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Profound Leadership: An Integrative Literature Review

This integrative literature review develops the concept of profound leadership. Using Torraco’s (2005, 2016) framework for integrative literature reviews as a foundation, the purpose of this study is threefold: (a) to review existing leadership theories fitting the profound learning framework (Kroth, 2016); (b) to examine the definitions, characteristics, and dependent variables of these existing leadership theories; and (c) to apply the outcomes of (a) and (b) to build the theory of profound leadership and make recommendations for future theory-building. Leadership as a general concept has been extensively explored, researched, and written about, developing a rich palette of explanatory theories. Profound leadership, on the other hand, is an emerging concept to elaborate through this integrative review of the literature of specific leadership theories resonating with profound learning.

Introduction

This integrative literature review develops the concept of profound leadership using a lens of profound learning to synthesize five selected leadership theories. An integrative literature review, “...reviews, critiques, and synthesizes representative literature on a topic ... such that new frameworks and perspectives on the topic are generated” (Torraco, 2016, p. 404). Profound learning theory is emerging in research literature (Kroth, 2016); providing a unique lens to view leadership, a concept we are calling profound leadership. This concept synthesizes characteristics from key leadership theories including servant, authentic, level 5, spiritual, and transformational. To expand the understanding and application of leadership, we identify the characteristics of these established theories that resonate with profound learning and synthesize them to elaborate the concept of profound leadership. Torraco’s (2005, 2016) approach served as our methodological framework.

Problem Statement

Profound learning drives this project: viewing leadership through this lens is the foundation of our approach. The emergence of profound learning as a concept and the limited “profound leadership” search results demonstrate the need for this research. Searching for “profound leadership” results in 233 articles from the University of Idaho’s online library and 2 results on ERIC.ed.gov. Assessing these results, 42 of the 233 (18%) are from peer-reviewed journals.
The top eighty percent of items (80%) fall under the following topical categories: leadership (58), social sciences (47), education (44), management (20), and school administration (17).

Profound learning, which emphasizes meaning-making over time, also forces the issue of well-being, highlighting the second driving need for this research: to explore the intersection of leadership and well-being as they are expressed in profound leadership. Scholarly and popular literature discuss ethical, moral and values-based leaders as recognizing the importance of work-life integration. Huffington (2014) and Brown (2019) suggest common struggles with work-life balance, authenticity, and self-care. Braun and Peus (2018) assert leadership is a critical resource in promoting balance, health, and well-being. Weiss, Rasinskas, Backman, and Hoegl (2018) argue a lack of authentic leadership may reduce well-being.

Rao (2017) explores leadership based on principles, values, and morals, suggesting values-based leadership is built upon integrity, transparency, ethical considerations, and a focus on “what is right” (p. 2). Nygaard, Biong, Silkoset, and Kidwell (2017) suggest values-based leadership has the potential to influence employees' ethical attitudes and behaviors, “leadership by role model, ‘the good example’ or ‘the good shepherd’ (known as referent power), is the best way to support and promote ethical values... far better than forcing the effect” (p. 134). These assertions provoke further exploration of potential connections between values-based leadership theories, well-being, and the emerging profound leadership theory.

**Conceptual Framework**

The Kroth article on “The Profound Learner” (2016), develop our foundation of profound learning. Kroth (2016) defines the profound learner as “someone who pursues deeper knowledge regularly over time” (p. 29). We use this adult learning concept as the basis for selecting key leadership theories identified as contributing to profound leadership. The terms awe, wonder, deepening, and ever-seeking are fundamental characteristics of profound learning; contributing characteristics from the five key leadership theories share these foci.

Per Torraco’s (2005, 2016) approach, our review used five phases. Phase one establishes the research need, using a lens of profound learning to select ethical, moral, and values-based leadership theories. The structure of our approach is conceptual (integrating concepts) and not strictly thematic (developing themes from concepts).

The second phase focuses on methods. Due to the vast depth and breadth of leadership literature available, we select existing leadership theories that resonate with profound learning and have potential implications for well-being. With these guides to sift through the extensive literature, we focused on ethical, moral, and values-based leadership theories.

The third phase is analysis. We critically analyze the literature, finding theory building components from the five established leadership theories. Figure two conceptualizes the contributing ideas from selected articles. The fourth phase is synthesizing and integrating concepts and constituent characteristics from each leadership theory, using them to elaborate profound leadership. In the fifth and final phase we explain results and assess the limitations of our approach to stimulate further research.

