The Development and Initial Testing of the Purpose in Leadership Inventory: A Tool for Assessing Leader Goal-Orientation, Follower-Focus, and Purpose-in-Leadership

Justin A. Irving, Bethel University

Abstract

Various and sometimes divergent threads in the leadership literature emphasize the importance of leaders focusing on followers and goals, and having a sense of purpose and meaning in leadership. In order to facilitate further study around these themes, the researcher has developed and initially tested (N = 354) the Purpose in Leadership Inventory (PLI). A 24-item inventory provided the strongest overall set of factors, explained 70.01% of the variance in the factor analysis, and had Cronbach alphas of (a) .97, (b) .92, and (c) .90 for the three scales. An overview of the instrument's development and analysis is provided.

Keywords: Servant Leadership, Leadership, Purpose in Leadership, Follower Focus, Goal Orientation, Transformational Leadership, Organizational Spirituality, Research Instrument, Inventory, Meaning, Management, Leadership Effectiveness, PLI

Developing new instruments to measure leadership variables is one of the keys to ongoing advancement of the field. As the field of leadership studies has grown throughout the last century, noticeable shifts are occurring. Leader-centered models have been modified by more recent approaches such as transformational and servant leadership. Transformational leadership models focus on the organization such that the

leader's behavior is designed to build follower commitment toward organizational objectives. Conversely, servant leadership models "focus on the followers and the achievement of organizational objectives is a subordinate outcome" (Stone, Russell, and Patterson, 2004, p. 349). These new leadership approaches are "an important step toward balancing the needs of both leaders and followers as they work toward fulfilling organizational goals" (Matteson & Irving, 2006, p. 36). Drawing from both of these recent theories of leadership, effective leaders of the 21st century generally need to focus on both followers and organizational goals. Therefore, one of the main purposes of this study is to provide an inventory for measuring perceptions of leaders around both of these critical areas of leadership focus.

In addition to the two important areas the inventory developed in this study adds a third variable—purpose-in-leadership. Purpose-in-leadership as a variable is based on the work of individuals such as Paul Wong (1998; 2006; Wong & Fry, 1998) who focused on meaning-centered approaches to leadership and management. These approaches take seriously the leaders' and followers' sense of meaning and purpose. Such an approach may serve as a basis for shaping an organization's culture, a culture that can arguably focus on followers while simultaneously orienting its community around its goals. Therefore, the three constructs measured in the Purpose in Leadership Inventory (PLI) are discrete variables but not mutually exclusive. It is the researcher's desire that the PLI be used to advance the study of leadership around these important variables. In this article, the researcher provides a review of the literature surrounding each of these variables, an overview of the research methods used to evaluate the PLI, an overview of the analysis and findings, and a discussion of how the new inventory may be used to further the study of leadership around these three variables.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Goal-Orientation

Healthy organizations generally include leaders and organizational stakeholders who care about outcomes and meeting goals. This is evident in the business sector where managing bottom-line financial outcomes and goals is critical for ongoing success as a business. But goals matter for other sectors as well. An emphasis on measuring performance in government, public, and nonprofit organizations is growing (Poister, 2003; Marr, 2009). Accrediting associations for educational institutions increasingly emphasize the importance of measuring student learning outcomes (Hernon & Dugan, 2004; Nusche, 2008). As organizations across multiple sectors continue to prioritize goals and performance, so leaders who orient around goals become a priority for these organizations.

One leadership theory dominating the field in the 1970s and 1980s was path-goal theory. Path-goal theory, initially discussed by Evans and House (Evans, 1970; House, 1971; House & Dessler, 1974; House & Mitchell, 1974) emphasizes the importance of leaders coming alongside followers and subordinates as they work toward goals. Path-goal leaders help by defining goals, clarifying the path, removing obstacles, and providing support. Based on subordinate and task characteristics, path-goal leaders draw

from directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented behaviors in their work of motivating followers toward goal achievement and productivity. The variable of goal-orientation in the PLI is consistent with the goal-orientation of leadership in path-goal leadership.

