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ABSTRACT

Globally, the business environment and business leadership is increasingly becoming more volatile, uncertain and complex. Leaders need to reconsider the way they think about and manage their businesses. During the 4th industrial revolution one can assume that the rate of change will increase drastically over the next few years. The question then arises if businesses are ready for these changes?

For organisations to remain sustainable and develop, it is of vital importance that employees who are able to effectively handle changes and challenges are attracted and retained. One such change is a continuous shift in skills needed. The availability of key skills can be a major threat for companies, particularly in developing countries. Some of the expected skills needed for the future include complex problem solving, active learning and innovation. We therefor need to ask ourselves if current systems are able to support the development of these skills. I am of the opinion that we are not geared for the development of such skills and that the inability to adapt swiftly within current formal systems will be present.

Within this challenging environment, the leader’s role in developing individuals will become increasingly important. Leaders need to create working environments where individuals can optimise their potential and add value for the organisation whilst improving their own well-being. Research has found that amidst difficult times - positivity is of utmost importance for leaders. Leadership styles such as empowering leadership, positive leadership, and authentic leadership are gaining increasing field in literature and practise. These styles, as well as psychological empowerment are discussed from a theoretical basis and thereafter aligned with practical challenges.

In conclusion: It is important to have leaders which attract and develop talent, allow people the opportunity to explore their own ideas, set stretching challenges, engage in robust debate, create ownership with direct reports and invest in their potential by means of focused development.
INTRODUCTION
Globally, the business environment and business leadership are becoming increasingly more complex (Stander, Zikalala & Stander, 2017). The way in which we should think about and manage businesses has substantially changed within the last decade (Sarkar, 2016). It has become impossible to predict what will happen during the next few months, and long term planning has decreased from years to months, and even weeks. In the 4th industrial revolution one can assume that the rate of change will continue to drastically increase. This revolution is advancing at an extraordinary speed, is technologically driven, and creating global connectivity (Deloitte Insights, 2018). The question arises whether companies are ready for these changes?

Thun and Bakker (2018) state that for organisations to remain successful and attractive it is vital to attract employees who are able to effectively deal with changes and challenges. One of these changes is a continuous shift in skills needed. An authoritative organisation - the World Economic Forum’s research indicates a strong shift in skills needed to manage future challenges. Table 1 gives an indication of expected skills needed for 2022.

The content and grouping of skills are highly debatable and personal opinions can widely differ. However, it is important to take cognisance of these trends and plan accordingly. Through analysing Table 1 we should ask ourselves if current systems (example educational institutions on different levels; instructional designs & social systems) are able to support the development of these skills. It is the author’s opinion that we are not geared for the development of these skills and that we are unable to adapt quickly enough within our formal systems. The expected skills can be grouped into 3 broad categories namely complex problem solving, mature leadership and mastering technology. In the context of this paper - a strong focus is placed on the leader/manager role in developing such skills within the workplace.
The availability of key skills is amongst the top 10 threats for CEO’s in Africa (PWC, 2018). In their research Deloitte found that a mere 25% of executives are highly confident that they have the workforce and skills available to deal with the challenges of Industry 4.0 (Deloitte Insights, 2018). A greater concern is that talent remains low on their priority list. It is further reported that 35% of global leaders are of the opinion that a complete rethinking of the educational system is needed. To complicate this matter even further, South Africa is confronted with an outflow of professional skills, a lack of certain skills and in general skills development standards are lacklustre. In the World Talent Ranking report on how countries develop, attract and retain highly skilled professionals, it is reported that South Africa is ranked at number 50 out of 63 countries (IMD, 2018). South Africa is very low (56/63) on the investment and development of talent.
Amidst volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous (VUCA) business environments, which are characterised by instability, unpredictability rapid changes and fierce competition (Bersin, 2016; Blanch, Gil, Antino, Rodrigues-Munoz, 2016; Mohammad, AL-Zeaud, & Batayneh, 2011) a positive approach to business and specifically leadership is of paramount importance (Mohammad, et al., 2011; Rodriguez & Rodriguez, 2015; Youssef-Morgan & Luthans, 2013). Ellinger (2013) emphasised the critical supporting role that leaders are expected to undertake in order to empower employees to be successful. According to Liu and Batt (2010), leaders play a vital role in improving the performance of employees through the utilisation of coaching. Grant (2017) mentions that leaders are expected to create a culture of frequent, high quality conversations by means of workplace coaching and development. Performance and development discussions are to become the everyday norm. Within this challenging environment leaders are expected to manage employee’s expectations in a variety of cultures (Stander & Coxen, 2017). Managing expectations is an imperative part of the leader’s role as a developer of his direct reports.

Stander and Rothmann (2008) stated that organisations need to create working environments in which people can optimise their potential and add value to the organisation. Rath and Conchie (2008) are of the opinion that where leaders are robust in the development of their people, they will recognise and harness potential. When leaders openly share information and conduct robust performance management, employees will be increasingly engaged and the overall performance of the business will rise (Harter & Adkins, 2015). Sustainable organisations will focus on leaders who embrace engagement efforts at all levels of the organisation (Whittington & Galpin, 2010), while contributing to the psychological well-being of employees (Rothmann, 2013).

The job demands-resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti & Bakker, 2011) creates an advantageous framework to be used as basis to conceptualise the people development role of the leader within organisations. According to Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, and Taris (2008), job resources may play either an intrinsic motivational role (by fostering the employee’s growth, learning and development), or an extrinsic motivational role (by being instrumental in achieving work goals). Regarding the intrinsic motivational role, job resources (development) may fulfil the basic needs of employees in terms of autonomy, skill, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Job resources,
such as support and feedback, may reduce the effects of job demands (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001) and foster work engagement (Bakker & Demouroti, 2018). Barbier, Hansez, Chmiel, and Demerouti (2013) focused on two specific job resources, namely opportunities for development and perceived supervisory and organisational support leading to outcomes of well-being and happiness (Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2014). Another outcome should be improved task performance.