**Research Design and Methods**

Following Torraco’s (2005, 2016) approach to integrative literature reviews, we use a phased and iterative approach. Guided by profound learning, this “literature review addresses new or
emerging topics that would benefit from a holistic conceptualization and synthesis of the literature” (2016, p. 410). Our methodological approach is consistent with these emphases.

**Research Questions**

Four research questions guide and inform this inquiry:

1. Based on available resources, what leadership theories fit the profound learning framework?
2. What are the identified theories’ constituent characteristics and variables?
3. What patterns exist among the identified theories’ characteristics and variables?
4. How do resulting characteristics and variables elaborate the concept of profound leadership?

**Constituent Theories of Leadership**

The five existing theories on which we draw as constituent theories of profound leadership include servant leadership, level 5 leadership, authentic leadership, transformational leadership, and spiritual leadership. Addressing the generative role of integrative literature reviews, Torraco says, “because these topics are relatively new and have not yet undergone a comprehensive review of the literature, the review is more likely to lead to an initial or preliminary conceptualization of the topic (i.e., a new model or framework) rather than a reconceptualization of existing models” (2016, p. 410). Similarly, our preliminary conceptualization of profound leadership draws from, without reinterpreting, these five existing theories. We distill characteristics resonating most strongly with profound learning and synthesize these characteristics into our new model of profound leadership. This process required iterative phases of data collection and analysis.

This approach allows for exploration, development, and integration of the constituent characteristics. Through analysis, characteristics emerge and are selectively integrated, building the framework for profound leadership. Torraco states an integrative literature review is “... a distinctive form of research that uses existing literature to generate new knowledge” (2016, p. 404).

*Figure 1: Profound Leadership Venn Diagram*

Note: The constituent leadership theories’ interconnectedness is represented by discrete circles, their relationship and overlap consider the shared and contributing characteristics to profound leadership supported by profound learning foundation.
Preliminary searches for the existing leadership theories were conducted using the University of Idaho online library and ERIC.ed.gov online. We narrowed the total results by filtering for peer-reviewed journals. We reviewed abstracts, annotated select articles, and documented theory characteristics.

The volume of literature related to (general) leadership theory is large. Searching for “leadership” on the University of Idaho’s online library produces over five million (5,427,566) results. Limiting to peer-reviewed journals supplies one million (939,051) results. Searching for “leadership” on ERIC.ed.gov returned 68,543 results, with half (31,507) from peer-reviewed journals.

**Table 1: Preliminary Search Terms and Search Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Terms</th>
<th>University of Idaho Online Library Search</th>
<th>ERIC.ed.gov Online Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total results</td>
<td>Peer-reviewed journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>5,427,566</td>
<td>929,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual leadership</td>
<td>288,492</td>
<td>70,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>219,581</td>
<td>49,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership</td>
<td>141,378</td>
<td>26,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>129,724</td>
<td>36,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5 leadership</td>
<td>25,310</td>
<td>4,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership Greenleaf</td>
<td>8,101</td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Profound leadership”</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Table 1 includes results of preliminary online searches conducted on discrete instances, November 06, 2018 and December 03, 2018, searches continuing over four months.

Searching for authentic leadership on the University of Idaho’s online library returns 219,581 results, narrowing to peer-reviewed journals returns 49,392 results; searches from the same source for servant leadership return 141,378 results, with 26,807 from peer-reviewed journals; spiritual leadership returns 288,492 results, with 70,426 from peer-reviewed journals; transformational leadership returns 129,724 results, with 36,974 from peer-reviewed journals; and “level 5” leadership returns 25,310 results, with 4,842 from peer-reviewed journals. Searching combinations of terms produces different results and supplies opportunity to explore various theory relationships and synthesize related literature.

**Narrowing the Literature**

The research team divided the selected leadership theories, each member assessing the scholarly literature within one or more theories and tracking and documenting article selection criteria. Team members collaborated and learned from each other using shared online spreadsheets. Each spreadsheet tab allowed team members to capture specific article characteristics, sharing review criteria to ensure a repeatable, fair, and consistent process and building interrater reliability. The documented article characteristics include author, title, source, DOI, citation, link, search methods and terms, annotation, conceptual framework criteria, and questions. Using these characteristics, particularly our annotations and the conceptual framework criteria from profound learning theory, the researchers identified constituent qualities emblematic of each of the key leadership theories.
In the secondary search phase, we found sources dating to leadership theory origins, balancing historical theory building with current research while focusing on journals emphasizing values-based leadership. Our goal was not to review all the literature, but rather to capture the best leadership ideas as viewed through the profound learning lens and with implications for well-being, bringing forth the strongest, most contributory concepts.