Goal-orientation is not by definition contrary to the next theme, follower-focus. Although some in leadership may emphasize one more than the other, goal-orientation and follower-focus are not mutually exclusive. They can and do exist in harmony within the leadership practice of many leaders. From a servant leadership perspective, which emphasizes serving the needs of the followers as a primary leadership responsibility, it is arguable that a commitment to providing accountability is consistent with a commitment to valuing and developing followers (Irving, 2011). While different leaders will emphasize one of these more than another, healthy and effective leaders understand that there is an important relationship between both focusing on followers and seeing goals accomplished.

Follower-Focus

Building on goal-orientation, the 1970s through today have seen increased emphasis on the role of followers and the importance of leaders focusing on them. A major thread of this emphasis is found in the work of servant leadership theorists and researchers. Greenleaf (1977), known by many as pioneering the emphasis on follower-focus in contemporary leadership studies, wrote about the servant leader in the following manner:

> The servant-leader is servant first. . . . It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first. . . . The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived? (p. 27)

Based on Greenleaf's comments, we may observe that those leaders approaching their task from a leader-first orientation often have a tendency to use service for the purpose of achieving goals and may do so to the exclusion of authentically considering followers. In contrast, the servant-first orientation is focused on making "sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 27). It is by nature a follower-oriented approach to leadership (Irving & Longbothom, 2007; Laub, 1999; Matteson & Irving, 2006; Patterson, 2003; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004; Winston, 2003). In line with this path of study, Patterson (2003) shows how the role of the servant leader in this theory contrasts to other leadership approaches by its prioritization and highlighting of the needs of followers. Similarly, Hale and Fields (2007) emphasize follower development and argue for the importance of placing the good of followers over the self-interests of the leader.

Several works have compared the focus of transformational leadership and servant leadership. Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko (2004) emphasize their contextual differences. Transformational leadership is more oriented toward dynamic organizational environments while servant leadership is more oriented toward stable organizational environments. Others emphasize transformational leadership as more focused toward the organization and organizational goals while servant leadership is more focused on followers (Matteson & Irving, 2005; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004; van Dierendonck, 2011). On this point, van Dierendonck writes: "This is exactly where servant leadership and transformational leadership differ. The primary allegiance of transformational leaders is the organization (Graham, 1991). The personal growth of followers is seen within the context of what is good for the organization, because of a desire to perform better" (p. 1235). In contrast to this emphasis of transformational leaders, servant leaders see the value and growth of followers as primary, not secondary.

Matteson & Irving (2006) argue that while transformational leadership provided a significant step toward balancing the needs of leaders and followers, theoretical models such as servant leadership and self-sacrificial leadership have followed with an intentional approach that is more and primarily follower-oriented. The follower-focused variable in the PLI is consistent with and flows out of the emphases in the literature stream noted above.

Purpose-in-Leadership

Purpose-in-leadership as a variable is based on the work of individuals such as Paul Wong. Wong (2006; Wong & Fry, 1998) and others (Autrey, 1994; Conyne, 1998; Leider, 1997; Terez, 2000; Weisbord, 2004) engage the importance of meaning-centered approaches to leadership and management. These approaches highlight the significance of meaning and purpose for individuals and organizations. Wong (2006) notes that people inherently desire to belong to meaningful and purposeful agendas and organizations. Making a similar point, Albrecht (1994) writes, "Those who would aspire to leadership roles in this new environment must not underestimate the depth of this human need for meaning. It is a most fundamental human craving, an appetite that will not go away" (p. 22). This craving shapes leaders and followers alike and is increasingly important to study in this time.

