevant studies, and relevant literature is integrated so that a critical analysis emerges.

The sub-section that follows provides the demographic data of the sample.

<center>**SECTION A**</center>

4.2 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF THE RESPONDENTS

4.2.1 Age of the Respondents

The demographic data of the respondents are discussed in this sub-section, and the data are reported in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Age distribution of sample

Age	Frequency (n)	Percentage
Between 25 and 35	62	19.7%
Between 36 and 45	124	39.5%
Between 46 and 55	112	35.7%
Between 56 and 65	15	4.8%
Missing Data	1	0.3%
	314	100.0%

Table 4 reflects the age profile of the study's sample. As reflected, the sample was composed of a diverse range of age groupings from between 25 to 65 years of age. The majority of the respondents $(75,2\%; n=236)$ were between the ages of 36 to 55 years. Of this, the highest number of respondents were found to be between 36 and 45 years of age $(39,5\%; n= 124)$. The second highest category were those between 46 to 55 years of age $(35,7\%; n=112)$. Almost 20% $(19,7\%; n=62)$ of the sample constituted the youngest age grouping, which was between 25 and 35 years. About 5% $(4,8\%; n=15)$ were in the most senior age category, namely, those between 56 and 65. There were data missing for just one respondent.

4.2.2 Gender

This section describes the gender distribution of the sample. The data are reported in Table 5 below.

93

Table 5: Gender distribution of the sample

Gender	Frequency (n)	Percentage
Female	89	28.3%
Male	225	71.7%
Total	314	100%

More than 70% of the sample (71,7%; *n*=225) were males and 28,3% (*n*=89) females, reflecting the gender bias in leadership positions. This significant gender bias was evident in other international studies, where males were found to be predominantly in leadership positions (Diehl, Stephenson, Dzubinski and Wang 2020: 249; Xu *et al.* 2018: 746; Wang and Cheng 2009: 106).

4.2.3 Marital Status of Respondents

The marital status of the respondents is reflected on next, and the data are reported in Table 6.

Table 6: Marital status

Marital Status	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Single	63	20.1
Married	223	71.0
Divorced	21	6.7
Widowed	6	1.9
Missing data	1	0.3
Total	314	100.0

As is evident in Table 6, more than 70% (71,0%; *n*=223) of the sample were married. About 20% (*n*=63) were single, whilst 6.7% (*n*=21) reported being divorced. Almost 2% (1,9%; *n*=6) stated that they were widowed. There were data missing for one respondent.

4.2.4 Number of Children

This section indicates whether the respondents had any children.

Table 7: Respondents with children

Children	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Yes	233	74,2
No	81	25,8
Total	314	100.0 %

Almost 74,2% (n=233) of the sample indicated that they had children. Only about 26% (25,8%; n=81) said they did not have children. More than half of the sample (61,2%; n=192) stated they had one or two children. About 7% (6,7%; n=21) indicated having three children, whilst 4,8% (n=15) said they had more than three children.

4.2.5 Religious Background of Respondents

The data reflecting the religious affiliation of the respondents is presented below (Table 8).

Table 8: Religious background of respondents

Religious background	Frequency (n)	Percentage
Christian	194	61.8
African Traditional Religion	9	2.9
Muslim	39	12.4
Hindu	52	16.6
Jewish	1	.3
Missing data	19	6.1
Total	314	100.0%

As indicated in Table 8, the majority of the respondents belonged to the Christian faith (61,8%; *n*=194). The rest followed the Hindu faith (16,6 %; *n*=52); Muslim faith (12,4%; *n*=39); or

were Jewish (0,3%; *n*=1). About 2.9% (*n*=9) of the sample were adherents of African Traditional Religion. There were missing data for 6,1% (*n*=19) of the sample.

4.2.6 Province Within Which the Respondents' Work

The respondents' work location in terms of province is noted in this section. The data is reported in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Province within which the respondents' work

Province	Frequency (n)	Percentage
Kwa Zulu Natal	141	44.9
Gauteng	92	29.3
Western Cape	61	19.4
Missing Data	20	6.4
Total	314	100%

Participants were recruited from three major provinces in South Africa. This distribution is presented in Table 9. Almost half of the sample (44.9%; $n = 141$) resided in KZN, about a third of the sample (29.3%; $n= 92$) of the leaders in Gauteng, and the other 19.4% (*n*=61) in the Western Cape.

4.2.7 Highest Level of Education

The respondents' level of education is reported in this sub-section. The data are presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Highest education level of the respondents

Education level	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
National Diploma	33	10,5
Bachelor of Technology	20	6,4
Bachelor Degree	97	30,9
Master's Degree	14	4,4

Master's of Business Administration (MBA)	53	16,9
Professional Qualification	21	6,7
Honours	43	13,7
Other	13	4,1
Missing Data	20	6,4
Total	314	100.0%

The educational qualifications of the respondents are reflected in Table 10 above. Almost a quarter of the sample (41,4%; n=130) had a national diploma or bachelor's degree. Almost 20% (20,1%; n=63) had an honours degree or Bachelor of Technology Degree. A similar percentage of 21,3% (n=67) was found for those with a master's qualification or a Master's of Business Administration. Just 7% of the sample (n=21) reported having a professional qualification. Almost 4% (n=13) reported "other" in relation to their qualification, without specifying, and there were missing data for 20 respondents. Other studies on benevolent leaders also found that most leaders had a bachelor's degree or higher postgraduate degree (Xu *et al.* 2018: 746; Karakas 2009: 69).

4.2.8 Number of Years with Current Employer

The total number of years the respondents have been working at their current place of employment is reported in this section (see Table 11).

Table 11: Number of years served with current employer

Number of years	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Less than 3 years	72	22.9
Between 4 year and 6 years	22	7,0
Between 7 years and 10 years	89	28.3
More than 10 years	105	33.4

Missing data	26	8.3
Total	314	100.0%

Table 11 outlines the number of years that the respondents had worked at their current organisation. About a third of the sample (33,4%; $n=105$) were with their present company for more than ten years, and almost the same percentage (28.3%; $n=89$) were there for between 7 and 10 years. About 7.0% ($n=22$) reported being with the company for between 4 to 6 years. Twenty three percent (22.9%; $n=72$) indicated that they were at the present organisation for less than three years. There were missing data for 26 respondents. If one looks at the data in its entirety, about 61,7% ($n= 194$) of the sample were with their present place of employment for more than seven years.

4.2.9 Type of Organisation the Respondents Worked For

Hailing from diverse fields, the types of organisations the respondents are employed at are indicated below.

Table 12: Type of organisation

Type of Organisation	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Profit	279	88.9
Non-profit	13	4.1
Missing Data	22	7.1
	314	100.0%

Table 12 reflects that almost 90% (88,9%; $n=279$) of the sample was employed at profit organisations, whilst 4% (4,1%; $n=13$) stated that they were employed at non-profit organisations. There were missing data for 7,1% of the sample ($n=22$). Other studies which explored benevolent leadership used respondents from non-profit organisations which focussed on primary health care, support services to seniors, aged and physically or mentally challenged citizens, local development, and self-help groups (Ghosh 2015: 600).

4.2.10 Business Sector of the Organisation

The respondents that completed the survey came from a diverse range of business sectors in three provinces across the country. These sectors are noted in Table 13 below.

Table 13: Business sector of the organisation

Business sector	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Vehicle manufacture and assembly	23	7.3
Financial and Business Services	107	34.1
Clothing and Textile	36	11.5
Construction	25	8.0
Gas and Petroleum	53	16.9
Food processing	13	4.1
Transportation	28	8.9
Real Estate	2	0.6
Fast moving consumer goods	3	1.0
Telecommunication	1	0.3
Legal Services	1	0.3
Government	1	0.3
Other	21	6.7
Total	314	100.0%

Table 13 reflects the various sectors within which the managers in the sample are employed. The highest sector represented within the sample was the financial and business service sector (34.1%; $n=107$), followed by the gas and petroleum sector (16.9%; $n=53$), clothing and textile sector (11.5%; $n=36$), and transportation sector (8,9%; $n=28$). The least represented sectors were respondents from telecommunication (0,3%; $n=1$), legal services (0.3%; $n=1$), and the government (0,3%, $n=1$). About 7% (6,7%; $n=21$) identified "other" as being the sector within which they work.

In the study undertaken by Karakas (2009: 75), the highest sector represented was found to be non-governmental organisations, non-profit and community organisations (11,4% $n=20$), followed by education and research institutions (9,14%; $n=16$), governmental organisations

(6,9%; *n*=28), and the health sector (5,2%; *n*=25). The least represented sector was defence (0,5%; *n*=1). There were no missing data in his study.

4.2.11 Management Level

The different levels of management held by the respondents are discussed below and recorded in Table 14.

Table 14: Management level of respondents

Management level	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Junior Manager	33	10.5%
Middle Manager	128	40.8%
Senior Manager	130	41.4%
Executive Manager	22	7.0%
Missing data	1	0.3%
Total	314	100.0%

Respondents were found to occupy a diverse range of managerial levels as reflected in Table 14. Almost half of the sample (48,4%; *n*=152) were either at the executive level (7,0%; *n*=22) or senior manager level (41,4%; *n*=130). About 40,8% (*n*=128) reported being middle managers. Just about 11% indicated being junior managers (10,5%; *n*=33). Data were missing for 1 respondent (0,3%). Other international studies on benevolent leadership also reveal a mix of respondents at senior manager and middle and junior manager levels (Ghosh 2015: 600; Karakas 2009: 68).

4.2.12 Years in Current Management Position

The number of years the respondents have been in management is the focus of this sub-section. The data is recorded in Table 15.

Table 15: Number of years in current position

Number of years	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
3 years or less	152	48.4

Between 4 years and 6 years	107	34.1
Between 7 years and 10 years	29	9.2
More than 10 years	26	8.3
Total	314	100.0%

Table 15 reflects the number of years that respondents had been at the organisation in their current capacity. A small percentage (8,3%; *n=26*) stated that they were in their present position for more than ten years. A similar percentage reported being in this position for between 7 and 10 years (9,2%; *n=29*). Just over a third (34,1%; *n=107*) stated that they were in this position for between 4 and 6 years. The largest percentage reported being in their current capacity for three years or less (48,4%; *n=152*).

4.2.13 Number of People Working in the Organisation

The current sub-section considers the sizes of the organisations where the respondents are employed, indicating the number of people working there. These figures are recorded in Table 16 below.

Table 16: Number of people working in the organisation

Number of people	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Less than 100	59	18.8
100 to 1000	142	45.2
More than 100	110	35.0
Missing data	3	1.0
Total	314	100.0%

4.2.14 Number of Subordinates Reporting to the Respondents

Holding different management positions and being organisations of different sizes, this sub-section reflects on the number of subordinates that report to the respondents in their work environments. The data are recorded in Table 17.

101

Table 17: Number of subordinates

Number of subordinates	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Less than 10	96	30.6
10 to 20	71	22.6
More than 20	122	38.9
Missing data	25	4.4
	314	100.0%

Table 17 outlines the number of subordinates that reported to the respondents. Almost 40% (38,9%; *n=122*) had more than 20 subordinates who reported to them. A further 22,6% (*n=71*) managed between 10 to 20 people. Almost a third of the sample (30,6%; *n=96*) managed less than 10 people. There were missing data for 4.4% (*n=25*) of the sample.

In Karakas' (2009: 77) study, almost 60% of the sample were found to manage less than 10 subordinates (56%, *n=98*). Almost 20% of his sample of managers managed more than 11 subordinates (24,2%; *n=31*).

SECTION B

Section B presents data from the four sub-scales that make up Benevolent Leadership, namely: Ethical Sensitivity (section 4.3), Spiritual Depth (section 4.4), Positive Engagement Scale (section 4.5), and Community Responsiveness Scale (section 4.6).

In the section below, data in relation to ethical sensitivity is presented and discussed.

4.3 ETHICAL SENSITIVITY

Table 18: Ethical Sensitivity Scale

Variable (items abbreviated)	N	Missing	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.
Reflect on ethical consequences of decision	311	3	4.46	.620	2	5
Take a moral stand	311	3	4.58	.508	3	5
Take ethical rules seriously	310	4	4.57	.533	3	5
Behaviours congruent with ethical values and beliefs	311	3	4.57	.540	3	5
Keep promises and commitments	311	3	4.56	.541	1	5
Stand up for what is right	311	3	4.49	.642	1	5
Take responsibility for mistakes	310	4	4.56	.614	1	5
Role model of integrity and honesty	311	3	4.56	.540	3	5
Challenge colleagues when they depart from ethical values	311	3	4.42	.741	1	5
Work guided by high ethical standards	303	11	4.59	.543	2	5

Table 18 above outlines data in respect of the first scale of benevolent leadership, namely *ethical sensitivity*. This was captured through the Ethical Sensitivity Scale. The overall mean of this scale was found to be 4.53, with a standard deviation of 0.438 in the present study. This overall high mean rating reflected a strong level of ethical sensitivity amongst the respondents. Karakas (2009: 81), who used this scale in his study, reported a similar overall mean for this scale, namely, 4.22, with an overall standard deviation of 0.486.

The highest mean variable on the Ethical Sensitivity Scale in the present study was found to be 4.59 and related to the item "*work guided by high ethical standards*". The second highest mean variable of 4.58 related to the item "*I take a moral stand when I believe in something*". The items "*I take ethical rules seriously*" and "*my behaviours are congruent with ethical values and beliefs*" both had the third highest mean of 4.57. In Karakas' (2009: 81)

103

study, the highest means reported for this scale were for the following two variables, viz. "*take a moral stand*" (4.35; *SD*=.70) and "*keep promises and commitment*" (4.35; *SD* =.7.11). The findings made in respect of the first variable in Karakas' (2009: 81) study resonated with that in the present study as "*take a moral stand*", which received a high mean rating.

T h e item "*I challenge my colleagues when they depart from ethical values at work*" had the lowest mean of 4.42 (0.741) in the present study. This item also had the lowest mean in Karakas' (2009: 81) study (mean 3,87; *SD*=0.823). This item also had the highest standard deviation, viz. 0.741 on this scale in the present study. The lowest standard deviation was 0.508, and it belonged to the item "*I take a moral stand*" in the present study.

As evident from the findings, leaders displayed a high level of ethical sensitivity by working with a high level of ethical standards, by taking a moral stand, and by engaging in behaviours that are congruent with ethical values and beliefs. Ethical leaders have been seen as those who embrace positive employee outcomes because they care, act with integrity, treat their followers with respect and dignity, and are seen as trustworthy (Brown, Treviño and Harrison 2005: 129). Brown and Treviño (2006: 955) wrote that ethical leaders attempt to positively influence their followers' ethical conduct, communicate ethical standards, and hold them accountable for these standards through the use of rewards and punishments.

An ethical leader's moral characteristics and behaviours are therefore expected to influence the implementation of ethical practices (Treviño, Brown and Hartman 2003: 10). Additionally, ethical leaders are more likely to introduce training and orientation practices to discuss training and orientation practices related to business ethics or values with employees (Brown, Treviño and Harrison 2005: 120). With regards to accountability and responsibility practices, they are more likely to set examples of the way things should be in terms of ethics. Ethical leaders are also more likely to make fair and balanced decisions (Xu, Loi and Ngo 2016: 495), and encourage employees to do the correct thing during decision making. It is therefore crucial that the priorities and behaviours of ethical leaders and business ethics be reflected within organisational practices (Kuenzi, Mayer and Greenbaum 2018: 48).

A study by Mayer, Kuenzi and Greenbaum (2010: 7) found that leadership ethics and the work ethics environment are linked with a wider continuum of positive work-related outcomes as

104

well as ethical practices. A few other studies on ethical leadership have found that it enhances employees' organisational citizenship behaviour (Zhang, Zhang, Liu, Duan, Xu and Cheung 2019: 18; Shareef and Atan 2019: 583). Ethical leaders then play a pivotal role in creating an ethical and positive work environment whilst enhancing employee attitudes and behaviour (Mitonga-Monga 2018: 4). *Work ethics culture* has been described as the ethical quality of an organisation, which is seen as shared values, norms, and beliefs that enable and nurture ethical behaviour (Huhtala, Kaptein and Feldt 2016: 337).

Ethical climate refers to the ethical policies, practices, and procedures within an organisation (Mayer, Kuenzi and Greenbaum 2010: 7). Resick, Hanges, Dickson and Mitchelson (2006: 347) reported that integrity, ethical awareness, and people-orientation values amongst leaders affect the way they behave and apply their power during decision making. The overall high mean rating on ethical sensitivity in the current study reflects a high level of awareness of ethical issues and a commitment to lead ethically amongst leaders in the current sample.

Vivier (2013: 69) wrote that the personal values of a business leader have a salient effect over the ethical practices of small and medium businesses, saying that these values "orientate company culture and practices" and constitute the "fundamental determinant of company ethics and practices". A study undertaken by Robinson and Jonker (2017: 72-73) with 13 business leaders found that 84% of the sample strongly believed that their personal values were evident within the business culture. Hence, 70% stated that the rules and regulations in their business very much reflected their personal values. With regards to business ethics being an imperative, the entire sample in Robinson and Jonker's (2017: 72) study agreed that acting ethically was critical to their business success. There was further total consensus that unethical behaviour could destroy their business. Eight five percent of the sample reported that they emphasised the importance of ethical behaviour when communicating with subordinates, while 15% agreed to doing so moderately. When asked if they sometimes disregarded their own rules for the sake of the business, 92% said not at all, and the entire sample stated that they would not turn a blind eye to an employee contravening the law or rules if it contributed to profits with minimal risk.

The King Reports (I, II, III, IV) were published in 1994 by the Institute of Directors in Southern Africa (Roberts-Lombard, Mpinganjira, Wood and Svensson 2019: 380). Each

report made recommendations with regards to business ethics evolving to greater levels, to inspire organisations to aspire towards better practices.

The King Report of 2016 detailed the need for rigorous business ethics principles that do not permit fraudulent or deceptive actions related to customer transactions (Roberts-Lombard *et al.* 2019: 380). It calls for the promotion of ethical principles such as good governance, compliance, and reliability between all stakeholders (Rowe and Moodley 2013: 5), which should underpin a company philosophy that promotes professional relationships between all stakeholders. Drechsel (2016) noted that the King Report IV emphasised several key foci of a sound code of ethics, namely, ethical and effective leadership; the role of the company and its responsibility towards its surrounding community; corporate citizenship; sustainable development; stakeholder inclusivity and responsiveness; as well as integrated reporting and thinking. This Report emphasises the need for ethical sensitivity as a key component of good leadership behaviour and has relevance for good ethical practice in South Africa.

The Kings Reports are supported by growing research evidence which suggests that ethical leadership not only deters followers from engaging in immoral behaviour, such as workplace incivility or organisational deviance (van Gils, van Quaquebeke, van Knippenberg, van Dijke and De Cremer 2015: 192-193), but that it inspires positive organisational citizenship behaviour amongst employees (Mo and Shi 2017: 295). Findings from this study as well as that of Karakas (2009: 93) revealed a high level of *ethical sensitivity* amongst benevolent leaders.

4.4 SPIRITUAL DEPTH

Table 19: Spiritual Depth Scale

Variable (items abbreviated)	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min.	Max.
Spend time on self-reflection, meditation, or prayer at work	307	7	3.82	.903	1	5
Try to find a deeper sense of meaning at work and in leadership	307	7	4.20	.661	1	5

106

Incorporate spirituality into work done	303	11	3.95	.925	1	5
Believe that we are all interconnected and part of a meaningful whole	304	14	4.27	.867	1	5
Feel vitally alive and passionate when I bring my soul into work	300	13	4.11	.867	1	5
Spirituality makes me a more helpful and compassionate leader	301	13	4.17	.775	1	5
Spirituality makes me a gentler person towards colleagues	301	13	4.16	.755	1	5
Try to nurture or support the spiritual growth of my colleagues around me	301	13	3.91	.890	1	5
When faced with an important decision, spirituality plays an important role	301	13	4.15	.803	1	5
Searching for something that makes my life feel significant and satisfying	298	16	4.33	.660	1	5
Graduates' management training should include spirituality in the curriculum	301	13	4.27	1.00	1	5

Table 19 reflects data obtained in respect of the second scale, namely, the Spiritual Depth Scale. The overall mean for the Spiritual Depth Scale in the present study was 4.14 (*SD*=0.643). Karakas (2009: 83) reported an overall mean of 3.78, which was significantly lower than that obtained in the present study. It was also significantly lower than all the other three sub-scales in his study, namely, the Ethical Sensitivity Scale, Positive Engagement Scale, and Community Responsiveness Scale. He found that the standard deviation of this scale was also significantly higher than the aforementioned other three sub-scales, namely 0.733 in his study.

The data reflected in Table 19 indicated that there was significantly greater variation in terms of spiritual orientation of the respondents with respect to other variables. The highest mean item on this scale was 4.33 (*SD*= 0.660) and belonged to the item "*searching for something that makes my life feel significant and satisfying*". It was noteworthy that Karakas (2009: 83) also found that this item had the highest mean on this scale, viz. 4,00 (*SD*=.864).