To continue narrowing the large volume of leadership literature and to further address our research questions, we used an iterative process, revisiting prior conclusions in light of new data. Recognizing the infeasibility of reviewing five million articles (Table 1), broad search results were further narrowed by assessing previously published integrative and comprehensive reviews of leadership literature, focusing on articles addressing altruistic leadership, humanity of leadership, leadership and learning, and values-based leadership, and choosing those ideas most resonant with profound learning. Keeping the contributory ideas in mind, we reviewed abstracts, assessed various criteria, and decided if there is a need to dig deeper. Selecting literature informed by our lens enabled a productive and recursive cycle, allowing continuous refinement, partnered reviews, and a progressively narrowing focus. After each round of reviews, the team assembled to evaluate findings and identify areas needing expansion.

To build rigor into our process and allow for review by other members, we sought to build consensus about relevant articles by highlighting in the spreadsheet. Color coding by leadership theory and whether the article was suggested for use, the spreadsheet allowed each team member to see search methods and terms, annotations, and articles planned for inclusion. Over time and across iterations, we reached thematic consensus and determined the servant, authentic, level 5, spiritual, and transformational leadership articles which best contributed to our theory building.

### Table 2: Secondary and Tertiary Search Terms, Results, and Refining Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Term / Category</th>
<th>Secondary Results &amp; Refining Criteria</th>
<th>Tertiary Results &amp; Refining Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other / leadership</td>
<td>22 Theory founders / builders</td>
<td>16 Integrative, comprehensive, or systematic reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual leadership</td>
<td>1 Leadership characteristics</td>
<td>1 Characterizing leaders as altruistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>20 Discussed differences in style based on leader characteristics</td>
<td>6 Humanity of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 Leadership and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>5 Defining leadership</td>
<td>2 Values-based leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Resonant to profound learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5 leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Profound leadership”</td>
<td>8 AOLL Coursework</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most valuable and contributory articles were selected from each leadership theory to build and develop the profound leadership concept. After discussing and agreeing upon article merit, each team member evaluated selected articles for fit, consistency of voice and theory, and applicability to the nascent leadership theory. An opportunity for divergent thinking was
created by meeting often to discuss findings, approach, and next steps, allowing individual progress following a consistent methodological approach.

Divergent thinking generated creative ideas, laying a solid foundation for the next step in our review. Once our divergent thinking captured relevant literature, we assessed approaches for synthesizing our findings. An approach marked by divergence followed by synthesis emphasizes an active and questioning mindset, an attribute of profound learning, and supports independent analysis and peer review. Theory building blocks were extracted from selected articles and included key concepts from servant, authentic, level 5, spiritual, and transformational leadership, with each leadership theory playing a crucial role.

**Findings and Analysis**

Credited to Burns (1978) over forty years ago and still true today, “leadership may be the most studied and least understood topic in any of the social sciences” (Allen, 2018, p. 54). Multiple reasons exist for the vast literature around leadership, ...

... it is important to recognize the reasons no unified theory of leadership currently exist. Leadership theory emphasizes many outcomes, from how leaders are perceived to how leaders affect unit performance; it involves actions of group members (Day, 2000) as well as those of formal leaders; it has been applied to levels that include events, individuals, dyads, groups, organizations, and political systems; it has focused on immediate and delayed effects; and it often incorporates contextual differences (Dinh et al., 2014, 55-56).

What follows is both a synopsis of the relevant literature for each of our five constituent leadership theories and a representation of the constituent characteristics that will contribute to the synthetic approach to developing profound leadership as a concept.

**Servant Leadership**

Searching for “servant leadership” in the University of Idaho’s online library returns 141,378 results with 26,807 results in peer-reviewed journals. Adding “Greenleaf” returns 8,101 results, with 1,467 from peer-reviewed journals. On ERIC.ed.gov “servant leadership” returned 304 results, with 138 from peer reviewed journals. Articles were limited to publication in years 2015-2018, using leadership theory origins as useful context. Eva, Robin, Sendjaya, Van Dierendonck, and Liden (2019) published an integrative and comprehensive review of servant leadership literature including 285 articles spanning 20 years, asserting the lack of coherence around a definition of servant leadership impedes theory development.

