Servant Leadership and Violent Extremism: An Evaluative Framework

Eric J. Russell, Utah Valley University

Ardian Shajkovci, ACTRI (American Counterterrorism Targeting and Resilience Institute)

Abstract

The following article presents a conceptual servant leadership framework for evaluating preventing violent extremism (PVE) policies and programs. The purpose of the work was to discover how servant leadership could strengthen existing PVE evaluative strategies. This article stems from work being done in servant leadership, counterterrorism, and countering violent extremism at Nichols College and Utah Valley University. The authors used a secondary analysis of empirical and literary servant leadership and PVE works to develop the framework. The analysis revealed a relationship between servant leadership's commitment to the growth of people and building community and the need for PVE to be about nurturing resilient individuals and communities. That relationship became the foundation for the work, allowing for a discussion of many different aspects of the two areas. The framework led to the development of a servant leadership evaluative framework to be used as part of an overall PVE evaluative toolkit.

Keywords: Servant Leadership, Violent Extremism, Counterterrorism, Prevention, Evaluation

The following article presents a strategic conceptual framework regarding a place for servant leadership within an overall evaluative process for policies and programs focused on preventing violent extremism (PVE). The authors employed a secondary analytical approach to formulate this framework, utilizing existing

empirical and literary servant leadership and PVE works. The article offers a model servant leadership evaluative framework that can be merged into existing evaluative processes regarding current and proposed policies and programs aimed at PVE (Christmann et al., 2012; Cherney et al., 2020g; Gielen, 2017; Gielen, 2019; Helmus et al., 2017; Malet, 2021).

Governments and non-governmental agencies (NGOs) develop and implement programs to prevent radicalizing and violent extremism. These programs are intended to prevent the radicalization of individuals, thus preventing a pathway to becoming a violent extremist. Those putting forth said PVE programs often seek to understand program effectiveness. This means that PVE programs are often evaluated at the pre-and post-implementation stages. Cherney et al. (2020) note that PVE programs must ensure program integrity throughout the process, evaluating the program from conception to implementation. Despite numerous PVE evaluative instruments existing worldwide, there are still disparities in the decisions surrounding the use and implementation of said PVE programs (Nehlsen et al., 2020), not to mention disparities in or a lack thereof pre-and post-implementation PVE program evaluation (Cherney et al., 2020). One of the disparities in the evaluation of PVE programs is the lack of involvement of community stakeholders in creating a PVE initiative, essentially ignoring those directly interfacing with those succumbing to radicalization and developing violent extremist tendencies (Christmann et al., 2012).

In an analysis of prevention programs across multiple areas and jurisdictions, the effectiveness of PVE interventions remains to be discovered, even though PVE programs are being evaluated (Brouillette-Alarie et al., 2022). The PVE evaluative instruments seemingly fail to assess the program's effectiveness, or the evaluation takes place long after implementation rather than during and soon after the development. The problem is threefold: the development of the PVE program itself, the need for evaluation pre-implementation, and the evaluative methodology in which the program is assessed once implemented. In addition, when assessing PVE policies and strategies, there is a susceptibility to bias (Dean & Lloyd, 2022) and looming blind spots associated with their effectiveness (Brouillette-Alarie et al., 2022).

Knight et al. (2002) argue that PVE approaches need to "tailor interventions for different types of individuals and groups" (p. 700). Amit and Kafy (2022) note that PVE strategies must empower individuals and communities, form healthy individual characteristics, and promote social and religious values and cognitive resources. PVE programs need to create resilience to radicalization in young people in a way that respects their specific culture and beliefs (Amit & Kafy (2022). This means that pre-and post-implementation evaluations should be conducted where the needs of those impacted by a policy are understood and the identity of persons and culture is respected. Said differently, PVE needs to be evaluated humanistically.

This article aims to put forth a conceptual framework that spotlights the influence servant leadership attributes could have on the decisions being made regarding PVE policies and programs (Malet, 2021). The framework offers a direct exploration of the relationship between the goals of PVE and the attributes of

servant leadership. The article presents a humanistic servant leadership framework to assess whether a PVE program or policy being put forward or is currently in practice distinctly meets the needs of people and communities in a way that fosters resiliency against radicalization (Cherney et al., 2020; Christmann et al., 2012; Cousins & Chouinard, 2012; Grossman, 2021; Royse et al., 2015). This work is neither a critique nor an alternative to evaluating existing PVE programs, but rather, offers an additional tool for governmental and NGO leadership to employ alongside existing evaluative procedures.

Background

The central question guiding the creation of this conceptual framework asked, how could the pragmatic foundations of servant leadership strengthen existing PVE policy and program strategies (Helmus et al., 2017)? This idea stemmed from the authors' work on servant leadership, counterterrorism, and countering violent extremism at Nichols College and Utah Valley University. A reoccurring theme was noted in servant leadership and PVE literature regarding personal growth and its influence on an individual's resilience against being radicalized into violent extremism (Eliot, 2020; Grossman, 2021; Stephens et al., 2019; Wilkinson, 2020). Fundamental to the philosophy of servant leadership is the concept of meeting the needs of individuals so they grow as persons (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Spears, 2010). Harland et al. (2005) discovered that a leader's positive behavior and commitment toward their people influence follower resiliency within the organizational setting. That same positive influence seems to hold possibilities for what is put forward in the form of PVE policies and programs.

Throughout PVE literature, individual growth seemingly becomes an antidote to radicalization and stopping violent extremist beliefs from taking hold (Pocciolini, 2020; Stephens et al., 2019). From a leadership perspective, this means meeting the needs of individuals in a way that supports their journey towards finding a healthy identity, personal growth, a safe and accepting community to belong to, economic and educational opportunities, and a purpose in life (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Grossman, 2021; Kamali, 2021; Kassab, 2020; Pocciolini, 2020; Wilkinson, 2020).

The PVE evaluative process is understanding whether policies and programs meet their objectives (Gielen, 2019). This conceptual work and the evaluative framework seek to enhance an overall soft-power strategy for PVE by offering servant leadership as an evaluative framework to understand whether a PVE policy or program meets the needs of people so they, in turn, can grow as resilient persons (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Grossman, 2021; Wilkinson, 2020).

Three factors led to the decision to focus on servant leadership within PVE. The first is the philosophy's core belief that great leadership flows outwardly from the desire to see the growth of people (Greenleaf, 1977/2002), and individuals gain resiliency from said growth (Wilkinson, 2020). As Wilkinson (2020) stated, a significant factor in strengthening an individual's resiliency has a leader that "helps subordinates grow and succeed" (p. 154). From one's growth and success come personal power and strength, individual capability, and resiliency, and as Greenleaf (1977/2002) argued, "no one should be powerless" (p. 98).

Second, the idea to focus on servant leadership is its "gender integrative" (Lehrke & Sowden, 2017; Reynolds, 2014; Reynolds, 2011) and culturally inclusive foundations (Irving, 2010). The servant leadership approach towards the humanistic aspects of people-focused leadership seems to transcend patriarchal norms and cultural hierarchies (Alston, 2005; Barbuto & Gifford, 2010; Scicluna-Lehrke & Sowden, 2017). Such inclusivity matters since women not only overwhelmingly endure the burdens and brutality of violent extremism across cultures but are also burdened with finding pathways for PVE, often unsupported, in their respective communities (Brady & Marsden, 2021; Martin, 2021; Speckhard & Shajkovci, 2017).

Third, different aspects, characteristics, and constructs of servant leadership have been used in evaluative and measurement tools for individuals, organizations, and industries (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2007; Eva et al., 2019; Liden et al., 2008; Laub, 2010; van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011; Varra et al., 2012). For example, Laub (2010) developed the Organizational Leadership Assessment Tool to measure an organization's health and performance based on different aspects of servant leadership. Dennis and Bocarnea (2007) put forth an instrument based upon the work of Patterson's (2003) virtuous servant leadership constructs to assess individuals and organizations. Because of the success of different servant leadership-focused instruments across multiple areas, situations, and industries, it seemed servant leadership also held promise for establishing an evaluative framework for PVE policies and programs.

Defining Violent Extremism

There is not a clear and agreed-upon definition throughout industry or academia regarding violent extremism (UNDOC, 2021) or, for that matter, terrorism (Martin, 2021). There are, however, many working definitions throughout the literature that overlap and complement each other. For the sake of this article, the United States Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) definition serves as a guide for understanding what violent extremism means. The FBI defines violent extremism as "the encouraging, condoning, justifying, or supporting the commission of a violent act to achieve political, ideological, religious, social, or economic goals" (UNDOC, 2021).