107

The belief "*that we are all interconnected and part of a meaningful whole*" (4,27; *SD*=.867), that "*spirituality makes me a more helpful and compassionate person*" (4.17; *SD*=.775), and "*spirituality makes me a gentler person towards colleagues*" (4,16; *SD*=.755) also received higher mean ratings on this scale. These findings reflect that leaders believe that they are connected to their subordinates within the organisation, and that they believe that spirituality enables them to be more compassionate and helpful in their leadership approach.

The items that had the lowest means, which were means of below 4,00, were for the items "*incorporate spirituality into work done*" (3.95; *SD*=.925) and "*try to nurture or support the spiritual growth of my colleagues around me*" (3.91; *SD*=.890). The lowest mean in the current study was for the item, "*spend time on self-reflection, meditation or prayer at work*" (3.82; *SD*=.903). These findings suggest that leaders endeavour to keep spirituality separate from work. This might be due to arguments that spirituality is seen as a part of religion and should not be brought into the work environment. Hence, spiritual activities, such as prayer or meditation, were least supported as activities that should be undertaken in the work environment. It is possible that whilst leaders may engage in these spiritual activities outside of work, they do not see them as being appropriate to engage in at a personal level whilst at work.

Karakas (2009: 82) found that the item "*incorporate spirituality into work done*" (3.47; *SD*=1.029) had the overall lowest mean on this scale in his study. This is consistent with the views of writers who believe that spirituality is more a personal experience that should remain outside the work context (Pruzan 2011: 35; Phipps and Benefiel 2013: 33). The standard deviations of all the variables in Karakas' (2009: 83) study were significantly high, with three variables being found to have a standard deviation which was higher than 9.00. In the present study, two items were also found to have a standard deviation higher than 9.00, namely "*incorporate spirituality into work done*", and "*spend time on self-reflection, meditation, or prayer at work*".

Spiritual leadership has been described as creating an organisational culture that is linked to the values of altruistic love where leaders and followers experience a sense of membership, belonging, and feeling understood and valued. Spiritual leadership theory has been developed to create an intrinsically motivated organisation that fosters higher levels of organisational productivity, team creativity, and organisational learning capacity (Chen and Yang 2012:

108

107). Spiritual leaders are concerned more with active engagement in the workplace, such that people experience meaning in life which, consequently, fosters their growth and development (Wang *et al.* 2019: 2). Moreover, spiritual leadership has been described as delivering faith/hope in a spiritually embedded vision and through a process of creating that vision for subordinates or followers (Wang *et al.* 2019: 3). It includes spiritual values and management practices that inspire people to engage in meaningful work, and through creating contexts that are characterised by a sense of warmth and caring (Deci and Ryan 2000: 69).

Hence, through the practice of spiritual values and demonstrating altruistic love in the workplace, higher level productivity is fostered (Fry and Cohen 2009: 267). One of the earliest models on spiritual leadership underscored a corporate philosophy emphasising development, mutual trust and concern for others, group orientedness, and inner integrity (Fairholm 1996: 14). Recently, Fairholm (2000), a major advocate of spirituality and spiritual leadership as the novel leadership paradigm for the current century, argued for its inclusion as a holistic approach to work and life. He recognised that a leader's spiritual core (the spirit) was an important agent of guidance, and in turn developed a model of spiritual leadership that promoted cooperation, trust, mutual care, and a commitment to team and organisational effectiveness (Al Arkoubi 2013: 105).

Samul (2019: 844) asserted that all spiritual leadership models embrace a stakeholder approach through their explanation of organisations as structures that are composed of different layers, all of which have significance in the overall productivity of the organisation. Barett (cited in Law 2016: 444) said that spiritual leaders are more likely to establish value-based organisations which are highly successful, profitable, and more productive, because the nature of their commitment with employees brings about greater commitment amongst them. Spiritual leadership then focuses on developing strategic initiatives that create profits by contributing to the greater good and by making a difference in the larger community (Fry, 2009).

A study conducted by Chen, Jiang, Zhang and Chu (2019: 1206) with 188 subordinate-leader dyads in organisations in China found that spiritual leadership had a hugely beneficial effect on work behaviour. Moreover, they found that spiritual leadership positively influences organisational identification, and that the latter influences psychological safety, which consequently encourages the proactive behaviour of employees and pro-active work

behaviour. Other studies have shown that spiritual leadership has a beneficial effect on strategic leader effectiveness in terms of relationships with both employees and relationships with stakeholders outside the organisation (Fry 2003: 694; Nahavandi 2009: 242; Stead and Stead 2013: 275). These findings further support the importance of *spiritual depth* and the various attitudes, characteristics, and behaviours embedded in the scale as part of a benevolent approach to leadership.

4.5 POSITIVE ENGAGEMENT SCALE

Table 20: Positive Engagement Scale

Variable	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min.	Max.
I strive to communicate a clear and positive vision of the future	301	13	4,41	0,500	3	5
I encourage my team members to have bold dreams in this organisation	301	13	4,35	0,601	3	5
Even when others get discouraged, I know I can find a way to solve the problem	301	13	4,31	0,605	2	5
I am passionate about bringing in positive change around me	301	13	4,39	0,546	2	5
I try to provide hope and courage for people around me to take positive action	301	13	4,41	0,532	3	5
I work with my colleagues to create a shared common vision for positive change	300	14	4,38	0,580	3	5
If I want to change something positively at work, I take an action and initiate the change process	301	13	4,37	0,611	3	5
I am open-minded about new ideas to create change and innovation in the organisation	301	13	4,44	0,530	3	5
I am hopeful about what we can accomplish in this organisation	301	13	4,39	0,564	2	5
I have a fundamental belief in our abilities to produce positive results in this organisation	300	14	4,43	0,594	1	5

111

The Positive Engagement Scale is the third scale related to benevolent leadership (see Table 20). The overall mean for the Positive Engagement Scale in the present study was found to be 4.39 (*SD*=0.476). The overall mean of this scale in Karakas' (2009: 84) study was slightly lower (4.09; *SD*=0.457). The overall means for all the items on this scale were all above 4.00, unlike the other three scales in the present study, which had means that were slightly lower. This suggests a strong desire amongst leaders in the current study to create positivity, both in the organisation and outside it.

The highest mean on this scale was 4.44 (SD=0.53) for the item "I am open minded about new ideas to create change and innovation in the organisation". The other highest means were for the following variables, "I have a fundamental belief in our abilities to produce positive results in this organisation" (4.43; SD=0.59); "I strive to communicate a clear and positive vision of the future" (4.41; SD=5.00); "I try to provide hope and courage for people around me to take positive action" (4.41; SD=0.53). In Karakas' (2009: 84), study the highest mean was obtained for the item, "I am open-minded about new ideas to create change and innovation in the organisation" (4.22; SD=.70). This was the same item that received the highest mean in the current study. The other two items receiving the second and highest mean ratings in Karakas' (2009: 84) study were for: "I am passionate about bringing in positive change around me" (4.17; SD=0.65), and "I provide hope and courage for people to take positive action" (4.15; SD=0.67).

The lowest mean for the Positive Engagement Scale belonged to the item, "*Even when others get discouraged, I know I can find a way to solve the problem*" (4.31; *SD*=0.60). The highest standard deviation was 0.611 for the item, "*If I want to change something positively at work, I take action and initiate the change process*", whilst the lowest standard deviation was 0.500 for the item, "*I strive to communicate a clear and positive vision of the future*". In Karakas (2009: 84) study, the lowest means were for the following items, "*I encourage team members to have bold dreams in this organisation*" (3.87; *SD*=0.68) and "*I strive to communicate a clear and positive vision of the future*" (4.04; *SD*=0.58).

Cameron and Caza (2005: 90) described leadership as enabling a positive climate, positive connections with others, positive communication, and highest human potentialities in organisational activities. Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil (2013: 809) described positively engaged leaders as those who inspire people, bring hope, and create positive change in human

112

systems. Hence, positive engagement is linked to how organisations can be transformed using strength-based approaches. It includes inspiring and empowering followers or subordinates, creating and leading self-motivated teams, providing courage for action, and working collaboratively towards positive change. The intent then is to reinvigorate the organisation and create vitality by empowering the human potential of employees.

4.6 COMMUNITY RESPONSIVENESS SCALE

Table 21: Community Responsiveness Scale

Variable	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min.	Max.
In my work, I strive to help other people in my organisation and in my community	294	20	4,31	0,620	1	5
Care for my community drives my leadership at work	294	20	4,15	0,693	2	5
The work I do makes a difference in people's lives around me	294	20	4,27	0,570	2	5
I care about the legacy I will leave for future generations	294	20	4,38	0,558	3	5
I feel and act like a responsible leader in my community	294	20	4,17	0,654	2	5
I go beyond my job definition to contribute to my community and to the world	294	20	4,09	0,731	2	5
I am willing to devote time and energy to things that are important to my community	294	20	4,20	0,639	2	5
I am actively involved in social responsibility projects for community benefit	293	21	4,02	0,881	1	5

I evaluate the consequences of my managerial decisions for all our stakeholders	293	21	4,34	0,535	3	5
I give my time and money to charitable causes in my community	294	20	4,22	0,728	1	5

The data with regards to the Community Responsiveness Scale is presented in Table 21 above. The overall mean of this scale was 4.21 (*SD*=0.501). It was significant to note that all the variables in this scale had means that were above 4, which suggests a strong commitment to the community and society amongst leaders in the current sample. Karakas (2009: 85) made similar findings in his study, as the overall mean of this scale in his study was 3.99 (*SD*=0,59), which suggests that leaders in his sample were also socially responsive.

The highest mean among the variables on this scale in the present study was 4.38 (*SD*=0.558) for the item, "*I care about the legacy I will leave for future generations*". The second highest mean (4.34; *SD*=0.53) was for the variable, "*I evaluate the consequences of my managerial decisions for all our stakeholders*". The item "*In my work, I strive to help others*" had the highest mean (4.16; *SD*=0.636) in Karakas' (2009: 85) study. The item "*I am willing to devote time and energy to things that are important to my community*", had the second highest mean (4.06; *SD*=7.33) in his study. Whilst these two variables did not have the highest means in the present study, the mean ratings for both these items were above 4. This suggests a strong commitment to community stakeholders, and a willingness to devote time and energy to the community in the hope of leaving a legacy for future generations.

The lowest mean was for the item "*I am actively involved in social responsibility projects for community benefit*" (4.02; *SD*=0.88). Although it was the lowest on the scale, it was still over 4, which reflects a commitment to social responsibility projects. The item "*care for my community drives my leadership at work*" was found to have the lowest mean (3.89; *SD*=0.846) in Karakas' (2009: 85) study. The lowest standard deviation in the current study was 0.53. It was related to the variable, "*I evaluate the consequences of my managerial decisions for all our stakeholders*". The lowest standard deviation reported on this scale in Karakas' (2009: 85) study was 0.36 for the item, "*In my work I strive to help other people*".

Drawing upon various perspectives, Tastan and Davoudi (2019: 279) defined *socially responsible leadership* as "a multilevel phenomenon involving individuals, groups and organisations that emphasises leadership effectiveness, ethical behaviour, respect for stakeholders and economically, socially and environmentally sustainable practices". Gleason (2012: 11) similarly described socially responsible leadership as "consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship and change". Socially responsible leadership, therefore, includes the social-relational processes of individual managers and collectivises that actively to involve stakeholders so that they function as an ethical and socially responsible organisation (Doh, Stumpf and Tymon 2011: 86). These definitions suggest the interconnectedness between ethical leadership and social responsibility.

Responsible leadership is founded on the basis that corporate leaders have a responsibility to a broader range of stakeholders such as non-governmental organisations, employees and customers, governments, societies, and future generations, all of whom are affected by the organisations' activities (Maak and Pless 2006: 101-102). It was significant then that the second highest mean on the Community Responsiveness Scale was linked to leaders' consideration of managerial decisions for all stakeholders. In fact, Maak and Pless (2009: 539) who pioneered the understanding of responsible leadership, described it as a values-based and principle-driven relationship between leaders and stakeholders who are connected through shared meaning and purpose, and who they raise to higher levels of motivation and commitment for achieving sustainable value creation and responsible change. In accordance with this, they defined responsible leadership as the ability to build and maintain morally sound relationships that are based on a sense of justice, recognition, care, and responsibility for a wide range of economic, social, political, and human tasks (Maak and Pless 2009: 539). The Community Responsiveness Scale makes strong reference to engagement with the community, charitable causes, social responsibility projects, and contribution to the global world. The high means obtained for these items (above 4) on the Community Responsiveness Scale suggests a strong commitment to community amongst leaders in the present study.

Doh and Stumph (2005: 86) argued that responsible leadership integrates three components, namely: *values-based leadership, ethical decision making*, and *quality stakeholder relationships*. Hence, care for community is driven by positive values and a strong ethical background. This supports Karakas' (2009: 47) argument that the various aspects of

115

leadership embedded within each of the other scales, namely Spiritual Depth and Ethical Sensitivity, are all interrelated with each other. It further supports the notion that in order to be responsive to the community, one has to have a strong spiritual and ethical leadership framework. Collectively then, these different dimensions make up *benevolent leadership*.

This was evident in one example of a CEO and an organisation that strives to serve all stakeholders from a humanistic ethical system and that reflects The Spiritual Leadership Triple Bottom Line Business model. Poleman, who is the CEO of Unilever, considers environmental risks and poverty as major problems for almost every part of business operations, from manufacturing laundry detergents to growing tea. The organisation has been successful as Poleman's leadership philosophy is based on the view that the real purpose of business is to come up with solutions that are relevant to society and that will help make society better. Leadership that emphasises sustainability is focussed on leaders who live their lives and lead their organisations in ways that account for their impact on the earth, society, and health of local and global economies.

Several writers have in fact asserted that managerial values and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility in a particular institutional context are likely to have a strong influence on the outcomes of corporate social responsibility initiatives (Kim and Thapa 2018; de Roeck and Farooq 2018). A study done by Ashmos and Duchon (2000: 143) found a significant relationship between two items used in their scale, viz. *"I see a connection between my work and the larger social good of my community*" and "*the work I do is connected to what I think is important in life*" (Ashmos and Duchon 2000: 143). They also found in their study a third salient aspect, that people in the workplace valued being able to feel part of a larger community or being interconnected. This was reflected in their response to the item, "*Part of being alive is living in connection to other human beings*" (Ashmos and Duchon 2000: 136).

SECTION C

Section C focusses on a discussion of data from the Perceived Organisational Performance Scale.

4.7 PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE

In this section of the survey, a subjective and multidimensional measure of organisational performance was investigated. Respondents were asked to rate key dimensions of organisational performance on a 5-point Likert-type scale which ranged from 1 ("much worse"), 2 ("worse"), 3 ("equal"), and 4 ("better"), and 5 ("much better"). Some of the dimensions of organisational performance that were rated were employee morale, positive organisational change, and corporate social responsibility. This data are captured in the Perceived Organisational Performance Scale in Table 22 below.

Table 22: Perceived Organisational Performance Scale

Variable	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min.	Max.
Financial performance indicators, i.e. profitability	288	26	4,20	0,776	2	5
Managerial effectiveness in this organisation	289	25	4,13	0,864	1	5
Ability to attract and retain essential employees	289	25	4,10	0,842	1	5
Satisfaction of customers or clients	289	25	4,21	0,838	1	5
Relations between management and other employees	288	26	4,13	0,785	1	5
Relations among employees in general	288	26	4,17	0,779	1	5
Employee morale	288	26	4,14	0,806	1	5
Employee productivity	288	26	4,13	0,900	1	5
Business ethics	288	26	4,28	0,766	1	5
Spirituality at work	288	26	3,98	0,914	1	5
Positive organisational change	288	26	4,16	0,780	1	5
Corporate social responsibility	288	26	4,25	0,786	1	5
Innovation	288	26	4,22	0,829	1	5
Long term organisational health	288	26	4,29	0,785	1	5

117

An analysis of the data set for the Perceived Organisational Performance Scale reflected significantly more missing data as compared to the Benevolent Leadership Scale. This may be attributed to the fact that they did not want to comment on organisational performance. It may also be possible that some participants had left the survey incomplete as the amount of missing data seems to be progressive as the survey progresses.

The overall mean of this scale was found to be a high of 4.18 (*SD*=0.670). All the items related to *organisational performance* had a mean above 4, except for "*spirituality at work*". Karakas (2009: 87) reported an overall mean of 3.73 (*SD*=0.60) in his study. In general, the mean scores of the variables in this scale are relatively similar to the variables of those on the four preceding scales which collectively constitute the BLS (Benevolent Leadership Score).

The highest mean 4.29 (*SD*=0.785) found on this scale was for the item "*long term organisational health*". High means were also obtained for the variables "*business ethics*" (4.28; SD=0.76); "*corporate social responsibility*" (4.25; *SD*=0.78), and "*innovation*" (4.22; *SD*=0.82). The *perceived organisational performance* with regards to these variables support earlier findings which reflect high mean ratings on the Ethical Sensitivity Scale and Community Responsiveness Scale. They suggest that when leaders exhibit high levels of ethical sensitivity and responsiveness to community and society, then organisational performance is enhanced in these areas.

The high mean ratings above 4 in the areas of financial performance, customer satisfaction, good manager-employee relations, and overall employee relationships attest to this. The lowest mean related to the variable "spirituality at work" (3.98; SD=0.91. This aligns itself with earlier findings from the Spiritual Depth Scale, where the variable "incorporate spirituality into work" had a much lower mean rating of 3.95 (SD=0.92). This was in comparison to other variables on the Spiritual Depth Scale.

Karakas (2009: 86) reported some similar findings in his study. The highest mean on the Organisational Performance Scale in his study was for the item, "*innovation*" (3.99; *SD*=079). Although this was lower than the mean in the current study, both his study and the present one found this to be amongst the highest means on this scale. The other high means reported for

his study were for "positive organisational change" (3.81; *SD*=0.74) and "satisfaction of customers or clients" (3.79; *SD*=0.71).

Business ethics, which is linked to organisational performance, was found to have the second highest mean in the present study. It has been described as the "ethical reflection of an organization in terms of its behaviours and impacts on its stakeholders. Corporate values related to integrity, accountability, honesty, trust, fairness, responsibility, co-operation, mutuality, professionalism and open communication are the reflections of the business ethics of any organization" (Su, cited in Tastan and Davoudi 2019: 280; Francis, Mónico, Pais and Dos Santos 2018: 85).

Benevolent leadership then creates the opportunity to enhance psychological health and well-being, as well as emotional stability, and a sense of adequacy (Kara *et al.* 2013: 12-13), which in turn can positively affect working relationships with other colleagues.

The personal values of leaders not only influence their behaviour, but also encourage strong organisational performance. Leaders with strong personal values such as honesty, altruism, and trustworthiness have impressive leadership outcomes (Saha, Kashav, Cerchione and Singh 2019: 412). Having a leader who displays respect and dignity and acts with integrity and fairness, creates the potential for followers or subordinates to be happy with the organisation's reward system, promotion opportunities, relationships with colleagues, and working conditions (Tu, Lu and Yu 2017: 240). A South African study by Mitonga-Monga, Flotman and Moerane (2019: 16) found that the work ethics culture bridges and acts as a mediator in the relationship between ethical leadership and job satisfaction. They explained that when employees perceive a positive work ethics culture and high ethical leadership qualities such as honesty, integrity, respect, and trustworthiness, they might demonstrate a higher level of job satisfaction, including organisational effectiveness.

Whilst personal values of leaders influence organisational performance related to ethics, the ethical climate of the organisations is also important. A survey by KPMG (2008: 3) of 5,065 employees at US based organisations found that organisations with ethics programmes have a healthy ethics climate with a lower incidence of misconduct and greater effectiveness in detecting and responding to misconduct. Organisations which had a comprehensive ethics and

119

compliance programme were characterised by an environment in which people who felt empowered to do the right thing doubled from 43% to 90% in comparison to companies without these programmes.

According to Gerpott, Van Quaquebeke, Schlamp and Voelpel (2019: 1064), *organisational citizenship behaviour* refers to "altruistic voluntary activities that organisational members undertake outside of their job requirements and possibly without compensation". These activities can focus on individual organisational members or the entire organisation itself. They reported that employees who score highly on organisation directed behaviour, present with higher attendance at work, protect organisational property, and avoid unnecessary break times. Given that these are morally appropriate workplace behaviours, ethical leadership is one of the main antecedents of such follower behaviour (Kacmar, Bachrach, Harris and Zivnuska 2011: 633).

Research has confirmed that *ethical leadership* has been significantly related to the performance of an organisation within different life cycles (Carpenter, Geletkanycz and Sanders 2004: 7). Organisations under ethical and sustainable leadership are expected to achieve greater external legitimacy and a positive brand image on the basis that their business practices are responsible (Wang, Chen, Yu and Hsiao 2015: 2232).