Robert K. Greenleaf is viewed as the father of servant leadership theory, first proposing the concept in his 1970 *The Servant as Leader* essay. Greenleaf (2008) states his idea for the servant leader came from Herman Hesse’s Journey to the East and the character of Leo. Greenleaf defines a servant leader as one whose work focuses on the servant first, is part of who the person is, and where the servant nature is the real person.

Greenleaf (2008) identifies awareness as a launch pad for learning; asserting “awareness is not a giver of solace – it is just the opposite. It is a disturber and an awakener. Able leaders are usually sharply awake and reasonably disturbed. They are not seekers after solace. They have their own inner serenity” (p. 15). This “tolerance for awareness” (p. 14) and “ability to see oneself in perspective” (p. 15) are fundamental to profound learning and key contributing components to profound leadership.
Gabriele and Caines (2013) suggested servant leadership contributes to the idea of LeaderBeing defined as being, not just doing, and lifelong experience. An increasing focus on outcomes, work demands and pressure to perform require a focus on the humanity of leadership. Relevant to servant leadership, LeaderBeing may be a key contributing concept to the idea of profound leadership. Gabriele and Caines (2013) cite Mary, Queen of Scots, “in the end is my beginning”; Mary realized consummation is not a final state but a beginning prompted by a profound experience:

LeaderBeing perhaps can be understood best as a consummation. First, it is not a thing. It is a process within the person of the servant leader. By entering the maturing growth that is LeaderBeing, the servant leader gives flesh to the processes of real human leadership that makes a difference. And as others observe the servant leader so involved, they also are moved to change, and grow and develop. Indeed, the consummation of real LeaderBeing in those who would dare truly to be servant leaders gives birth to something new and unforeseen among one’s peers, within one’s organization, and outwardly toward those the organization is called to serve (pp. 19–20).

A servant leader’s self-awareness and integration of wellness in leadership, combined with positive other-directed emotions may produce long-lasting, deep change in followers’ lives. Vieweg (2018) cited Coetzer, Bussin, and Geldenhuys (2017) “altruism is essential to servant leadership” (p. 7) and Parris and Peachey (2012) “servant leaders demonstrate altruism through prosocial behaviors, like emotional healing and organizational stewardship” (p. 7).

A true servant leader is likely to be seen as different, odd, and guiding herself with a different kind of compass. Moving beyond the platitudes of servant leadership requires a deeper motivation (Nouwen, 1994) – a sense of the practice and life of servant leadership as digging deeper into one’s own experience to practice a constant and vital acknowledgement of the depth of suffering at the heart of the human condition which we all share. The humanity of servant leadership with a focus on others’ needs, giving, and servitude offers contribution to profound leadership.

Authentic Leadership

Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, and Walumbwa (2005) define an authentic leader as one who fosters healthy ethical climates with transparency, trust, integrity, high moral standards, and helps followers to achieve authenticity. Dinh et al. (2014) named 31 articles on the theory of authentic leadership in the 12 years of their survey (p. 40); these articles span the emergence, development, and exploration of the theory. In June 2005, The Leadership Quarterly’s special issue published 9 of these articles.

Authentic leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011) describes leaders who are self-aware, process positive and negative ego-relevant information in a balanced fashion, achieve relational transparency with close others, and are guided in their actions by an internalized moral perspective (Dinh, et al., 2014, p 42).

Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, and Walumbwa (2005) emphasized the traits of self-awareness (an iterative process of reflecting on personal values) and modelling authenticity for followers. From a longer list of traits posited by Avolio and Gardner (2005), Illies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang (2005) distilled four main characteristics of authentic leaders: 1. self-awareness, 2. balanced processing, 3. ethical and moral identity, and 4. relational transparency (p. 376). In addition, the authors
... make a case that an important introspective yet relational concept, authenticity (i.e. being one’s true self), has substantial implications for the meaningfulness of employee’s lives, especially in the process of leadership. ... authentic leaders ... focus on building followers’ strengths (Illies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005, p. 374).

Braun and Nieberle (2017) provide perhaps the most succinct definition of authentic leadership, credited to Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, and May (2004), “… authentic leadership characterizes leaders who ‘know who they are, what they believe and value,’ and who, ‘act upon those values and beliefs while transparently interacting with others’ (p. 781). Michie and Gooty (2005) discuss the role of values and emotions in authenticity, and classified leadership by combinations of high and low self-transcendent values and high and low frequency of other-directed emotions.