Podolny, Khurana, and Besharov (2010) argue that an emphasis on purpose and meaning is found in earlier management theorists such as Max Weber, and that in the writing of these theorists "leadership was deemed important because of its capacity to infuse purpose and meaning into the lives of individuals" (p. 69). In contrast to this view of leadership, Podolny et. al. express concern as "leadership research went awry when the concept of leadership became decoupled from the notion of meaning" and became inextricably tied to a concern with performance instead (p. 98). Defining meaningful action as "action that is directed toward a broader ideal" (p. 87), Podolny et. al. argue for "a positive relationship between the meaningfulness of work and economic performance" (p. 97). The purpose-in-leadership variable of the PLI provides a pathway for testing such assertions concerning the role of meaning and purpose in leadership.

As Coombs (2002) notes, "People are thinking about the words 'meaning' and 'purpose' more than ever before" (p.46), and it is arguable that purpose and meaning may be viewed as a key pathway to intrinsic motivation for leaders and followers. In contrast to approaches that aim to manage particular follower behavior toward desired outcomes, meaning-centered approaches aim to motivate organizational members intrinsically. This holds the power to shape organizational culture. In his study on the connection between meaning and organizational culture, Wong (2002; 2006) argues that meaning-centered approaches to leadership and management help to avoid toxic corporate cultures such as those that are overly authoritarian, conflictive, laissez faire, corrupt, and rigid. He further argues that a shift to positive corporate cultures such as progressive-adaptive, purpose-driven, community-oriented, and people-centered contribute to intrinsically motivated high-performance. This results from the capacity of these cultures to meet people's deepest needs for meaning, community, spirituality, and agency.

One foundational theory to meaning and purpose-based approaches is Viktor Frankl's logotherapy (Pattakos, 2004). Viktor Frankl who lived from 1905-1997 was a survivor of imprisonment in a concentration camp during WWII. In his book *Man's Search for Meaning* (1984), Frankl identified meaning as a central factor enabling people to endure torture and injustice. The "will to meaning" is the focal structure of Frankl's system of logotherapy according to which "man's search for meaning is the primary motivation in his life and not a 'secondary rationalization' of instinctual drives" (p. 121). Frankl (1992) also analyzed what he called purpose-in-life (PIL). Regarding purpose-in-life, Sosik (2000) writes, "PIL represents a positive attitude toward possessing a future-oriented self-transcendent goal in life. PIL can be described in terms of its depth (strength) and type (content) of meaning associated with the goal" (p. 4). The purpose-in-leadership variable in the present study applies the logic of Frankl's purpose-in-life to the realm of organizational leadership, and builds on Wong's (2006) argument for the priority of meaning-centered approaches to working with followers.

Providing additional definition and description of this construct, Sosik (2000) defines personal meaning, "as that which makes one's life most important, coherent and worthwhile" (p. 61). Korotkov (1998) defines meaningfulness as, "the degree to which people's lives make emotional sense and that the demands confronted by them are perceived as being worthy of energy and commitment" (p. 55). Irving and Klenke (2004) further argue that, "a leader's sense of personal meaning provides him or her with the conceptual spine to endure in difficult circumstances." Irving and Howard (2013, 2014) add to this discussion in their study on the priority of resiliency in leadership, or the capacity of leaders to motivate themselves in the face of challenges.

The importance of purpose-in-leadership is clear. Leaders and followers of all types need this "conceptual spine" for endurance and resiliency. Meaning-centered approaches have the capacity to aid individuals and leaders, helping them see "that the demands confronted by them are perceived as being worthy of energy and commitment" (Korotkov, p. 55). As Eisenberg and Goodall (2001) note, "Employees [and leaders of these employees] want to feel that the work they do is worthwhile, rather than just a way to draw a paycheck," and to see their investment in work and their organization as "a

transformation of its meaning—from drudgery to a source of personal significance and fulfillment" (p. 18). The purpose-in-leadership scale in the PLI provides a tool for studying this important dimension of meaning and purpose in leadership.