Innovation was also found to be a significant variable related to organisational performance both in this study and Karakas' (2009: 87) study. It had a high mean rating in this study and Karakas' (2009: 87) study as well, with respect to organisational performance. Aguinis (2019: 25) supported this, saying that innovation serves as a crucial factor in determining organisational success.

"Innovation begins with recognition and generation of novel ideas or solutions that challenge past practices and standard operating procedures" (LePine and Van Dyne 1998: 865). It, however, does not occur in the absence of creativity, and leaders must therefore create organisational contexts that enable creative behaviours and activities. Innovation leaders have been described as change agents who promote the manifestation of new ideas by ensuring that a supportive climate for creativity prevails and by managing the innovation process (Kremer, Villamor and Aguinis 2019: 65).

Kremer, Villamor and Aguinis (2019: 67) outlined some of the best practice recommendations of innovation leaders. Firstly, innovation leaders should encourage employee trust and support, and praise those experts willing to help other employees, as well as facilitate a culture of knowledge sharing. Secondly, the design of teams has important consequences for promoting the voice of members as valuable partners, ensuring team cohesion and valuing the input of new ideas and suggestions. Thirdly, innovation leaders create opportunities for interaction outside the team as they recognise that knowledge exists within broader organisational networks. Hence, interacting with others beyond the team may help develop creative ideas. In so doing, innovation leaders strive to strengthen employees' awareness of others' expertise. Fourthly, signs of support, and acknowledging contributions, promotes the voice of others and knowledge sharing initiatives.

Business ethics and innovation appear to be not only interlinked in the present study, but also in the literature. A study by Chen and Hou (2016: 1) discovered that when leaders are perceived to be ethical, the creativity of followers is enhanced. Innovation leaders who display ethical behaviours to support employees inevitably influence front and line workers to be ethical (Chen and Hou 2016: 5).

Innovation leaders create opportunities for knowledge sharing across different levels in organisations, which enhances organisational performance (Aguinis, Gottfredson and Joo 2012). In larger organisations, particularly with skip level employees, there is a greater need for opportunities for them to interact at various levels and to build trust amongst each other (Kremer, Villamor and Aguinis 2019: 72).

The lowest mean on the organisational performance scale was found for the variable "*spirituality at work*" (3.98; *SD*=0.914). The highest standard deviation was 0.914 also for the variable "*spirituality at work*". The lowest standard deviation, 0.77, was for financial performance indicators, namely, *profitability*. In Karakas' (2009: 86) study, the lowest mean (3.65; *SD*=0.814) was for the item, "*ability to attract and retain essential employees*".

Ethical leaders were found to be more likely to influence employees' organisational citizenship behaviour, more importantly, enhance it (Ko, Ma, Kang, English and Haney 2017: 408). Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 547) reported that the vitality and community streams of benevolent leadership positively influenced organisational citizenship behaviour. This was further supported in Ghosh's (2015: 598) study which found that ethical sensitivity, spiritual

121

wisdom, positive engagement, and community responsiveness had influenced organisational citizenship behaviour.

A positive relationship between benevolent leadership and team performance was also found in a study by Li *et al.* (2018: 369). Moreover, even within highly turbulent and unknown environments, life-oriented and work-oriented benevolent leadership was found to influence team identification and satisfaction (Lin, Liao and Kuo 2018: 1).

"*Spirituality at work*" had the lowest mean on the Organisational Performance Scale. This low mean may be linked to the fact that the collective mean for the Spiritual Depth Scale was found to be lowest (4,13; *SD*=0,65) compared to the other three scales. Despite this, "*spirituality at work*" and "*spiritual leadership*" are linked to greater organisational performance in multiple studies, which makes it important to consider. Rathee and Rajain (2020) believed that introducing spirituality in the workplace would not only benefit employees, but economic outputs using measures such as quality, productivity, and profitability would also increase. Most importantly, their study found that workplace spirituality positively influenced work attitudes like organisational performance, involvement in work and commitment to the same, as well as job satisfaction as a whole.

Other writers have noted that workplace spirituality has had a positive impact on employee work attitudes such as increased job satisfaction (Lee, Lovelace and Manz 2014: 45-46), organisational commitment, and a reduced intention to leave work (Gatling, Kim and Milliman 2016: 473). Researchers also found that workplace spirituality was essential in building an ethical climate in organisations and to promoting a culture of prosocial motivation. A study undertaken by Otaya-Ebede, Shaffakat and Foster (2020: 611) with 51 branches of a British retail organisation, found that workplace spirituality was positively associated with ethical climate, prosocial motivation, and moral judgment. Similar findings were made in South Africa in a study by van der Walt and Steyn (2019: 1) who found that organisations that had spiritual values, or what they regarded as workplace spirituality, had a significant impact on the ethical behaviour of project managers.

Aboobaker and Zakkariya (2020: 1) investigated the relationship between workplace spirituality and meaningful work, sense of community, and alignment with organisational values and employee loyalty with a sample of 308 employees in a private sector in India. They

122

found that employees' experience of workplace spirituality had a salient positive influence on their loyalty toward the organisation. These findings suggest that by enhancing spiritual leadership and spirituality at work, other variables described on the Organisational Performance Scale can be improved.

The following sub-sections look at the correlations between certain demographic variables and the sub-scales of the Benevolent Leadership Scale, namely: Ethical Sensitivity Scale, Spiritual Depth Scale, Positive Engagement Scale, and Community Responsiveness Scale. Following this, the results for the correlation between benevolent leadership and perceived organisational performance is presented.

4.8 T-TESTS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCES

The relationship between the sub-scales of Benevolent Leadership and the demographic variables were also investigated. T-tests and analysis of variances (ANOVA) were used, and focused specifically on the homogeneity and intergroup differences measured by ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, positive engagement, community responsiveness, and the overall *benevolent leadership.*

First, the differences between males and females in terms of their benevolent leadership tendencies were investigated (see Table 23). Females were found to have marginally higher mean scores for positive engagement and community responsiveness, while the males were found to have higher mean scores for ethical sensitivity and spiritual depth, the differences between genders are not significant. Karakas (2009: 138) in contrast found the females to have a higher mean for all the sub-scales of the Benevolent Leadership Scale, with significant differences being found in relation to gender and the Spiritual Depth sub-scale.

Table 23: Gender and the four sub-scales of benevolent leadership

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	Significance (2-tailed test)
Female	89	4.5255	.43747	.04637	-,302	0,763

123

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	Sig (2-tailed)
Ethical sensitivity scale	Male	222	4.5420	.43716	.02934		
Spiritual Depth Scale	Female	88	4.0917	.83744	.08927	-0,287	0,775
	Male	219	4.1196	.55997	.03784		
Positive Engagement Scale	Female	89	4.4461	.52006	.05513	1,315	0,270
	Male	212	4.3627	.45569	.03130		
Community Responsiveness	Female	86	4.2779	.51641	.05569	1.380	0,169
	Male	208	4.1894	.49342	.03421		
Benevolent Leadership Score	Female	89	4.3364	.48420	.05132	0,664	0,508
	Male	223	4.2984	.38314	.02566		

4.9 T-TESTS CONT'

The second independent sample *t*-test that was conducted investigated whether or not there was a significant difference between married respondents and single (includes unmarried, divorced, and widowed) respondents (see Table 24). Married respondents had a slightly higher mean score than single respondents for all the sub-scales. However, the difference in marital status was found to be significant for the Spiritual Depth Scale. The *t* statistic for the Spiritual Depth Scale was -5.061 with 119,530 degrees of freedom and a *p* value of 0.00. Karakas (2009: 139) reported no differences in benevolent leadership tendencies and marital status.

Table 24: Marital Status and the four sub-scales of the Benevolent Leadership Scale

	Marital Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	Sig (2-tailed)
Ethical_ Sensitivity Scale	Single	61	4.4995	.45660	.05846	-0,923	0.961
	Married	222	4.5578	.43170	.02897		
	Single	62	3.7424	.85662	.10879	-5.061	0,000

124

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error		
Spiritual Depth Scale	Married	218	4.2012	.54964	.03723		
Positive Engagement Scale	Single	62	4.3532	.49513	.06288	-0,523	0,651
	Married	211	4.3891	.46846	.03225		
Community Responsiveness	Single	61	4.1033	.58051	.07433	-2.102	0,524
	Married	209	4.2574	.47954	.03317		
Benevolent_ Leadership_ Score	Single	62	4.1737	.48642	.06178		
	Married	222	4.3446	.39049	.02621		

When testing for differences between means of variables across multiple (more than two) independent groups, one-way ANOVA (or, single factor ANOVA) is appropriate, and was used accordingly below.

4.10 ANOVA TESTS

The ANOVA test was firstly conducted to determine whether or not there was a significant difference in the benevolent leadership sub-scales across levels of education (see Table 25). The respondents were split into 3 groups: 1) *Graduate* (national diploma, Bachelor of Technology, and bachelor's degree); 2) *Postgraduate* (master's degree, doctoral degree, and MBA); and 3) *Professional and other* (professional qualification and other). The *F* statistic indicates statistically significant differences between education groups and Ethical Sensitivity ($F=5,2790$: $p \leq 0,01$), Spiritual Depth ($F=5,3650$; $p \leq 0,01$) and the overall Benevolent Leadership Scale ($F=4,928$; $p \leq 0,01$). Karakas (2009: 140) also found significant differences within the education levels with regards to community responsiveness and the Benevolent Leadership Scale. This can be seen in Table 25 below.

Table 25: Level of education

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F	Sig
	Graduate	150	4.6201	0.42370	0.03459	5.2790	.0,006
	Postgraduate	66	4.4322	0.42668	0.05252		

Ethical Sensitivity Scale	Professional and Other	77	4.4983	0.40293	0.04592		
	Total	293	4.5457	0.42513	0.02484		
Spiritual Depth Scale	Graduate	149	4.2114	0.56804	0.04654	5.3650	0,005
	Postgraduate	65	4.1986	0.49712	0.06166		
	Professional and Other	76	3.9585	0.62871	0.07212		
	Total	290	4.1423	0.57846	0.03397		
Positive Engagement Scale	Graduate	150	4.4500	0.47878	0.03909	2,419	0,091
	Postgraduate	63	4.3603	0.44957	0.05664		
	Professional and Other	74	4.3108	0.45588	0.05299		
	Total	287	4.3944	0.46901	0.02768		
Community Responsiveness	Graduate	144	4.2840	0.57824	0.04819	1,944	0,145
	Postgraduate	64	4.1969	0.40590	0.05074		
	Professional and Other	73	4.1493	0.38842	0.04546		
	Total	281	4.2292	0.50007	0.02983		
Benevolent Leadership Scale	Graduate	150	4.3947	0.41546	0.03392	4,928	0,008
	Postgraduate	67	4.2908	0.32942	0.04025		
	Professional and Other	77	4.2333	0.36245	0.04130		
	Total	294	4.3288	0.38891	0.02268		

Overall, the graduates had the highest mean score between education level and for all the sub-scales and the Benevolent Leadership Scales in Karakas' (2009: 142) study. Managers with graduate degrees had significantly higher scores on the Spiritual Depth, Positive Engagement and Benevolent Leadership scores than managers with a postgraduate and professional qualification. A majority of these participants were found to be young to middle age (69%), and more than a third were female (46%). Karakas (2009: 142) found significant differences on the Community Responsiveness Scale and Benevolent Leadership scores with graduates.

126

4.11 AGE

The second ANOVA was applied to explore whether or not there was a significant difference in the Benevolent Leadership sub-scales across ages. The respondents were split into three groups, namely: young (respondents between the ages of 25 to 35 years), middle age (respondents between the ages of 36 to 55 years), and old (respondents who were over 56 years). The F statistic reflects significant differences for the Spiritual Depth Scale ($F=20,264$, $p \leq 0,01$) and the Benevolent Leadership Scale ($F= 7,996, p \leq 0,01$) and moderately significant differences for the Positive Engagement Scale ($F=4,077, p \leq 0,05$). This is reflected in Table 26 below.

Table 26: Statistical differences between age and the Benevolent Leadership sub-scales

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F	Sig
Ethical Sensitivity Scale	Young	61	4.4913	0.44149	0.05653	4,442	0,13
	Middle age	234	4.5668	0.43463	0.02841		
	Old	15	4.2400	0.33764	0.08718		
	Total	310	4.5361	0.43683	0.02481		
Spiritual Depth Scale	Young	61	3.6689	0.90817	0.11628	20,264	0,000
	Middle age	231	4.2310	0.52803	0.03474		
	Old	14	4.0779	0.20126	0.05379		
	Total	306	4.1119	0.65137	0.03724		
Positive Engagement Scale	Young	61	4.2967	0.52312	0.06698	4,077	0,018
	Middle age	224	4.4263	0.46257	0.03091		
	Old	15	4.1333	0.35187	0.09085		
	Total	300	4.3853	0.47575	0.02747		
Community Responsiveness	Young	61	4.1246	0.64850	0.08303	1,564	0,211
	Middle age	219	4.2447	0.46106	0.03116		
	Old	13	4.1308	0.30926	0.08577		

	Total	293	4.2147	0.50173	0.02931		
Benevolent Leadership Scale	Young	61	4.1454	0.55126	0.07058	7,996	0,000
	Middle age	235	4.3606	0.36533	0.02383		
	Old	15	4.1525	0.28653	0.07398		
	Total	311	4.3084	0.41442	0.02350		

As reflected in the table above, overall, the middle age group has a higher mean value across all Benevolent Leadership sub-scales.

4.12 CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE BENEVOLENT LEADERSHIP SCALE AND THE PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE SCALE

Table 27 below presents a summary of the correlations found between the four sub-scales, namely: Ethical Sensitivity Scale, Spiritual Depth Scale, Positive Engagement Scale, and Community Responsiveness Scale.

Table 27: Correlations between Benevolent Leadership Scale and Perceived Organisational Scale

		Ethical Sensitivity Scale	Spiritual Depth Scale	Positive Engagement Scale	Community Responsiveness	Benevolent Leadership Score	Perceived Organisational Performance
Ethical Sensitivity Scale	Pearson Correlation						
	N						
Spiritual Depth Scale	Pearson Correlation	.404**					
	N	306					
Positive Engagement Scale	Pearson Correlation	.471**	.591**				
	N	300	297				
Community Responsiveness	Pearson Correlation	.366**	.599**	.623**			
	N	293	292	290			
Benevolent_ Leadership_ Score	Pearson Correlation	.677**	.855**	.832**	.813**		
	N	311	307	301	294		
	Pearson Correlation	.193**	.380**	.341**	.386**	.411**	

		292	288	286	279	292	
Perceived	N						
Organisational	N	296	293	290	283	297	281
Performance							

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

As is evident in Table 27 above, the correlations were significant and positive. The correlations measure of significance was found to be moderate (0.05) to high (0.01). The correlations between the four sub-scales of Benevolent Leadership range from 0,366 to 0,623. The highest correlation amongst the sub-scales was found to be 0,632, which represented an association between community responsiveness and positive engagement. Karakas (2009: 158) found a similar correlation in his study.

The correlations between the four Benevolent Leadership sub-scales, as highlighted in the table above, and the outcome variables of "perceived organisational performance" were found to be significant and positive. These correlations ranged from 0,128 to 0,386. The Pearson correlation coefficient representing the association between Benevolent leadership and Perceived Organisational Performance was found to be 0.411 with $p \leq 0{,}01$. Karakas (2009: 158) also had significant positive correlations when developing for the convergent validity and predictive validity for the construct of Benevolent Leadership.

SECTION D

Section D focuses on data related to whether aspects of benevolent leadership were covered in the education the participants received.

4.13 LEADERSHIP EDUCATION

4.13.1 Benevolent Leadership in Education

Table 28: Inclusion of benevolent leadership in education

Benevolent Leadership in Education	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Yes	51	16.2%
No	240	76.4%
Missing Data	23	7.4%
Total	314	100%

Table 28 outlines whether respondents' leadership training included aspects of benevolent leadership. More than 75% (76.4%; *n*=240) of the sample indicated that their training did not

include aspects of benevolent leadership. It was only about 16% (16,2%; *n*=51) of the sample who expressed that those aspects of benevolent leadership were included in their management training. About 7% (7,4%; *n*=23) did not respond to this question. This reflects a huge gap in their educational preparedness related to benevolence. This was despite there being relatively high levels of mean scores across all four sub-scales, which collectively relate to benevolent leadership. This suggests that the characteristics of benevolent leadership were also acquired personally through their experience as leaders.

4.13.2 Inclusion of Morality, Spirituality, Positivity or Community

Table 29: Extent to which leadership training included morality, spirituality, positivity or community

	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Missing data	Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%
Morality	25	8	0	0	0	0	5	1.6	10	3.2	274	314	100
Spirituality	1	0.3	8	2.5	11	3.5	4	1.3	9	2.9	281	314	100
Positivity	7	2.2	6	1.9	8	2.5	10	3.2	10	3.2	283	314	100
Community	2	0.6	6	1.9	6	1.9	2	0.6	17	5.4	281	314	100

Table 29 presents data related to the extent to which their training covered the following aspects of benevolent leadership, namely: *morality, spirituality, positivity* and *community*. The high percentage of missing data can be attributed to the fact that only those who responded positively to whether their education included benevolent leadership, as under the preceding question, answered this question. *Morality* was described as business ethics, leadership values, and ethical decision making. *Spirituality* was described as spiritual actions of leaders and employee spiritual well-being. *Positivity* was described as strength-based approaches, namely how leaders create positive change in organisations and the world. *Community* was described as corporate social responsibility and leaders' contribution to society and community service.

The fact that benevolent leadership and the four dimensions which constitute it were not extensively included in education and training is reflected in Table 29. As is evident in the data, there were higher percentages of those who "strongly disagreed" or "disagreed" or

remained "neutral" that morality, spirituality, positivity, and community was extensively covered. Only 8% (*n*=25) "strongly agreed" that morality was covered, and 4,1% (*n*=13) "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that positivity had been covered. About 3% (2,8%; *n*=9) "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that spirituality had been covered, and 2,5% (*n*=8) "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that community had been covered. In its totality, this reflects a huge gap in education and training with regards to the four aspects of benevolent leadership.

4.13.3 Coverage of Aspects Related to Morality, Spirituality, Positivity and Community

Table 30: Morality, spirituality, positivity and community were equally covered

	Frequency (n)	Percent
Strongly agree	6	1.9
Agree	1	.3
Neutral	9	2.9
Disagree	33	10.5
Strongly Disagree	210	66.9
Missing data	55	17.5

As indicated in Table 30 above, more than 65% (66,9%; *n*=210) "strongly disagreed" and a further 10,5% (*n*=33) "disagreed" that aspects of morality, spirituality, positivity, and community were equally covered during their education. This in total indicates that more than 80,3% (*n*=252) either "disagreed" or opted to stay "neutral", lending strong support that these aspects were not equally covered as part of benevolent leadership collectively.

4.13.4 Aspects of Benevolent Leadership Requiring Attention in Education

Table 31: Aspects of benevolent leadership requiring attention

	Frequency (n)	Percent
Morality	220	70.1
Spirituality	219	69.7
Positivity	232	73.9
Community responsiveness	205	65.3

133

Table 31 reflects data with regards to the respondents' views on whether morality, spirituality, positivity, and community responsiveness required greater attention in education. More than 65% of the sample "agreed" that all four aspects should receive greater attention in education. The highest level of support was received for positivity (73,9%; *n*=232), followed by morality (70,1 %; *n*=220), spirituality (69,7 %; *n*=219), and community responsiveness (65, 35; *n*=205).

Support for the individual aspects of benevolent leadership, namely: *ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, positive engagement*, and *community responsiveness* are evident in the literature. A report by The Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC), published by the Council on Higher Education in 2004, emphasised the relevance and importance of business ethics in MBA curricula (Council on Higher Education, 2004, cited in Louw and Wessels 2016: 558). In order to investigate whether business ethics modules were being meaningfully explored, a research project was undertaken by Louw and Wessels (2016: 557) to investigate whether business ethics education had increased between 2003 and 2011 and between 2011 and 2016. A content analysis was undertaken of the MBA (Master of Business Administration) and MBL (Master of Business Leadership) curricula documents of business schools. The study found a decline between 2003 and 2011, and a further decline between 2011 and 2016, in the number of MBA programmes that meaningfully included business ethics in their curricula. Louw and Wessels (2016: 571) concluded from their study that the deliberate and meaningful inclusion of business ethics in MBA programmes was crucial in South Africa. The decline found in South African MBA programmes with regards to the inclusion of business ethics in their curricula implies a decline in the number of business schools with the ability to instil and strengthen moral judgment, values, perspectives, and ways of perceiving the long-term interest of society in their students. This meant a loss of opportunities to teach MBA students good ethical behaviour.

Ethical corporate values in the form of ethical culture guides an organisation's corporate social responsibility decision-making. Moreover, corporate ethical policies are part of an explicit ethical culture that will strengthen responsible behaviours and constrain irresponsible behaviours (Jones, Felps and Bigley 2007: 138), thus making this an important part of education.