LEADERSHIP CHALLENGES
South African businesses and leaders, as in the rest of the world, are faced by significant challenges where the need to maintain leader-employee relations for optimal performance (Rothmann & Rothmann, 2010; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) and wellbeing exists (Grant, 2017). In the next paragraphs the focus will be on leadership challenges in terms of people management with a specific focus on employee wellness and performance.

Increasing engagement, rewards and performance levels
Globally, employee’s levels of engagement are of concern. Gallup’s research indicates that 34% of US employees are “engaged”, 53% are “not engaged” and 13% are “actively disengaged” (Harter, 2018). Thibault Landry, Schweyer, and Whillans, (2017) postulated that organisations are required to re-look their approach to motivate employees. Part of this process will be to focus on intangible rewards such as greater autonomy, flexible work structures, as well as training and development opportunities. The Institute for Corporate Productivity (2019) identified psychological safety, clear organisational (and role) purpose, learning agility, clarity and trust as critical factors to ensure high performance in a disruptive and volatile business environment. Thibault Landry, et al. (2017) is of the opinion that organisations should focus on rewards which satisfy employees needs for autonomy, competence, belonging and meaning. Leaders need to rethink their rewards management approach.

Availability and retention of talent
Considering the scarcity, as well as competition for talent, South African organisations will have to attract and retain skilled employees in order to be competitive and attain world-class status (Rothmann, Diedericks, & Swart, 2013). Employee turnover is costly and therefore understanding
and managing the factors which influence employees’ intention to leave may be beneficial (Morrell, Loan-Clarke, & Wilkinson, 2004). One of the main reasons for employees leaving organisations is due to their relationship with their leaders. People tend to leave leaders and not organisations (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Mendes and Stander (2011) stated that organisations need to adapt their business models to ensure that their employees are engaged. According to Anitha (2013), work engagement refers to employees’ support for organisational values and beliefs, as well as the willingness to go the extra mile to deliver high performance, take responsibility for organisational goals and motivate fellow employees to ensure organisational success.

Employee well-being

There is a general concern regarding the wellness of employees. The Profmed Stress Index (Beeld, 2019), for professional people indicates an increase in experienced stress levels. The report indicates that more than 45% of the 2500 respondents experience high levels of stress. It is the author’s experience that there is a decrease in engagement levels of managers and employees and a definite increase in burnout amongst South African managers. Promoting employees' psychological well-being is a way to promote individual and organisational performance (Wright & Cropanzano, 2004). Research has found that employee satisfaction is an indication of overall life satisfaction. It has been found that people who are dissatisfied with their lives and activities outside the work environment will likely be unhappy at work (Zhao, Qu, & Ghiselli, 2011). According to Shuck and Reio (2014), when workers experience a lack of support from their peers and leaders, they will most likely experience negative emotions at work. These emotions will result in reduced work engagement and a decline in employee well-being and productivity. Life satisfaction is positively related to personal and work-related factors (Mafini, 2014). When employees are unhappy at work, it may contribute to unhealthy relationships with their supervisors, as well as increase their intention to quit (Yang, Tradway, & Stepina, 2013). At the same time one can make the assumption that a sound positive relationship between leader and employee can contribute to employee wellbeing.
**Trust in leadership**

In many organisations the level of trust in leadership is low. Mishra, and Mishra, (2013) postulates that during times of low trust, leadership play a strong role in influencing the organisation in a positive way. Coxen, Van der Vaart and Stander, (2016) found that that when employees work in an environment that they perceive as being supportive, fair, reliable and where leaders recognise their performance, they will be inclined to go beyond what is formally expected of them. They further state leaders need to display genuineness which results in a greater degree of trust.

Other challenges include, geopolitical threats, sustainability, creating a positive organisational culture, managing ambiguity, availability of leaders that can manage unpredictability, digitisation, cyber security and reputation management.

**ALIGNING LEADERSHIP CHALLENGES WITH OWN RESEARCH**

In the next part I would attempt to align some of my own research over the years within the context of the above discussion. I will measure my main areas of research the past 15 years by a) conceptualising the construct, b) briefly discuss core measuring instruments, c) report some publications and d) give a brief overview of outcomes (results).

**Psychological empowerment**

Psychological empowerment differs from the situational concept of empowerment in that it focuses on intrinsic motivation rather than the managerial practices used to increase an individual’s level of power.

Psychological empowerment exists when employees feel that they have been granted power and they can exercise a degree of control over their work life (Spreitzer, 1995). Menon (2001) defines psychological empowerment as a cognitive state characterised by a sense of perceived control, competence and goal internalisation. Spreitzer and Quinn (1997) state that empowerment is a way of thinking or an active orientation that an employee has towards the organisation. Spreitzer (1995) postulated a second important assumption regarding her definition
of psychological empowerment, namely that employee’s cognitions are shaped by the work environment, and is not an unchangeable personality attribute.

Psychological empowerment impact both employee and organisational effectiveness. Organisations expect of employees to take initiative, embrace risk, stimulate innovation and cope with high uncertainty, and this requires effectiveness and inventive behaviour (Spreitzer, 1995). Menon (2001) conceptualises motivational empowerment as psychological enabling, that is augmenting personal efficacy or increasing the sense of self-worth by creating conditions for enhancing motivation for task accomplishment (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Managerial strategies that strengthen the belief in personal self-efficacy will make people feel increasingly powerful. Efficacy expectations determine how much time and energy people will invest and how long they will persist in the face of difficulties and challenging situations (Bandura, 1997).

Chen, Kanfer, Kirkman and Allen (2007) mention that empowered employees are motivated to perform well as they believe they have the autonomy and capability to perform meaningful work that can make a difference in their organisation. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) define empowerment more broadly as increased intrinsic task motivation manifested in a set of four cognitions reflecting an individual’s orientation to his work role. The set of four task-related cognitions pertaining to an individual’s work role consist of: meaning, competence, choice (self-determination) and impact.

Thomas and Velthouse (1990), as well as Spreitzer (1995) describe meaning as the value of a work goal or purpose, valued in relation to an individual’s own ideals or standards. Menon (2001) states that employees need to internalise the goals of the organisation, while Spreitzer and Quinn (1997) mention that empowered individuals feel that their work is important to them and they care about what they are doing.