Evaluating PVE Policies and Programs

Cherney et al. (2020) argue that PVE policies and programs must be evaluated to measure whether what they are intended, i.e., reducing possibilities for radicalization and thus violent extremism by strengthening individuals and communities, is what they do. The problem, however, is the need for clearly defined, widely adopted guidelines (Cherney et al., 2020). As it is with disagreements and inconsistencies in defining terrorism, domestic terrorism, and violent extremism (Martin, 2021), so too is the lack of consistency and agreement regarding how PVE policies and programs should be evaluated, or for that matter, whether they can or should be evaluated at all (Cherney et al., 2020; Christmann et al., 2012; Gielen, 2017; Gielen, 2019; Helmus et al., 2017; Holmer et al., 2018; Malet, 2021). An area of concern is the difficulty of accurately evaluating PVE

initiatives to understand their impact or whether they meet the intended objectives (Gielen, 2017; Gielen, 2019; Holmer et al., 2018; Malet, 2021). Such difficulties and inconsistencies seem to foster the dismissal of evaluations altogether (Malet, 2021). That dismissal or lack of consistency hurts the vulnerable in society the most.

The servant leadership PVE framework aims to reduce such inconsistencies and difficulties by offering an evaluative framework that can focus on the needs of the persons and populations they are intended to help. This framework is neither prescriptive nor offers specifics on what should be contained in PVE policies and programs. Moreover, this framework avoids prescribing a specific evaluative process. Instead, the servant leadership PVE framework supplements existing PVE evaluation processes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Many empirical and literary works have identified and expanded upon different characteristics, constructs, and attributes, as well as the benefits servant leadership has on individuals and organizations (Eva et al., 2019; Laub, 2010; Patterson, 2003; Rivkin et al., 2014; Shim et al., 2016; Spears, 2010; Wong & Davey, 2007). Some of these works are used and cited within this article. However, to form the servant leadership PVE framework, the article relies on Greenleaf's (1977/2002) three pragmatic questions of servant leadership as the conceptual foundation; this literature review delineates the pragmatic questions in a subsequent section.

As with servant leadership, the field of PVE also contains many empirical and literary works (Stephens et al., 2019). For this article, the authors chose to focus on and build out the servant leadership PVE framework using four themes identified by Stephens et al. (2019) as being seen as common aspirations throughout most PVE literature: (1) "the resilient individual," (2) "identity," (3) dialogue and action, and (4) "engaged, resilient communities" (pp. 348-354). Stephens et al. (2019) evaluated more than 70 empirical PVE works to identify these four common themes. Again, like the three pragmatic questions of servant leadership, the four themes identified by Stephens et al. (2019) serve as the foundation for constructing the servant leadership PVE framework.

The Philosophy of Servant Leadership

In 1970, Robert K. Greenleaf penned his seminal essay *The Servant as Leader*. Greenleaf's inspiration for the work emerged from his studies in Eastern philosophy, western philosophy and was sparked by a work by Herman Hess titled *The Journey to the East* (Frick, 2004). Servant leadership philosophy grounds itself in the idea that it is the leader's moral responsibility to meet followers' needs so said followers can grow as persons. From said growth, followers gain strength, autonomy, and resiliency. Throughout his professional career, what Greenleaf witnessed in organizations was the opposite of meeting the needs of followers, where many found themselves loyally serving the organization's needs with little reciprocity (Frick, 2004). Greenleaf discovered that the norm was more of a toxic organizational environment bogged down by the bureaucratic milieu found

throughout many public and private institutions (Russell, 2019). Through years of study, reflection, and inspiration, Greenleaf realized that this type of organization stifled and weakened people, causing humanity to take second place to policies and procedures (Frick, 2004; Russell, 2019).

The Servant as Leader became an antidote to what Greenleaf described as a sickness afflicting the organization (Greenleaf, 1977/2002). Philosophically, Greenleaf's work was to be a pragmatic roadmap possessing the power to benefit the leader, the follower, the organization, the clients, and society. Nevertheless, although *The Servant as Leader* is considered the cornerstone of servant leadership philosophy, Greenleaf believed it was only the beginning, a starting point for positive change in organizations and people (Frick, 2004). Greenleaf intended to create a conundrum, a servant who is a leader that could be put forth as both a vision and a spark so that others would want to test it and bring it to fruition literarily, empirically, and in practice (Frick, 2004).

As noted earlier, the philosophy of servant leadership grounds itself in a widely quoted statement and three pragmatic questions. Greenleaf's work and the many works emerging since his original essay seemingly begins with a discussion on these two fundamental aspects of his essay. The first is Greenleaf's (1977/2002) statement about the stark difference between one's desire to serve versus one's desire to lead, the other being his three pragmatic questions. As Greenleaf (1977/2002) stated:

> Servant leadership begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. He is sharply different from the leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual acquire material possessions. For such it will be a later choice to serve after leadership is established. The leader first and the servant first are two extreme types. Between them, there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature (p. 27).

Greenleaf (1977/2002) offers the reader two pathways for how one comes to leadership, whether through a desire to serve or to lead (Greenleaf, 1977/2002). Greenleaf (1977/2002) presents the notion that serving the needs of others so that they grow as persons is a pure act of leadership. Greenleaf's work is purposefully provocative and vague, leaving it up to the individual to define what "*serve*" means to them (Frick, 2004). Greenleaf avoids bracketing servant leadership to specific fields, situations, or levels of rank and authority. Greenleaf (1977/2002) leaves it as a "conscious choice" for each person (P. 27). In doing so, Greenleaf opens the work to all by allowing it to be personalized, reflective, and applied to a multitude of situations and functions (Frick, 2004).

The Pragmatic Questions of Servant Leadership

In *The Servant as Leader*, Greenleaf (1977/2002) asks three pragmatic questions that form a reflective measurement tool for evaluating how the actions and decisions of a leader influence and impact others. The first pragmatic question asks, "Do those served grow as persons" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27)? This goes to the foundation of the philosophy and the notion that because of one's actions as a leader, people should be better tomorrow than they were today. Again, the word

serve is used without a specific definition as to its meaning. Greenleaf leaves it up to the reader to assign meaning to the word *serve* and how to go about it (Frick, 2004). Greenleaf (1977/2002) recognized the vastness and diversity of needs amongst persons and that how one serves the needs of others will vary amongst individuals, situations, and communities.

It needs to be noted that this is also an ongoing area of skepticism facing servant leadership because, in the minds of many, the word "servant" or "serve" connotes ideas of class, servitude, and second-place finishers (Hesket, 2013; Russell, 2016). However, Greenleaf did not imply servitude. Instead, Greenleaf places the onus of meeting the needs of people squarely on the shoulders of leaders because leadership positions within organizations naturally create hierarchies; followers exist within the established hierarchical boundaries and are impacted by the behaviors and decisions of leadership. Put another way; leaders positionally hold power and influence over followers. Within said power, one can consciously choose to serve followers' needs. Hence, they grow as persons allowing for empowerment, creativity, and innovation, or ignore the needs of followers and face stagnation, toxicity, turnover, dependency, and idleness (Russell, 2016).

Moreover, the question becomes about evaluating one's behaviors, decisions, and actions. The first pragmatic question becomes a self-evaluation tool regarding one's leadership. Greenleaf (1977/2002) says that one can look to one's followers to see one's effectiveness as a leader by asking oneself whether one's people are growing. For example, a city mayor can self-evaluate or be evaluated by the conditions of their constituents and the state of the communities in which they live.

The second pragmatic question asks, "Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27)? The second question builds upon the first pragmatic question, giving specific benchmarks for the leader to consider. The question is complex, and the individual aspects deserve unpacking. The first, healthier, encompasses physical, psychological, and spiritual health (Russell, 2019). It involves healing people's wounds (Spears, 2010). It is about getting followers from suffering and surviving to thriving. The move is to heal wounds, allowing the person to move from weak and vulnerable to powerful and resilient (Eliot, 2020; Grossman, 2021; Stephens et al., 2019; Wilkinson, 2020). Within the context of PVE, individuals previously engulfed in a spiral of violent extremism, Picciolini (2021) highlights the relevance of addressing health in PVE, stating, "All are correct in that they recognize some form or expression of personal trauma as the primary driver of an individual's descent into extremism" (p. 16). The leader cannot expect followers to thrive or develop resiliency when festering wounds of unresolved traumas are left untreated. The violent extremist recruiter exploits the untreated wounds, wounds servant leaders seek to heal.