4.13.5 Areas Warranting Attention in Leadership Education

Table 32: Aspects that students must be prepared to address in their role as leaders

Areas for attention in leadership education	Frequency (n)	Percent
Complexity, i.e. recreating organisation as dynamic and adaptive system	286	91.1
Community, i.e. centring on the social responsibilities of organisations towards society and community service	279	88.9
Creativity, i.e. focussing on innovative and creative thinking within the organisation	280	89.2
Flexibility, i.e. new business models based on flexibility and adaptiveness	277	88.2
Positivity, i.e. centred on positive and strength-based approaches to organisations	277	88,2
Spirituality, i.e. new business models based on flexibility and adaptiveness	250	79,6

Respondents were asked to indicate their support for whether complexity, community, creativity, spirituality, flexibility, and positivity, as explained in Table 32, were aspects that students must be prepared to address in their role as leaders. As such, they reflect components of educational preparedness for leadership.

Table 32 reveals that almost 90% of the sample viewed complexity (91,1%; $n=286$), creativity (89,2%; $n=280$), community (88,9 %; $n=279$), flexibility (88,2 %; $n=277$), and positivity (88,2 %; $n=277$) as important areas that students must be able to address in their role as leaders. Almost 80% (79,6%; $n=250$) also supported spirituality as an important aspect that students must be prepared to address in their leadership role. These six different dimensions also holistically encompass dimensions of benevolent leadership.

4.13.6 Broad Themes that must be Integrated into a Course on Benevolent Leadership

Table 33: Broad themes that must be integrated into a course on benevolent leadership

Broad Themes	Frequency (n)	Percent
Good governance and corporate sustainability	252	80.3
Corporate social responsibility and citizenship	250	79.6
Business philosophy	234	74.5
Bio ethics and sustainability	225	71.7
Ethical dilemmas and decision making	254	80.9
Responsible leadership	256	81.5
Public relations management	210	66.9
Personal integrity and development of organisational integrity systems	243	93.5
Fraud and corruption	232	89.9
Human and worker rights	244	77.7
Ethics of market competition	251	79.9
Corporations and peacebuilding	228	72.6
Intercultural relations	251	79.9
Ethics: finance, human resources, professional, ethical management of business	260	82.8
Work and family	254	80.9

Several broad themes related to a course of benevolent leadership were presented to the respondents. These broad themes are interlinked and can be subsumed under the broad pillars of benevolent leadership, namely: *ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, positive engagement*, and *community responsiveness*. Respondents were asked to indicate whether certain specific elements required consideration. There was strong support for aspects that fell under *ethical sensitivity*, namely: personal integrity and organisational integrity (93,5 %; *n*=243); fraud and corruption (89,9%; *n*=232); ethics related to finance; human resources and management of the business (82,8%; *n*=260); ethical dilemmas and decision making (80,9 %; *n*=254); and ethics of market competition (79,9%; *n*=251) to be included in a course on benevolent leadership. Aspects related to *positive engagement*, such as work and family (80,9%; *n*=254), also received very strong support, lending itself to the need for students to be prepared for a good work balance between work life and family life for subordinates. Support was also received for aspects related to *spiritual depth*, namely: intercultural relations (79,9%; *n*=251),

corporates and peacebuilding (72,6%; *n*=228), and human and worker rights (77,7%; *n*=244) to be included in a course on benevolent leadership.

4.13.7 Aspects Requiring Attention to Prepare Students for Benevolent Leadership

Table 34: Aspects of benevolent leadership in education

Aspects of benevolent leadership in education	Frequency	Percent
Ethical sensitivity	265	84.4
Spiritual depth	224	71.4
Positive engagement	273	87.0
Community responsiveness	250	79.6

In this section, respondents were asked, based on their experience as benevolent leaders, to indicate which aspects of benevolent leadership, namely, *ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, positive engagement,* and *community responsiveness* were important to prepare students for the role of benevolent leaders. As reflected in Table 34, there was strong support for all four dimensions of benevolent leadership. Almost 90% of the sample expressed support for positive engagement (87%; *n*=273). About 85% of the sample indicated that ethical sensitivity (84,4%; *n*=265) was important, and almost 80% (79,6%; *n*=250) supported community responsiveness as an important aspect of student preparedness. Spiritual depth received support from 71,4% (*n*=224) and was ranked fourth when considering all four aspects of benevolent leadership.

There is strong support in the literature for all four dimensions listed in Table 34. Most importantly, writers do not view each aspect as separate from each other, but highlight their interrelatedness with each other. A study undertaken by Tormo-Carbó *et al.* (2019: 516) with a Polish sample of management students, also found strong support regarding the importance of business ethics education. A study undertaken by Sigurjonsson, Vaiman and Arnardottir (2015: 1-13) amongst managers also found that business schools were required to empower students with strong values, perspectives, and methods to discern the long-term interest of society. These managers suggested that "business schools should increase student's fundamental understanding of business ethics strengthen their values, and allow for much

stronger personal development" (Sigurjonsson *et al.* 2015: 9). The Declaration on International Business Ethics, which is built on the precepts of justice, mutual respect, stewardship, and honesty (Gasparski 2011: 144), reflect that these four aspects be embedded in business training courses offered at colleges and universities. This, together with the aspects identified in the previous sub-section, therefore, needs consideration.

There was also support for community responsiveness amongst respondents in the current sample. In line with this, The United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development delineated three pillars of sustainable development, namely: environmental, social, and economic sustainable development (UNESCO, 2004, cited in Kemper, Ballantine and Hall 2019: 1751) which reflect the key points "education about sustainability". As Pruzan (2011: 3) stated, management education at some universities is not only to develop students who will work for the transformation of society, but for "all good everywhere". Their academics seek to teach the best ideas and practices that express greater values of creativity and sustainability, so as to advance the quality of life for all people. Pruzan (2011: 4), however, described sustainable as a holistic view of corporate governance, which integrates economic, environment, social, and ethical responsibility. This suggests that community responsiveness is linked to ethical sensitivity.

Leadership education has also become influenced by a new perspective termed *spiritually-based leadership* (Pruzan 2011: 7). This is characterised by a stronger trend towards flatter, less hierarchical organisations with significantly less "distance" between the top management and the workers; new forms of organisations and communication; and more self-organising project-teams, where workers from various offices, with different specialisations and competencies, are brought together to meet a specific challenge by a specific deadline. Communication tends to be more dialogical rather than top-down, and competencies focus on meaningful visions, building enthusiasm, a strong sense of purpose amongst employees, personal integrity, the ability to instil confidence, and trustworthiness (Pruzan 2011: 8). Accordingly, these changes have created changes in educational programmes internationally, which emphasised the concepts of business ethics, self-referential organisations, corporate social/societal responsibility, and self-leadership (Pruzan 2011: 7), similar to the themes listed for inclusion in a course on benevolent leadership. This new approach to spiritually-based leadership is also supported by the current sample.

Fortune Magazine assessed corporations based on five dimensions, namely: credibility/trustworthiness, (truth/peace), respect (love), fairness (right action, non-violation), meaning of work (right action), and sense of family/community (love). Southwest Airlines, PeopleSoft, Goldman Sachs, and Hewlett-Packard were some of the well-recognised organisations that were in the top ten that adhered firmly to high-integrity character and these values that contributed to outstanding growth and performance (Miller 2011: 183). This lends support for including such values in education.

Business school educators can no longer avoid including teaching spirituality in their courses (Barnett, Krell and Sendry 2000: 563). It has been reported that while the literature on spirituality in management has grown, little exists on teaching spirituality in management courses, which results in business graduates leaving university without understanding their personal and professional values, their inner driving forces, their short and long-term purposes in life, and the ways in they can contribute to social organisations and society (Barnett, Krell and Sendry 2000: 573).

A survey by Allen and Williams (2015: 142) with graduate leadership and management students, explored their views on the inclusion of spiritual topics in their graduate programmes. It found positive support for its inclusion in education. Academics seeking to incorporate spirituality in management pedagogy used five spiritual principles to guide their teaching. These include self-knowledge, authenticity, respect for others' beliefs, trust, practising one's spirituality (e.g. prayer, walking in nature), humility, compassion, and simplicity (Harlos 2000: 617). The emphasis on the virtues of a leader creates the interrelationship between the leader and his/her spirituality in a more direct and explicit way (Dhiman and Marques 2011: 818; Trott 2013: 487).

The purpose of the globally responsible business is to create "economic and societal progress in a globally responsible sustainable way". In this definition, offered by de Woot (cited in de Bettignies 2013:176), it is the individual person who should rest at the centre of economic activity. Of significance is the work of the Globally Responsible Leadership Initiative, which indicates that management education should have three fundamental roles, namely: educating and developing globally responsible leaders; enabling business organisations to serve the common good; and engaging in the transformation of business and the economy. De Bettignies (2013: 178) argued for the need to create new, innovative institutions that prioritise

139

the development of individuals who are able to cope with a more complex world, who view their role as serving society, and who have a more holistic and balanced responsibility towards all stakeholders. This requires a paradigm shift, a commitment from academics, and students who can play a role in curriculum development and academics who support this change. Although corporate managers and corporate employers of graduates are not directly in the midst of universities, they could support the move towards change. As de Bettignies (2013: 178) articulated, these stakeholders should work towards a society model that is based on co-operative behaviours as opposed to competitive behaviours, on equity rather than growth, frugality instead of consumption, harmony rather than conflict, and the development of social entrepreneurs who are concerned with society.

There are many standalone courses in ethics and sustainability in the curricula of business schools (Giacalone and Thompson 2006: 270). Giacalone and Thompson (2006: 270) argued for a "human centered world view" of sustainability. The role of management educators then lies in cultivating the right values amongst management students (Giacalone and Promislo 2013: 90).

Support for the inclusion of sustainability in education is based on the "Sustainability Revolution", which urges organisations that are expanding to become more socially and ecologically responsible is growing internationally. These demands are in addition to the already complex web of resource scarcities, competitive dynamics, institutional requirements, customer demands, investor demands, and other challenges faced by businesses (Stead and Stead 2013: 273). Leaders need to secure innovative ways of meeting consumer demands, whilst using lesser resources and energy; lesser non-reusable, non-renewable, and non-recyclable wastes, lessening the carbon footprint; and contributing to global, social, and economic equity (Winston 2009). Such transformational change requires a shift in consciousness amongst strategic leaders. Stead and Stead (2013: 276) wrote that they "must serve as organisational Green Men who lead the translation of this new consciousness into meaningful sustainability-based organisational visions and value systems. It has been argued that leadership in building sustainability-based visions, values, and strategic initiatives in organisations should emerge from the highest level managers, such as chief executive officers, top management teams, and active boards of directors (Stead and Stead 2013: 274).

4.13.8 Support for a Course on Benevolent Leadership

Table 35: Course on benevolent leadership

Support for a course on Benevolent Leadership	Frequency	Percent
Yes	290	92.4
No	6	1.9
Missing Data	19	6.1

As indicated in Table 35, there was overwhelming support in the sample for a course on benevolent leadership. More than 90% (92,4%; n=290) stated that they supported a course on benevolent leadership. Only 1,9% (n=6) were not in favour of introducing a course on benevolent leadership. There was missing data for 6,1% of the sample (n=19). This huge level of support was not surprising due to the high level of benevolence evidenced across all four sub-scales in the Benevolent Leadership Scale in the current study. The importance of benevolent leadership related to various aspects of organisational performance has been discussed, and lends further support for this course. There is also support for benevolent leadership development as a framework to incorporate principles of responsible management education in leadership courses abroad. To this end, Karakas, Sarigollu and Manisaligil (2013: 805) developed a course entitled 'Benevolent Leadership and The Global Agenda', which they offered to professionals, managers, and university students in Turkey and in Canada. The course was organised around the four benevolent leadership pillars, namely, *ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, positive engagement,* and *community responsiveness,* and contains exercises that will focuses on encouraging benevolent tendencies amongst students.

4.14 CONCLUSION

The design adopted for this study enabled the study aim and objectives to be met. A quantitative approach, guided by an exploratory descriptive design, served to highlight the most prevalent characteristics, attitudes, behaviour patterns and values using the four sub-scales that underpin benevolent leadership. The study found a high prevalence of males occupying managerial or leadership positions. A majority of respondents were found to be married with children. Moreover, a majority were found to have either an undergraduate or post-graduate degree. Just over 60 % were with their current employer for more than 7 years.

Although the option of them owning the business or organisation was not presented to them, it appeared likely that this was possible as well. Almost 90% were found to work in profit organisations. Eighty percent (80%) of the sample described themselves as being middle or senior managers. This mirrors findings related to the length with which respondents were occupied at a particular organisation.

There were high means reported on all four of the sub-scales of the Benevolent Leadership Scale. All the means for each of the four sub-scales were over 4. The following means were found for each of these four sub-scales, namely: Ethical Sensitivity (4.53), Spiritual Depth (4.14), Positive Engagement (4.39), and Community Responsiveness (4. 21).

There was also a significantly high mean of 4.18 found for the Organisational Performance Scale. All the items on this scale were found to have means over 4, except for one variable. This points to the fact that the high level of benevolence amongst the respondents contributed to organisational performance in the following ways: financial performance, managerial effectiveness, customer satisfaction, ability to retain employees, ensuring good relations amongst employees, employee morale, productivity, business ethics, positive organisational change, corporate social responsibility, innovation, and long-term organisational health.

This resulted in understanding that there was a high prevalence of benevolence amongst the current sample. It is likely that high levels of spirituality gave rise to ethical sensitivity, concern for community, and positive organisational commitment. The correlational test run further found that that this high level of benevolence influenced organisational performance in several areas.

The study also found that benevolent leadership was largely excluded or omitted in the educational training of respondents. When considering the extent to which morality, spirituality, positivity, and community were covered individually in training, the study found that morality was most strongly covered. This is linked to the fact that business ethics may be more embedded in education than other aspects related to spirituality, community, and positivity. This was supported by findings that almost 85% of the sample strongly disagreed or disagreed that aspects related to morality, spirituality, positivity, and community were equally covered. Consequently, more than 70% of the sample supported the need for morality, spirituality and positivity to receive greater attention during educational preparedness. In

142

terms of specific aspects, more than 80% of the sample expressed that the following should be included to prepare students for their roles as leaders: how to recreate the organisation as a dynamic and adaptive system, focussing on the social responsibilities of organisations towards society and community service; focusing on innovative and creative thinking within the organisation; new business models based on flexibility and adaptiveness, and focussing on positive and strength-based approaches.

When asked what the essential elements for a course on benevolent leadership are, over 80% supported education on good governance and corporate sustainability, ethical dilemmas and decision making, responsible leadership, personal integrity and development of organisational integrity systems, fraud and corruption, and work and family. Over 70% felt the following should be included, namely: corporate social responsibility, business philosophy, bio ethics and sustainability, human and worker rights, peacebuilding in corporations and intercultural relations. These form the broad content areas identified for a course underpinning benevolent leadership. Overall, 92% of the sample supported a course on benevolent education in the South African context.

The next chapter presents the conclusions reached and recommendations made.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a summary of the major findings made (section 5.2), the major conclusions reached (section 5.3), and the limitations of the study (section 5.4). The penultimate section presents the recommendations that emerged from the research (section 5.5), followed by suggestions for further research (section 5.6).

5.2 MAJOR FINDINGS

The major findings of the study are discussed in terms of the participants' demographic details; benevolent leadership; organisational performance; and education.

5.2.1 Demographic Details

The majority of the sample was found to be between the ages of 36 and 55 years, with 70% being male. This reflected a strong gender bias within leadership positions in South Africa. More than 70% of the sample were found to have a bachelor's degree, honours degree, a postgraduate or a relevant professional qualification. A significant number of the sample was also found to be with their current employer for more than seven years, and were occupying middle or senior management positions.

5.2.2 Benevolent Leadership

The study found relatively high means for all four sub-scales which are part of the Benevolent Leadership Scale, namely: Ethical Sensitivity, Spiritual Depth, Positive Engagement, and Community Responsiveness. A high mean rating of over 4 was found for all the scales. Of all four sub-scales, the highest mean rating was received for Ethical Sensitivity scale. In total, the Benevolent Leadership Scale had a mean rating of 4.31 reflecting a very high level of benevolence amongst the current sample.

5.2.3 Organisational Performance

Benevolent leadership was found to influence organisational performance. The overall mean score for this was a high rating of 4.18. In terms of individual items on this scale, there were high mean ratings for items related to business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and innovation, which indicate the potential influence of *benevolent leadership* on these variables.

5.2.4 Education

The study found that aspects related to the four dimensions of benevolence, namely: *morality, spirituality, positivity,* or *community* were not covered adequately during their education and training. The high level of missing data also supported the fact that there was a void with regards to benevolent leadership in education. There was strong support for the inclusion of all aspects of benevolent leadership in education. The highest level of support was for positivity (74%), followed by morality (70%), spirituality (70%), and community responsiveness (65%). More than 80% of the sample agreed that students must be trained as leaders with regards to the following aspects: recreating organisations as dynamic and adaptive systems; centring on the social responsibilities of organisations towards society; focussing on innovative and creative thinking within the organisation; new business models based on flexibility and adaptiveness; and positive and strengths-based approaches to organisations. With regards to specific aspects requiring attention in education, the study found that more than 90% saw the need to include aspects related to fraud and corruption, as well as personal and organisational integrity; and more than 80% saw the need to include aspects related to ethical decision making, responsible leadership, intercultural relations, ethical management of businesses, work and family. More than 70% supported aspects related to business philosophy, bio ethics, corporate social responsibility, and peacebuilding. Collectively, the entire sample supported the notion that positive engagement (87%), ethical sensitivity (84%), community responsiveness (79,6%) and spiritual depth (71%) needed to be integrated into leadership education curricula. In total, more than 90% of the sample supported the introduction of a leadership course in South Africa.

5.3 MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

The overall aim of the study was achieved, the objectives were met, and the research questions as formulated in Chapter 1 were answered. The study found a high level of benevolent

characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours amongst the current sample. The study was able to document *the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of benevolent leaders in South Africa*, thus meeting the first objective. There were high means found in terms of items related to them taking a moral stand, taking ethical rules seriously, displaying behaviours congruent with ethical values and beliefs, and doing work guided by high ethical standards. With regards to behaviours related to spiritual depth, participants indicated that they believed we are all interconnected, that spirituality makes them more helpful and compassionate, and that they try to find a deeper sense of meaning at work. With regards to positive engagement, participants were found to display strongly the following behaviours, attitudes, and characteristics, namely: being open minded to new ideas to create change and innovation in the organisation; having a fundamental belief in their ability to produce positive results in their organisation; striving to create a clear and positive vision; encouraging team members to have bold dreams in the organisation; and being passionate about bringing positive change at work. In terms of community responsiveness, there were high mean scores for the following behaviours, attitudes, and characteristics, namely: that in their work, they strive to help other people in their organisation and community; that care for community drives their work; that they feel and act like a responsible leader in their community and are willing to devote time and energy to things important to their community; and they give their time and money to charitable causes in their community. Overall, then, the study found a high level of benevolence amongst the sample. This part of the research answered Research Question 1.

The second objective, namely, *to examine the impact of benevolent leadership on organisational performance*, was also met. The study found that benevolent leadership positively influenced organisational performance, particularly in the areas related to customer satisfaction, building relations amongst employees, better employee morale and productivity, corporate social responsibility, and long-term organisational health. This part of the research answered Research Question 2.

The third objective related to *whether university education had prepared managers for benevolent leadership*. The data indicated a strong level of unpreparedness for each of the four pillars, namely ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, positive engagement, and community responsiveness, as well as benevolent leadership in total. This part of the research answered Research Question 3.

Finally, the fourth objective was also met in that the study found a significantly high level of support for *the introduction of benevolent leadership in education*. In this regard, several aspects related to issues that influence benevolent behaviours, attitudes, and characteristics were identified. The specific content areas were presented in the preceding chapter (section 4.14) and are repeated in section 5.5 below (see point 2). This part of the research answered Research Question 4.

5.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although this was a survey, a relatively small sample was recruited. The inclusion criteria were perceived levels of benevolence. A larger sample size across all provinces in South Africa could have yielded a better understanding of benevolent leadership in South Africa. This was offset by the fact that this was an exploratory study.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

- It is recommended that benevolent leadership be introduced into South African tertiary curricula on business, management, and leadership.
- The specific content areas identified in the study to be integrated in the curricula include: fraud and corruption, personal and organisational integrity, ethical decision making, responsible leadership, intercultural relations, ethical management of businesses, work and family, business philosophy, bio ethics, corporate social responsibility, and peacebuilding.
- The aforementioned areas related to benevolence should be incorporated in seminars and workshops and presented to all leaders across South Africa.
- That benevolent leadership, and examples of such, be integrated into these training workshops and seminars in South Africa for leaders and managers.

5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

It is recommended that further research on benevolent leadership be undertaken using a qualitative research approach. This will help gain a more in-depth and rich understanding of

specific benevolent behaviours, attitudes, and characteristics unique to each benevolent leader.