Living authentically leads to personal eudaemonia, defined as “reflecting self-realization, personal growth and expressiveness and, more generally, human flourishing and the fulfillment or realization of one’s true nature” (Illies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005, p. 376). Braun and Nieberle (2017) discuss how emphasizing humanistic values and recognizing others’ strengths leads to a more balanced personal and professional life, improving both leader and follower eudaemonia. Follower eudaemonia incorporates personal and professional growth and development, aligning the work-family interface and the private-life domain.

Michie and Gooty (2005) tell us “authentic transformational leaders ... believe every individual has dignity and moral standing” (p. 442). Authentic leaders are transparent and express other-directed values in behavior and action; this positive other focus is a key trait of profound leaders. Authentic leaders know who they are and commit to iteratively assessing personal emotions and values, consistently practicing these values (George, Sims, McLean, & May, 2004).

The history of authentic leadership emphasizes the essential nature of self-reflection and consistency in modelling a true self and making positive and permanent changes in followers’ lives. A leader who does not strive to improve followers’ daily lives is not committed to profoundly changing themselves and society. As a profound learner never stops thinking, questioning, learning, or practicing self-awareness, two characteristics transfer well to profound leadership: self-awareness and relational transparency.

**Level 5 Leadership**

Collins (2006) defines a Level 5 leader as a “study in duality: modest and willful, shy and fearless (p. 70). To reach Level 5, a leader must progress through the preceding four levels. A level 5 leader must own lower level capability; they reach this pinnacle by possessing personal humility and professional will as attributed to Collins (2006). Level 1 is a highly capable individual, making productive contributions; Level 2 is a contributing team member, helping the group achieve; Level 3 is a competent manager, organizing and managing resources; Level 4 is an effective, committed leader, providing vision; finally, at Level 5, one achieves “executive” status.

Level 5 leaders are characterized as “never wavering ... never doubting ... never second-guessing” (Collins, 2006, p. 73). Humility and resolve are important characteristics of both profound leaders and level 5 leaders. Drawing on Collins, we posit a profound leader is ever-seeking, ever learning, often doubting, always questioning, possessed of will and ambition
balanced with self-awareness. Level 5 leaders are adept at selecting successors and profound leaders empower profound learners; both demonstrate the leaders’ impact on follower growth and development. Level 5 leadership contributes to profound leadership mainly in the element of growth, complemented by curiosity, which Collins (2006) conceptualizes under humility.

**Spiritual Leadership**

Cited to International Institute for Spiritual Leadership (2013), Smith, Minor, and Brashen (2018) define spiritual leadership as “encompassing motivating and inspiring workers through hope/faith in a vision of service to key employees and a corporate culture based on the values of altruistic love” (p. 87).

Smith, Minor, and Brashen (2018) also suggested spiritual leaders achieve “positive and humane results” using multiple leadership approaches (p. 80). Spiritual leadership embodies an intrinsic, visionary, and moral approach; it is focused on listening, appreciation for others' contributions, respect, and fair treatment. Smith, Minor, and Brashen (2018) assert the key skills required for spiritual leadership include intrapersonal introspection, observing others, feedback, self-assessment, communication, and promoting healthy conflict. Eva, Robin, Sendjaya, Van Dierendonck, and Liden (2019) suggested spirituality may drive servant leaders to act with a “propensity or altruistic motive to serve others” (p.3). This demonstrated relationship between servant leadership and spiritual leadership lends itself to a profound leadership connection. The key characteristics from spiritual leadership offering contribution to profound leadership include humanity and growth.

**Figure 2: Pillars of Profound Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Servant Leadership</th>
<th>Authentic Leadership</th>
<th>Level 5 Leadership</th>
<th>Spiritual Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepting people as imperfect, creative, fallible</td>
<td>Always thinking and questioning</td>
<td>Adept at selecting successors</td>
<td>Achieve positive and humane results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>Balanced processing</td>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>Appreciation for other contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble</td>
<td>Other-directed emotions</td>
<td>Promote follower growth and development</td>
<td>Fair Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>Ethical and moral identity</td>
<td>Resolve</td>
<td>Intrinsic, visionary, moral approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listener</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Will and ambition balanced with reflection and awareness</td>
<td>Leverage multiple leadership styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others needs first</td>
<td>eudemonia</td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Listening focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transformational Leadership**

Sun, Chen, and Zhang (2017) credit Burns (1978) with conceptualizing transformational leadership theory; Bass' (1990) transformational leadership contribution lies in a non-educational context. Cited to Burns (1978), the definition of transformational leadership strives towards achievement and self-actualization, rather than safety and security. Bass’s (1990) characteristics include idealized influence (charisma), inspirational motivation,
intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Leithwood and Jantzi (1999) conceptualized transformational leadership as fifteen specific practices classified into four broad categories: “(1) setting directions, (2) developing people, (3) redesigning the organization, and (4) managerial aggregate” (Sun, Chen, & Zhang, p. 3).