Continuing with this question, wiser points to followers envisioning a path utilizing foresight and having the courage and ability to conceptualize new ideas and personal and professional direction (Laub, 2010; Patterson, 2003; Spears, 2010). Wiser is a person growing intellectually, becoming capable of making good choices for themselves and others. Within PVE, wiser means being able to see

through the propaganda and misinformation of the recruiter. In addition, wiser means the individual becomes aware that a path toward violent extremism voids a future full of positive opportunities and meaningful purpose.

The construct freer is free from needing supervision and oversight, and the leader is free from having to directly manage (Russell et al., 2017; Russell, 2016). Freer means followers are eligible to receive the gift of empowerment. Freer means becoming unattached to that which is holding one back. Freer is about the individual's ability to chart their path, realize personal responsibility and self-discipline, and seek a healthy purpose. Freer, in the sense of PVE, is being free from the susceptible fissures recruiters exploit to radicalize the individual.

The aspect of being more autonomous can be summed up in Winston's (2004) work regarding the servant-follower possessing the constructs of self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation. The autonomous individual is one possessing the ability to move forward in a way that can overcome obstacles and adversity. Possessing the gift of autonomy stems from one's opportunity to grow as persons. The wise and autonomous individual is then free to become a servant leader, growing from a fragile to the resilient and capable person and a future servant leader (Eliot, 2020; Picciolini, 2021; Wilkinson, 2020).

The third pragmatic question asks, "What is the effect on the least privileged in society, will they benefit or at least not be further deprived" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27)? This question seemingly points to the heart of PVE. Overwhelmingly, the individuals most susceptible to radicalization and succumbing to the call to violent extremism find themselves lonely, marginalized, lacking community, barely holding on to the lowest rungs of the socioeconomic ladder (Kassab, 2020; Picciolini, 2020). The question seems to be an attempt by Greenleaf to get those in leadership to recognize that their decisions have the most significant impact on the most vulnerable. For example, downsizing public services in a county affects those on the lowest rungs of society. The privileged have many options, i.e., move or seek private services, whereas the least privileged do not (Russell, 2019).

The Scaffolding of Violent Extremism

The scaffolding of violent extremism involves an individual's journey, from a law-abiding citizen to a radicalized believer, to a violent extremist, and for some, a terrorist (Striegher, 2015). The process towards violent extremism generally begins externally, with nefarious individuals identifying vulnerable recruits. The arduous task of radicalization involves getting the radicalized recruit to move to support violent extremism and, finally, for some, becoming a committed, actionable terrorist (Striegher, 2015). This pathway, which can take anywhere from months to years, has been identified as the one most violent extremist has followed (Kassab, 2020). The purpose of PVE is to thwart the ability of those seeking to radicalize individuals, thus addressing conditions conducive to radicalization (UN, 2018) and preventing violent extremist ideology from ever taking hold, as well as strengthening the resiliency of individuals via primarily community-based prevention efforts (Stephens et al., 2019).

Those that recruit for violent extremist organizations look for specific cues and characteristics that can be exploited (Kassab, 2020). They seek young, isolated, marginalized, traumatized, and predominately male targets (Kamali, 2021; Kassab, 2020; Pocciolini, 2020). These characteristics create vulnerabilities that the recruiter seeks because those that are isolated and marginalized seem to be the most susceptible to radicalization for no other reasons than the intrinsic need for identity, purpose, and belonging (Kassab, 2020; Maslow, 1943; Pocciolini, 2020). Most individuals targeted by these recruiters, whether militant-Islamist, white-nationalists, neo-Nazi, separatists, or any other fringe radicalized group, share these vulnerable characteristics and follow the same path towards violent extremism (Blazak, 2001; Kamali, 2021; Kassab, 2020; Pocciolini, 2020; UNODC, 2021).

Radicalization

While not a linear pathway, an individual's radicalization generally begins by exploiting their vulnerable characteristics and introducing a new narrative that sparks what Pocciolini (2020) refers to as their sense of purpose and need for adventure. According to Gerwehr and Daly (2006), there are three critical actions known as "the net, the funnel, and the infection" (p. 76). The net involves the dissemination of propaganda and media in a way that potentially hooks a few individuals within a larger community, getting them to at least sympathize with a cause or an ideology (Gerwehr & Daly, 2006). For instance, in the case of neo-Nazi hate groups, vulnerable youth are manipulated over time by older extremists, continuously exposing them to such propaganda (Blazak, 2001). Similarly, Daesh's, also known as the Islamic State (IS), "narrowcasting" recruitment strategy involves creating propaganda content tailored to suit the needs of specific, niche audiences (Awan, 2017; Speckhard et al., 2018; Wadhwa & Bhatia, 2016; Wired, 2016). Recruiters create a narrative of the other, an invisible enemy for possible recruits to learn to blame for their current conditions in life or what the group gets them to believe are atrocities. The recruiter's goal is to get potential recruits to start believing in the group's ideals, to blame, and ultimately become disgusted with the other.

Gerwehr and Daly (2006) discuss the second key acts as the funnel. In this process, recruiters take a more hands-on approach. They begin to create physical or virtual communities with potential members "by milestones such as hazing rituals and group identity-building exercises" (Gerwehr & Daly, 2006, p. 77; Walther & McCoy, 2021). This process starts to feed a new sense of belonging to those experiencing feelings of isolation and marginalization (Kassab, 2020; Pocciolini, 2020). As Gerwehr and Daly (2006) note, many see through this and leave the process; however, for the recruiters, it is not about getting all the potential members, but rather, the few that show signs of becoming true believers and can be manipulated further. IS' "grooming" process involves gradual manipulation of its niche receptive audiences to gain trust and forge emotional connections mainly via digital access. IS recruiters and ideologues place themselves in the internet forums to gain access to such vulnerable victim populations, learn about their vulnerabilities and interests, and then gradually introduce extremist content and the potential for in-person contact. For instance, one grooming aspect deployed by IS

involves the romantic manipulation of vulnerable women online by employing hyper-masculine images of IS male fighters (Nadel, 2017). The strategy proved consequential in many instances, as men and women were groomed through a "promise of sexual gratification, marriage, and guaranteed income as a glory of fighting" (NiAolain, 2016).

The third action is what Gerwehr and Daly (2006) refer to as the infection. The infection involves an opening within a specific community where a "trusted agent can be inserted into the target population to rally potential recruits through direct, personal appeals" (Gerwehr & Daly, 2006, p. 78). The infection allows these agents to gain the community's trust and be seen as legitimate members, thus giving them direct access to potential recruits (Borum, 2011). Part of PVE is developing communities that are resilient to the infection (Stephens et al., 2019).

Violent Extremism

Over time, and as radicalization takes hold of individuals, some receive a call to action (Rahman, 2018). They desire to go beyond knowing about the cause to become active participants (Carlsson et al., 2020). During radicalization, the individual spends time ingesting propaganda, visiting online chat rooms and message boards, being infused with mis-and disinformation, and growing in hatred for the other (Kassab, 2020). For the recruiter, more information and interaction become helpful to get the individual to become disgusted with the other and support the group's cause (Kassab, 2020). At this point, sympathy for the group's plight is no longer enough; the individual now desires to support violence, seeks retribution, and wants revenge for what they deem wrongdoings (Carlsson et al., 2020; Rahman, 2018). At this level in the process, the individual becomes, at a minimum, a purveyor and, for some, a perpetrator of violence (Becker, 2021). At this stage, the individual experiences change, growing from a radicalized sympathizer to a violent extremist (Becker, 2021; Carlsson et al., 2020; Rahman, 2018).

Striegher (2015) notes that violent extremists justify violence, not necessarily those who personally commit violent acts. Meaning the violent extremist can be one that materially or monetarily supports terrorist groups, produces/disseminates propaganda, or actively recruits others to join the cause (Becker, 2021; Carlsson et al., 2020; Rahman, 2018). Recruitment and propaganda dissemination has proven to be highly rewarding for extremist and terrorist groups of all spectra, with women more markedly leading the way lately (Samuels & Shajkovci, 2022). According to Striegher (2015), the violent extremist is an:

> An individual who justifies the use of violence in pursuit of ideological goals typically does this once they have moved through a process of radicalization that leads to the adoption of violent extremism *as an ideology*, where terrorism is solely the *act* of violence carried out in pursuit of these goals (p.1).

For a subset of violent extremists, their call to action moves them beyond a supportive role of propagandizing and recruiting to becoming actionable terrorists. This is the end stage of the process (Striegher, 2015). The individual reaches a point in their violent extremist journey where they feel they are not doing enough and need to move beyond simply supporting and condoning violence to becoming the

one committing acts of violence against the other in pursuit of their ideology (Striegher, 2015). The shift is fueled by hatred and disgust, the need to stand out, and the desire for what the individual sees as retribution (Carlsson et al., 2020; Kamali, 2021; Pocciolini, 2020).