Further research is recommended to interrogate leadership in an accelerated, complex world and the leadership demands to address the enormous global challenges of diversity, corruption, economic crises, disruption and climate change.

To close, I would like to leave with these final words:

"If your actions inspire others to dream more, learn more, do more or become more, you are a [benevolent] leader" – John Quincy Adams (n.d.)

REFERENCES

Aalateeg, S. 2017. Literature review on leadership theories. *Journal of Business and Management*, 19(11): 35-43.

Aboobaker, N., Edward, M. and Zakkariya, K. A. 2020. Workplace spirituality and employee loyalty: an empirical investigation among millennials in India. *Journal of Asia Business Studies,* 14(2): 211-225.

Aburdene, P. 2007. Megatrends 2010 –The Rise of Conscious Capitalism. Hampton Road Publishing.

Adams, J. Q. n.d. Quotations. *UC San Diego School of Medicine.* Available: https://medschool.ucsd.edu/som/medicine/divisions/gastro/research/labs/ghosh/about/Pages/quotes.aspx (accessed 20 June 2021)

Adamson, J. 2000. How Denny's went from icon of racism to diversity award winner. *Journal of Organizational Excellence,* 20(1): 55-68.

Afsar, B. and Rehman, M. 2015. The relationship between workplace spirituality and innovative behavior: the mediating role of perceived organization fit. *Journal of Management Spirituality and Religion*, 12(4): 329-353.

Aguinis, H. 2019. *Performance management* (4th ed.). Chicago, IL: Chicago Business Press.

Aguinis, H., Gottfredson, R. K. and Joo, H. 2012. Using performance management to win the talent war. *Business Horizons*, 55(6): 609-616.

Ahmadi, S., Nami, Y. and Barvarz, R. 2014. The relationship between spirituality in the workplace and organizational citizenship behavior. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 114: 262-264.

Ahmadian, S. Azarshahi, S. and Paulhus, D. L. 2017. Explaining Donald Trump via communication style: grandiosity, informality, and dynamism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 107: 49-53.

Akca, M. 2017. The impact of toxic leadership on intention to leave of employees. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 1(4): 285-298.

Al Arkoubi, K. 2013. The Islamic faith: Implications for business management. In: Neal, J. ed. *Handbook of Faith and Spirituality in the Workplace*. New York, NY: Springer, 103-118.

Albuquerque, I. F., Cunha, R. C., Martins, L. D. and Brito Sá, A. 2014. Primary health care services: workplace spirituality and organizational performance, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(1): 59-82.

Alegbeleye, I. D. and Kaufman, E. K. 2020. Relationship Between Middle Managers' Transformational Leadership and Effective Followership Behaviours in Organisations. *Journal of Leadership Studies,* 13(4): 6-19.

Allen, S. and Williams, P. 2015. Graduate leadership students' perspective on including spiritual topics. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 23(1): 142-153.

Allen, S. and Williams, P. 2020. Teaching management, spirituality, and religion: André Delbecq as a pioneer. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 17(1): 37-44.

149

Antonakis, J. and House, R. J. 2014. Instrumental leadership : measurement and extension of transformational-transactional leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(4): 746-771.

Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A.T. and Sternberg, R.J. (eds.). 2004. *Leadership: Past, present, future.* Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Antwi, C. O., Fan, C., Aboagye, M. O., Brobbey, P., Jababu, Y., Affum-Osei, E. and Avornyo, P. 2019. Job demands stressors and employees' creativity: a within-person approach to dealing with hinderance and challenge stressors at the airport environment. *The Service Industries Journal,* 39(3-4): 250-278.

Aselage, J. and Eisenberger, R. 2003. Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 24(5): 491-509.

Ashar, H. and Lane-Maher, M. 2004. Success and spirituality in the new business paradigm. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 13(3): 249-260.

Ashmos, D. and Duchon, P. 2000. Spirituality at work: a conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19(2): 134-145.

Aslan, M. and Korkut, A. 2015. Spiritual Leadership in Primary Schools in Turkey. *Journal of Educational Research,* 5(2): 123-136.

Avey, J. B., Palanski, M. E. and Walumbwa, F. O. 2011. When leadership goes unnoticed: The moderating role of follower self-esteem on the relationship between ethical leadership and follower behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(4): 573-582.

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F. and May, D. R. 2004. Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(6): 801-823.

Aydin, B. and Ceylan, A. 2009. The effect of spiritual leadership on organizational learning capacity. *African Journal of Business Management*, 3(5): 184-190.

Babbie, E. 2001. Qualitative field research. *The Practice of Social Research*, 9, 298-300.

Babbie, E. and Mouton, J. 2001. *The practice of social research: South African edition*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Babbie, E. R. 2016. *The basics of social research*. (7th ed.). Australia, Brazil, Mexico, Singapore, United Kingdom, United States: Cengage Learning.

Badshah, S. 2012. Historical study of leadership theories. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management,* 1(1): 49-59.

Balakumar, P., Inamdar, M. N. and Jagadeesh, G. 2013. The critical steps for successful research: The research proposal and scientific writing: (A report on the pre-conference workshop held in conjunction with the 64th annual conference of the Indian Pharmaceutical Congress-2012). *Journal of Pharmacology & Pharmacotherapeutics*, 4(2): 130.

Barbuto, J. E. and Wheeler, D. W. 2006. Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(3): 300-326.

Barling, J., Christie, A., and Turber, N. 2008. Pseudo-Transformational Leadership: towards the Development and Test of a Model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(4): 851-861.

Barnett, C. K., Krell, T. C. and Sendry, J. 2000. Learning to learn about spirituality: A categorical approach to introducing the topic into management courses. *Journal of Management Education*, 24(5): 562-579.

Bartol, K. and Martin, D. 1998. *Management* (3rd Ed.). Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

150

Bartol, K. M., Martin, D. C. and Kromkowski, J. A. 2003. Leadership and the glass ceiling: Gender and ethnic group influences on leader behaviors at middle and executive managerial levels. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(3): 8-19.

Bass, B. M. 1999. Two Decades of Research and Development in Transformational Leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 8(1): 9-32.

Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. 1993. Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In: Chemers, M. M. and Ayman, R. E. (eds.). *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions.* Academic Press, 49-80

Bass, B. M. and Bass, R. 2008. The bass handbook of leadership: theory, research and managerial applications (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. and Steidlmeier, P. 1999. Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behaviour. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2): 181-217.

Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I. and Berson, Y., 2003. Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(2):207-218

Basson, A. and Du Toit, P. 2017. Enemy of the people: how Jacob Zuma stole South Africa and how the people fought back. Jonathan Ball Publishers.

Bayle-Cordier, J., Mirvis, P. and Moingeon, B. 2015. Projecting Different Identities: A Longitudinal study of the 'Whipsaw' Effects of Changing Leadership Discourse About the Triple Bottom Line. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 51(3): 336-374.

Bayle-Cordier, J., Moingeon, B. and Mirvis, P. H. 2012. Leadership, social responsibility, and projected identity: The Ben and Jerry's story. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings,* 2012(1): 12029.

Bentein, K., Vandenberghe, C., Vandenberg, R. and Stinglhamber, F., 2005. The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: a latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(3): 468.

Bento, R. F. 2000. The Little Inn at the Crossroads : A spiritual approach to the design of a Leadership course. *Journal of Management Education*, 24(5): 650-661. https://doi.org/10.1177/105256290002400508

Bjekic, R. Jelca, M. S. and Maric, S. 2019. The Importance of Active Leadership Style for Organizational Innovativeness. *Sciendo,* 57(4): 481-495. https://doi.org/10.2478/ethemes-2019-0027

Boje, D. 2008. Critical Theory approaches to spirituality in business. *Spirituality in Business.* 160-187.

Bouilloud, J. P., Deslandes, G. and Mercier, G. 2019. The leader as chief truth officer: the ethical responsibility of "managing the truth" in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 157(1): 1-13.

Bowen, P. A., Edwards, P. J. and Cattell, K. 2012. Corruption in the South African construction industry: A thematic analysis of verbatim comments from survey participants. *Construction Management and Economics*, 30(10): 885-901.

Bozeman, B., Molina, A. L. and Kaufman, W. 2018. Angling for sharks, not pilot fish: deep corruption, venal corruption, and public values failure. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 1(1): 5-27.

Brown, A. 2016. Against the Führerprinzip: For collective leadership. *Daedalus*, 145(3):109-123.

151

Brown, M. E. and Trevino, L. K. 2006. Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4): 954-962.

Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K. and Harrison, D. A. 2005. Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes,* 97(2): 117-134.

Brungardt, C. 1997. The making of leaders: a review of the research in leadership development and education. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(3): 81-95.

Bryman, A. 1992. Charisma and leadership in organizations. London: Sage.

Bryson, J. M. and Crosby, B. C. 1992. Leadership for the common good: tackling public problems in a shared-power world. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Budhram, T. and Geldenhuys, N. 2018. Combating corruption in South Africa: Assessing the performance of investigating and prosecuting agencies. *Acta Criminologica: African Journal of Criminology & Victimology*, 31(2): 23-46.

Burns, J. M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Burns, N. and Grove, S. K. 2009. *The Practice of Nursing Research: Appraisal, Synthesis and Generation of Evidence*. Maryland Heights, Missouri: Saunders Elsevier.

Burns, N., and Grove, S. K. 2007. *The Practice of Nursing Research—Conduct, Critique and Utilisation* (5th ed.). St Louis: Elsevier Saunders.

Burton, N., Culham, T. and Vu, M.C., 2021. Spiritual Practice and Management Education Pedagogy: Exploring the Philosophical Foundations of Three Spiritual Traditions. *Journal of Management Education*, *45*(2): 206-242.

Byron, W. 2006. The Power of Principles: Ethics for New Corporate Culture. United States: Orbis Books.

Cameron, K. and Caza, A. 2005. Developing strategies and skills for responsible leadership. In: Doh, J.P. and Stumpf, S. A. eds. *Handbook on responsible leadership and governance in global business*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 87-11.

Cameron, K., Dutton, J. and Quinn, R. E. 2003. *Positive organizational scholarship: foundations of a new discipline*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Cappelli, P. 1999. Career jobs are dead. *California Management Review*, 42(1): 146-167.

Carey, M. R. 1992. Transformational Leadership and the Fundamental Option for Self-Transcendence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3: 217-236.

Carpenter, M. A., Geletkanycz, M. A. and Sanders, Wm. G. 2004. Upper Echelons Research Revisited: Antecedents, Elements, and Consequences of Top Management Team Composition. *Journal of Management,* 30(6): 749-778.

Chan, C. H. 2017. Benevolent leadership, perceived supervisory support, and subordinates 'performance: the moderating role of psychological empowerment. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 38(7): 897-911.

Chan, S. C. and Mak, W. M. 2012. Benevolent leadership and follower performance: The mediating role of leader–member exchange (LMX). *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29(2): 285-301.

Check, J. and Schutt, R. K. 2012. *Research Methods in Education*. London: Sage, 255-271.

Chen, A. S. Y. and Hou, Y. H. 2016. The effects of ethical leadership, voice behaviour and climate for innovation on creativity: A moderated mediation examination. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 27(1): 1-13.

Chen, C. Y. and Li, C. 2013. Assessing the spiritual leadership effectiveness: The contribution of follower's self-concept and preliminary tests for moderation of culture and managerial position. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 24(1): 240-255. DOI: 10.1016/J.LEAQUA.2012.11.004.

Chen, S., Jiang, W., Zhang, G. and Chu, F., 2019. Spiritual leadership on proactive workplace behavior: The role of organizational identification and psychological safety. *Frontiers in psychology*, *10*:1206.

Chen, X. P., Eberly, M., Chiang, T. J., Farh, J. L., and Cheng, B. S. 2014. Affective trust in Chinese leaders: linking paternalistic leadership to employee performance. *Journal of Management*, 40(3): 796-819.

Chen, Y. C and Hsieh, K. C. 2011. Development and significance of paternalistic leadership behavior scale. *Asian Social Science*, 7(2): 45-55.

Chen, C.Y. and Yang, C.F. 2012. The impact of spiritual leadership on organizational citizenship behavior: A multi-sample analysis. *Journal of business ethics*, *105*(1):107-114.

Cheng, B. S, Shieh, P. Y. and Chou, L. F. 2002. The Principal's leadership, leader-member exchange quality, and the teacher's extra-role behaviour: the effects of transformational and paternalistic leadership. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 17: 105-161.

Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F,. Wu, T. ., Huang, M. P. and Farh. 2004. Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7(1): 89-117.

Chu, P. and Hung, C. 2009. The relationship of paternalistic leadership and organizational citizenship. The mediating effects of upward communication. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning,* 5(2): 66-73.

Chung, P. 2010. Distinguishing characteristics of service leadership and management education. Hong Kong Institute of Service Leadership and Management. Available at: http://hki-slam.org/index.php?r=article&catid=2&aid=29.

Ciancutti, A. and Steding, T. 2000. Trust fund. *Business*, 2: 105-116.

Ciulla, J. 1998. *Ethics: The Heart of Leadership*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Conger, J. 2015. Charismatic Leadership. In: Cooper, C. ed. *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management.* Wiley.

Costanzo, E. S., Stawski, R. S., Ryff, C. D., Coe, C. L. and Almeida, D. M. 2012. Cancer survivors' responses to daily stressors: Implications for quality of life. *Health Psychology*, 31(3): 360.

Creswell, J. W. 2003. Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage publication

Creswell, J. W. and Creswell, J. D. 20187. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (5ᵗʰ ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage publication.

Cullen, J. B., Parboteeah, K. P. and Victor, B. I. 2003. The effects of Ethical Climates on Organizational Commitment: A Two-Study Analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 46(2): 127-141.

de Bettignies, H. C. 2013. Can Business Schools Lead the Way to a World Worth Living In?. In: Rothlin S., Haghirian P. (eds) D*imensions of Teaching Business Ethics in Asia*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 169-181.

De Déa Roglio, K. and Light, G., 2009. Executive MBA programs: The development of the reflective executive. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *8*(2):156-173.

153

De Roeck, K. and Farooq, O. 2018. Corporate social responsibility and ethical leadership: Investigating their interactive effect on employees' socially responsible behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(4): 923-939.

De Vos, A. S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C. B. and Delport, C. S. L. 2005. *Research at grass roots: for the social sciences and human service professions*. (3rd ed.). Hatfield, Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

de Woot, P. 2011. Giving back economic activity its ethical and political dimensions. Paper proposed at the Zermatt Summit, June 16-18, 2011.

DeCelles, K. A. and Pfarrer, M. D. 2004. Heroes or villains? Corruption and the Charismatic Leader. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies,* 11(1): 67-77.

Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. 2000. The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuit: human needs and self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4): 227-68.

Deichmann, D. and Stam, D. 2015. Leveraging transformational and transactional leadership to cultivate the generation of organization-focused ideas. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 26: 204-219.

Delbecq, A. L. 2009. Spirituality and business: one scholar's perspective. *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion*, 6(9): 3-13.

Denney, A. S. and Tewksbury, R. 2013. How to write a literature review. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 24(2): 218-234.

Dennis, R. S. and Bocarnea, M. 2005. Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 26(8): 600-615.

Dent, E. B. and Wharff, D. M. 2005. Spirituality and leadership: An empirical review of definitions, distinctions, and embedded assumptions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(5): 625-653.

Deshwal, V. and Ashraf Ali, M. 2020. A Systematic Review of Various Leadership Theories. *International Journal of Commerce,* 8(1): 38-43.

Dhiman, S. and Marques, J. 2011. The role and need of offering workshops and courses on workplace spirituality. *Journal of Management Development*. 30(9): 816-835

Diehl, A. B., Stephenson, A. L., Dzubinski, L. M. and Wang, D. C. 2020. Measuring the invisible: Development and multi-industry validation of the Gender Bias Scale for Women Leaders. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 31(3): 249-280.

Doh, J. P., Stumpf, S. A. and Tymon, W. G. 2011. Responsible leadership helps retain talent in India. In: Pless N.M., Maak T. (eds) *Responsible Leadership.* Dordrecht: Springer, 85-100.

Drechsel, N. 2016. King IV report. *Nexia SAB&T.* Available at: www.nexia-sabt.co.za/2016/11/ (accessed 13 April 2018).

Dreijmanis, J. 2005. A portrait of the artist as a politician: the case of Adolf Hitler, *The Social Science Journal,* 42(1): 115-127.

Duchon, D. and Plowman, D. 2005. Nurturing the Spirit at Work: Impact on the work unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 16(5): 807-833.

Dwivedi, A. 2019. Peace in Economic Equilibrium: A Micro-Perspective. In: Lutfy, M.W. and Tofflo, C (eds) *Handbook of Research on Promoting Peace Through Practice, Academia, and the Arts.* IGI Global, 427-439.

Edmondson, A. C. 1999. Psychological safety and learning behavior in teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44: 250-282.

Edmondson, A. C. 2003. Speaking up in the operating room: how team leaders promote learning in interdisciplinary action teams. *Journal Of Management Studies*, 40(6): 1419-1452.

Edwards, M.S. and Gallagher, E.C. 2018. Oh, Behave! Insights and Strategies for Teaching Business Ethics to Gen Y Students. *e-Journal of Business Education and Scholarship of Teaching*, *12*(1):1-18.

Ensley, M. D., Himieleski, K. M and Pearce, C. 2006. The Importance of Vertical and Shared Leadership Within New Venture Top Management Teams. *The Leadership Quarterly.* 17(3): 217-231.

Erben, G.S. and Güneşer, A.B. 2008. The relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment: Investigating the role of climate regarding ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *82*(4):955-968.

Erkutlu, H. and Chafra, J. B. 2006. Relationship Between leadership power bases and job stress of subordinates: example from boutique hotels. *Management Research News*. 29(5): 285-297. DOI: 10.1108/01409170610674419.

Erkutlu, H. and Chafra, J. B. 2016. Benevolent leadership and psychological well-being: The moderating effects of psychological safety and psychological contract breach. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal,* 37(3): 369-386.

Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendock, D. and Liden, R. C. 2019. Servant leadership: a systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1): 111-132.

Fairholm, G. W. 1996. Spiritual leadership: Fulfilling whole-self needs at work. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(5): 11-17.

Fairholm, G. W. 2000. Capturing the heart of leadership: Spirituality and community in the new American workplace. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Farh, J. L. and Cheng, B. S. (2000). A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In: Li, J. T., Tsui, A. S. and Weldon, E. eds. *Management and Organizations in the Chinese Context*. London: Macmillan, 84-127.

Farh, J. L., Cheng, B. S, Chou, l. F. and Chu, X. P. 2006. Authority and benevolence: employees 'responses to paternalistic leadership in China. In: Tsui, A. S., Bian, Y. and Cheng, L. eds. *China's Domestic Private Firms: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Management and Performance*. New York: Sharpe Publishers, 230-260.

Farh, J. L., Liang, J., Chou, L. F and Cheung, B. S. 2008. Paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations: research progress and future research directions. In Chen, C. C. and Lee, Y. T. eds. Business leadership in China: Philosophies. Theories and practices. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge, 171-205.

Fatoki, O. 2013. Internal whistleblowing intentions of accounting students in South Africa: The impact of fear of retaliation, materiality and gender. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 37(1): 31-44.

Fourie, D. 2018. Ethics in municipal supply chain management in South Africa. *Local Economy*, 33(7): 726-739.

Fragouli, E. 2018. The Dark-Side of Charisma and Charismatic Leadership. *Business and Management Review,* 9(4): 298-307.

Francis, A. G., Mónico, L., Pais, L. and Des Santos, N. R. 2018. Business ethics: a study of Portuguese social representation of business ethics. *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*, 13(1): 85-106.

155

Franco, M. and Antunes, A. 2020. Understanding servant leadership dimensions: theoretical and empirical extensions in the Portuguese context. *Nankai Business Review International*, 11(3) 1-25.

Fransen, K., Delvaux, E., Mesquita, B. and Van Puyenbroek, S. 2018. The Emergence of Shared Leadership in Newly Formed Teams with an Initial Structure of Vertical Leadership: A Longitudinal Analysis. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science,* 54(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886318756359

Fransen, K., Mertens, N., Cotterill, S. T., Vande Broek, G. and Boen, F. 2020. From autocracy to empowerment: teams with shared leadership perceive their coaches to be better leaders. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology,* 32(1): 5-27.

Friedland, J. and Jain, T., 2020. Reframing the purpose of business education: Crowding-in a culture of moral self-awareness. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, p.1056492620940793.

Fry, L. W. 2003. Toward a Theory of Spiritual Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6): 693-727.

Fry, L. W. 2005. Editorial: Introduction to the Leadership Quarterly special issue: toward a paradigm of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(5): 619-622.

Fry, L. W. 2009. Spiritual Leadership as a model for student inner development. Journal of Leadership Studies, 3(3): 79-82.

Fry, L. W. 2009. Spiritual leadership as a model for student inner development. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(3): 79-82.