*Competence* is the degree to which a person believes he or she can perform activities according to certain standards (Baruch, 1998). Spreitzer and Quinn (1997) state that empowered employees are confident regarding their ability to do their work well, and they know they can perform. Employees with a positive self-esteem perceive themselves as valued resources having talents worth contributing, and are thus more likely to assume an active orientation with regard
to their work (Spreitzer, 1995). This dimension is labelled competence rather than self-esteem because of a focus on efficacy specific to a work role within an organisational context. According to Conger and Kanungo, (1988) competence refers to self-efficacy, which is an individual’s belief that he or she is capable of successfully performing a certain job (Bandura, 1997). Bandura (1997) links competence to personal mastery and further postulates that empowerment is gained through development of personal efficacy.

Where competence is a mastery of behaviour, *self-determination* is an individual’s sense of having a choice in initiating and controlling actions. Self-determination reflects autonomy in the initiation, continuation of work behaviours, making decisions and deciding on pace and effort (Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989). Spreitzer, (1995) describe self-determination as having significant opportunity for independence and freedom in how employees do their job. Self-determination relates to the opportunity one feels one has to select activities that make sense and will be able to perform well, while choice is the feeling of being able to use one’s own judgment (Spreitzer & Quinn, 1997).

*Impact* is the degree to which behaviour is seen as making a difference (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) and having significant influence over the outcomes within the organisation. Spreitzer (1995) and Ashforth (1989) describe it as an individual’s ability to influence outcomes at work. Spreitzer and Quinn (1997) state that impact is the accomplishment one feels in achieving goals.

The *Measuring Empowerment Questionnaire* (MEQ) (Spreitzer, 1995) was used to measure psychological empowerment. The MEQ consists of 12 items. Response options range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Sample items for each of the four sub-dimensions of psychological empowerment include (Spreitzer, 1995): “The work I do is meaningful to me” (meaning); “I have mastered the skills necessary for my job” (competence); “I have significant autonomy in determining how to do my job” (self-determination), and “I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department” (impact). Stander and Rothmann (2009) reported acceptable alpha coefficients of 0.88 (meaning), 0.81 (competence), 0.85 (self-determination) and 0.77 (impact).
Although very limited research is available, one can make the assumption that when leaders develop their people it should strongly impact on employee’s feelings of competence (self-efficacy) and self-determination - hopefully creating enhanced meaning and impact. The assumption can be made that there is a strong link between the leader role as people developer and psychological empowerment. Table 2 is a summary of some of the research publications on psychological empowerment.

Table 2

*Published research on psychological empowerment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Stander, and Rothmann, (2010), found statistically significant relationships between psychological empowerment, job insecurity and employee engagement. Affective job insecurity had a main effect on three dimensions of psychological empowerment (viz. competence, meaning and impact) and on employee engagement. Affective job insecurity moderated the effect of psychological empowerment on employee engagement.
De Villiers, and Stander, (2011), report that role clarity mediated the relationship between leader-member exchange and psychological empowerment, while psychological empowerment mediated the relationship between role clarity and work engagement, as well as turnover intention.

**Leader Empowering Behaviour**

Park, Kim, Yoon and Joo (2017) found that leaders empowering behaviours positively influence employee’s personal and work state of mind. Sarkar (2016) postulates that empowerment leads to innovation and creativity which is crucial for sustainability in today’s complex business world. Kim, Beehr, and Prewett, (2018), further claim that empowering leadership results in favourable employee attitudes that may lead to sustaining competitiveness for the organisation. Leaders who empower their people can constructively impact the way in which knowledge is shared, as well as the way teams work together; having a positive impact on performance (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006). Thun and Bakker (2018) research indicates empowering leadership as an antecedent of job crafting, and activity to ensure increased meaning for the employee.

The concept of empowerment, as derived from the “theories of participative management and employee involvement, promotes the idea that leaders should share decision-making processes and power with their subordinates. This would remove the conditions of powerlessness and allow subordinates to be flexible as circumstances warrant” (Van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012, p. 13). Employees who are given sufficient power, authority and responsibility to act autonomously feel comfortable experimenting and innovating (Kuo, Lai & Lee, 2011; Pertusa-Ortega, Zaragoza-Saez, & Claver-Cortes, 2010).

Four major questionnaires have been developed that measure leadership empowerment behaviour. The first one by Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, and Drasgow (2000) consists of eight categories of leader behaviours. The second measure by Pearce and Sims (2002) measures three factors around leadership empowerment. Ahearne, Mathieu, and Rapp’s (2005) questionnaire consist of four constructs. All aforementioned questionnaires measure similar constructs, such as
self-directed decision making, coaching, as well as sharing of information. Arnold, et al. (2000) identified four other distinct constructs, namely leading by example, encouragement, showing concern and interacting with the team. Pearce and Sims (2002) additionally identified opportunistic thinking and self-development, whilst Konczak, Stelly, and Trusty (2000), added delegation of authority, accountability and skills development as part of their six constructs instrument.

According to Konczak et al. (2000), delegation of authority is a distinct type of power-sharing process whereby the employee is given authority to make decisions that would typically be carried out at management level. Delegation is seen as giving the employee new responsibility and the power to fully execute those responsibilities (Weshah, 2012). Yukl (2006) indicated that empowerment and delegation of authority “offers a number of potential advantages if carried out in an appropriate manner. It improves decisions’ quality; greater subordinate commitment to implement decisions effectively and increases job satisfaction” (p. 100). Accountability is defined as “an implicit or explicit expectation that one’s decisions or actions will be subject to evaluation by some salient audience with the belief that the potential exists for one to receive either rewards or sanctions based on the expected evaluation” (Hall, Royle, Brymer, Perrewe, Ferris, & Hochwarter, 2006, p. 33). Enzle & Anderson, (1993) indicate that accountability yields potential benefits for the organisation, such as higher levels of motivation and performance.