Burns (1978) tells us “the purpose of leadership is to motivate followers to work towards transcendental goals instead of immediate self-interest” (Sun, Chen, & Zhang, p. 3). Leadership purpose connects an altruistic notion of working towards the greater good with leader deepening, expanding, and growing. Vieweg (2018) suggested an altruistic approach to leadership may nurture organizational culture and motivate employees (p. 1). Accepting the altruistic connection with generalized leadership, we believe altruism is a key part of profound leadership.

Cited to Mallén, Chiva, Alegre, and Guinot (2014), Vieweg (2018) holds altruism as a key part of servant, authentic, and spiritual leadership (p. 6); Vieweg, as cited by Furnham, Treglown, Hyde, and Trickey (2016), contend altruism is associated with other positive characteristics. These positive characteristics include interpersonal sensitivity, social ability, and inquisitiveness. Dictionary.com defines (inquisitiveness) as “given to inquiry, research, or asking questions; eager for knowledge; intellectually curious.” Connecting inquisitiveness to profound learning, one sees openness as part of leading; inquisitiveness may be a key contributing characteristic of a profound leader. The profound leader is a profound learner and promotes learning in their followers and continued learning through their leadership. The transformational leadership components of growth and learning translate well to profound leadership.

**Synthesis**

As we move into synthesis, our intent is to integrate the components in a value-based manner, as a synthetic metathtory. The main concepts elicited from our analysis are brought together in the final synthesis phase and outlined in Table 4.

**Table 4: Synthetical Representation of Common Collected Profound Leadership Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Concept</th>
<th>Supportive Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>Child-like wonder, leader as learner, endless questioning, ever-seeking, asking, pursuit of knowledge, embodiment of intuition and humility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanity</td>
<td>Being human, fallible, serving heart on platter, embracing heart in others, servitude, focus on other’s needs, listening and empathy, giving, balancing achievement with humane results, mindful, altruistic approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Planting seeds, nurturing, offering and seeking ideas, supplying and cultivating growth and development, self-awareness and reflection, ability to adjust, find gaps or needs, create space for flourishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Learning focus, profound learning, collaboration, connection and putting pieces together, relationship management, problem-solving and integration, offering and adjusting, bringing in the other components.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concepts of curiosity, humanity, growth, and learning are common concepts that resonate when looking at leadership through the lens of profound learning. These four concepts
become the key framework for our profound leadership concept, viewing leadership through the lens of profound learning.

Curiosity can be expressed through child-like wonder, endless questioning, ever-seeking, and the leader as learner pursuing knowledge. The humble, ever-constant pursuit of knowledge and truth propels a leader to look further, ask more, and embrace learning in themselves and followers. Curiosity resonates strongly with profound learning and embodies intuition and humility.

The humanity of leadership is our second synthesized concept. This human quality to leadership includes listening and empathy, servitude, and a profound leader’s giving nature. A values-based leader serves their heart on a platter; embraces heart and humanity in others; and offers, gives, serves, and focuses on others’ needs. Balancing achievement with humane results partnered with a recognition of humanity in others supplies balance and a mindful, altruistic leadership approach.

A profound leader nurtures growth and development aligned with performance expectations. A leader plants seeds, offers and seeks ideas, and cultivating an environment for improvement and maturation. The profound leader provides support and awareness of developmental needs. The profound leader reflects on progress, makes adjustments, identifies gaps or needs, and creates space for flourishing.

Our fourth concept centers on learning, clearly resonating with profound learning, adding elements of collaboration, connection, and putting pieces together. Viewing the complex and puzzling nature of work relationships, one sees the ability to contextualize and adjust approach in an incredibly valuable manner, promoting problem-solving and integration.