Fry, L. W. and Cohen, M.P. 2009. Spiritual leadership as a paradigm for organizational transformation and recovery from extended work hours cultures. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(2): 265-278.

Fry, L. W. and Whittington, J. L. 2005. August. Spiritual leadership as a paradigm for organization transformation and development. *National Academy of Management Meeting,* 25(6): 1-45.

Fry, L. W., Matherly, L. L., Whittington, J. L. and Winston, B. E. 2007. Spiritual leadership as an integrating paradigm for servant leadership. *Integrating Spirituality and Organizational Leadership*, 2007:70-82.

Fry, L. W., Nisieiwcz, M., Vitucci, S. and Cedillo, M. 2007. Transforming city government through spiritual leadership. Paper presented at the 2007 National Academy of Management, Philadelphia, PA. Available from https://www.iispiritualleadership.com/index.htm (Accessed 15 October 2020)

Gandolfi, F., Stone, S. and Deno, F. 2017. Servant Leadership: an ancient style with 21st Century relevance. *Review of International Comparative Management*, 18(4): 350-361.

Ganguly, M. and RoyBardhan, M. 2020. Role of appreciative leadership in organizational development: The road to employee growth. In: Bhattacharya, S. and Chakraborty, T. eds. *Appreciative inquiry approaches to organizational transformation*. USA: IGI Global, 182-193.

Gasparski, W.W. 2011. Spirituality as the Context for Leadership. In: Zsolnai, L. (eds)*Spirituality and ethics in management*. Dordrecht: Springer, 133-150.

Gatling, A., Kim, J. and Milliman, J. 2016. The relationship between workplace spirituality and hospitality supervisors' work attitudes : a self-determination theory perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(3): 471-489. DOI: 10.1108/IJCHM-08-2014-0404.

Gerpott, F. H., Van Quaquebeke, N., Schlamp, S. and Voelpel, S. C. 2019. An identity perspective on ethical leadership to explain organizational citizenship behavior: the interplay of follower moral identity and leader group prototypicality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4): 1063-1078.

Ghosh, K. 2015. Benevolent leadership in not-for-profit organizations. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 36(5): 592-611.

Ghosh, S. and Mukherjee, S. 2020. The Relevance of Spirituality and Corporate Social Responsibility in Management Education: Insights from Classical Indian Wisdom. *Philosophy of Management*, 19(4): 469-497.

Giacalone, R. A. and Jurkiewicz, C. L. 2003a. The interaction of materialist and postmaterialist values in predicting dimensions of personal and social identity. *Human Relations*, 57: 1379-1405.

Giacalone, R. A. and Jurkiewicz, C. L. eds. 2003b. Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance. Me Sharpe.

Giacalone, R. A. and Jurkiewicz, C. L. 2003c. Right from wrong: The influence of spirituality on perceptions of unethical business activities. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 46(1): 85-97.

Giacalone, R. A. and Promislo, M. D. 2013. Broken when entering: The stigmatization of goodness and business ethics education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12(1): 86-101.

Giacalone, R. A. and Thompson, K. R. 2006. Business ethics and social responsibility education: Shifting the worldview. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(3): 266-277.

Giambatista, R., McKeage, R. and Brees, J. 2020. Cultures of Servant Leadership and Their Impact. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership,* 13(1): Article 12.

Gleason, M. 2012. *Mentoring influence on socially responsible leadership capacity based on institutional Carnegie Classification*. Available: http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/12329/ (Accessed 17 May 2021).

Gotsis, G. and Kortezi, Z. 2009. Philosophical Foundations of Workplace Spirituality: A Critical Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 78(4): 575-600.

Graham, J. W. 1991. Servant-leadership in organizations: inspirational and moral. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2(2): 105-119.

Greenleaf, R. K. 2002. Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. Paulist Press.

Guerrero, S. and Herrbach, O. 2009. Manager organizational commitment: a question of support or image?. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(7): 1536-1553.

Gumusluoglu, L., Karakitapoglu-Aygun, Z., and Scandura, T. 2017. A Multi-Level Examination of Benevolent Leadership and Innovative Behavior in R and D Contexts: a Social Identity Approach. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 1(24): 479-493.

Gupta, M., Shaheen, M. and Reddy, P.K. 2017. Impact of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behavior: Mediation by work engagement. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(7):973-983

Haertle, J., Parkes, C., Murray, A. and Hayes, R., 2017. PRME: Building a global movement on responsible management education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *15*(2): 66-72.

Hahl, O. Kim, M., and Sivan, W. Z. 2018. The authentic appeal of the lying demagogue: proclaiming the deeper truth about political illegitimacy. *American Sociological Review*, 83(1): 1-33.

Harjoto, M. A. 2017. Corporate social responsibility and corporate fraud. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 13: 762-779.

Harlos, K. P. 2000. Toward a spiritual pedagogy: Meaning, practice and applications in management education. *Journal of Management Education,* 24: 612-630.

Harman, W. 1992. 21st century business: A background for dialogue. IN J. Renesch ed. *New tradition in business: Spirit and leadership in the 21st century*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 11-24.

Harman, W. W. 1998. Global mind change: The promise of the 21st century. Peterson Institute.

Harms, P. D. and Credé, M. 2010. Emotional intelligence and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 17(1): 5-17.

Harris, K. J., Wheeler, A. R., Kacmar, K. M. 2009. Leader-member exchange and empowerment: Direct and Interactive Effects on Job Satisfaction, Turnover Intentions, and Performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3): 371-382.

Hassan, M., Nadeem., A. B. and Akhter, A. 2016. Impact of workplace spirituality on job satisfaction: mediating effect of trust. *Cogent Business and Management*, 3: 1-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2016.1189808.

Hasson, H., von Thiele Schwarz, U. and Tafvelin, S. 2020. Shared or different realities: self-other agreement on constructive and passive leadership and employee outcomes. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 41(1): 37-51.

Heale, R. and Twycross, A. 2015. Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. *Evidence-based Nursing*, 18(3): 66-67.

Herremans, I. M. and Murch, R. 2021. International corporate responsibility and MBA programs: Using an integrated approach. In: G. R. Iyer (eds) *Teaching International Business.* Routledge, 91-117.

Hertz, S. and Friedman, H. H. 2015. Why Spirituality Belongs in the Finance and Accounting Curricula. *Journal of Accounting & Finance*, 15(5): 11-25.

Hinkin, T. R. 1995. A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, 21(5): 967-988.

Hoch, J. E. Bommer, W. H. Dulebohn, J. H. and Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44(2): 501-529.

Horne, J., Venter, J. and Lochner, H. 2018. The red flag system as the gatekeeper in tender fraud prevention and detection of misrepresentation. *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies-Multi-, Inter-and Transdisciplinarity*, 13(1): 129-143.

Huhtala, M., Kaptein, M. and Feldt, T. 2016. How perceived changes in the ethical culture of organizations influence the well-being of managers: A two-year longitudinal study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(3): 335-352.

Hunt, T. and Fedynich, L. 2019. *Leadership: Past Present, and Future: Evolution of an Idea*. DOI: 10.18533/journal.v8i2.1582

Hutchins, D. A. 2019. The organizational effects of employee engagement and benevolent leaderships. Capella University.

Illes, K. and Zsolnai, L., 2015. The role of spirituality in business education. *Society and Business Review*, 10(1): 67-75.

Ingham-Broomfield, R. 2014. A nurses' guide to quantitative research. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing,* 32(2): 32-38.

Iszatt-White, M., Saunders, C., Botha, T., Ladzani, W., Rudansky-Kloppers, S and Strydom, J. 2017. *Leadership: principles and applications for Africa*. South Africa: Oxford University Press.

Janfeshan, K., Panahy, B., Veiseh, S. and Kamari, F. 2011. *Spirituality in the work place and its impacts on the efficiency of management*. 2nd International Conference on Business and Economic research (2nd ICBER2011).

Jayakumar, T. and Joshi, R. K. 2017. Rethinking the role of management education in developing a "new" locus of CSR responsibility: An Indian case study. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 9(1): 51-69.

Jena, L. K. and Pradhan, S. 2018. Conceptualizing and validating workplace belongingness scale. *Journal Of Organizational Change Management*, 31(2): 451-462. DOI: 10.1108/JOCM-05-2017-0195

Jones, T. M., Felps, W. and Bigley, G. A. 2007. Ethical Theory and Stakeholder-Related Decisions. *The Academy of Management Review,* 32(1): 137-155.

Joosse, P. and Willey, R. 2020. Gender and Charismatic Power. *Theory and Society,* 49(3). DOI:10.1007/s11186-020-09392-3

Judge, T. A., and Piccolo, R. F. 2004. Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of their Relative Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 89(5): 755-768.

Jurkiewicz, C. L. and Giacalone, R. A. 2004. A values framework for measuring the impact of workplace spirituality on organizational performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49(2): 129-142.

Kacmar, K. M., Andrews, M. C., Harris, K. J. and Tepper, B. J. 2013. Ethical leadership and subordinate outcomes: The mediating role of organizational politics and the moderating role of political skill. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115(1): 33-44.

Kacmar, K. M., Bachrach, D.G., Harris, K. J. and Zivnuska, S. 2011. Fostering good citizenship through ethical leadership: Exploring the moderating role of gender and organizational politics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(3): 633.

Kaiser, R. B., Hogan, R. and Craig, S. B. 2008. Leadership and the fate of organizations. *American Psychologist*, 63(2): 96-110

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, N. and De Hoogh, A. H. B. 2011. Ethical Leader Behaviour and Big Five Factors of Personality. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 100*:* 349-366.

Kanwal, F., Rathore, K. and Qaisar, A. 2019. Relationship of benevolent leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: Interactional effect of perceived organizational support and perceived organizational politics. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 13(2): 283-310.

Kanyane, M. H., Houston, G. F. and Sausi, K. 2013. State of South African Public Service in the context of macro socio-economic environment. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 3(1): 126-141.

Kara, D., Uysal. M., Sirgy. M. J., and Lee, G. 2013. The effects of leadership style on employee well-being in hospitality. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34(1): 9-18.

Karakas, F. 2006. Towards a universal set of values bridging east and west: Global positive spirituality for world peace, *Journal of Globalization for the Common Good,* Fall 2006: 1-12.

Karakas, F. 2009. *Benevolent leadership* (Doctoral dissertation, McGill University).

Karakas, F. 2010. Spirituality and performance in organizations: A literature review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(1): 89-106.

Karakas, F. and Sarigollu, E. 2011. Benevolent leadership: Conceptualization and construct development. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108(4): 537-553.

Karakas, F. and Sarigollu, E. 2012. Benevolent leadership: Conceptualization and construct development. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108(4): 537-553.

Karakas, F., and Sarigollu, E. 2013. The role of leadership in creating virtuous and compassionate organizations: Narratives of benevolent leadership in an Anatolian tiger. *Journal Of Business Ethics*, 113(4): 663-678.

Karakas, F., Manisaligil, A. and Sarigollu, E. 2015. Management learning at the speed of life: Designing reflective, creative, and collaborative spaces for millennials. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 13(3): 801-822.

Karakas, F., Sarigollu, E. and Kavas, M. 2014. Discourses of Collective Spirituality and Turkish Islamic Ethics: An Inquiry into Transcendence, Connectedness and Virtuousness in Anatolian Tigers. *Journal of Business Ethics.* 129(4). DOI: 10.1007/s10551-014-2135-6

Karakas, F., Sarigollu, E. and Manisaligil, A. 2013. The use of benevolent leadership development to advance principles of responsible management education. *Journal of Management Development*,32(8) 801-822.

Karakas, F., Sarigollu, E. and Mustafa, K. 2015. Spirituality and Turkish Islamic ethics: an inquiry into transcendence, connectedness, and virtuousness in Anatolian Tigers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129: 811-822.

Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z and Gumusluoglu, L. 2013. The bright and dark sides of leadership: Transformational leadership in non-Western context. *Journal of Leadership,* 9(1): 107 -133.

Kemper, J. A., Ballantine, P. W. and Hall, C. M. 2019. Combining the 'why' and 'how' of teaching sustainability: the case of the business school academics. *Environmental Education Research*, 25(12): 1751-1774.

Kerlinger, F.N. 1966. *Foundations of behavioral research*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York.

Khan, M.S., Khan, I., Qureshi, Q.A., Ismail, H.M., Rauf, H., Latif, A. and Tahir, M., 2015. The styles of leadership: A critical review. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 5(3):87-92.

Khatri, N., Ng, H. A., and Lee, T. L. 2001. The distinction between charisma and vision: An empirical study. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 18: 373-393.

Kihl, L., Ndiaye, M. and Fink, J. 2018. Corruptions impact on organizational outcomes. *Social Responsibility Journal,* 14(1): 40-60.

Kim, M. S. and Thapa, B. 2018. Relationship of ethical leadership, corporate social responsibility and organizational performance. *Sustainability*, 10(2): 447.

Kim, S. K. 2018. *The Rationale for Fighting Corruption: Facts and Issues*. Korean Institute for International Economic Policy.

Ko, C., Ma, J., Kang, M., English, A. S. and Haney, M. H. 2017. How ethical leadership cultivates healthy guanxi to enhance OCB in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 55(4): 408-429.

Kokt, D. and Palmer, E. P. 2019. Strategic priorities for cultivating commitment amongst academic staff: The militating effect of workplace spirituality. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(1): 1-8.

Kouzes, J. M. and Posner, B. J. 2002. *Leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M. and Posner, B. Z. 2007. The five practices of exemplary leadership. Fullan, M.(ed) *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership*, John Wiley and Sons Inc. 2nd Ed: 63-74.

KPMG. 2008. Integrity Survey 2008–2009. Washington, DC: KPMG. Available: KPMG_Integrity-Survey-2008-2009[2].pdf (corporatecompliance.org) (Accessed on 28 December 2020).

Kremer, H., Villamor, I. and Aguinis, H. 2019. Innovation leadership: Best-practice recommendations for promoting employee creativity, voice, and knowledge sharing. *Business Horizons*, 62(1): 65-74.

Kretzschmar, L. and Bentley, W. 2013. Applied ethics and tertiary education in South Africa: Teaching business ethics at the University of South Africa. *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 34(1): 01-07.

Kriger, M. 2013. Wise leadership in organizations: Integrating Eastern and Western paradigms. In: Neal, J. *Handbook of faith and spirituality in the workplace*. Springer, New York, NY, 255-269.

Krishnakumar, S. and Neck, C. P. 2002. The "what," "why," and "how "of spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(3): 153-164.

Kuenzi, M., Mayer, D. M. and Greenbaum, R. L. 2020. Creating an ethical organizational environment: The relationship between ethical leadership, ethical organizational climate, and unethical behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 73(1): 43-71.

Kulik, B.W. and Alarcon, M. 2016. Manipulative businesses: Secular business cults. *Business and Society Review*, 121(2): 247-270.

Kumar, R. 2014. Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners. Sage.

Labuschagne, W. J. P. 2012. *Towards developing a model for spirituality in the workplace* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Johannesburg).

Law, P. 2016. Spiritual leadership. *Leadership: Perspectives from the frontline.* Randburg: KR Publishing.

Law. K. P. K. 2013. An integrated spiritual leadership model for the South African public service: a case of selected government departments. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Western Cape)

Lazarus, G. N., Ijanikin, L., Adesoji, N. A. A. and Jinadu, I. 2019. Leadership and management practices in the 21st century academic libraries. *Journal of Library Services and Technologies*, 1(2): 51-61.

Lee, S, Lovelace, K. and Manz, C.C. 2014. Serving with Spirit : an integrative model of workplace spirituality within service organizations. *Journal of Management Spirituality and Religion,* 11(1). DOI: 10.1080/14766086.2013.801023

LePine, J. A. and Van Dyne, L. 1998. Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6): 853.

Li, G., Rubenstein, A. L., Lin, W., Wang, M. and Chen, X. 2018. The curvilinear effect of benevolent leadership on team performance : the mediating role of team action processes and the moderating role of team commitment. *Personnel Psychology*, 71(3): 369-397.

Lin, C. P., Lyau, N. M., Tsai, Y. H., Chen, W. Y. and Chiu, C. K. 2010. Modeling corporate citizenship and its relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(3): 357-372.

Lin, T., Liao, Y and Kuo, S. 2018. Benevolent leadership in an uncertain environment: Dimensionality and contingency effects in teams. *Academy of Management Proceedings,* 2018(1): 14817.

Liphadzi, M., Aigbavboa, C. O. and Thwala, W. D. 2017. A theoretical perspective on the difference between leadership and management. *Procedia Engineering*, 196: 478-482.

Louw, T. and Wessels, J. S. 2016. Three snapshots of business ethics education at South African business schools: Sharp or still blurred?. *Southern African Business Review*, 20(1): 557-576.

Luthans, F. 2002. The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(6): 695-706.

Luu, T. 2019. Relationship between benevolent leadership and the well-being among employees with disabilities. *Journal of Business Research*, 99: 282-294.

Lynham, S. A. and Chermack, T. J. 2006. Responsible leadership for performance: A theoretical model and hypotheses. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 12(4): 73-88.

Maak, T. and Pless, N. M. 2009. Business leaders as citizens of the world. Advancing humanism on a global scale. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(3): 537-550.

Maak, T. and Pless, N.M. 2006. Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society–a relational perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(1): 99-115.

Makhooane, S. M. 2011. An investigation into fraud and corruption risk management policies and procedures at institutions of higher learning (Doctoral dissertation, Rhodes University).

Makka, A. 2019. Spirituality and leadership in a South African context. In: Kok, J.K. and van den Heuvel, S.C. (eds) *Leading in a VUCA World*. Cham: Springer, 77-90.

Makoni, R. and Higgs, L. G. 2016. The nature of peace education in African Indigenous Knowledge Systems. *Indilinga African Journal of Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, 15(3): 191-201.

Maloni, M. J., Palmer, T. B., Cohen, M., Gligor, D. M., Grout, J. R. and Myers, R. 2021. Decoupling responsible management education: Do business schools walk their talk?. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 19(1): 100456.

Mantzaris, E. A. 2018. Towards an evidence-based corruption index in South Africa: the first step. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 10(4): 271-294.

Mareus, R., Firestone, S., Patterson, K. and Winston, B. E. 2019. Exploring Servant Leadership in a Top-Down Environment. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice,* 6(1): 53-74.

Markham, S. K. and Lee, H. 2014. Marriage and Family Therapy in NPD Teams: effects of We-mess on knowledge Sharing and Product Performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management,* 31(6). DOI: 10.1111/jpim.12184

Marques, J., Dhiman, S.K. and Biberman, J., 2014. Teaching the un-teachable: Storytelling and meditation in workplace spirituality courses. *Journal of Management Development*, 33(3): 196-217

Marschke, E., Preziosi, R. and Harrington, W. 2009. Professionals And Executives Support A Relationship Between Organizational Commitment And Spirituality In The Workplace. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (JBER),* 7(8). https://doi.org/10.19030/jber.v7i8.2320

Mathieu, C., Neumann, C., Babiak, P. and Hare, R. D. 2015. Corporate Psychopathy and the full-range leadership model. *Assessment*, 22(3): 267-278.

Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M. and Greenbaum, R. L. 2010. Examining the link between ethical leadership and employee misconduct: The mediating role of ethical climate. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(1): 7-16.

Mayrhofer, W. and Steinbereithner, M. A., 2016. Religion and Spirituality–the Blind Spot of Business Schools? Empirical Snapshots and Theoretical Reflections. In: Mayhofer, W. and Steinberithner , M.A. Groshl, S. and Bendl, R. (eds) Be *Managing Religious Diversity in the Workplace*. Routledge, 303-324.

Mendonca, M. and Kanungo, R. N. 2007. *Ethical Leadership*. New York: Open University Press.

Mercier, G. and Deslandes, G. 2020. Formal and Informal Benevolence in a Profit-Oriented Context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 165(1): 125-143.

Miller, K. L and Hubbard, J. 2018. Martin's Big Words: The Life of Dr Martin Luther King. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 13(3): 383-401.

Miller, W. C. 2011. Spiritual-based leadership. In: Zsolnai L. (eds) *Spirituality and ethics in management*. Dordrecht: Springer, 181-187.

Milliman, J., Czaplewski, A. J. and Ferguson, J. 2003. Workplace spirituality and employee work attitudes: An exploratory empirical assessment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16(4): 426-447

Milliman, J., Ferguson, J., Trickett, D. and Condemi, B. 1999. Spirit and community at Southwest Airlines: An investigation of spiritual values based model. *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* 12(3): 221-233.

Mitonga-Monga, J. 2018. Employees' work engagement in a railway organisation: A perspective of ethical work climate and leadership behaviour. *Acta Commercii*, 18(1): 1-9.

Mitonga-Monga, J., Flotman, A.P. and Moerane, E.M. 2019. Influencing ethical leadership and job satisfaction through work ethics culture. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 16(2): 673-694.

Mladenovic, R., Martinov-Bennie, N. and Bell, A., 2019. Business students' insights into their development of ethical decision-making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155(1): 275-287.