The Hard-Power and Soft-Power Approaches for PVE

An expanding threat landscape is currently associated with international and domestic violent extremism, including militant Islam, white supremacy, and other fringe right and left ideologies (Federal Bureau of Investigations, 2022; National Counterterrorism Center, 2022). As the Global War on Terror (GWOT) continues, many nations are experiencing their citizens joining violent extremist groups, with some even traveling abroad to become foreign-terrorist-fighters (FTFs) (Morag, 2018; Roy et al., 2020; Speckhard et al., 2018). Equally important, the current Russia-Ukraine war has elevated concerns that global volunteers joining both sides may be linked to white supremacists and violent far-right extremist and terrorist groups (Miller-Idriss, 2022; Shajkovci, 2022). Governments, advocacy groups, and organizations are now seeking a tiered approach for reducing radicalization to prevent future violent extremists, as well as a process for the repatriation of FTFs, and, ultimately, minimizing future acts of terror (Gielen, 2017; Kamali, 2021; Morag, 2018; Roy et al., 2020; Speckhard et al., 2018; UNODC, 2021a).

The argument from many of the governments, groups, and organizations on the front lines of PVE is that issues and problems about PVE need to be addressed using both a hard-power approach and a soft-power approach (Cohen, 2016; Gielen, 2017; Green & Proctor, 2016; Hedayah, 2022; Van Ginkel, 2017; Zeiger et al., 2015). The hard-power approach involves meeting violence with force, hardening vulnerable targets, judicial after-actions such as arrests and incarcerations, and human and signals intelligence gathering (Martin, 2021). The hard-power approach is about antiterrorism, focusing on areas of deterrence, response, stopping an action in its planning stages or in motion, and retaliation for successful violent operations (Roy et al., 2020). The hard-power approach is essential for dealing with violence and terrorism; however, it is its responsibility and focuses that limit its ability to deal with other areas of need, such as preventing radicalization and PVE (Mastoe, 2016). Hence, the call for a second tier, known as a soft-power approach within counterterrorism, focused on prevention (Frazer & Nünlist, 2015; Gielen, 2017; Mastoe, 2016).

The soft-power approach concerns PVE (Cohen, 2016; Green & Proctor, 2016; Hedayah, 2022; Van Ginkel, 2017; Zeiger et al., 2015). Meaning, unlike a hard-power approach needing to focus on enforcement, security, and response, the attention of a soft-power approach is on intervening with vulnerable groups to strengthen marginalized individuals and communities to prevent radicalization from taking hold in the first place and ultimately stopping violence (Frazer & Nünlist. 2015; Kassab, 2020). Thus, PVE is about building resilient individuals and communities (Grossman, 2021). As Grossman (2021) notes, "the international policy focus on resilience as a core feature of counterterrorism and PVE strategies has developed significantly in particular over the last decade" (p. 295). The purpose of the soft-power PVE approach is to formulate and implement policies and

programs that can strengthen the resolve and resiliency of individuals or groups, limit the pool that can be recruited, and get those in the grips of radicalization to turn back from a destructive future of violent extremism (Cohen, 2016; Green & Proctor, 2016; Grossman, 2021; Hedayah, 2022; Van Ginkel, 2017; Zeiger et al., 2015).

Leadership and PVE
PVE policies and programs are matters of leadership - leaders, managers, and administrators – form, take part, and oversee the task forces and committees that develop PVE strategies. Leaders decide what policies to adopt, what programs to fund, what ideas to support, and what initiatives to let go of. It needs to be noted that the more vulnerable the person or the community, the greater the need for a leader to be a steward for others by willingly considering the ramifications of their decisions (Greenleaf, 1977/2002).

Recruiters for violent extremist groups exploit vulnerabilities to their advantage (Kassab, 2020). Vulnerabilities such as broken families, poverty, marginalization, and loneliness, along with the anger and hurt that result from said vulnerabilities, are exploited by recruiters (Kassab, 2020; Pocciolini, 2020). A cornerstone of servant leadership is focusing on the least among us (Greenleaf, 1977/2002). Thus, utilizing a servant leadership lens to evaluate PVE initiatives naturally considers the most vulnerable.

The vulnerabilities, radicalization, and violent extremism are not isolated to one group or a specific set of beliefs. Radicalization and violence exist across spectrums of political and ideological beliefs and demographics (Kamali, 2021). This adds to why servant leadership needs to become a part of the PVE discussion since a servant leadership approach is cross-culturally relevant, influential, and gender-inclusive (Irving, 2010; Reynolds, 2014).

The strategy known as Turning Points provides an example of the relationship between the role of leadership and PVE (Green & Proctor, 2016). The Turning Points Commission co-chairs were former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair and former US Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, two individuals with executive-level leadership experience (Green & Proctor, 2016). Turning Points' global strategy to counter violent extremism was developed by "a bipartisan commission composed of 23 public- and private-sector leaders from technology companies, civil society, the faith community, and academia" (Green & Proctor, 2016, p. VI). For this article, the keyword in this statement is "leaders." At the core of Turning Points' international strategy is a merging of leaders, leadership, leadership judgment, and leadership decision-making, all converging to form a global strategy that considers the lives and well-being of people and communities (Green & Proctor, 2016). Turning Points addresses hard and soft power aspects, putting forth antiterrorism and counterterrorism strategies (Green & Proctor, 2016). Moreover, Turning Points notes the need for shared leadership and empowerment within communities (Green & Proctor, 2016). Again, both shared leadership and empowerment are attributes of servant leadership philosophy (Laub, 2010; Patterson, 2003).

Summary

The need to identify pathways for how servant leadership can become a part of PVE has to do with its effect on nurturing individual resiliency (Eliot, 2020; Wilkinson, 2020). Grossman (2021) argues that PVE needs to be about resiliency to radicalization that comes through empowerment, personal growth, and healthy communities. The idea being strengthening individuals in a way that protects them from the "push-pull" of violent extremism (Cherney et al., 2020, p. 6). As the Turning Points example highlights, PVE policies and programs are the responsibility of leaders (Green & Proctor, 2016). Thus, there seems to be a need for those leading and managing PVE initiatives to demonstrate whether what is being put forth or is currently in practice serves people in a way that fosters growth and resiliency (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Grossman, 2021).

Constructing the Servant Leadership PVE Theoretical Framework

To advance understanding through empirical study within the social sciences, there must first be theoretical and conceptual discoveries, ideas, and frameworks to build the research (Bell, 2008; Shoemaker et al., 2004). Such conceptual discoveries become part of a foundation for constructing future research. One pathway for uncovering emergent conceptual discoveries, ideas, and frameworks within existing social science literature occurs through a secondary analysis of existing empirical and literary works (Bell, 2008; Chang & Phillips, 2014; Heaton, 2008; Shoemaker et al., 2004; Stewart & Kamins, 1992).

The process of secondary analysis involves revisiting, repurposing, and synthesizing existing empirical and literary works across "multidisciplinary phenomena" to answer a central research question (Jabareen, 2009, p. 50). The secondary analysis opens possibilities for discovering novel conceptual ideas and creating new starting points for future discovery or application (Bell, 2008; Heaton, 2008; Stewart & Kamins, 1992). The secondary analysis offers academics, writers, and researchers a systematic inductive reasoning approach to glean deeper meanings and new concepts by looking at and converging existing works through a fresh lens and testing or repurposing concepts with new ideas (Bell, 2008; Chang & Phillips, 2014; Coyne, 1984; Hayes et al., 2010; Jabareen, 2009; Ketokivi & Mantere, 2010; Stewart & Kamins, 1992).

To construct this conceptual framework and address the central question, a systematic secondary analytical approach was employed to identify a possible servant leadership pathway for PVE policy and program evaluation (Cherney et al., 2020; Helmus et al., 2017). The conceptual framework stems from converging empirical and literary works across servant leadership and PVE disciplines (Heaton, 2008; Jabareen, 2009; Shoemaker et al., 2004; Stewart & Kamins, 1992). The first step in the approach involved identifying and utilizing academic databases to acquire servant leadership, and PVE works. The second step involved the application of an analytical, inductive reasoning process that involved converging servant leadership and PVE literature, looking for ideas and themes within the works to identify relationships, overlaps, and commonalities (Coyne, 1984; Hayes et al., 2010; Jabareen, 2009; Ketokivi & Mantere, 2010). The analytical analysis of the literature led to the third step involving the conceptual formulation of a servant

leadership framework for PVE (Bell, 2008; Cousins & Chouinard, 2012; Coyne, 1984; Hayes et al., 2010; Heaton, 2008; Ketokivi & Mantere, 2010; Royse et al., 2015; Shoemaker et al., 2004). This final step involved the write-up of the conceptual framework, presenting the ideas through a rich-descriptive discussion (Bell, 2008; Cousins & Chouinard, 2012; Heaton, 2008; Shoemaker et al., 2004).