Self-directed decision making could be seen as allowing employees to participate in decision making in order to achieve organisational goals and improve performance (Knoop, 1995; Scott-Ladd, Travaglione, & Marshall, 2005). Self-directed decision making include delegation of responsibility, giving employees the autonomy to make their own decisions and allowing considerable discretion in deciding how certain tasks are performed (Langfred & Moye, 2004; Leach, Wall, & Jackson, 2003).

Information sharing is seen as significant in empowerment when leaders are willing to share sensitive financial information, market shares, business opportunities, and even competitive strategies. Sharing of information is beneficial in assisting employees to understand the business, establishes trust and creates and maintains sound relationships (Si & Wei, 2012). Stander and
Rothmann (2008) indicate that leaders should outline clear expectations, provide a plan of action and provide information that enables employees to reach outcomes.

*Skills development and coaching* for innovative performance are seen as people development behaviours. Leaders are seen as genuine, while strong relationships are built when they show substantial interest in their employees’ development and growth (Knobel, 2008). People development includes behaviours that encourage calculated risk taking; provide positive and negative feedback, and optimise setbacks as opportunities to learn from (Konczak et al., 2000).

Previous research found that leadership empowerment contributed positively to outcomes such as work engagement (Albrecht & Andreetta, 2010; De Klerk & Stander, 2014; Greco, Laschinger, & Wong, 2006), organisational commitment (Albrecht & Andreetta, 2010; Dewettinck & Ameijde, 2011; Greco, Laschinger, & Wong, 2006), turn over intention (Albrecht & Andreetta, 2010; Stander & Rothmann, 2010; Van Schalkwyk, Du Toit, Botma & Rothman, 2010), role clarity (Stander & Hunter, 2009), job satisfaction (Dewettinck & Ameijde, 2010; Dhladla, 2011; Srivastava et al., 2006; Stander & Rothman, 2010), structural empowerment (Greco et al., 2006; Slatten, Svensso, & Svaeri, 2011), psychological empowerment (Albrecht & Andreetta, 2010; Boudrias, Gaudreau, Savoie & Morin 2009; De Klerk & Stander, 2014; Stander & Stander, 2016), organisational citizenship (Bester, Stander, & Van Zyl, 2015) and job crafting (Thun & Bakker, 2018). Table 3 provides a detailed list of the items of Konczak et al. (2000) and specific items related to people development from Arnold et al. (2000).

Table 3

* Constructs and Items of the Leadership Empowerment Questionnaire *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Empowerment Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My leader gives me the authority I need to make decisions that improve our work processes and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My leader gives me the authority to make changes necessary to improve things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My leader delegates authority to me that is equal to the level of responsibility that I am assigned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Continue)

| Accountability   | My leader holds me accountable for the work I am assigned.  
|                  | I am held accountable for performance and results.  
|                  | My leader holds people in the department accountable for customer satisfaction.  
| Self-directed Decision Making | My leader tries to help me arrive at my own solutions when problems arise.  
|                  | My leader relies on me to make my own decisions about issues that affect how work gets done.  
|                  | My leader encourages me to develop my own solutions to problems I encounter in my work.  
| Information Sharing | My leader shares information I need to ensure high quality results.  
|                  | My leader provides me with the information I need to meet customer needs.  
|                  | My leader explains his/her decisions and actions to me.*  
|                  | My leader explains company goals to me.*  
| Skills Development | My leader encourages me to use systematic problem solving methods.  
|                  | My leader provides me with frequent opportunities to develop my skills.  
|                  | My leader ensures that continuous learning and skills development are priorities in our department.  
| Coaching for Innovative Performance | My leader is willing to risk mistakes on my part if, over the long term, I will learn and develop as a result of the experience.  
|                  | I am encouraged to try out new ideas even if there is a chance that they might not succeed.  
|                  | My leader focuses on corrective action rather than placing blame when I make a mistake.  

*Arnold et al. (2000) and Konczak et al. (2000)

The Leadership Empowerment Behaviour Questionnaire (LEBQ) was developed by Konczak et al. (2000). The original instrument consists of 17 items and is scored on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). All alpha reliability coefficients were acceptable, ranging from 0.80 to 0.91. The original questionnaire had only two items for information sharing; as a result, limiting the effective use of the construct. Two information-sharing items by Arnold et al. (2000) were added, namely “My manager explains his/her decisions and actions to my work group” and “My manager explains company goals to my work group”.

Table 4 is a summary of some of the research publications on leader empowerment behaviour.
### Published research on leader empowerment behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

According to Mendes and Stander, (2011), statistically significant relationships exist between leader empowering behaviour, role clarity, psychological empowerment, work engagement and
intention to leave. It was also evident that development and meaningful work plays an extremely important role in the retention of talent.

De Klerk and Stander, (2014) report that leadership empowerment behaviour correlated statistically significantly with psychological empowerment and work engagement and negatively with turnover intention. The results of their study show that leadership empowerment, psychological empowerment and engagement predicted 20% of the variance in turnover intention. Increased leadership empowerment behaviour will result in higher levels of psychological empowerment which, in turn, will increase work engagement.

Bester, et al., (2015), report that employees' perception of their leaders' empowering behaviour (keeping employees accountable, self-directed decision-making and people development), psychological empowerment (attitude and influence) and organisational citizenship behaviours (loyalty, deviant behaviour and participation) predict intention to leave the organisation.

**Authentic Leadership**

The presence of authentic leaders in organisations impacts upon the climate and culture of the organisation. According to Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, and Walumbwa, (2005), authentic leadership results in a culture and/ or climate that is characterised by involvement, care for one another, enhancing engagement, and focusing on the development of strengths. Walumbwa Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson (2008), define authentic leadership as a type of leadership that draws on “positive psychological capacities and positive ethical climate to foster the four core dimensions of authentic leadership, enabling positive follower self-development” (p. 94). It is regarded as a construct which consists of four dimensions which include balanced processing, internalised moral perspective, relational transparency, and self-awareness (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Neider & Schriesheim, 2011).