METHOD

Sample Composition

A convenience sample of followers (N = 354) responded to the instrument and evaluated their leaders around the three leadership themes as well as provided relevant demographics and a measure of the effectiveness of their leaders. The average age of followers in the study was 45.56, and 55.2% were male and 44.8% were female. The education level of followers was .6% less than high school, .3% high school or GED, 5.5% some college, 2.3% associates, 25.1% bachelors, 46.1% masters, and 20.2% doctorate. Because the researcher works primarily with graduate students at the masters and doctoral levels, the convenience sample for this study was skewed toward both a middle aged and educated population.

The leaders evaluated by followers had an average age of 51.33, and were 77% male and 23% female. The leaders evaluated worked in the following organizational sectors: 12.1% business, 2.3% government, 28.6% education, 9.8% nonprofit, 43.6% religious, 3.2% other. Due to convenience sampling methods, the researcher's context within religious-oriented higher education skewed the organizational sectors of the study. The education level of the leaders was .3% less than high school, 2.3% high school or GED, 2.0% some college, .9% associates, 22.9% bachelors, 35.7% masters, and 35.9% doctorate. Followers reported an average of 6.03 years of answering to the leaders evaluated in the study.

Data Collection Procedures

Participants were contacted by email and invited to an electronic version of the inventory housed through Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com). Participants included contacts of the researcher, and primarily represented current or former students of the researcher. The following instructions were provided for participants at the Qualtrics landing page:

> [The questions are] focused on the development of a leadership inventory to help us better understand the practice of effective leadership. In order to explore a range of leadership characteristics, you will be asked to provide some demographic information, and then will be asked to quickly respond to a set of questions about ONE current or past leader. Simply answer each question to the best of your knowledge, being sure to keep this one individual in mind as you work through the questions. You are encouraged to go with your first quick response to each question—no need to over-analyze or spend too much time on any one question. Your participation is greatly appreciated and is confidential.

Scale Development & Analysis

An item pool of 46 items was developed for the instrument around the themes of follower-focus, goal-orientation, and purpose-in-leadership. The items were developed based on relevant emphases in the associated literature. The researcher gathered scholarly perspectives on the format and wording of the research instrument. The invited scholars were individuals who possessed a PhD degree with academic work in organizational leadership or management studies. Based on the scholarly feedback, adjustments were made including the deletion of unclear, unfocused, or overly repetitive items, and adjustments were made in the wording of items and the format of the inventory. This feedback was used to arrive at the 46 items included in the study.

Once the participants responded to the inventory the researcher analyzed the data to determine the strongest set of items. Then the item pool was reduced based on this analysis. After this, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was taken along with Bartlett's test of sphericity. The researcher was looking for a KMO value of .8 or higher and a Bartlett's significance value of less than .05. A principal component analysis extraction method and an Oblimin rotation method were used. Eigenvalues were analyzed, and factors were included when the eigenvalues were greater than 1.0. Of the factors included, the researcher was looking for these factors to cumulatively account for at least 60% of the total variance. Once the factors were identified, alpha coefficients were calculated for the scales; the researcher was looking for a minimum alpha coefficient of .70 for each of the scales. Additionally, participants were asked to evaluate the leadership effectiveness of their leaders, and this measure of leadership effectiveness was hypothesized to positively correlate with each of the PLI factors. Pearson r correlations were conducted to evaluate the relationship between these items and the three factors. A significance level of .05 or less was set to accept the relationships as statistically significant.

Findings

Based upon initial analyses, the item pool of 46 items was reduced to 33 items after item coefficients less than .3 were suppressed and items that loaded on multiple factors were removed. The initial 33-item factor analysis yielded 18 items for follower-focus, 8 items for goal-orientation, and 7 items for purpose-in-leadership. For this solution, these three factors each had eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and explained 69.66% of the cumulative variance. Additionally, this solution had a KMO value of .967, a Bartlett's test of sphericity significance value of .000, and the alpha coefficients for the three scales were .98 (follower-focus), .92 (goal-orientation), and .90 (purpose-in-leadership). All of the findings noted for the 33-item solution meet the standards set for accepting the factors and scales noted in the previous section.