DISCUSSION

Violent extremism is marketed to the unsuspecting individual as a means of identity and belonging (Bérubé et al., 2019; Pocciolini, 2020). In essence, recruiters sell their dark desires as an antidote for meeting basic human needs (Maslow, 1943). Kassab (2020) argued, "Terrorism is a symptom of the grand disease of marginalization and injustice, whether real or imagined" (p. 16). At times, an individual's feelings of marginalization and injustice, coupled with thoughts of retribution regarding said injustice, become the fissures recruiters manipulate to access the minds of potential violent extremists (Kassab, 2020). For instance, violent extremist recruiters use images of children killed in a military drone airstrike to spark an individual's desire to seek revenge for what they perceive as an injustice (Kassab, 2020). Recruiters invoke references to "legacies of colonialism," such as the 2003 US invasion of Iraq, or the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, among others, to elicit vengeful reactions from its receptive audiences (Euben, 2015). Recruiters disguise the pathway toward radicalization as a call to adventure (Gendron, 2016; Pocciolini, 2020). Recruiters present their groups' malicious wants and aspirations to the unsuspecting, malleable individual as a means of finding purpose (Gendron, 2016; Kassab, 2020; Pocciolini, 2020; Speckhard & Shajkovci, 2017).

The soft-power approach of PVE partly involves countering individual feelings of marginalization, isolation, injustice, and ostracization. Meaning PVE needs to be about overcoming vulnerabilities. The absence of the vulnerable individual leaves the recruiter without a target (Speckhard & Shajkovci, 2017). To reduce vulnerabilities, people must grow as persons, becoming resilient by finding a healthy identity, a purpose, and a community to belong to (Pocciolini, 2020). This is where servant leadership and PVE converge. Because, to become resilient, a person must grow, central to servant leadership is the question, "Do those served grow as persons" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27).

Much of the servant leadership literature focuses on being a servant leader or the impact of servant leadership on an organization (Autry, 2007; Eva et al., 2019). For instance, how a leader's ability to listen impacts followers (Autry, 2007). The attributes of that leader are measured against a set of characteristics, constructs, and attributes identified as being part of what makes up a servant leader (van Dierendonck & Heeren, 2006). Moreover, as Waterman (2011) notes, the presence and practice of servant leadership behavior have shown to be a net positive to followers, organizations, and communities.

These same positive attributes, constructs, and characteristics can become the makings for measuring not only the individual leader but also the leader's decisions, as well as what policies and programs they choose to put forth and why (van Dierendonck & Heeren, 2006). As noted earlier, policies and programs,

including those specific to PVE, are the responsibility of leadership. Existing policies and programs are byproducts of a leader's decisions. Thus, if said PVE policies and programs need to strengthen an individual's resilience or build community, then seemingly, the very attributes, constructs, and characteristics that measure servant leadership hold promise for measuring whether what a leader puts forth in the form of PVE policies and programs meet the needs of the very people and communities they are intended to help (Cherney et al., 2020; Christmann et al., 2012; Gielen, 2017; Gielen, 2019; Helmus et al., 2017; Malet, 2021).

Throughout the analysis of servant leadership and PVE works, aspects of resiliency, empowerment, and individual growth continuously appeared in the writings. When analyzing the work of Stephens et al. (2019) regarding PVE, the three pragmatic questions of servant leadership become an overlay. The themes identified by Stephens et al. (2019) seem to revolve around a familiar premise, meet the needs of individuals in such a way that they, in turn, can emerge resilient, engaged, productive people, capable of forming and, if need be, leading, healthy communities. These same premises, which meet the needs of individuals and likely to become servant leaders themselves, are fundamental to servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977/2002)

Identifying the Servant Leadership and PVE Comparative Framework

Since the 1970s, scholars have put forth many empirical and literary works building upon Greenleaf's seminal essay, *The Servant as Leader* (Eva et al., 2019). For this framework, multiple servant leadership aspects stemming from various published works are used to highlight the comparison between servant leadership and PVE. It must be noted that what is presented in this discussion are comparative examples of servant leadership and should not be construed as exhaustive.

The Resilient Individual

The resilient individual is the first theme Stephens et al. (2019) identified as needing to be a part of PVE strategies. Table 1 presents the comparison between resiliency and servant leadership.

Table 1

The Resilient Individual

PVE Theme	Comparative Servant leadership Aspects
"The Resilient Individual" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 348)	"Provides opportunities for learning and growth" (Laub, 2010, p. 108)
	"Commitment to the growth of people" (Spears, 2010, p. 19)
	"Servant leadership will have positive consequences for employees' psychological health" (Rivkin, 2014, p. 18)
	"Servant leadership behavior of helping subordinates grow and succeed" (Wilkinson, 2020, p. 154)
	"Servant leadership can have a positive impact on a subordinate's resilience" (Eliot, 2020, p. 412)

Resilient individuals have grown strong in their openness and ability to think (Everly et al., 2012). An individual's resiliency involves having control over their own life and decisions and an inner belief that they both can and deserve to be a healthier, ever-evolving person (Everly et al., 2012). The resilient individual is

optimistic about opportunities and the future and can delay satisfaction for long-term growth and achievement (Everly et al., 2012). Policies and procedures involving PVE must be able to address how they build individual resiliency.

As Stephens et al. (2019) note, resilience is not about placing the burden of growth on the vulnerable but rather "placing primary importance on the social and physical context for enabling positive growth" (p. 356). Thus, PVE policies and programs must address the conditions that foster radicalization and violent extremism and seek to make meaningful changes so that individuals can grow as persons, becoming heather and wiser in the process (Greenleaf, 1977/2002).

Individual Identity

Stephens et al. (2019) identified the concept of identity as something individuals are faced with as a factor that can lead to radicalization and violent extremism. The individual identity, being core to the person, needs both confirmation and acceptance in society. Table 2 presents servant leadership aspects that focus on individuals' identities.

Table 2
Individual Identity

PVE Theme	Comparative Servant leadership Aspects
"Individual Identity" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 350)	"Building up others through encouragement and affirmation (Laub, 2010, p. 108)
	"Provides a platform upon which the unique cultural perspective of leaders and followers may be considered" (Irving, 2010, p. 118)
	"Activation of a prosocial identity within a follower in turn motivates the follower to perform actions consistent with that identity, that is, prosocial actions that benefit the collective "we" of the group" (Liden et al., 2014, p. 15)
	"As servant leader behaviors are by nature prosocial, a strong prosocial identity should predispose individuals to manifest them" (Liden et al., 2014, p. 8)
	"Giving people chances to move into new and more powerful roles by preserving their roots, respecting their value, and preserving their dignity (Patterson, 2003, p. 6)

Identity is core to a person (Pocciolini, 2020). The problem is that many youths are searching for an identity, of being in or out based upon who they are demographically, culturally, or spiritually. One's culture and ancestry are all aspects that make up the individual and are what the young seek to understand about themselves as they journey to discover who they are as persons (Pocciolini, 2020; Stephens et al., 2019).

Identity has been known to be weaponized by violent extremist recruiters, particularly when individuals find themselves being discriminated against or othered. Recruiters use identity as a wedge to separate those being made to feel marginalized for being who they are from the society that seems to be shunning them (Stephens et al., 2019). The more an individual is made to feel unwelcome or ashamed of who they are, the more vulnerable they become to being swept up into a life of violent extremisms to experience an acceptance of their identity (Pocciolini, 2020).

It also needs to be noted that in cases such as white supremacist/neo-Nazi groups, the use of identity is two-fold, the in-group, i.e., radical white identity (Keenan & Greene, 2019), versus a vast set of out-groups, including persons of color, LGBTQ+, and those of Jewish faith and ancestry (Kamali, 2021). White supremacist/neo-Nazi groups adhere to an ideology that they, because of their ancestry, are somehow superior and have the right to dominate and brutalize what they see as others (Pocciolini, 2020). Moreover, these same groups work to convince potential recruits that these other groups are somehow responsible for their current state, i.e., poverty or purposeless (Pocciolini, 2020). For example, identity issues led to the mass killings of innocent people in the Al-Noor Mosque in Christchurch, New Zealand (Besley & Peters, 2020), and the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina (Keenan & Green, 2019). In both cases, radicalized white supremacist/neo-Nazi identity was weaponized against other identities and used to justify violence (Besley & Peters, 2020; Keenan & Green, 2019). Similarly, the Buffalo, NY supermarket mass shooter left a profound digital footprint amassed with similar political and ideological screeds (Anti-Defamation League, 2022).