*Balanced processing* refers to objectively evaluating and considering the opinions of others in decision-making in order to reach conclusions (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008). An *internalised moral perspective* is described as being guided by internalised moral standards and values when making decisions – even though external pressures are present
Relational transparency focuses on genuineness when information is shared as well as an open expression of thoughts and feelings (Men & Stacks, 2014; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Finally, self-awareness is regarded as the leaders’ insight to have self-knowledge in terms of strengths, development areas and beliefs (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005; Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011; Penger & Cěrne, 2014).

Authentic leaders’ have the ability to inspire and motivate subordinates to take responsibility for their own work and to subsequently have a stronger identification with their work (Avolio & Walumbwa, 2014; Coxen et al., 2016). Pues, Wesche, Streicher, Braun, and Frey (2012) also argue that authentic leaders have a strong impact on their subordinates, resulting in positive outcomes such as organisational citizenship behaviour, commitment, satisfaction, as well as performance (Alok, 2014; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Alok (2014) found that relational transparency strongly influences subordinates’ feelings of belongingness. The need to belong is regarded as a basic human need which is satisfied by supportive and positive relationships (Alok, 2014).

Authentic leadership results in higher levels of self-efficacy (Walumbwa et al., 2008), while employees who regard their leaders as authentic tend to experience higher levels of psychological capital (Feelings of hope, optimism, resilience, and self-efficacy) (Clapp-Smith, Vogelsang, & Avey, 2009). Authentic leadership is focused on objective analyses of information to facilitate fair decision making (Neider & Schriesheim, 2011; Walumbwa et al., 2008). In this regard, authentic leaders show that they assume responsibility for making decisions that are unbiased, moral and in the best interests of others (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004).

The Authentic Leadership Inventory (ALI) (Neider & Schriesheim, 2011) was used to determine employee’s perceptions regarding the authenticity of their leaders. The ALI measures the same dimensions as the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) developed by Walumbwa et al. (2008). Neider and Schriesheim (2011) developed the ALI as they were concerned about the subjective content analysis of the ALQ and aimed to improve model fit. The ALI contains
fourteen items, using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Example items of the ALI include: ‘My leader carefully listens to alternative perspectives before reaching a conclusion’ and ‘My leader uses his/her core beliefs to make decisions’. Neider & Schriesheim, (2011) found acceptable reliabilities with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranging between 0.74 and 0.90.

Table 5 is a summary of some of the research publications on authentic leadership.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The research of Stander, De Beer, and Stander, (2015), revealed that authentic leadership was a significant predictor of optimism and trust in the organisation and that optimism and trust in the organisation mediated the relationship between authentic leadership and work engagement.

Coxen, et al. (2016) found that authentic leadership positively influenced workplace trust in its three referents (organisational, manager and peers). Leaders who are perceived as being objective, authentic, sharing information with others and listening are more probable to encourage trust in the organisation, supervisors and co-workers.
Maximo, Stander, and Coxen, (2019) indicated that when subordinates perceive authenticity in their leaders, the subordinates will be more inclined to trust those leaders. In terms of the impact of authentic leadership on psychological safety, a positive effect between the two constructs had been found. When supervisors engage in authentic leadership behaviours, it leads to a climate of psychological safety among their subordinates.

**Positive Leadership**

From the 1990s, organisations have placed increased awareness on placing leaders who have the ability to build healthy working relationships, leaders who are authentic, and leaders who are positive (Härtel, Kimberley, & McKeown, 2008). Arakawa and Greenberg (2007) postulates that leaders who possess positive leadership behaviours such as focusing on the strengths of their employees, staying positive in the face of challenges, and continuously recognising the good work of their employees, contribute to the success of the organisation as a whole.

Antino, Gil-Rodríguez, Rodríguez-Muñoz, and Borzillo, (2014) argue that although positive leadership has been widely researched, there is still a lack of relevant contributions relating to how to measure positive leadership, while Avey, Hughes, Norman, & Luthans, (2008), Avey, Hughes, Norman & Luthans, (2011). Kelloway, Weigand, McKee, Das, (2013) and Youssef-Morgan & Luthans, (2013) even doubt the clarity of the conceptualisation of the construct. Zbierowski, (2016) echoes this notion, and points out that there is a lack of literature in the field of positive leadership and the field is “characterised by high degree of complexity and disorder” (p. 81).

Fry and Matherly (2006) define positive leadership as “leadership that develops higher level, universal moral values and character, enhances employee meaning and connection and maximises both employee well-being and sustained performance excellence” (p. 11). Antino et al. (2014) agree and allude that positive leadership “focuses its actions on what is good and on encouraging human potentialities, motivations and capacities; it refers to the way leaders encourage outstanding performance by centring on virtue and eudemonism, which justifies what
a person does if their goal is to attain happiness and positive leadership behaviour shows a bias towards the positive end” (p. 590).

As an authoritative author on the topic, Cameron (2008) believes that positive leadership refers to “an emphasis on what elevates individuals and organisations (in addition to what challenges them), what goes right in organisations (in addition to what goes wrong), what is life-giving (in addition to what is problematic or life-depleting), what is experienced as good (in addition to what is objectionable), what is extraordinary (in addition to what is merely effective), and what is inspiring (in addition to what is difficult or arduous)” (p. 3–4). Dutton and Spreitzer (2014), identify four clusters of positive leader strategies: Fostering positive relations; unlock resources from within; tap into the good and create resourceful change.

Smith, Koppes Bryan, and Vodanovich (2012) remark that “positive leadership features motivational and ethical characteristics and behaviours of leaders that result in positive employee outcomes and increased performance” (p. 175). Blanch et al. (2016) conceptualise positive leadership focusing on people’s strengths, optimising their human potential and facilitating above average performance, while Wijewardena, Samaratunge and Härtel (2014), highlighted positive leadership behaviours, namely, support, ethical behaviour, enhancing positive emotions, increasing social well-being, ensuring organisational citizenship behaviour, and individual and organisational performance. “Positive leadership emphasises the need for positive climate, positive relationships, positive communication and positive meaning” (Oades, Crowe, & Nguyen, 2009, p. 34).