Because the 18-items on follower-focus were over twice as many as goal-orientation and purpose-in-leadership, items in the factor with coefficients less than .8 were suppressed in order to reduce the number of items in the follower-focus factor. After doing this, a 24-item solution yielded 9 items for follower-focus, 8 items for goal-orientation, and 7 items for purpose-in-leadership (See Pattern Matrix, Table 1).

Table 1. Pattern Matrix for 24-Item Solution (values below .3 suppressed).

	Pattern Matrix Components		
	Follower-Focus	*Goal Orientation*	*Purpose-in-Leadership*
Follower-Focus – 1	.90		
Follower-Focus – 2	.87		
Follower-Focus – 3	.87		
Follower-Focus – 4	.87		
Follower-Focus – 5	.86		
Follower-Focus – 6	.83		
Follower-Focus – 7	.82		
Follower-Focus – 8	.81		
Follower-Focus – 9	.81		
Goal-Orientation – 1		.83	
Goal-Orientation – 2		.76	
Goal-Orientation – 3		.75	
Goal-Orientation – 4		.74	
Goal-Orientation – 5		.73	
Goal-Orientation – 6		.72	
Goal-Orientation – 7		.67	
Goal-Orientation – 8		.62	
Purpose-in-Leadership – 1			.91
Purpose-in-Leadership – 2			.88
Purpose-in-Leadership – 3			.75
Purpose-in-Leadership – 4			.61
Purpose-in-Leadership – 5			.60
Purpose-in-Leadership – 6			.55
Purpose-in-Leadership – 7			.55

For this solution, the three factors each had eigenvalues greater than 1.5 (1.0 was set as a minimum) and explained 70.01% (60% was set as the minimum) of the cumulative variance (see Table 2).

Table 2. 24-Item Solution.

	Initial Eigenvalues		
Component	*Total*	*% of Variance*	*Cumulative %*
Follower-Focus	12.45	51.95	51.95
Goal-Orientation	2.77	11.53	63.49
Purpose-in-Leadership	1.57	6.53	70.01

Additionally, this solution had a KMO value (see Table 3) of .95 (.80 was set as a minimum) and a Bartlett's test of sphericity significance value of .00 (.05 was set as a maximum).

Table 3. KMO and Bartlett's Test.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.95
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	*Approx. Chi-Square*	6559.14
	df	276
	Sig.	.00

The alpha coefficients (a minimum was set at .70) for the three scales were .97 (follower-focus), .92 (goal-orientation), and .90 (purpose-in-leadership). The reduction of follower-focus from 18 items to 9 items only resulted in a reduction of the alpha coefficient from .98 to .97, both strong indications of scale reliability. The alpha coefficients for goal-orientation and purpose-in-leadership also are strong indications of scale reliability and well above the stated minimum of .70 (see Table 4).

Table 4. Alpha Coefficients Scale Reliability Analysis.

Scale	*Alpha Coefficient*
Follower-Focus	.97
Goal-Orientation	.92
Purpose-in-Leadership	.90

All of the findings noted for the 24-item solution meet and exceed the standards set for accepting the factors and scales. Because the 24-item solution largely parallels the results of the 33-item solution in critical areas, and because it offers a more efficient set of items, the 24-item solution was adopted.

Once the 24-item model of three factors was adopted, the scales were measured against a six item leadership effectiveness scale. The three factors were hypothesized to positively correlate with the leadership effectiveness scale and this analysis was used to help establish convergent validity for the PLI. The six items of the leadership effectiveness scale were developed by Ehrhart and Klein (2001). The leadership effectiveness scale focuses on follower perceptions of their leader around the extent to which the respondents believed they (a) worked at a high level of performance under their leader, (b) enjoyed working for their leader, (c) got along well with their leader, (d) found the leadership style of the leader compatible with their own, (e) admired their leader, and (f) felt this leader was similar to their ideal leader. The alpha coefficient for the leadership effectiveness scale used in this study was .91. This leadership effectiveness scale was utilized because of its efficiency as a 6-item scale and because of its track record of inclusion in previous work such as Hale and Fields' study (2007).