Dialogue and Action

The third PVE theme identified by Stephens et al. (2019) involves dialogue and action. The idea grounds itself in the need for open spaces for discussion, acceptance, and respect. Table 3 presents the comparison between dialogue and action with servant leadership.

Table 3
Dialogue and Action

PVE Theme	Comparative Servant Leadership Aspects
"Dialogue and Action" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 351)	"Listening" (Spears, 2010, p. 17)
	"By a willingness to learn from others" (Laub, 2010, p. 108)
	"Interpersonal communication mediates the positive effect of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior" (Ezerman & Sintaasih, 2018, p. 29)
	"Dialogue is an essential ingredient to the enactment of servant leadership – one that can be cultivated and enhanced over time" (Gigliotti & Dwyer, 2016, p. 80"

Stephens et al. (2019) highlight one of the critical components of dialogue as "creating the space and opportunity for the exploration and critique of ideologies" (p. 352). Gigliotti and Dwyer (2016) note that open dialogue allows for addressing injustice and serves as a core value of servant leadership. Additionally, Gigliotti and Dwyer (2016) argue that a leader's aspiration to serve the needs of others effectively "hinges upon one's ability and willingness to engage in authentic dialogue" (p. 70). Meaning essential to effective leadership is a desire to know, understand, respect, and appreciate the thoughts and ideas of others, especially those who experience vulnerability, marginalization, and injustice (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Kassab, 2020).

Engaged, Resilient Communities

Stephens et al. (2019) identified strong communities as the fourth theme for PVE initiatives. Stephens et al. (2019) note that communities must be resilient places for people to belong and engage in the PVE process. Table 4 presents aspects of servant leadership as they compare to engaged, resilient communities.

Table 4
Engaged, Resilient Communities

PVE Theme	Comparative Servant leadership Aspects
"Engaged, resilient communities" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 352)	"Building Community" (Spears, 2010)
	"Community helps the person grow" (Greenleaf 1977/2002, p. 51)
	"Only community can give the healing love that is essential for health" (Greenleaf 1977/2002, p. 51)
	"Building strong personal relationships" (Laub, 2010, p. 108)
	"By working collaboratively with others" (Laub, 2010, p. 108)
	"Concern for stakeholders beyond the organization manifests itself for the servant leader in the creating value for the community dimension" (Liden et al., 2014, p. 11)

Resilient communities within PVE involve strengthening communities to create a place to belong, making radicalization seemingly improbable (Stephens et al., 2019). Building community is widely accepted as a core characteristic of a servant leader (Spears, 2010). Greenleaf (1977/2002) talks explicitly about the importance of community in his seminal essay. Greenleaf (1977/2002) argued that a caring community is essential in every aspect of life and belonging, from rehabilitating prisoners into productive members of society to caring for the vulnerable such as the elderly, the sick, and the young. Servant leadership seeks to build a collaborative, welcoming community where stakeholders have a say, and people can belong (Laub, 2010; Liden et al., 2014).

The Servant Leadership PVE Evaluative Framework

The pragmatic questions and identified aspects of servant leadership, coupled with the themes of Stephens et al. (2019), converge to form the evaluative framework for PVE policies and programs. The framework is built to foster reflection on the four identified PVE themes (Stephens et al., 2019, pp. 348-354). The evaluative framework is formulated to understand how a PVE policy or program meets the needs of people and communities. The questions that make up the framework are qualitative in nature, allowing for reflective exploration and explanation as a means of evaluation and understanding (Lub, 2015). The framework scrutinizes PVE policies and programs by using questions of "how" and "what" that require explanation rather than a simple "yes" or "no" or quantitatively "to what degree."

The servant leadership evaluative framework consists of an 8-question reflective questionnaire. Table 5 presents the evaluative framework and the related literature. Each question seeks to elicit a reflective response explaining how a

policy or program meets a specific PVE theme relating to servant leadership (Stephens et al., 2019, pp. 348-354).

Table 5

The Servant Leadership PVE Policy and Program Evaluative Framework

Evaluative Question (Q)	The Relating PVE Theme
Q1: How does this PVE policy or program cultivate an individual's growth as a person (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Spears, 2010)?	"The Resilient Individual" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 348)
Q2: What steps does this PVE policy or program take to promote a person's physical and mental well-being (Eliot, 2020; Laub, 2010; Rivkin, 2014; Wilkins, 2020)?	"The Resilient Individual" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 348)
Q3: How does this PVE policy or program safeguard a person's dignity (Irving, 2010; Liden et al., 2014)?	"Individual Identity" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 350)
Q4: What steps does this PVE policy or program take to respect an individual's culture (Irving, 2010; Laub, 2010; Patterson, 2003)?	"Individual Identity" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 350)
Q5: How were community stakeholders involved in formulating this PVE policy or program (Ezerman & Sintaasih, 2018; Gigliotti & Dwyer, 2016; Laub, 2010; Spears, 2010)?	"Dialogue and Action" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 351)
Q6: What steps were taken to ensure ideas and concerns of individuals were heard and addressed when formulating this PVE policy or program (Ezerman & Sintaasih, 2018; Gigliotti & Dwyer, 2016; Laub, 2010; Spears, 2010)?	"Dialogue and Action" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 351)
Q7: What does this PVE policy or program do to bring people together, build trust, foster opportunity, and strengthen community (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Laub, 2010; Spears, 2010)?	"Engaged, resilient communities" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 352)
Q8: What does this PVE policy or program do to decrease community vulnerability stemming from poverty, marginalization, injustice, and isolation (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Liden et al., 2014)?	"Engaged, resilient communities" (Stephens et al, 2019, p. 352)

This framework becomes a tool in the overall PVE policy and program evaluative toolkit. For example, Cherney et al. (2020) discovered that PVE programs needed to be evaluated to understand how successful they are at "building trust and generating clear lines of communication between stakeholders, community members, clients, and partners" (p. 42). The servant leadership PVE evaluative instrument addresses stakeholders (Q5), building trust (Q7), and communication (Q6). Christmann et al. (2012) noted that individuals experienced feelings of discrimination in their dealings with PVE programs. The servant leadership PVE evaluative framework recognizes this issue by asking PVE leaders and administrators to explain how the policy or program safeguards a person's dignity (Q3) and shows respect for an individual's culture (Q4).

Gielen (2019) argues that PVE policies and programs need to be about "what works, for whom, in what circumstances, and how" (p. 1). The servant leadership PVE evaluative framework considers this and seeks to understand how a policy or program directly affects individuals (Q1) and (Q2) and communities (Q7) and (Q8). The servant leadership PVE evaluative instrument focuses on the

core objective of PVE policies and programs - its effect on people and the community.

CONCLUSION

The weight of PVE decisions, such as what policies and programs are approved, funded, and ultimately implemented, falls upon those individuals with gifted responsibility and authority over others. Meaning at the center of PVE is leadership. Leaders need to recognize that PVE policies and programs are about people and that their decisions as leaders regarding how and what gets implemented directly impact individuals and communities. Thus, to be a trusted and effective steward of a governmental or NGO agency or organization that deals with PVE, leadership must approach decisions around PVE humanistically, understanding that their role is to meet the needs of others.

With the core objective of PVE being what is best for building resilient people and communities, leaders must ask how their actions and decisions impact the needs and growth of others, especially the most vulnerable. The servant leadership PVE evaluative framework approaches the assessment of PVE policies and programs in a way that can answer these questions. In addition, if the evaluative process discovers that a PVE policy or program misses the mark, then leadership, authentically and with humility, can take it to the stakeholders, acknowledge its shortcomings, and collectively work with others to get it right.

The framework and the servant leadership PVE evaluative framework are put forth to understand better whether a policy or a program allows people to "grow as persons," to be "healthier, wiser, freer," and attempts to spotlight the influence a policy or program has on the "least among us" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27). The authors' attempted to formulate the servant leadership PVE and evaluative frameworks by employing a secondary analytical approach. What became the foundation of the framework was the relationship between PVE policies and programs needing to be about nurturing resilient people and communities and the keen human-centered emphasis on servant leadership.

