BLESS YOUR HEART

A Secular Guide to Servant Leadership

Vered Siegel, CFRE
Principal, Seagull Partners

Executive Summary

Servant leadership has become one of the most widely accepted and least interrogated leadership models in the nonprofit sector. It is frequently invoked as shorthand for ethical, values-driven leadership, particularly in mission-oriented organizations.

Yet its popularity has outpaced serious examination of its origins, assumptions, and real-world consequences…and servant leadership, despite its good intentions and intuitive appeal, is a poor fit for secular organizations and increasingly misaligned with the structural, equity, and governance realities facing nonprofits today.

That poor fit is because servant leadership is not a neutral or universal framework. It is rooted in theological and moral constructs that emerge from Christian traditions[1] emphasizing humility, sacrifice, and service as markers of virtue.

When imported uncritically into secular, pluralistic organizations, these constructs function less as leadership guidance and more as moral framing. This framing quietly normalizes non-universal cultural values, elevates intention over impact, and obscures the actual mechanics of power and accountability inside organizations.

In practice, servant leadership tends to substitute personal virtue for organizational design. Leaders are encouraged to "serve" their teams, organizations, and missions, but far less attention is paid to clarifying decision rights, governance responsibilities, boundaries, and systems of accountability. The result is a leadership culture that relies on individual moral performance rather than durable structures, leaving organizations vulnerable to burnout, role confusion, and governance failure.

Further, servant leadership reinforces inequitable labor expectations, particularly in the nonprofit sector. The behaviors most valorized by the model (e.g. emotional availability, caretaking, self-sacrifice, and overextension) are disproportionately expected of women, people of color, and others already subject to unequal workplace demands. Framed as

---

[1] "But I'm a Christian leader! Are you asking me to abandon my principles?"

Servant leadership can still function effectively as a theological ethic within Christian institutions. The difficulty arises when it is presented as a secular management philosophy rather than as a faith-informed leadership practice. See Appendix for more on this.

virtue, this labor is frequently uncompensated, unacknowledged, and structurally unsupported.

Servant leadership also risks masking power rather than distributing it. By casting leaders as benevolent servants, the model can make authority feel morally insulated from critique. Decisions are justified by intent rather than examined through transparent governance processes.

We offer:

1. A critical analysis of servant leadership's origins and assumptions.
2. An examination of sector-specific consequences.
3. A roadmap for adopting leadership approaches centered on accountability, pluralism, and systems thinking.

Servant leadership has long been treated as a moral good. **We invite readers to ask a tough question: good for whom, and at what cost?**

Introduction: Why This Paper, Why Now?

The nonprofit sector is experiencing a sustained leadership crisis. Executive burnout, turnover, staffing shortages, and governance failures have become defining features of the field.

Many explanations focus on individual resilience: leaders need better self-care, better training, or stronger emotional capacity.

But this framing obscures the structural reality that, when subject to a servant leadership framework, nonprofit leaders are frequently expected to absorb unsustainable levels of responsibility without clear authority or systems.

"Nonprofit leaders are frequently expected to absorb unsustainable levels of responsibility without clear authority or systems."

At the same time, alternative leadership models such as adaptive leadership, shared leadership, and systems-based governance are gaining traction. These frameworks emphasize organizational design, decision rights, and collective responsibility rather than personal virtue.

And simultaneously, organizations are reexamining the cultural assumptions embedded in professional norms. Leadership philosophies are increasingly understood as carriers of cultural values and power structures.

In that context, servant leadership and other leadership models rooted in specific theological traditions deserve renewed scrutiny.

The Problem

"Servant leadership" has become shorthand for benevolent leadership across the nonprofit sector. It is widely used in job descriptions, leadership training programs, and board conversations.

Yet the model functions more as a moral narrative than a practical governance framework. Its language, e.g. service, sacrifice, humility, and stewardship, reflects

theological traditions that resonate in Christian faith-based settings but are less appropriate in secular organizations committed to pluralism.