The leadership effectiveness scale correlated with the three factors in the PLI at a high level of significance (p = .000). The Pearson *r* correlations for the relationship between leadership effectiveness and three PLI scales are .84 for follower-focus, .68 for goal-orientation, and .69 for purpose-in-leadership (see Table 5). Because these were measures of follower perceptions of their leader, it is also relevant to note that it is logical

and anticipated that followers would evaluate follower-focus more positively in relation to leadership effectiveness. Based on the analysis provided above, the 24 items identified in this study are the items included in The Purpose in Leadership Inventory within the Appendix.

Table 5. PLI Correlations with Leadership Effectiveness (LE).

	Follower-Focus	Goal-Orientation	Purpose-in-Leadership
Correlation with LE	$r = .84$	$r = .68$	$r = .69$
Significance	$p = .00$	$p = .00$	$p = .00$

DISCUSSION

Based on the findings, the PLI performed well in its initial testing. The factor analysis revealed a solution explaining 70.01% of the variance with items loading strongly on three discrete factors. The reliability of the factors was strong as evidenced by the following alpha coefficients: .97 for follower-focus, .92 for goal-orientation, and .90 for purpose-in-leadership. The instrument has face validity with the items loading around logical factor sets consistent with the item content. Additionally, the construct validity of the factors was confirmed in an examination of convergent validity. Each of the PLI factors demonstrated convergent validity with the leadership effectiveness scale used by Ehrhart and Klein (2001) and Hale and Fields (2007). One weakness of the study is that an additional measure was not included in the study in order to examine a test of discriminant validity.

The PLI holds promise for advancing the study of leadership around the leader variables of follower-focus, goal-orientation, and purpose-in-leadership. The inventory provides a tool that measures follower perceptions of their leaders based on their leadership attitudes and associated behaviors. This approach is based on Matteson and Irving's (2006) discussion of the ontological, attitudinal, and behavioral dimensions of leadership, and focuses on studying leadership behavior through an evaluation of the attitudinal dimension of leader focus. As a 24-item inventory with three scales, the instrument is an efficient approach to measuring follower perceptions of their leaders around these important factors associated with transformational leaders, servant leadership, and organizational spirituality. In this study, leadership effectiveness was found to be significantly correlated with all three of the leadership variables in the Purpose-in-Leadership Inventory.

While each of the scales are a helpful addition to the field, the purpose-in-leadership scale perhaps holds the most promise for adding a unique contribution to future leadership studies. Irving and Klenke (2004) suggest the vital role that meaning and purpose play in leadership effectiveness. With the addition of the purpose-in-leadership scale, a tool now exists for establishing this connection between meaning and leadership effectiveness. In fact, one of the findings of this study demonstrates the connection of purpose-in-leadership and leadership effectiveness ($r = .69$; $p = .00$). Hopefully this study

opens the door to a future study of the role of meaning and purpose in leadership, as well as the role of follower-focus and goal-orientation.

Study Limitations & Future Research Directions

While the factor correlations presented in Table 6 provide convergent validity, the instrument would also benefit from establishing discriminant validity. As noted above, including a scale that allows for an analysis of discriminant validity would help to strengthen the validity of the inventory. Also, additional factor analysis with the inventory is in order. For example, pursuing confirmatory factor analysis with structural equation modeling software like LISREL would be helpful. Further, it would be helpful to administer the instrument with diverse populations and among diverse organizational sectors in order to examine how it functions among various demographic populations. In the research sample demographics noted earlier in this article there is an absence of information on race and ethnicity for the present study. In future studies, it will be important to examine how the PLI performs with distinct racial, ethnic, and linguistically diverse populations. Additionally, the study sample was skewed around the areas of organizational sector, age, and educational level. In future studies it will be important to study more representative samples around these demographic factors. Finally, it would be helpful to use the PLI to see how the three scales relate to additional variables such as leadership effectiveness (included in this study), team effectiveness, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and other organizational, managerial, and leadership variables.