Limitations and Future Research
This article is limited to a secondary analysis of existing literature and the authors' interpretation of the works. The work relied on the authors' use of inductive logic to converge the literature and compare PVE and servant leadership. Future research is needed better to understand the specificities and relationship between the two areas. In addition, future studies are needed to discover the strengths and weaknesses of the servant leadership PVE evaluative framework when used to assess an existing PVE policy or program. With enduring gender stereotypes in the PVE space, gendered expectations of leaders included, future servant leadership evaluative avenues may focus on studying gender roles in achieving organizational goals, serving [local] communities, and empowering people. Given women's increased and proactive role in the prevention space, particularly in recent years (Obiezu, 2021; OSCE 2022), the servant leader framework could prove crucial in

better defining relevant leadership styles across genders and overcoming any prevailing gender stereotypes.

REFERENCES

Alston, J. A. (2005). Tempered radicals and servant leaders: Black females persevering in the superintendency. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 41*(4), 675–688.

Amit, S., & Kafy, A. A. (2022). A systematic literature review on preventing violent extremism. *Journal of Adolescence, 94*(8), 1068-1080.

Anti-Defamation League. (2022). Buffalo shooter's manifesto promotes 'great replacement' theory, antisemitism, and previous mass shooters. https://www.adl.org/resources/blog/buffalo-shooters-manifesto-promotes-great-replacement-theory-antisemitism-and-previous-mass-shooters

Autry, J. A. (2007). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom-line performance*. Currency.

Awan, I. (2017). Cyber-extremism: ISIS and the power of social media. *Society, 54*(2), 138-149.

Barbuto, J. E., & Gifford, G. T. (2010). Examining gender differences of servant leadership: An analysis of the agentic and communal properties of the servant leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Leadership Education, 9*(2), 4–22.

Bérubé, M., Scrivens, R., Venkatesh, V., & Gaudette, T. (2019). Converging patterns in pathways in and out of violent extremism. *Perspectives on Terrorism*, *13*(6), 73-89.

Besley, T., & Peters, M. A. (2020). Terrorism, trauma, tolerance: Bearing witness to white supremacist attack on Muslims in Christchurch, New Zealand. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *52*(2), 109-119.

Bell, D. C. (2008). *Constructing social theory*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Becker, M. H. (2021). When extremists become violent: Examining the association between social control, social learning, and engagement in violent extremism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, *44*(12), 1104-1124.

Blazak, R. (2001). White boys to terrorist men: Target recruitment of Nazi skinheads. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *44*(6), 982-1000.

Borum, R. (2011). Radicalization into violent extremism II: A review of conceptual models and empirical research. *Journal of Strategic Security*, *4*(4), 37-62.

Brady, E., & Marsden, S. (2021). *Women and preventing and countering violent extremism interventions*. United Kingdom. Centre for Research and Evidence on Security Threats.

Brouillette-Alarie, S., Hassan, G., Varela, W., Ousman, S., Kilinc, D., Savard, É. L., & Pickup, D. (2022). Systematic review on the outcomes of primary and secondary prevention programs in the field of violent radicalization. *Journal for Deradicalization*, 30, 117-168.

Carlsson, C., Rostami, A., Mondani, H., Sturup, J., Sarnecki, J., & Edling, C. (2020). A life-course analysis of engagement in violent extremist groups. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *60*(1), 74-92.

Cherney, A., Belton, E., & Koehler, D. (2020). *Program integrity guidelines to inform the design, implementation, and evaluation of PVE initiatives: Guideline review document & program integrity toolkit*. Victoria, Australia. Countering Violent Extremism Unit, Department of Justice, and Community Safety.

Christmann, K., Hirschfield, A., Thomas, P., Gill, S. (2012). *Process Evaluation of preventing violent extremism programs for young people*. Youth Justice Board for England and Wales.

Cheng, H. G., & Phillips, M. R. (2014). Secondary analysis of existing data: Opportunities and implementation. *Shanghai Archives of Psychiatry*, *26*(6), 371.

Cohen, J. D. (2016). The next generation of government CVE strategies at home: Expanding opportunities for intervention. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *668*(1), 118-128.

Cousins, J. B., & Chouinard, J. A. (2012). *Participatory evaluation up close: An integration of research-based knowledge*. IAP.

Coyne, A. (1984). *Introduction to inductive reasoning*. University Press of America.

Dean, C., & Lloyd, M. (2022). Challenging bias in the assessment of extremist offending. In G. Liell, M. Fisher, & L. Jones (Eds.), *Challenging bias in forensic psychological assessment and testing* (pp. 423-438). Routledge.

Dennis, R., & Bocarnea, M. (2007). Servant leadership assessment instrument. In R. Reynolds, R. Woods, & J. Baker (Eds.), *Handbook of research on electronic surveys and measurements* (pp. 339-342). IGI Global.

Eliot, J. L. (2020). Resilient Leadership: The impact of a servant leader on the resilience of their followers. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *22*(4), 404–418.

Euben, L. R. (2015). How violent ISIS videos help mobilize new recruits. *Defense One*.https://www.defenseone.com/threats/2015/08/how-violent-isis-videos-help-mobilize-new-recruits/119098/

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

Everly, G., McCormack, D., & Strouse, D. (2012). Seven characteristics of highly resilient people: Insights from Navy SEALs to the 'Greatest Generation'. *International Journal of Emergency Mental Health*, *14*(2), 137-143.

Ezerman, M. M., & Sintaasih, D. K. (2018). Effect of servant leadership, trust in leadership on organizational citizenship behavior with interpersonal communications as mediation variables. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 20(4)*, 21-30.

Federal Bureau of Investigations. (2022). Terrorism. Washington, D.C. https://www.fbi.gov/investigate/terrorism

Frazer, O., & Nünlist, C. (2015). The concept of countering violent extremism. *CSS Analyses in Security Policy*, *183*.

Frick, D. (2004). *Robert K. Greenleaf: A life of servant leadership*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers

Gendron, A. (2016). The call to jihad: Charismatic preachers and the internet. In *Violent Extremism Online* (pp. 25-44). Routledge.

Gerwehr, S. & Daly, S. (2006). *Al-Qaida: Terrorist selection and recruitment*. RAND CORP. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA604384.pdf

Gielen, A. J. (2017). Evaluating countering violent extremism. *Deradicalization: Scientific Insights for Policy*, 101-118.

Gielen, A. J. (2019). Countering violent extremism: A realist review for assessing what works, for whom, in what circumstances, and how. *Terrorism and political violence*, *31*(6), 1149-1167.

Gigliotti, R. A., & Dwyer, B. (2016). Cultivating dialogue: A central imperative for the study and practice of servant leadership. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, *3*(1), 4.

Green, S., & Proctor, K. (2016). *Turning point: A new comprehensive strategy for countering violent extremism*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Greenleaf, R. (1977/2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Grossman, M. (2021). Resilience to violent extremism and terrorism: A Multisystemic Analysis. In *Multisystemic Resilience* (pp. 293-317). Oxford University Press.

Harland, L., Harrison, W., Jones, J. R., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2005). Leadership behaviors and subordinate resilience. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 11*(2), 2–14.

Hayes, B. K., Heit, E., & Swendsen, H. (2010). Inductive reasoning. *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews: Cognitive science*, *1*(2), 278-292.

Heaton, J. (2008). Secondary analysis of qualitative data: An overview. *Historical Social Research*, 33-45.

Hedayah (2022). Guidelines and good practices for developing national CVE strategies. Abu Dhabi, UAE. https://hedayahcenter.org/resources/

Helmus, T. C., Matthews, M., Ramchand, R., Beaghley, S., Stebbins, D., Kadlec, A., & Acosta, J. D. (2017). *RAND program evaluation toolkit for countering violent extremism*. Rand National Defense Research Institute. Santa Monica, CA.

Heskett, J. (2013). Why isn't servant leadership more prevalent? Harvard Business School. http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/7207.html

Holmer, G., Bauman, P., & Aryaeinejad, K. (2018). Measuring up: Evaluating the impact of P/CVE programs. Washington, DC. United States Institute of Peace.

Irving, J. (2010). Cross-cultural perspectives on servant leadership. In K. Patterson & D. van Dierendonck (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 118-129). Palgrave Macmillan.

Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedure. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *8*(4), 49-62.

Kamali S. (2021). *Homegrown hate: Why white nationalists and militant Islamists are waging war against the United States.* University of California Press.

Kassab, H. S. (2020). *Terrorist recruitment and the international system.* Lexington Books.

Keenan, K., & Greene, A. (2019). Whiteness or resilience? Placing terror by studying the Charleston, South Carolina Mother Emanuel Church shooting. *Urban geography*, *40*(1), 104-127.

Ketokivi, M., & Mantere, S. (2010). Two strategies for inductive reasoning in organizational research. *Academy of management review*, *35*(2), 315-333.