Gauthier, (2015) emphasises that positive leadership is an approach where the leader has high expectations of his/her employees, while the leader uses five major areas to influence his/her employees to achieve the objectives of the organisation. The five areas include (a) building a positive structure, (b) operating with a positive purpose, (c) establishing a positive climate, (d) developing positive relationships, and (e) engaging in positive communications.

According to Davenport, Allisey, Page, LaMontagne, and Reavley (2016), positive leadership is about leaders making an effort to involve employees in problem solving and decision making, sharing negative feedback in a positive way and ensuring that the employee feels valued.
Table 6 is a summary of some of the research on positive leadership.

Table 6

**Published research on positive leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nel, T., Stander, M. W., &amp; Latif, J. (2015). Investigating positive</td>
<td>PE; WE; Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership, psychological empowerment, work engagement and satisfaction</td>
<td>with life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with life in a chemical organisation. <em>South African Journal of Industrial</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Psychology, 41</em>(1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive leadership styles and psychological ownership. In C Olckers, L.</td>
<td>styles; Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Van Zyl, &amp; L van der Vaart(Ed.), Theoretical orientations and practical</td>
<td>ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive leadership: Moving towards an integrated model and interventions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In L. E. van Zyl &amp; S Rothmann (Ed). Positive psychological interventions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories, methodologies and applications within multi-cultural contexts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY: Springer. (In press)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further emphasise the importance of positive leadership, Nel, et al. (2015) reported that positive leadership has a significant positive relationship with psychological empowerment, work engagement and satisfaction with life of employees while Positive leadership has an indirect effect on work engagement and satisfaction with life via psychological empowerment.

Malinga, Stander and Nell (2019) derived an integrated conceptualisation of positive leadership that is visually illustrated in Figure 2.
Figure 2. Categories and themes of positive leadership (Malinga, et al, 2019)

**LEADERSHIP TRAITS**

**OPTIMISM AND A ‘CAN-DO’ MIND-SET**
- Hopeful
- Staying positive in the face of difficulty
- Positively biased

**ALTRUISM**
- Self-sacrifice

**ETHICAL ORIENTATION**
- Fair
- Trustworthy
- Integrity

**MOTIVATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS**
- Inspirational
- Purpose driven

**LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS**

**CREATING A POSITIVE WORK ENVIRONMENT**
- Eliminating the negative

**BUILDING POSITIVE RELATIONSHIPS THROUGH TEAMWORK AND TRUST**
- Empowering and supporting employees

**BEING RESULTS DRIVEN**
- Recognizing employee accomplishment
- Having high expectations
- Influencing employees in achieving organisational goals
- Encouraging outstanding performance
- Utilising employee strengths and potential

**ENGAGING IN POSITIVE COMMUNICATION**
- Providing negative feedback constructively
- Adapting a two-way inclusive approach of involving employees in decision-making and problem-solving processes

**LEADERSHIP OUTCOMES**

**ENHANCED EMPLOYEE WELL-BEING**
- Increased employee engagement and commitment
- Increased social well-being
- Increased employee trust
- Employee experiencing positive emotions and happiness

**INCREASED INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE AND ORGANISATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY**
- Increased individual performance
- Increased organisational productivity

**INCREASED ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR**
- Going the extra mile
As reflected in Figure 2, thematic analysis of existing definitions of positive leadership suggests that this construct can be conceptualised in terms of certain leadership traits that the positive leader should possess, as well as certain leadership behaviours demonstrated by the leader, which will result in certain leadership outcomes, which benefit the employees, the leader, and the organisation as a whole.

**The Leader as People Developer (LPD)**

Chamorro-Premuzic, Adler and Kaiser (2017), postulate that investing in the right people will maximise business returns. One way of having the right people is to develop them. Ellinger, (2013), Zenger and Folkman, (2014), as well as Giles, (2016), have identified people development as a core competence of leaders. In most organisations leaders provide employees with opportunities to develop their skills. However, high level focused individual training and coaching support is limited.

Developing individuals is one of the important roles of leaders today (Grant, 2017; Ladyshewsky, 2009). Leaders are required to have many skills in their toolkit, especially mentoring, coaching and providing feedback to support employees (Ellinger, 2013; Knobel, 2008). Although coaching is a key element of leadership practice, little practical guidance has been published (Milner & McCarthy, 2016), or researched.

In terms of the job demands-resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti & Bakker 2011) LPD can be viewed as a job resource in that where leaders coach and develop employees, it will positively influence employee wellness and optimistically performance. Thun and Bakker (2018) report that the leader plays an important role in inspiring employees to apply job crafting strategies such as increasing social resources (example, improving relationships via coaching and feedback from manager), increasing structural resources (developing competence and skills) and identifying more challenging tasks (demands).

The coaching and development role of the leader is critical in the organisational performance management process (Steelman & Wolfeld, 2018). Developing individuals is a core role of
leaders today. It could be argued that this is the most important job of a leader, as employees experience leaders as genuine when they show interest in their development (Knobel, 2008).

Stander and Rothmann (2008) are of the opinion that: “To be able to be a good people developer, leaders should be coached and developed themselves to delegate authority, hold employees accountable for outcomes, lead by example, encourage subordinates, show concern for others’ feelings, allow participative decision-making, share information, and coach and mentor people” (p. 12). Coaching has been identified as an important element of LPD, while coaching is as an essential skill required by leaders in the workplace (Ellinger, Hamlin, & Beattie, 2008; Ladyshewsky, 2009). Coaching can play an important role in accomplishing both leader and employee success (Chen, Ai, & You, 2014; Jorgensen, 2012). Ladyshewsky (2009) stated that coaching can be conceptualised as: “A short-term developmental interaction focused on performance, with goal-setting, providing practical application, feedback and teaching as components” (p. 293). In essence, the objective of coaching is to help employees grow and develop and to improve performance (Liu & Batt, 2010). Huang and Hsieh (2015) stated that where leaders create optimal organisational conditions for employees to learn, grow, develop and perform, not only will performance and self-management of their professions enhance, but also add value to the organisation’s bottom line. Higher levels of LPD correlated with performance, indicating that when leaders focus on the growth and development of their employees, their performance will increase (Ellinger, Ellinger, & Keller, 2003; Jorgensen, 2012).

Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) identified a key quality of an effective leader as the ability to develop others. The leader will act as coach and give employees timely and constructive feedback in order to grow and improve (Goleman et al., 2002; Steelman & Wolfeld, 2018). The importance of the leader as coach is emphasised by Ladyshewsky (2009) who identified coaching as one of the core leadership skills and an integral part of the performance management process. Goleman et al. (2002) stated that coaching could help employees improve their work performance and this could have a direct effect on organisational performance. Grant (2017) comments that leaders need to build a culture of quality conversations by means of workplace coaching.
However, an important stumbling block in the way of achieving these aims is managers’ competence in developing people. Despite the fact that it holds a lot of promise as a strategy for supporting positive leadership, coaching and developing people are activities that a high percentage of managers feel uncomfortable with, which is compounded by the fact that they typically have very little formal training in the development of people. Based on several decades of exposure to the industry in various capacities, the author’s experience is that managers are aware of this competence gap and are more than willing to address the perceived gap. Knobel (2008) stated the first step for any leader who wants to develop others would be to consciously choose to become a developer of others. The GROW coaching model (Whitmore, 2009) is a popular approach where the leader identifies and prioritise specific outcomes or goals (G), assesses the existing situation or reality, as well as required resources related to the goal (R), explores various alternative strategies to achieve goals (O) and gets the employee to commit to specific action steps as part of the way forward (W). Training in a specific model such as GROW should be further supported by enhancing specific ancillary skills and attitudes. This could be gained by a combination of classroom training and a more on-the-job approach like coaching.

Steelman and Wolfeld (2018) mentioned that a manager-coach must be able to: “evaluate patterns and trends in employee performance, create awareness through ongoing feedback, provide learning experiences, allow opportunities for reflection and assist in action planning and identifying critical steps to goal accomplishment” (p. 42). Steelman and Wolfeld (2018) referred to three factors as being important in becoming a good manager-coach: Specific behaviours needed to be a coach, creating positive relationships with direct reports, and following a sound feedback process. These three factors can be a beneficial framework to add to the training of a specific coaching model (such as GROW) to develop managers as coaches.

Specific behaviours needed to be an optimizer of potential: Hamlin, Ellinger and Beattie (2006) reported a summary of their research on coaching behaviours (1997 – 2004), and concluded that the following are some of the behaviours needed: Questioning approach, being a resource, transferring ownership, creating a learning environment, communicating expectations, broadening employees’ perspectives, engaging, caring, informing, being
professional, advising, reflective thinking, empowering, challenging, proactive management, supportive leadership, inclusive decision making, consults widely and keeps people informed.

To support the above, organisations should focus on developing managers in the following specific behaviours: Active listening, observation of behaviour, accurate responding to content and emotions, clear and direct feedback, clarifying expectations, setting challenging goals, clear and transparent communication, facilitation skills, challenging thinking, removing obstacles, creating ownership and driving for results.

A core behaviour of the LPD is the ability to identify and focus on individual strengths, opposed to weaknesses, and to facilitate a process for the employee to fully optimise these strengths. Bakker and Van Woerkom (2018) argue that when organisations stimulate employees to use their strengths it may contribute to employees flourishing and being more energised and authentic. Van Woerkom, et al. (2016) report that focusing on strengths lead to augmented performance. Els, Mostert, and Van Woerkom’s, (2018), research provides evidence that supports a combined approach with a focus on employees’ strengths and their areas for development.

**Leaders’ positive relationship with employees:** Gregory and Levy (2010) identified genuineness, effective communication, comfort with relationship, and facilitating development as important for a high quality coaching relationship. According to Grant, Passmore, Michael, and Parker (2010) and Grant (2014), the presence of integrity, trust, genuine interest, respect, clear intent, commitment and support for employees’ development from their leaders strengthen employees’ growth experiences. Ellinger (2013) adds to this that a sound manager-coach also has the confidence needed to share personal experiences, knowledge and skills with direct reports. Kim and Kuo (2015) stated that a manager’s trustworthiness can be a critical element in establishing an effective relationship and trust in their leaders.

**Following a sound feedback process:** Leaders must be able to give clear, direct feedback in a respectful manner. Mann and Wigert (2018) report that recent Gallup research found that only 25% of employees strongly agree that their manager’s feedback is meaningful for their development and performance. Steelman, Levy and Snell (2004) identified seven dimensions
that will contribute to favourable feedback environment: Manager credibility, quality of feedback, feedback delivery, promotion of feedback seeking, frequency of favourable feedback, frequency of unfavourable feedback and manager availability” (p. 173).

The leader as people developer could partly be linked to leadership empowerment behaviour. Kim, et al. (2018), report that most studies in their research characterise empowering leadership as providing learning and development opportunities. Konczak, et al. (2000) identified six dimensions of leadership empowerment behaviour. Two of these dimensions, namely skills development, and coaching for innovative performance are directly related to people development. Arnold, et al. (2000) identified five dimensions of empowering leadership with coaching, and informing related to people development.

The Leader as People Developer (LPD) was measured by selected items from the Leadership Empowerment Behaviour Questionnaire (LEBQ) (Konczak et al., 2000), and the Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ) (Arnold et al., 2000). Both scales are scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). From the LEBQ, the skills development and coaching for innovative performance dimensions were used. Konczak et al. (2000) reported reliability coefficients that ranged between 0.70 and 0.88. From the ELQ, the coaching dimension was used. Arnold et al. (2000) reported reliability coefficients that ranged between 0.89 and 0.94. (See Table 3 for detail items).

Table 7 is a summary of some of the research on leader as people developer.