Summary & Conclusion

In this article, the researcher provided an overview of the development and initial analysis of the Purpose in Leadership Inventory (PLI). An overview of the literature related to follower-focus, goal-orientation, and purpose-in-leadership was provided. Methods and findings of the factor analysis, reliability coefficients, and convergent validity analyses were presented. Finally, a discussion and set of recommendations were brought based on the significance of the inventory and how it may be further studied as an instrument and used in future leadership and organizational studies. It is the researcher's hope that the PLI may serve many other leadership researchers and practitioners as together we seek to advance the field of leadership study and practice. A copy of The Purpose in Leadership Inventory (PLI) is provided in the Appendix.

REFERENCES

Albrecht, K. (1994). *The northbound train: Finding the purpose, setting the direction, shaping the destiny of your organization*. New York: AMACOM.

Autrey, J. (1994). *Life and work: A manager's search for meaning*. New York: Morrow.

Conyne, R. K. (1998). Personal experience and meaning in group work leadership: The views of experts. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, *23*, 245-256.

Coombs, A. (2002). *The living workplace*. New York: Warwick House.

Ehrhart, M. G., & Klein, K. J. (2001) Predicting followers' preferences for charismatic leadership: The influence of follower values and personality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *12*, 155–79.

Eisenberg, E. M., & Goodall, G. L. (2001). *Organizational communication: Balancing creativity and constraint* (3rd ed.). New York: Bedford / St. Martin's.

Evans, M. G. (1970). The effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *5*, 277-298.

Frankl, V. E. (1984). *Man's search for meaning*. New York: Washington Square Press.

Frankl, V. E. (1992). *Man's search for meaning: An introduction to logotherapy* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

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

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power & greatness* (25th anniversary ed). New York: Paulist Press.

Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership*, *3*, 397-417.

Hernon, P., & Dugan, R. E. (2004). *Outcomes assessment in higher education: Views and perspectives.* Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited.

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*, 321-328.

House, R. J., & Dessler, G. (1974). The path-goal theory of leadership: Some post hoc and a priori tests. In J. Hunt and L. Larson (Eds.), *Contingency approaches in leaders* (pp. 29-55). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, R. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, *3*, 81-97.

Howard, C. S., & Irving, J. A. (2013). The impact of obstacles and developmental experiences on resilience in leadership formation. *Proceedings of the American Society for Business and Behavioral Sciences*, *20*(1), 679-687.

Howard, C. S., & Irving, J. A. (2014). The impact of obstacles defined by developmental antecedents on resilience in leadership formation. *Management Research Review, 37*(5), 466-478.

Irving, J. A. (2011). A model for effective servant leadership practice: A biblically-consistent and research-based approach to leadership. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, *3*(2), 118-128.

Irving, J. A., & Klenke, K. (2004). Telos, chronos, and hermēneia: The role of metanarrative in leadership effectiveness through the production of meaning. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *3*(3), 1-31. Retrieved April 12, 2013 from http://www.ualberta. ca/~iiqm/backissues/3_3/pdf/irvingklenke.pdf

Korotkov, D. (1998). The sense of coherence: Making sense out of chaos. In P. T. P. Wong & P. S. Fry (Eds.) *The human quest for meaning: A handbook of psychological and clinical applications* (pp. 51-70). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Laub, J. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the Servant Organizational Leadership (SOLA) Instrument. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Volume 60, Number 2, 308.

Leider, R. J. (1997). *The power of purpose: Creating meaning in your life and work.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Marr, B. (2009). *Managing and delivering performance: How government, public sector and not-for-profit organizations can measure and manage what really matters*. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann/Elsevier.

Matteson, J. A., & Irving, J. A. (2005). Servant versus self-sacrificial leadership: Commonalities and distinctions of two follower-oriented leadership theories. *Proceedings of the 2005 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved April 12, 2013, from http://www. regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2005/matteson_servant.pdf

Matteson, J. A., & Irving, J. A. (2006). Servant versus self-sacrificial leadership: A behavioral comparison of two follower-oriented leadership theories. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *2*(1), 36-51.