Knight, S., Keatley, D., & Woodward, K. (2022). Comparing the different behavioral outcomes of extremism: A comparison of violent and non-violent extremists, acting alone or as part of a group. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, *45*(8), 682-703.

Koerner, I. B. (2016). Why ISIS is winning the social media war. WIRED. https://www.wired.com/2016/03/isis-winning-social-media-war-heres-beat/

Laub, J. (2010). The servant organization. In K. Patterson & D. van Dierendonck (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 105-117). Palgrave Macmillan.

Lehrke, S., & Sowden, K. (2017). Servant leadership and gender. In Davis (Eds.). *Servant Leadership and Followership* (pp. 25-50). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., & Wayne, S. J. (2014). Servant leadership: Antecedents, processes, and outcomes. In D. Day (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations* (pp. 357-379). Oxford Press.

Liden, C. R., Wayne, J. S., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(2), 161-177.

Lub, V. (2015). Validity in qualitative evaluation: Linking purposes, paradigms, and perspectives. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *14*(5), 1609406915621406.

Malet, D. (2021). Countering violent extremism: assessment in theory and practice. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, *16*(1), 58-74.

Martin, G. (2021). *Understanding terrorism: Challenges, perspectives, and issues 7ᵗʰ ed*. Sage Publishing.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50(4)*, 370-96.

Miller-Idriss, C. (2022). Fighting in Ukraine sadly appeals to racist, far-right extremists. *MSNBC*. https://www.msnbc.com/opinion/msnbc-opinion/fighting-russia-ukraine-sadly-appeals-far-right-extremists-n1290901

Morag, N. (2018). *Comparative homeland security: Global lessons*. John Wiley & Sons.

Nadel, B. (2017). The 'handsome, polite and heroic' ISIS terrorists who groom young girls like pedophiles. *Mirror.* https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/real-life-stories/handsome-polite-heroic-isis-terrorists-10212454

National Counterterrorism Center. (2022). US violent extremist mobilization indicators, (2021ᵉᵈ). McLean, VA. https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did= 863518

Nehlsen, I., Biene, J., Coester, M., Greuel, F., Milbradt, B., & Armborst, A. (2020). Evident and effective? The challenges, potentials, and limitations of evaluation research on preventing violent extremism. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV)*, *14*, 1-20.

NiAolain, F. (2016). Masculinity, jihad, and mobilization. *Political Settlements Research Program.* https://psrpdev.law.ed.ac.uk/psrpx/2016/10/19/ masculinity-jihad-and-mobilization/

Obiezu, T. (2021). Nigerian women lead reintegration of ex-Boko Haram militants. VOA News. https://www.voanews.com/a/africa_nigerian-women-lead-reintegration-ex-boko-haram-militants/6207706.html

OSCE (2022). Non-custodial rehabilitation and reintegration in preventing and countering violent extremism and radicalization that lead to terrorism: A guidebook for policymakers and practitioners in South-Eastern Europe. https://www.osce.org/secretariat/444838

Patterson, K. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3082719)

Picciolini, C. (2020). *Breaking hate: Confronting the new culture of extremism*. Hachette Books.

Rahman, T. (2018). Extreme overvalued beliefs: How violent extremist beliefs become "normalized". *Behavioral Sciences*, *8*(1), 10.

Reynolds, K. (2011). Servant leadership as gender integrative leadership: Paving a path for more gender-integrative organizations through leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Education, 10*(2), 155-171.

Reynolds, K. (2014). Servant leadership: A feminist perspective. *International Journal of Servant Leadership (10)*1, 35-63.

Rivkin, W., Diestel, S., & Schmidt, K. H. (2014). The positive relationship between servant leadership and employees' psychological health: A multi-method approach. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, *28*(1-2), 52-72.

Roy, M. I., Nawab, M. W., & Rafique, S. (2020). The United States counterterrorism strategy 2001-2020 (evolution, prospects, and challenges). *Orient Research Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*(1), 56-70.

Royse, D., Thyer, B. A., & Padgett, D. K. (2015). *Program evaluation: An introduction to an evidence-based approach*. Cengage Learning.

Russell, E. (2019). *In command of guardians: Executive servant leadership for the community of responders, 2ⁿᵈ Ed*. Springer Nature.

Russell, E. (2016). Servant leadership's cycle of benefit. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice, 3*(1), 52-68.

Russell, E., Maxfield, J., & Russell, J. (2017). Discovering the self-interest of servant leadership. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice, 4*(1), 75-97.

Samuels, S., & Shajkovci, A. (2021). Far-right violent extremist women: Threats and security considerations. *Women & Criminal Justice. 33*(3) 221-240.

Scicluna-Lehrke, A., & Sowden, K. (2017). Servant leadership and gender. In C. Davis, *Servant leadership and followership: Examining the impact on workplace behavior* (pp. 25-50). Palgrave Macmillan

Shajkovci, A., & McDowell-Smith. (Under publication review, 2022). Foreign fighter volunteers in Ukraine and the threat of violent extremism and terrorism.

Shim, D. C., Park, H. H., & Eom, T. H. (2016). Public servant leadership: Myth or powerful reality? *International Review of Public Administration*, *21*(1), 3-20.

Shoemaker, P., Tankard, J., & Lasorsa. D. (2004). *How to build social science theories*. Sage Publishing.

Spears, L. (2010). Servant leadership and Robert K. Greenleaf's legacy. In K. Patterson & D. van Dierendonck (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 11-24). Palgrave Macmillan.

Speckhard, A., & Shajkovci, A. (2017). Drivers of radicalization and violent extremism in Kosovo: Women's roles in supporting, preventing & fighting violent extremism. *International Center for the Study of Violent Extremism.*

Speckhard, A., Shajkovci, A., & Yayla, A. S. (2018). Defected from ISIS or simply returned, and for how long? Challenges for the west in dealing with returning foreign fighters. *Homeland Security Affairs*, *14*.

Speckhard, A., Shajkovci, A., Wooster, C., & Izadi, N. (2018). Engaging English-speaking Facebook users in an anti-ISIS awareness campaign. *Journal of Strategic Security, 11*(3), 52-78.

Stephens, W., Sieckelinck, S., & Boutellier, H. (2019). Preventing violent extremism: A review of the literature. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, *44*(4), 346-361.

Stewart, D, & Kamins, M. (1992). *Secondary research: Information sources and methods*. Sage Publishing.

Striegher, J. L. (2015). Violent-extremism: An examination of a definitional dilemma. https://ro.ecu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://scholar. google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C45&q=The+Nature+of+violent+Extremism&btnG=&httpsredir=1&article=1046&context=asi

UNODC (2021). Radicalization and violent extremism. https://www.unodc.org/ e4j/en/terrorism/module-2/keyisues/radicalization-violent-extremism.html

UN (2022). Preventing violent extremism. https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/ preventing-violent-extremism

Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26,* 249-267.

Van Dierendonck, D., & Heeren, I. (2006). Toward a research model of servant leadership. *The International Journal of Servant Leadership*, *2*(1), 147-164.

Van Ginkel, B. (2017). Countering and preventing the threat of terrorism and violent extremism: From the international and European to the national and local levels. *Resilient Cities, Countering Violent Extremism at Local Level. In cooperation with CIDOB (Barcelona Center for International Affairs), University of St. Andrews and Europe for Citizens. Barcelona*, 29-35.

Varra, L., Buzzigoli, C., & Loro, R. (2012). Innovation in destination management: Social dialogue, knowledge management processes and servant leadership in the tourism destination observatories. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *41*, 375-385.

Wadhwa, P., & Bhatia, M.P.S. (2016). New metrics or dynamic analysis of online radicalization. *Journal of Applied Security Research, 11*(2), 166-184.

Walther, S., & McCoy, A. (2021). US extremism on Telegram: Fueling disinformation, conspiracy theories, and accelerationism. *Perspectives on Terrorism, 15*(2), 100-124.

Waterman, H. (2011). Principles of 'servant leadership' and how they can enhance practice. *Nursing Management*, *17*(9), 24-26.

Wilkinson, A. D. (2020). *Investigating the relationship between servant leadership and employee resilience* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana Wesleyan University).

Winston, B. (2003). Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Explaining how leaders and followers interact in a circular model. *Regent University Servant Leadership Roundtable. Regent University*.

Wong, P. T., Davey, D., & Church, F. B. (2007). Best practices in servant leadership. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, School of Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship, Regent University*, *7*(1), 1.

Zeiger, S., Aly, A., Neumann, P. R., El Said, H., Zeuthen, M., Romaniuk, P., & Younis, A. (2015). *Countering violent extremism: Developing an evidence-base for policy and practice*. Melbourne, Australia. Analysis & Policy Observatory.