Further synthesizing these four conceptual components, we see the gelling of a profound leadership concept; it recognizes leaders are human and embraces others’ humanity, while getting effective and productive work done. These concepts are not mutually exclusive, and we are not required to choose one or the other. Instead, we integrate seeming opposites: humane performance, seeing and reflecting, and giving and flourishing.

**Limitations**

We have defined profound leadership as delivering positive personal and societal changes, with profound leaders supporting the common good. This integrative literature review is not the proper venue for an in-depth analysis and discussion of this question. Determining whether profound leadership is limited to positive change presents further research opportunities.

Differences in leadership style and efficacy driven by gender, educational attainment, age, and ethnicity are other areas needing more in-depth exploration than this literature review allows. Searching Google Scholar for “gender differences in leadership,” limited to items published between 2015 and May 3, 2019, returns 70,200 results. Further narrowing our search for the same timeframe, adding terms “authentic,” “servant,” “spiritual,” and “transformational,” returns 15,000 – 20,000 results. Searching Google Scholar for “age differences in leadership,” limited to items published between 2015 and May 17, 2019 returns 162,000 results. Further narrowing our search for the same period and adding terms “authentic,” “servant,” “spiritual,” and “transformational” returns 17,200 – 17,800 results.
Our profound leadership construct would benefit from investigating the correlational or causal relationships with these variables.

**Significance**

We use the lens of profound learning to assess literature on key leadership theories to integrate into the concept of profound leadership. Using the Kroth (2016), and theory of profound learning as a foundation, we identify key contributing leadership theory pillars to support a profound leadership construct.

Profound leadership has not been defined or developed as a leadership theory; this integrative literature review identifies future values-based leadership development opportunities. Accepting Schein and Schein’s (2017) assertion “leadership is the key to learning” (p. 14), we posit profound leadership can be a logical next step in leadership development. With a current popular focus on mindfulness and interrelatedness, we have a responsibility to decide the meaning of the next phase of leadership - socially, behaviorally, and individually.

Profound leadership supplies a necessary perspective. Continually increasing pressures for efficiency and productivity force organizational leaders toward transactional leadership styles at the expense of more developmental and humane approaches. Bogenschneider (2016) credits Hollander from 1978, “a neo-corporate view of leadership sometimes identifies a leader as merely a person that de facto has followers” (p. 30). He challenges this notion with an exploration of leadership, expressing the complexity of leader versus manager, leader as one who has followers, and leadership beyond leading a project (p. 30). We assert leadership is more than positional.

Bogenschneider (2016) attributes the distinction between transactional and transformational leadership to Burns (1978) and Bass (1990). Shifting from a managerial focus on productivity, quotas, and efficiencies to a mindful humanistic leadership approach may be as important as it is difficult. This mindset shift links back to Bogenschneider’s leadership exploration and leadership science cited to Fairholm (1995) where there is a need to “distinguish leadership from simply management” (p. 65). Leadership drives towards transformation; this informs our profound leadership concept.

Integrating humanity and performance expectations, supported by Fry and Slocum Jr (2008) suggests leaders simultaneously maximize the triple bottom line of “People, Planet, and Profit” (p. 86). Huffington (2014) and Brown (2019) delve into leadership and well-being, reinforcing a shift to a more mindful approach to leadership. A thoughtful, considerate approach to leadership shows increased performance achievement. These humanistic leadership approaches support our profound leadership concept, yet are disruptive to the traditional style of transactional “leadership.”

As Gavin and Mason (2004) wrote in *The Virtuous Organization: The Value of Happiness in the Workplace*,

> When a workplace is designed and managed to create meaning for its workers, they tend to be more healthy and happy. Healthy and happy employees tend to be more productive over the long run, generating better goods and more fulfilling services for their customers and the others with whom they interact and do business. These three things—health, happiness, and productivity—are the essential ingredients of a good society. Improvement
in productivity alone, which is almost the sole emphasis of many organizations today, is not enough (p. 381).

Productivity should not be a leader’s sole focus; employee health and well-being are increasingly important, especially when striving for work-life-balance. A profound leader has a key role to play; embodying endless seeking and learning, partnered with self-awareness and servitude, supporting others in flourishing, in outcomes and in wellness.

Ilies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang (2005) discussed the intersection of eudaemonia with authentic leadership qualities, “…eudaemonic well-being as reflecting self-realization, personal growth and expressiveness and, more generally, human flourishing and the fulfillment or realization of one’s true nature” (p. 375). Authentic leaders’ focus on growth and well-being is a key component of the professional successes experienced by teams with authentic leaders: “… authentic leaders have more satisfied followers because their goals focus on values and well-being, in addition to individual and organizational performance” (p. 384). These assertions promote and provoke the diverse impact and responsibility of leadership; affecting others beyond their workplace, touching on well-being, values, and performance.