Nusche, D. (2008). Assessment of learning outcomes in higher education: A comparative review of selected practices. *OECD Education Working Papers*, *15*.

Pattakos, A. (2004). *Prisoners of our thoughts: Viktor Frankl's principles at work*. Berrett & Koehler.

Patterson, K. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *64*(02), 570. (UMI No. 3082719)

Podolny, J. M., Khurana, R., & Besharov, M. L. (2010). Revisiting the meaning of leadership. In N. Nohria, & R. Khurana (Eds.), *Handbook of leadership theory and practice: A Harvard Business School centennial colloquium*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Poister, T. H. (2003). *Measuring performance in public and nonprofit organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *10*(4), 80-91.

Sosik, J. J. (2000). Meaning from within: Possible selves and personal meaning of charismatic and non-charismatic leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *7*(2), 3-17.

Stone, G. A., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *25*(4), 349-361.

Terez, T. (2000). *22 keys to creating a meaningful workplace*. Avon, Mass: Adams Media.

Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 1228 -1261.

Van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (2010). Servant leadership: An introduction. In, D. van Dierendonck & Patterson, K. (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weisbord, M. R. (2004). *Productive workplaces revisited: Dignity, meaning, and community for the 21ˢᵗ Century* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Winston, B. E. (2003). Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Explaining how leaders and followers interact in a circular model. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved April 12, 2013 from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/winston_extending_patterson.pdf

Wong, P. T. P. (1998). Implicit theories of meaningful life and the development of the personal meaning profile. In P. T. P. Wong and P. S. Fry (Eds.), *The human quest for meaning*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wong, P. T. P. (2002). Creating a positive, meaningful work climate: A new challenge for management and leadership. In B. Pattanayak and V. Gupta (Eds.), *Creating performing organizations: International perspectives for Indian management*. New Delhi, India: Sage.

Wong, P. T. P. (2006). Is your organization an obstacle or a relay team? A meaning-centered approach to creating a collaborative culture. In S. Schuman (Ed.), *Creating a culture of collaboration* (pp. 229-256). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.

Wong, P. T. P., & Fry, P. S. Eds. (1998). *The human quest for meaning: A handbook of psychological and clinical applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Appendix: The Purpose in Leadership Inventory

The Purpose in Leadership Inventory is designed as a tool to measure follower perspectives of leader attitudes and focus. Please consider one current or past leader as you take this inventory, and respond to each of the 24 items based on the extent to which you disagree or agree with the statement. The scale contains strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, agree, and strongly agree. Thank you for taking a few minutes to share your feedback.

PART I
1. My leader values people.
2. My leader is committed to loving and caring for followers.
3. My leader values the individuality of followers.
4. My leader is focused on the needs of followers.
5. My leader values followers.
6. My leader understands how to encourage followers.
7. My leader understands how to relate well with people.
8. My leader values the uniqueness of individuals in our organization.
9. My leader is committed to seeing potential in people.

PART II
10. My leader focuses on task accomplishment.
11. My leader understands how to be efficient.
12. My leader knows how to get things done.
13. My leader values excellence.
14. My leader understands how to formulate strategies.
15. My leader does not allow distractions to interfere with the achievement of important organizational goals.
16. My leader understands the importance of reviewing results in order to improve future performance.
17. My leader is able to stay focused of organizational goals.

PART III
18. My leader believes in the purpose of our organization.
19. My leader believes that what our organization does matters.
20. My leader sees the importance of our organization's mission in light of a larger sense of purpose.
21. My leader understands how his/her personal life purpose connects to the organization's purpose.
22. My leader believes we are committed to a vision that is bigger than any one person.
23. My leader understands the place of our organization in the broader community outside of the organization.
24. My leader understands his/her personal life purpose.

Author's Note