Mo, S. and Shi, J. 2017. Linking ethical leadership to employee burnout, workplace deviance and performance: Testing the mediating roles of trust in leader and surface acting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 144(2): 293-303.

Mouton, J. 2001. How to succeed in your master's and doctoral studies: A South African. Van Schaik Publishers.

Mulki, J. P., Jaramillo, J. F. and Locander, W. B. 2008. Effect of Ethical Climate on turnover intention: linking attitudinal -and stress theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78: 559-574.

Mydin, A. A, Kanesan, A.G., Pitchay, AA. 2018. Workplace spirituality enhance organizational commitment in the school management. *Psychology.*1(1): 1-8 .DOI:10.18488/JOURNAl.138.2018.11.1.8 (Accessed 31 January 2021)

Nahavandi, A. 2009. Cultural mythology and global leadership in Iran. In: E.H. Kessler & D.J. Wong-Mingji (eds.), Cultural mythology and global leadership, Cheltenham, U.K: Edward Elgar Publishers, 242-256.

Neal, J. 2013. Faith and spirituality in the workplace: Emerging research and practice. In: Neal, J. (eds)*Handbook of Faith and Spirituality in the Workplace*. New York, NY: Springer, 3-18.

Neuman, W. L. 1997. Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches. (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Neuman, W. L. 2014. Basics of social research: qualitative and quantitative approaches. Canada: Pearson Education.

Ng, T. W., Yam, K. C. and Aguinis, H. 2019. Employee perceptions of corporate social responsibility: Effects on pride, embeddedness, and turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 72(1): 107-137.

Niu, C., Wang, A., and Cheng, B. 2009. Effectiveness of a moral and benevolent leader : probing the interactions of the dimensions of paternalistic leadership. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 12(1):32-39.

Northouse, P.G. 2018. *Leadership: theory and practice*. New Delhi: Sage.

Oh, J. and Wang, J. 2020. Spiritual leadership: Current status and Agenda for future research and practice. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 17(3): 223-248.

O'Reilly, C. . and Pfeffer, J. 2000. Hidden value: How great companies achieve extraordinary results with ordinary people. Harvard Business Press.

Otaye-Ebede, L., Shaffakat, S. and Foster, S. 2020. A multilevel model examining the relationship between workplace spirituality, ethical climate and outcomes: A social cognitive theory perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 166(3): 611-626.

Page, D. and Wong, T.P. 2000. Ä conceptual framework for measuring servant-leadership. In: Adjibolosoo, S. ed. The Human Factor in Shaping the Course of History and Development. New York, NY: University Press of America, 69-109.

Pandey, A., Gupta, R. K. and Arora, A. P. 2009. Spiritual climate of business organizations and its impact on customers' experience. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(2): 313-332.

Pellegrini, E. K. and Scandura, T. A. 2006. Leader-member exchange (LMX), paternalism and delegation in the Turkish business culture : an empirical investigation. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 37(2): 264-279.

Pellegrini, E. K. and Scandura, T. A. 2008. Paternalistic leadership: a review and agenda for future research, *Journal of Management*, 34(3): 566-593.

Pellegrini, E. K., Scandura, T. A., and Jaidyanathan, J. 2010. Cross-cultural generalizability of paternalistic leadership: an expansion of leader-member exchange theory. *Group and Organization Management*, 35(4): 391-420.

Petchsawang, P. and McLean, G. N. 2017. Workplace spirituality, mindfulness meditation, and work engagement. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 14(3): 216-244.

Pfeffer, J. 2003. Management practices that sustain values. In: Giacalone, R.A. and Jurkiewicz, C.L. (eds). *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*, New York: M E Sharpe, 29-45

Pfeffer, J. and Baron, J. N. 1988. Taking the workers back out: Recent trends in the structuring of employment. *Research in organizational behavior*, 10(1988): 257-303.

Phipps, K. and Benefiel, M. 2013. Spirituality and Religion: Seeking a Juxtaposition That Supports Research in the Field of Faith and Spirituality at Work. In: Neal, J. (eds) *Handbook of Faith and Spirituality in the workplace*, New York, NY: Springer, 33-43.

Pielstick, C.D., 2005. Teaching spiritual synchronicity in a business leadership class. *Journal of Management Education*, *29*(1): 153-168.

Pieterse, A. N., van Knippenberg, Schippers, M., and Stam. 2009. Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behavior: the moderating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal Of Organizational Behaviour*, 31(4): 609-623.

Pietersen, J. and Maree, K. 2016. Overview of some of the most popular statistical techniques. *First Steps in Research*, Pretoria: Van Schaik, 249-304.

Pinho, A. P. 2018. The Impact of Corruption on Economic Growth of Emerging Economies. (Masters dissertation, University of Porto)

Pitelis, C. and Wagner, J. D. 2018. Strategic Shared Leadership and Organizational Dynamic Capabilities. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 30(2). DOI:10.1016/j.leaque.2018.08.002

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. and Bachrach, D. G. 2000. Behaviors: a critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 26(30): 513-563. DOI: 10.1177/014920630002600306.

Polit, D. F and Hungler, B. P. (2013). Essentials of nursing research, methods, appraisal, and utilization (8th ed.).Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.

Polit, D. F. and Beck, C. T. 2012. Nursing research: Generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Polit, D. F. and Beck, C. T. 2013. Is there still gender bias in nursing research? An update. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 36(1): 75-83.

Ponto, J. 2015. Understanding and evaluating survey research. *Journal of the Advanced Practitioner in Oncology*, 6(2): 168.

Poole, E. 2009. Organisational spirituality - a literature review. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 84(4): 577-588.

Pourmola, M. H. P., Bagheri, M., Alinezhad, P., and Nejad, Z. P. 2019. Investigating the impact of organizational spirituality on human resources productivity in manufacturing organizations. *Management Science Letters*, 9(1): 121-132.

Poutiatine, M. I. 2009. What is transformation?: Nine principles toward an understanding of the transformational process for transformational leadership. *Journal of Transformative Education*. 7(3): 189 -208.

Price, J. J. 2009. The Conception and Operationalization of leadership in construction companies (Masters dissertation).

Pruzan, P. 2011. Spirituality as the Context for Leadership. In: Zsolnai, L. (eds)*Spirituality and ethics in management*. Dordrecht: Springer, 3-21.

Pruzan, P. and Pruzan-Mikkelsen, K. 2007. *Leading with wisdom: Spiritual-Based Leadership in Business.* New Delhi: Sage/Response Books.

Puchalski, C., Ferrell, B., Virani, R., Otis-Green, B. P., Baird, Bull, J., Chochinov, H. Handzo, G., Nelson-Becker, H., Prince-Paul, K. P., Pugliese, K. and Sulmasy, D. 2009. Improving the quality of spiritual care as a dimension of palliative care: the report of the Consensus Conference. *Journal of palliative medicine*, *12*(10): 885-904

Quinlan, C., Zikmund, W., Babin, B., Carr, J. and Griffin, M. 2015. *Business research methods*. Hampshire, UK: Cengage Learning.

Ranasinghe, V. and Samarasinghe, S. 2019. The Effect of Workplace Spirituality on Innovative work Behavior. *International Business Research*. 12(12). DOI: 10. 5539/ibr.v12n12p29.

Rapanyane, M. B. and Ngoepe, C. 2020. The impact of illicit financial flows on the South African political economy under Jacob Zuma, 2009-2018. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 20(2): e2020.

Rathee, R. and Rajain, P. 2020. Workplace Spirituality: A Comparative Study of Various Models. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, 9(1): 27-40.

Reave, L. 2005. Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 16(5): 655-687.

Resick, C. J., Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W. and Mitchelson, J. K. 2006. A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63(4): 345-359.

Robert, K. 1970. The servant as leader. *Greenleaf Publishing Center.*

Roberts-Lombard, M., Mpinganjira, M., Wood, G. and Svensson, G. 2019. South African corporate ethics codes: establishment and communication. *European Business Review*, 31(3): 379-396

Robinson, B. M. and Jonker, J. A. 2017. Inculcating ethics in small and medium sized business enterprises: A South African leadership perspective. *African Journal of Business Ethics*, 11(1): 63-81

Rocha, R. G. and Pinheiro, P. G. 2020. Organizational spirituality: concept and perspectives. *Journal of Business Ethics,171(2):241-252*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04463-y

Roof, R. 2015. The association of individual spirituality on employee engagement : the Spirit at work. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(3): 585-59.

Rowe, K. and Moodley, K. 2013. Patients as consumers of health care in South Africa: the ethical and legal implications. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 14(1): 1-9.

Rubin, A. and Babbie, E. 2008. *Research methods for social work*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks.

Sadaghani, J., Beikzad, J., Jafary, S., and Maleki, S. G. 2012. Spirituality at the workplace and its role on organizational justice. *Management Science Letters*, 2(1): 391-396.

Saha, R., Kashav, S., Cerchione, R., and Singh, R. 2019. Effect of ethical leadership and corporate social responsibility on firm performance: A systematic review. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(2): 409-429.

Saks, A. M. 2011. Workplace spirituality and employee engagement. *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion*, 8(4): 317-340. https://doi. Org/10.1080/14766086.2011.630170.

Samul, J. 2019. Spiritual leadership: Meaning in the sustainable workplace. *Sustainability*, 12(1): 1-16.

Samul, J. 2020. Spiritual leadership: Meaning in the sustainable workplace. *Sustainability*, 12(1): 267.

Saunders, C. J. and Iszatt-White, M. 2017. *Leadershi*p (2nd ed). Oxford University Press.

Schrempf-Stirling, J., Palazzo, G. and Phillips, R. A. 2016. Historic corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(4): 700-719.

Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., and Cogliser, C. 1999. Leader-member exchange (LMX) research: a comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(1): 63-113.

Seligman, M. E. and Csikszentmihalyi, M. 2000. Positive Psychology: An Introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1): 5-14.

Shakeel, F., Kruyen, P. M. and Van Thiel, S. 2019. Ethical Leadership and Process: A Conceptual Proposition. *Public Integrity,* 21(6): 1-12.

Shareef, R. A. and Atan, T. 2019. The influence of ethical leadership on academic employees' organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention. *Management Decision*, 57(3): 583-605.

Sharma, G. D., Aryan, R., Sıngh, S. and Kaur, T. 2019. A Systematic Review of Literature about Leadership and Organisation. *Research Journal of Business Management,* 13(1): 1-14.

Sheep, M. L. 2006. Nurturing the Whole Person: The Ethics of Workplace Spirituality in a Society of Organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 66: 357-375.

Shek, D. T. L., Chung, P. P. Y. and Leung, H. 2015. How unique is the service leadership model? A comparison with contemporary leadership approaches. *International Journal on Disability and Human Development,* 14(3): 217-231.

Shen, Y., Chou, W., Wei, L. and Zhang, Q. 2017. Benevolent leadership and subordinate innovative behavior: The mediating role of perceived insider status and the moderating role of leader-member exchange differentiation. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 49(8): 1100-1112.

Shrestha, A. K., Luitel, B. C. and Petchsawang, P. 2020. Conceptualization of Workplace Spirituality in an Eastern Context. Sixth Biannual Conference of Indian Academy of Management. *Organized by Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirrapalli*, India.

Making. Available:https://doi.org/10.1108/S1529-209620170000017009 (assessed 17 May 2021).

Sigurjonsson, T.O., Arnardottir, A.A., Vaiman, V. and Rikhardsson, P., 2015. Managers' views on ethics education in business schools: An empirical study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(1): 1-13.

Sileyew, K. J., 2019. Research design and methodology. *Cyberspace*: IntechOpen, 27-37. Doi: 10.5772/intechopen.85731

Singh, B., Winkel, D. E., and Selvarajan, T. T. 2013. Managing diversity at work: Does psychological safety hold the key to racial differences in employee performance? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86(2): 242-263.

Singh, R. R. and Gupta, R. 2021. Principles of Responsible Management Education. *International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management*, 4(2): 35-39.

Singh-Sengupta, S. (ed.). 2009. *Integrating spirituality and organizational leadership*. MacMillan Publishers: India, 1-204.

Singh-Sengupta, S. and Fields, D. (eds.). 2007. Integrating Spirituality and Organizational Leadership: 1st International Conference on Integrating Spirituality and Organizational Leadership. India: MacMillan Publishers, 259-284.

Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S. and Hetland, H. 2007. The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,* 12(1): 80.

Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V. and Kuzmenko, T. O. 2004. Transformational and servant leadership: content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership and Organisation Studies,* 10(4): 80-91.

Soltani, B. 2014. The Anatomy of Corporate Fraud: A comparative analysis of high profile American and European Corporate Scandals. *Journal Of Business Ethics*, 2: 251-274.

Sony, M. and Mekoth, N. 2019. The relationship between workplace spirituality, job satisfaction and job performance. *International Journal of Process Management and Benchmarking*, 9(1): 27-46.

Sousa, V. D., Driessnack, M. and Mendes, I. A. C. 2007. An overview of research designs relevant to nursing: Part 1: quantitative research designs. *Revista Latino-americana de Enfermagem*, 15(3): 502-507.

Spears, L. C. 2010. Character and servant leadership : ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues Leadership,* 1: 25-30.

Stead, W. Edward, and Jean Garner Stead.2013. Green Man Rising: Spirituality and Sustainable Strategic Management. In: Neal, J.(ed) Handbook *of Faith and Spirituality in the Workplace*, Springer, New York, NY, 271-283

Stedham, Y. and Skaar, T. B. 2019. Mindfulness, Trust and Leader Effectiveness: a Conceptual Framework. *Front Psychology,* 10: 1588-1594.

Struwig, F. W. and Stead, G. B. 2001. Planning, designing and reporting research. Cape Town. Pearson Education South Africa. Weinberg, ML, Allen, DN. and Schermerhorn, Jr. JR (1991). Interorganizaton challenges in the design and management of business incubators. *Policy Studies Review*, 10(2/3), 149-160.

Strydom, H. 2011. Sampling in the quantitative paradigm. In: de Vos, A. S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B. and Delport, C. S. L. eds. *Research at grassroots: for the social sciences and human service professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers, 222-235.

Sullivan, P. M. 2013. EEOC best practices support best practices for spirit and religion at work. In: Neil, J. ed. *Handbook of Faith and Spirituality: emerging research and practice.* New York: Springer, 19-31.

Suresh, A and Rajini, J. 2013. Transformational leadership approach in organizations-its strengths and weaknesses. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(3): 155-160.

Swanepoel, A. P. and Meiring, J. 2018. Adequacy of law enforcement and prosecution of economic crimes in South Africa. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 25(2): 450-466.

Swanson, D.L. and Frederick, W.C., 2003. Campaign AACSB: Are business schools complicit in corporate corruption?. *Journal of Individual Employment Rights*, *10*(2):151-165.

Sweeney, P. J. and Fry, L. W. 2012. Character Development Through Spiritual Leadership. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research.* 64(2): 89-107.

Sy, T., Horton, C. and Riggio, R. 2018. Charismatic leadership: Eliciting and channelling follower emotions. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 29(1): 58-69.

Tan, J. X., Zawawı, D. And Azız, Y. A. 2016. Benevolent Leadership and Its Organisational Outcomes: A Social Exchange Theory Perspective. *International Journal of Economics & Management*, 10(2): 343-364

Taştan, S. B. and Davoudi, S. M. M. 2019. The relationship between socially responsible leadership and organisational ethical climate: in search for the role of leader's relational transparency. *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*, 13(3): 275-299.

Thompson, C. M. 2000. The congruent life: Following the inward path to fulfilling work and inspired leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thompson, J. W. 1992. Corporate leadership in the 21st century. *New tradition in business: Spirit and leadership in the 21st century*, 209-224.

Thompson, W. 1992. Spirituality, Spiritual Development and Holiness. *Review for Religious*, 51(5): 646-658.

Thompson, W. D. 2000. Can you train people to be spiritual? *Training & Development*, 54(12): 18-19.

Toh, T. and Ruot, K. 2019. The role of traits in the leadership process. *SSRN electronic Journal.* Doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3441179

Toor, S. U. R. 2011. Differentiating leadership from management: An empirical investigation of leaders and managers. *Leadership and Management in Engineering,* 11(4): 310-320.

Tormo-Carbó, G., Oltra, V., Klimkiewicz, K. and Seguí-Mas, E. 2019. "Don't try to teach me, I got nothing to learn": Management students' perceptions of business ethics teaching. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 28(4): 506-528.

Tormo-Carbó, G., Seguí-Mas, E and Oltra, V. 2016. Accounting ethics in unfriendly environments: The educational challenge. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135(1): 161-175.

Treviño, L. K., Brown, M. and Hartman, L. P. 2003. A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations*, 56(1): 5-37.

Trott, D. C. 2013. Teaching spirituality and work: A praxis-based pedagogy. *Management Learning*, 44(5): 470-492.

Tu, Y., Lu, X. and Yu, Y. 2017. Supervisors' ethical leadership and employee job satisfaction: A social cognitive perspective. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 18(1): 229-245.

Van der Walt, F. and Steyn, P. 2019. Workplace spirituality and the ethical behaviour of project managers. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 45(1): 1-9.

Van Dierendonck, D., 2011. Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of management*, *37*(4):.1228-1261.

van Gils, S., Hogg, M. A., Van Quaquebeke, N. and van Knippenberg, D. 2017. When organizational identification elicits moral decision-making: A matter of the right climate. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142(1): 155-168.

van Gils, S., van Quaquebeke, N., van Knippenberg, D., van Dijke, M. and De Cremer, D. 2015. Ethical leadership and follower organizational deviance: The moderating role of follower moral attentiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(2): 190-203.

Verbeek, P. and Peters, B. A. 2018. *Peace ethology: behavioral processes and systems of peace*. John Wiley & Sons.

Vergauwe, J., Wille, B., Hofmans, J., Kaiser, R. B. and De Fruyt, F. 2018. Too Much Charisma Can Make Leaders Look Less Effective. *Harvard Business Review. 1-6*

Vickers, M.H. 2010. From the editor-in-chief's desk: feelings, work, and beautiful theory: Toward engaging the hearts and minds of employees and employers. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 22(2): 79-81.

Victor, B. and Cullen, J.B. 1987. A theory and Measure of Ethical Climate in organizations.. *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy*, 9: 51-57.

Viot, C. and Benraiss-Noailles, L. 2019. The link between benevolence and well-being in the context of human-resource marketing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 159(3): 883-896.

Virakul, B. and Russ-Eft, D. F. 2019. A model for business responses to global challenges and sustainable development. *Social Responsibility Journal,* 16(1): 199-224.

Vivier, E. 2013. A tough line to work through': Ethical ambiguities in a South African SME. *African Journal of Business Ethics*, *7*(2): 68-77.

Wagner-Pacifici, R and Tavory, I. 2017. Theorizing the restlessness of events. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(5): 307-321.

169

Walker, W. 2005. The strengths and weaknesses of research designs involving quantitative measures. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 10(5): 571-582.

Wang, A. C. and Cheng, B. S. 2010. When does benevolent leadership lead to creativity? The moderating role of creative role identity and job autonomy. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 31(1): 106-121.

Wang, D. H. M., Chen, P. H., Yu, T. H. K. and Hsiao, C. Y. 2015. The effects of corporate social responsibility on brand equity and firm performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(11): 2232-2236.

Wang, G., Oh, I. S., Courtright, S. H and Colbert, A. E. 2011. Transformational Leadership and Performance Across Criteria and Levels: A Meta-analytic Review of 25 years of research. *Group and Organization Management,* 36(2): 223-270.

Wang, M., Guo, T., Ni, Y., Shang, S. and Tang, Z. 2019. The effect of spiritual leadership on employee effectiveness: An intrinsic motivation perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9: 2627. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02627

Wang, P. and Wang, S. 2018. What Role Does the Authoritarian Leadership Play in the Relationship between Voice Behaviour and Innovative Behaviour? *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research,* vol. 230. 3rd International Conference on Education, Sports, Arts and Management Engineering (ICESAME 2018). https://doi.org/10.2991/icesame-18.2018.58

Wankhade, P. And Patnaik, S. 2020. *Collaboration and Governance in the Emergency Services,* Palgrave Pivot, Cham.:127-141.

Weitz, E., Vardi, Y. and Setter, O. 2012. Spirituality and organizational misbehavior. *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion.* 9(3): 255-281. https://doi.org/10.1080/14766086.2012.730782

West, M.A. 2002. Sparkling fountains or stagnant ponds: An integrative model of creativity and innovation implementation in work groups. *Applied psychology*, *51*(3):355-387.

Whittington, J. L. and Maellaro, R. 2006. The principles of practice of servant-leadership: The case of TD Industries. *John Ben Shepperd Journal of Practical Leadership*, 1(1): 130-144.

Whittington, J. L., Pitts, T. M., Kageler, W. V. and Goodwin, V. L. 2005. Legacy leadership: The leadership wisdom of the Apostle Paul. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(5): 749-770.