More importantly, the model centers identity rather than structure. Leaders are judged by their perceived humility rather than by the systems they build or the power they exercise.

As a result:

1	Governance responsibilities are blurred	2	Emotional labor is moralized	3	Power softened rhetorically, but still centralized operationally

By interrogating the historical roots and practical consequences of this leadership framework, we can find ways to move our sector beyond ill-fitting assumptions and towards examined, intentional structures that better enable advancement professionals and the work we do.

The Origins of Servant Leadership

The contemporary concept of servant leadership is most commonly traced to Robert K. Greenleaf's 1970 essay *The Servant as Leader*. In that essay, Greenleaf proposed a deceptively simple premise: the most legitimate leaders are those who begin with a desire to serve rather than a desire to lead. Leadership, in this formulation, emerges as a natural extension of service rather than as the pursuit of authority, status, or institutional power.

Greenleaf's argument was not primarily concerned with organizational structure or governance design. Instead, it was rooted in questions of moral orientation and character.

The test of leadership, he suggested, was whether those being led became "healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous," and more inclined themselves to serve. Leadership legitimacy therefore flowed from the leader's internal disposition and external moral modeling rather than from formal authority, positional power, or institutional accountability.

Humanist Yes, Secular No

Although Greenleaf framed his work in broadly humanistic terms, **the language and assumptions embedded in his writing draw heavily from Christian ethical traditions**. Concepts such as humility, stewardship, sacrifice, and service—axiomatic values within Christian-centered theology, philosophy, and community but not universal outside those contexts—are central not merely as metaphors but as moral anchors for the model itself.

The leader's authority is justified through self-effacement: the willingness to place others' needs first, to accept personal cost, and to subordinate ambition to the well-being of followers.

> Nonprofits depend heavily on moral legitimacy to justify their existence.

This emphasis on moral posture rather than organizational mechanics proved deeply appealing, particularly in sectors already predisposed to view leadership through an ethical lens. Greenleaf's framework suggested that the health of an institution could be secured not primarily through systems or structures, but through the character of the person at its helm. If the leader were sufficiently committed to service, the organization would follow suit.

It is therefore not surprising that nonprofit organizations proved especially receptive to the model. Long before Greenleaf articulated servant leadership as a leadership theory, nonprofits (particularly those rooted in social services) were already steeped in the language of service. Staff were often described as answering a "calling," working for mission rather than profit, and contributing to the public good. Greenleaf's ideas did not so much introduce new values as give formal leadership vocabulary to values that were already culturally embedded within the sector.

A Bridge Too Far

But it's one thing for a professional community to resonate with Christian values. It's another thing entirely to assume, enshrine, and operationalize those values. And that's exactly what the sector did.

As nonprofit leadership professionalized in the late twentieth century, servant leadership gained further traction through leadership institutes, executive education programs, and consulting firms working within philanthropy and the social sector. The establishment of the Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership helped institutionalize the framework, promoting it through publications, conferences, and training programs that translated Greenleaf's philosophical reflections into leadership guidance for boards and executives.

Christian faith-based organizations played an important role in this diffusion. In religiously-affiliated nonprofits such as hospitals, schools, and social service agencies, the theological echoes in servant leadership were not incidental but affirming. The model aligned comfortably with Christian religious teachings about humility, service, and moral responsibility. Through shared professional networks and leadership pipelines, these ideas gradually migrated into secular nonprofit spaces as well.

As servant leadership traveled across institutional contexts, the explicitly religious language that undergirded it was often softened or omitted. What remained intact, however, was the moral architecture of the model. Leadership continued to be framed as service; authority continued to be justified through sacrifice; and ethical legitimacy continued to be located in the leader's personal orientation rather than in institutional design.

In this sense, servant leadership became a kind of secularized theology; religious in origin but presented as broadly applicable to any organization committed to ethical practice.