The results of Stander, Van Dyk, and Stander's (2018) research indicates that there were practically significant relationships between LPD and work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. In this study skills development, and coaching were positively related to work engagement, subjective well-being and performance, and negatively to turnover intention. The results also showed that LPD accounted for a large proportion of variance in work engagement. The analysis therefore showed that when leaders focus on the development and coaching of their employees, they ensure higher levels of work engagement.
Table 7

Published research on leader as people developer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
This is supported by De Klerk and Stander (2014) who found that a significant positive relationship existed between leadership empowerment behaviour (with a strong development component) and work engagement. Stander and Stander, (2010) found that where leaders coach and develop employees, it could potentially lead to higher retention levels.

Van Zyl, and Stander, (2013) develop a strengths based coaching model (Fig 3).

![Fig. 3 The Strength-based coaching model](image)

The above model was built on a sound theoretical basis and tried and tested in practice.
FUTURE RESEARCH

- Blanch et al. (2016) suggest that there is a “need to generate research that determines how to accelerate the emergence and development of positive leadership” (p. 173).

- Ahrens, McCarthy and Milner (2017) postulates that future research should examine the impact of coaching on employee wellness and long term benefits for the organisation.

- It is recommended that more research should be conducted on LPD, as this construct has not been fully conceptualised in literature. Going forward, a longitudinal research design is recommended to ensure that the causal effects among all the variables are identified.

- There are limited studies on the leader as people developer (LPD) and even less on the outcomes. A research gap exists to understand how employees’ experience of their leaders as people developers will affect their well-being and performance.

- Bakker and Van Woerkom (2018) mention that strengths-used research is still in its early stages and several research questions need to be answered.

SOME PRACTICAL EXPERIENCES WITH LEADERS AS PEOPLE DEVELOPERS

Managers are willing and eager to develop people - although the following are challenges in doing so:

- Lack of time or not making time
- Not knowing what competencies are needed to perform in position
- Feeling threatened by employee’s development (“outgrowing” me)
- Don’t have the “guts” to give open, direct feedback
- Not sensitive of what is important to people
- Not driving Individual Development Plans
Thinking development is not adding to the bottom line.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The famous work of Liz Wiseman (“Multipliers: How the best leaders make everyone smarter”) gives a good indication of what is expected of a leader that is a good people developer. Multipliers, “focus energy on extracting and extending genius of others”) opposed to Diminishers, not understanding their restrictive influence on others (Wiseman & McKeown, 2010, p.11). They have identified five disciplines to be a multiplier.

Table 8  
*The five disciplines of multipliers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTIPLIER (POSITIVE, INSPIRATION) LEADERS</th>
<th>DIMINISHER (BOSSES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talent magnet Attracts, develop, engage and retain talented people; people want to work with them.</td>
<td>Empire builder Ego, “I” like myself; “Take” recognition; “Use” talent for personal gain; Politician; “Owns” resources; Careers dying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberator Allow open thinking; Consider more than one possibility/solution; Explore; Encourage; Intense climate.</td>
<td>Tyrant Management by fear/ambush; No empowerment; No psychological safety; Blame; Judging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenger Stretch people; Stretching expectations; Tough performance management; Willing to challenge system (guts); Direct; Results driven; Challenge themselves.</td>
<td>Know it all (ENO’s) Impression management; “My way”; Lacking insight of their impact; “knows it all”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 (continue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Debate maker</strong></th>
<th><strong>Decision maker</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rigorous debate for development; Willing to admit mistakes; Open to be influenced; Consult; Sharing information; Two-way process.</td>
<td>Centralised decision making; No empowerment; Decide; Keep information for self; “Misuse” power.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Investor</strong></th>
<th><strong>Micro manager</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow ownership; ROI of talent; Not threatened by others success; Rigorous remuneration management; Give recognition; Utilising strengths; Influencing.</td>
<td>Checking over shoulder; Poor delegation; LOW; Tell.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Tough and exacting”; “Great sense of humour” (Wiseman & McKeown, 2010, p.24); Positive; Self-sacrifice; Purpose driven; Positive relationships; Self insight; Ethical.

The following practical steps are recommended for leaders to become good people developers:

- Develop own continuous learning and development mind-set
- Create a clear picture of competencies needed to perform within certain business context
- Set measurable end results for position (Drucker: if you can’t measure it you can’t manage it)
- Assess behaviour against competencies
- Identify strengths and area for development (3:1 ratio)
- Facilitate action plan to optimise strengths and develop areas for development
- Provide “on-the-job” and “just-in-time” workplace “fit-for-purpose” training (70:20:10 principle)
- Have continuous follow up development discussions

---
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• Reward growth and discipline lack of development.

ALIGNMENT WITH MY OWN RESEARCH?

The following indicates the link between my research and the demands of the business environment.

• Leader empowering behaviour: The leader must create an empowering environment by focusing on delegating for development, allowing decision making, holding employees accountable and allowing risk taking as method to learn. Leaders need to encourage individuals to try out new ideas and follow corrective actions, rather than blame and shame.

• Authentic leadership: When a leader considers the opinions of others in decision-making, follows an internalised moral perspective, focuses on genuineness when information is shared, as well as an open expression of thoughts and feelings, has high levels of self-awareness and self-knowledge in terms of strengths, development areas and beliefs he/she will create an environment of learning and development. A trust climate can be created by empowering employees to take part in decision-making, being transparent and being ethical. These are all characteristics of the authentic leader (Coxen, et al., 2016).

• Positive leadership: When a leader elevates individuals and organisations, focuses on what goes right in organisations, what is life-giving, what is experienced as good, what is extraordinary, and what is inspiring, followers will strive to have purpose and optimise their potential.

• Leader as people developer: Leaders who can identify and prioritise specific development outcomes, assess the existing competence, explore various alternative strategies to achieve goals and get employees to commit to specific action steps will add value to the individual and the organisation.

• Psychological empowerment: Employees that feel in control are competent and experience meaning in what they do, have a better chance of flourishing and being a high performer.
Based on the above discussion it can be concluded that the leader has an obligation to his/her employees, as well as the organisation to develop people to flourish and perform. My opinion is that a leader that holds competence in people development will address a majority of the leadership challenges mentioned earlier in the document.

**Final conclusion: The missing link IS leadership!**
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