Williams, C. 2007. Research methods. *Journal of Business & Economics Research* (JBER), 5(3): 65-72

Winston, B. E. 2004. Servant leadership at Heritage Bible College: a single case study. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25(7): 600-617.

Winston, B. E. 2013. Spirituality at the workplace. International Journal on Spirituality and Organization Leadership, 7(8): 33-46.

Winston, N. 2009. Urban regeneration for sustainable development: the role of sustainable housing?. *European Planning Studies*, 17(12): 1781-1796.

Wu, M., Huang, X., Li, C. and Liu, W. 2012. Perceived interactional justice and trust-in-supervisor as mediators for paternalistic leadership. *Management and Organization Review*, *8*(1):97-121.

Wu, J., Liden, R. C., Liao, C. And Wayne, S. J. 2020. Does Manager Servant Leadership Lead to Follower Serving Behaviors? It Depends on Follower Self-Interest. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000500 (accessed: 14 April 2021)

Xu, A.J., Loi, R. and Ngo, H. Y. 2016. Ethical leadership behavior and employee justice perceptions: The mediating role of trust in organization. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 134(3): 493-504.

Xu, Q., Zhao, Y., Xi, M., and Zhao, S. 2018. Impact of benevolent leadership on follower taking charge: roles of work engagement and role breadth self-efficacy. *Chinese Management Studies*, 12(4): 741-755. DOI: 10.1108/CMS-03-2018-0448.

Yadav, M., Choudhary, S. and Jain, S. 2019. Transformational leadership and knowledge sharing behaviour in freelancers: A moderated mediation model with employee engagement and social support. *Journal of Global Operations and Strategic Sourcing,* 12(2). DOI:10.1108/JGOSS-08-2017-0030.

Yan, A. and Zheng, B. 2018. Confucian wisdom and its managerial applications: A study of benevolence and righteousness from the perspective of "Harmony between Heaven and Man". In: Yan, A. and Zheng, B. eds. *Chinese Wisdom and Modern Management*. UK: Cambridge, 12-41.

Yasir, M., Imran, R., Irshad, M. K., Mohamad, N. A and Khan, M. M. 2016. Leadership Styles in Relation to Employees Trust and Organizational Change Capacity: Evidence from Non-Profit Organizations. *Sage Open,* 6(4). DOI: 10.1177/2158244016675396.

Yukl, G. 1989. Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management,* 15(2): 251-289.

Yukl, G. 2002. Ethical leadership and diversity. In: Yukl, G. (eds) *Leadership in Organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 401-420.

Yukl, G. 2012. Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4): 66-85.

Yusof, J., Yaacob, H. F. and Rahman, H. F. 2018. The relationship of Workplace Spirituality on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Sains Humanika*, 10(2): 31-39.

Yusof, J., Yaacob, H. F. and Rahman, H. F. 2019. The effects of psychological empowerment on organisational citizenship behaviour among Malaysian nurses. *Management Research Spectrum,* 9(1): 48-53.

Yusuf, M. O. and Kurniady, D. A. 2020. The implementation of transformational leadership: makes effective organizational culture. 3rd International Conference on Research of Educational Administration and Management (ICREAM 2019), 330-332. DOI https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k. 2000130.196

Zaccaro, S. 2007. Trait-Based Perspectives of Leadership. *American Psychologist,* 62(1): 6-16.

Zhang, Y., Huai, M.Y. and Xie, Y.H. 2015. Paternalistic leadership and employee voice in China: A dual process model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *26*(1): 25-36.

Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., Liu, G., Duan, J., Xu, S. and Cheung, M. W. L. 2019. How Does Ethical Leadership Impact Employee Organizational Citizenship Behavior?. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 277(1): 5-37.

Zwingmann, I., Wegge, J., Wolf, S., Rudolf, M., Schmidt, M., and Richter P. 2014. Is transformational leadership healthy for employees? A multilevel analysis in 16 nations. *Zeitschrift fur Personalforschung,* 28(1-2): 24-51.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Letter of Information

LETTER OF INFORMATION

Title of the Research Study:

Benevolent leadership : its influence on organizational performance and recommendations for management education in South Africa

Principal Investigator/ s/researcher:

- Dharmesh Bhagwan, CA (SA)

Co-Investigator/s/supervisor/s:

- Dr S Kaye, PhD.

Brief Introduction and Purpose of the Study:

Benevolent leadership shows promise in terms of ethical decision making, creating a sense of depth and meaning in organizations, , inspiring corporate social responsibility and leaving a positive impact for the larger community. Proponents of benevolent leadership believe that it will enable the millennial manager to achieve excellent business results, ensure an ethical business climate and ensure a satisfied workforce. Benevolent leaders are those who lead ethically and demonstrate care for their employees, their families and the community.

This study was designed to explore whether the characteristics, attitudes and behaviours of those who show a tendency towards benevolent leadership, to ascertain the impact of such leadership on organizational performance and to identify what aspects are most relevant for business education. As such a survey will be conducted with those who practice some of the principles of benevolent leadership

Outline of the Procedures:

You will be invited to participate in the study, on line, via email or personally through the researcher or a professional contact. Once you express interest in participating voluntarily you will be requested to complete the survey questionnaire. This should take between 15 to 20 minutes. The questionnaire is based on an instrument developed by Karakas and Sarigollu (2012: 537). It contains five broad sub-sections related to demographic information, benevolent leadership, its impact on organizational performance and aspects of benevolent leadership that are most relevant for business education.

Inclusion Criteria

- Those who practise benevolent leadership.
- Those willing to participate

Exclusion Criteria

- Those who do not practise benevolent leadership.
- Those unwilling to participate

Risks or Discomforts to the Participant:

There will be no risk or discomfort to study participants. The questionnaire does not contain any questions that may cause harm or personal discomfort to you in any way. You are not required to divulge personal identifying details or the name of your organization except for indicating what sector your organization belongs to. At no point will the name of your organization be revealed when the results of the study are published.

Benefits:

This study will highlight if and how benevolent leadership is practised and its impact on organizational performance. It is also important in that it will help to identify what aspects of the practice of benevolent leadership are most appropriate for management education.

Reason/s why the Participant May Be Withdrawn from the Study:

174

A participant may be withdrawn from the research if the letter for informed consent is not fully completed. There is no coercion or pressure to participate and participants may withdraw from the study at any time during the research. There will be no adverse consequences incurred should participants wish to withdraw from the study.

Remuneration:

The study is entirely voluntary. Participants will not receive monetary or any other types of remuneration for participation in the study.

Costs of the Study:

There is no compensation for your participation and no cost will be incurred by you.

Confidentiality:

Confidentiality will be maintained as participants do not need to provide their identifying details. Anonymity is guaranteed as each questionnaire will indicate the name of the organization unless the participant explicitly wishes to do so.

Research-related Injury:

There are no anticipated risks related to participation in this study. Hence there will be no compensation.

Persons to Contact in the Event of Any Problems or Queries:

If you have any queries or would like further information, please feel free to contact the researcher,

- Cellular phone: 0829211070

- Email: bhagwand@dut.ac.za

The supervisor can be contacted via email as follows:

175

- Dr S. Kaye: sylviak@dut.ac.za

The Institutional Research Ethics administrator of the Durban University of Technology on,

- Telephone: 031 373 2900.

Complaints can be reported to the Director, Prof. C. Napier

- Telephone: 031 373 2382

  Email: carinn@dut.ac.za.

General:

Potential participants must be assured that participation is voluntary and the approximate number of participants to be included should be disclosed. A copy of the information letter should be issued to participants. The information letter and consent form must be translated and provided in the primary spoken language of the research population e.g. isiZulu.

176

Appendix 2: Consent Letter

CONSENT

Statement of Agreement to Participate in the Research Study:

- I hereby confirm that I have been informed by the researcher, _____ (name of

  researcher), about the nature, conduct, benefits and risks of this study - Research Ethics Clearance

  Number: _____,

- I have also received, read and understood the above written information (Participant Letter of

  Information) regarding the study.

- I am aware that the results of the study, including personal details regarding my sex, age, date of

  birth, initials and diagnosis will be anonymously processed into a study report.

- In view of the requirements of research, I agree that the data collected during this study can be

  processed in a computerised system by the researcher.

- I may, at any stage, without prejudice, withdraw my consent and participation in the study.

- I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and (of my own free will) declare myself prepared

  to participate in the study.

- I understand that significant new findings developed during the course of this research which may

  relate to my participation will be made available to me.

_____   _____   _____   _____

Full Name of Participant   **Date**   **Time**   **Signature**   /   **Right**

Thumbprint

I, <u>Dharmesh Bhagwan</u> (Name of researcher) herewith confirm that the above participant has been fully

informed about the nature, conduct and risks of the above study.

Dharmesh Bhagwan
_____   _____   _____
Full Name of Researcher   **Date**   **Signature**

_____   _____   _____
Full Name of Witness (If applicable)   **Date**   **Signature**

_____   _____   _____
Full Name of Legal Guardian (If applicable) Date   **Signature**

Please note the following:

Research details must be provided in a clear, simple and culturally appropriate manner and prospective participants should be helped to arrive at an informed decision by use of appropriate language (grade 10 level

- use Flesch Reading Ease Scores on Microsoft Word), selecting of a non-threatening environment for interaction and the availability of peer counselling (Department of Health, 2004)

If the potential participant is unable to read/illiterate, then a right thumb print is required and an impartial witness, who is literate and knows the participant e.g. parent, sibling, friend, pastor, etc. should verify in writing, duly signed that informed verbal consent was obtained (Department of Health, 2004).

If anyone makes a mistake completing this document e.g. a wrong date or spelling mistake, a new document has to be completed. The incomplete original document has to be kept in the participant's file and not thrown away, and copies thereof must be issued to the participant.

References:

Department of Health: 2004. *Ethics in Health Research: Principles, Structures and Processes*

http://www.doh.gov.za/docs/factsheets/guidelines/ethnics/

Department of Health. 2006. *South African Good Clinical Practice Guidelines*. 2nd Ed. Available at:

http://www.nhrec.org.za/?page_id=14

179

Appendix 3: Survey Instrument/Questionnaire

Benvolent leadership survey

Introduction

This survey is designed to investigate various aspects of how managers contribute to their organizations and the world around them. As such, your insights are extremely valuable to our research. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. It is important for the quality of the research that you try to respond to all the questions. All individual responses are completely confidential and anonymous. You do not need to identify yourself by name on any materials. There are no known or anticipated risks from participating in this study. The data collected from this study will be accessed only by the researcher named below. If you have any questions or would prefer to complete either an electronic (email attachment) or paper version of this survey, please contact Dharmesh Bhagwan (Principal Researcher); Masters. Candidate; Department of Public Management; Faculty of Management Sciences; Durban University; bhagwand@dut.ac.za. If you confirm your agreement to participate in this study, you acknowledge that you have read and understand the information regarding participation in this research study. If you agree, please sign the consent form attached. I sincerely appreciate your time, effort, and contribution in this study.

Could you please provide answers to the following questions? Please note that all of your answers will be kept strictly confidential to ensure your privacy.

Instructions:

1. Please indicate your response by simply placing a tick (✓) in the appropriate box.
2. Questions with options will be specified, simply tick (✓) the correct box or boxes, if necessary.
3. If you ticked (✓) "other", please specify your answer.

Guide for interpreting the Likert scale responses

- Strongly Agree: you strongly agree with the statement and feel very positive about the statement

- Agree: the statement is acceptable to you. You feel positive about the statement.

- Neutral: unable to decide if you agree or disagree with the statement

- Disagree: the statement is not acceptable to you. You feel negative about the statement

- Strongly disagree: you strongly disagree with the statement and feel very negative about the statement.

1.   Gender:
   1.1. Female ___
   1.2. Male ___

2.   Please indicate you age:

Code	Age	Tick (✔)
1	25-35	
2	36-45	
3	46-55	
4	56-65	

3.   Please indicate your marital status:

Code	Status	Tick (✔)
1	Single	
2	Married	
3	Divorced	
4	Widowed	

4.   Do you have children ?

Code		Tick (✔)
1	Yes	
2	No	

5. Indicate how many children you have:

Code		Tick (✔)
1	1	
2	2	
3	3	
4	More than 3	

6.   Please indicate your religion:

Code	Religion	Tick (✔)
1	Christian	
2	African Traditional Religon	
3	Muslim	
4	Hindu	
5	Jewish	
6	Atheist	
7	Other (please specify): _____ _____	

7.   Please indicate your first language:

Code	First Language	Tick (✔)
1	English	
2	Afrikaans	
3	Zulu	
4	Xhosa	

5	Other (Please specify) _____ _____	

8. Which province do you live in

Code	Province	Tick (✔)
1	Kwa Zulu Natal	
2	Gauteng	
3	Western Cape	

9   How long have you been working for your current employer?

Code		Tick (✔)
1	1-3 years	
2	4-6 years	
3	7-10 years	
4	More than 10 years:	

10. Indicate what type of organization you work for:

Code		Tick (✔)
1	Profit	
2	Nonprofit	

11. Please indicate further what the main focus of your organization is:

Code	Sector	Tick (✔)
1	Retail	

183

2	Manufacturing	
3	Service	
4	Wholesale	
5	Mining or Extraction	

12. Please indicate the type of sector your organisation falls under

Code	Sector	Tick (✔)
1	Vechicle Manufacture and assembly	
2	Financial and business Services	
3	Clothing and textile	
4	Construction	
5	Gas and petroleum	
6	Fisheries	
7	Food processing	
8	Transportation	
9	Real Estate	
10	Tourism	
11	Other please specify _____	

13. Please indicate your level of management

Code		Tick (✔)
1	Junior Manager	
2	Middle Manager	
3	Senior Manager	
4	Executive Manager	

184

14. . How long have you been in your current capacity as manager:

Code	No of Years	Tick (✔)
1	1 to 3 years	
2	4 to 6 years	
3	7 to 10 years	
4	More than 10 years	

15. How many people are working in your organization

Code	No of employees	Tick (✔)
1	Less than 100	
2	100 – 1000	
3	More than 1000	

16. Indicate the approximate annual rate of staff turnover in your organization?

Code	Percentage	Tick (✔)
1	Less than 2%	
2	Between 3% and and 8%	
3	More than 9%	

17. How many people work under you?

Code	No. of employees	Tick (✔)
1	1 to 10	
2	10 to 20	
3	More than 20	

185

18. Please write the number in the box that most accurately describes your level of agreement/ disagreement with each of the following statements.

1 - Strongly Disagree

2 - Disagree

3 - Neutral

4 - Agree

5 - Strongly Agree

18.1: Ethical sensitivity

Code		1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1	When I make a managerial decision at work, I reflect on the ethical consequences of my decision.					
2	I take a moral stand when I believe in something.					
3	I take ethical rules seriously when I supervise people in this organization.					
4	I believe my behaviors are congruent with my ethical values and beliefs.					
5	I keep my promises and commitments and expect my subordinates to keep theirs.					
6	I stand up for what is right even if it will cost me.					

7	I take responsibility for my mistakes and make up for them.					
8	I try to become a role model of integrity and honesty at work.					
9	I challenge my colleagues when they depart from ethical values at work.					
10	I believe that my work is guided by high ethical standards.					

18.2: Spiritual depth

Code		1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1	I spend time on self-reflection, meditation, or prayer at work.					
2	I try to find a deeper sense of meaning in my work and in my leadership.					
3	I try to incorporate my spirituality into the work I do.					
4	I believe that we are all interconnected and part of a meaningful whole.					
5	I feel vitally alive and passionate when I bring my soul into work.					
6	My spirituality makes me a more helpful and compassionate leader.					
7	My spirituality makes me a gentler person towards my colleagues.					
8	I try to nurture or support the spiritual growth of my colleagues around me.					
9	When I am faced with an important decision at work, my spirituality plays an important role in my action.					
10	I am always searching for something that makes my life feel significant and satisfying.					

11	Gradutes management training should include sprituality in the curriculum					

18.3: Positive engagement

Code		1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1	I strive to communicate a clear and positive vision of the future.					
2	I encourage my team members to have bold dreams in this organization.					
3	Even when others get discouraged, I know I can find a way to solve the problem.					
4	I am passionate about bringing in positive change around me.					
5	I try to provide hope and courage for people around me to take positive action.					
6	I work with my colleagues to create a shared common vision for positive change.					
7	If I want to change something positively at work, I take an action and initiate the change process.					
8	I am open-minded about new ideas to create change and innovation in the organization.					
9	I am hopeful about what we can accomplish in this organization.					
10	I have a fundamental belief in our abilities to produce positive results in this organization.					

Code		1	2	3	4	5
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	In my work, I strive to help other people in my organization and in my community.					
2	Care for my community drives my leadership at work.					
3	The work I do makes a difference in people's lives around me.					
4	I care about the legacy I will leave for future generations.					
5	I feel and act like a responsible leader in my community.					
6	I go beyond my job definition to contribute to my community and to the world.					
7	I am willing to devote time and energy to things that are important to my community.					
8	I am actively involved in social responsibility projects for community benefit.					
9	I evaluate the consequences of my managerial decisions for all our stakeholders.					
10	I give my time and money to charitable causes in my community.					

191

(Perceived organizational performance scale based on multiple dimensions)

PART C:

19 How would you compare the organization's performance over the past three years to that of other organizations that do the same kind of work?

| 1 much worse | 2 worse | 3 equal | 4 better | 5 much better |

Please put a number in the boxes from 1 to 4 based on the guidelines above.

In terms of....

Code	Perfomance Indicator	1 Much worse	2 Worse	3 Equal	4 Better	5 Much better
1	Financial performance indicators, i.e. profitability?					
2	Managerial effectiveness in this organization?					
3	Ability to attract and retain essential employees?					
4	Satisfaction of customers or clients?					
5	Relations between management and other employees?					
6	Relations among employees in general?					
7	Employee morale?					
8	Employee productivity?					
9	Business ethics?					
10	Spirituality at work?					

11	Positive organizational change?					
12	Corporate social responsibility?					
13	Innovation?					
14	Long term organizational health?					

Part E

Management Education

20. Please indicate your highest level of tertiary education (Tick (✔) the appropriate box, please)

Code	Qualification	
1	N.Diploma	
2	B.Tech	
3	Bachelor's degree	
4	Masters Degree	
5	Doctoral degree	
6	MBA	
7	Professional Qualification (please specify) _____ _____	
8	Other (please specify) _____ _____	

21. Did your training include apects of benevolent leadership ?

194

Code		
1	Yes	
2	No	

22. İf yes please indicate to what extent training covered the following aspects:

Code	Training	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	Morality viz. business ethics, leadership values and ethical decision making.					
2	Spirituality viz. spiritual actions of leaders and employee spiritual well-being.					
3	Positivity viz. Strength based approaches viz. how leaders create positive change in organizations and the world.					
4	Community viz. corporate social responsibility and leaders' contribution to society and community service.					

195

23   Would you say that all aspects viz. Morality, spirituality, positivity and community were covered equally in training and education:

Code		
1	Strongly Agree	
2	Agree	
3	Neutral	
4	Disagree	
5	Strongly Disagree	

24.   If not please indicate which of the following four areas require more attention:

Code		
1	Morality i.e. ethical sensitivity	
2	Spirituality i.e. spiritual depth	
3	Positivity i.e. positive engagement	
4	Community responsiveness	

25.   Please indicate whether the following are important aspects students must be prepared to adress in their roles as managers:

Code	Response	Yes	No
1.	Complexity i.e. recreating organizations as dynamic and adaptive systems.		
2.	Community i.e.centering on the social responsibilities of organizations towards society and community service.		

196

3.	Creativity i.e. focussing on innovative and creative thinking within the organization.		
4.	Spirituality i.e. focussing on the spiritual needs of organizational members		
5.	Flexibility i.e. new business models based on flexibility and adaptiveness.		
6.	Positivity i.e. centered on positive and strength based approaches to organizations.		

26. Please indicate which of the following themes should be integrated into a course on benevolent leadership:

Code	Themes for education	Yes	No
1.	Good governance and corporate sustainability		
2.	Corporate social responsibility and citizenship		
3.	Business philosophy		
4.	Bio Ethics and Sustainability		
5.	Ethical dilemmas and decision making		
6.	Responsible leadership		
7.	Public relations management		
8.	Personal integrity and development of organizational integrity systems.		
9.	Fraud and corruption		
10	Human and worker rights		
11	Ethics of market competition		
12	Corporations and peacebuilding		
13	Intercultural relations.		
14	Ethics: finance, human resources, profesional, ethical management of business.		
15	Work and family		

27. Based on your management experience please indicate which specific aspects should be included in management education to better prepare students for benevolent leadership:

Code		
1	Ethical sensitivity	
2	Spiritual depth	
3	Positive engagement	

198

4	Community responsiveness	

28. Based on your interaction with Dergree or diploma graduates as subordinates would undergardute students benifit from exposure to a course on benevolent leadership?

Code		
1	Yes	
2	No	

29. Are there any other issues that you think should be included in a course on benevolent leadership. Please indicate below.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME IN COMPLETING MY QUESTIONNAIRE.

199