Michie and Gooty (2005) discussed the importance of often experiencing positive other-directed emotions and the motivation these emotions provide for leaders to act on self-transcendent values, arguing this is an important determinant of authentic leadership. Bass and Stogdill (1990) explained the support and concern authentic leaders have for followers: “Authentic transformational leaders are concerned with the welfare of others, because they believe every individual has dignity and moral standing” (p. 442).

Authentic leaders strive to enrich the work-family interface and improve personal lives through increased work resources. Braun and Nieberle (2017) explored the positive relationship between authentic leadership and followers’ eudaemonia and work family enrichment (WFE); “Authentic leadership emphasizes nurturing and protecting followers' resources” (p. 781). Authentic leaders are a resource followers can draw upon for conflict reduction and increased enrichment at the work-family interface:

Our findings thus support the notion that authentic leadership relates to followers’ attitudes and behaviors beyond bottom line success (Avolio et al., 2004), not only as a buffer of negative outcomes (e.g., burnout, stress; Laschinger, 2014; Laschinger & Fida, 2014), but to promote positive aspects and well-being (Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005, p. 792).

Recognition that the employee exists beyond the workplace is important to our profound leadership conception. Leading to success takes on an entirely new perspective outside of the traditional workplace; profound leaders are iteratively self-aware and self-reflective, a contributing part from both authentic and level 5 leadership theories.

Korkmaz (2007) asserted transactional leadership style negatively affects job satisfaction, and these two factors influence organizational health. Conversely, he found transformational leadership style to have a profound positive impact on teachers’ job satisfaction and a potentially positive effect on organizational health. Where transactional leadership was incredibly tactical, directive, and command and control focused, transformational leadership focuses more on the individual, inspiration, motivating others, and working towards collective
goals (Korkmaz, 2007). Peter Senge (1990) alluded to these desirable positive outcomes from transformational leadership (as cited by Merriam & Bierema, 2013),

*Leaders must give up the old dogma of planning, organizing and controlling and realize the almost sacredness of their responsibility for the lives of so many people. A managers’ fundamental task is providing the enabling conditions for people to lead the most enriching lives they can* (Merriam & Bierema, pp. 141-142).

The leadership conceptual evolution has continued over time, exemplified by Senge’s writing in the introduction for the 2011 edition of Joseph Jaworski’s Synchronicity: The inner path of leadership. Senge wrote:

*The real gift of leadership is not about positional power; it’s not about accomplishments; it’s ultimately not even about what we do. Leadership is about creating a domain in which human beings continually deepen their understanding of reality and become more capable of participating in the unfolding of the world. Ultimately, leadership is about creating new realities* (Jaworski & Senge, 2011).

While humanity, altruism, deepening, and meaning resonate from the 2011 writings, they also connect to Senge’s first 1990 writing, demonstrating the leadership construct continues to evolve and has not arrived at a single answer. We continue to strive for a more developmentally focused approach to leadership, supporting the need to pursue and explore the profound leadership concept.

**Conclusions**

In this integrative literature review, we identified five leadership theories that, in conjunction with profound learning, we use as a theoretical framework for profound leadership theory building. Profound learning is our essential, underlying, foundational concept. Endless pursuit of knowledge, constant questioning, and seeking for understanding contribute to curiosity as a critical quality of profound leaders. The humanity of servant, authentic, and spiritual leadership offer to the profound leadership concept. The growth element shown in Level 5 and transformational leadership extend to profound leadership. Learning is underlined by profound learning and reinforced through each of the five leadership theories, informing a solid strand of learning focus embraced by the profound leadership concept.

The answers to our research questions have important implications for the field of values-based leadership development. A better understanding of profound leadership will contribute to leadership practice. Leveraging our findings, leadership development may be further integrated with profound learning, contributing to a dynamic, evolving humanistic approach.

Focusing on profound leadership, deeper thinking, and the service orientation may drive improved organizational health. The connection between leadership and learning supplies a foundation for the profound leader. The opportunity to further define this connection and promote a profound leadership approach may benefit individuals, society, and theory through contributions to deeper, more meaningful learning, holistic perspectives, and growth.
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