A Uniquely Sticky Situation for Nonprofits

The durability of servant leadership within the nonprofit sector can be explained in part by how effectively it addressed several narrative needs. Nonprofits depend heavily on moral legitimacy to justify their existence. Unlike commercial enterprises, they cannot rely on market success as the primary measure of their value. Instead, they draw authority from the perception that they act in pursuit of social good. Framing leadership itself as an act of service reinforced this moral identity and helped align organizational authority with the sector's broader ethical narrative.

Servant leadership also emerged at a time when hierarchical and command-and-control leadership styles were increasingly criticized. As nonprofits adopted more formal management practices, many leaders were wary of appearing corporate or bureaucratic.

Servant leadership offered a softer alternative: one that preserved authority while rejecting the overt language of control.

Finally, the model resonated deeply with the emotional motivations that draw many individuals to nonprofit work in the first place. People who choose careers in the helping professions often do so out of a desire to contribute, care, and make a difference. Servant leadership validated these motivations by framing selflessness not as naïveté but as leadership strength.

Taken together, these dynamics allowed servant leadership to become more than a theory. It became a cultural norm. Over time, it embedded itself in how nonprofits describe effective leadership, evaluate executives, and socialize emerging leaders into the field. Because the model is framed in explicitly moral terms, questioning it can feel tantamount to questioning kindness or commitment to mission itself.

Yet it is precisely this moral insulation that makes the model difficult to interrogate. What began as a philosophically appealing reflection on ethical leadership has gradually hardened into an assumed standard; one whose origins, cultural assumptions, and practical consequences often go unexamined. Understanding how servant leadership emerged and why it spread is therefore a necessary first step in assessing whether it remains an appropriate framework for the complex, pluralistic organizations nonprofits have become.

Structural Problems with Servant Leadership

The appeal of servant leadership lies in its moral clarity. It promises leadership that is humble, caring, and ethically grounded: an appealing contrast to models associated with hierarchy, ego, or domination.

Yet when examined in practice, servant leadership reveals a set of structural problems that are not incidental to the model but embedded within its assumptions.

When organizations rely on servant leadership as a guiding philosophy, these problems tend to surface repeatedly across governance, workplace dynamics, and leadership sustainability.

Archetype – Not Quite a "Culture Fit"

Anika was hired because of her reputation as a strong, decisive leader. But once hired, she was told she was "not warm enough," and "a bit direct."

She delivered results, built systems, and made clear decisions. But she did not perform humility in the way her organization expected. She did not soften authority with self-effacement or frame decisions as acts of service. Over time, the message became clear: her leadership style was effective, but misaligned.

Misaligned with what?

One of the most immediate tensions emerges from the **cultural assumptions embedded in the model's moral language**. Servant leadership relies heavily on terms such as "service," "humility," "stewardship," and "sacrifice," all of which resonate strongly within Christian ethical traditions.

While these ideas may feel broadly appealing, they are not culturally neutral. They reflect a specific moral framework that carries implicit expectations about how authority should be exercised and how leaders should present themselves.

In pluralistic workplaces, treating these values as universal risks normalizing Christian-coded moral expectations as professional norms. Employees whose cultural traditions frame leadership differently may find themselves subtly out of alignment with the implicit moral ideal of the "servant leader."

Even when religious language is softened or omitted, the underlying moral grammar remains intact. Leadership becomes associated with self-effacement and sacrifice, while other expressions of authority risk being interpreted as arrogance, distance, or lack of care. In this way, servant leadership can inadvertently reproduce cultural hegemony while presenting itself as inclusive.

Archetype – The Shield of Good Intentions

Javier made every major decision himself. He justified each one as an act of service: protecting staff from uncertainty, shielding the organization from risk, carrying the burden so others wouldn't have to.

When his staff asked for more input, Javier reminded them that he was trying to make things easier for everyone. The more he emphasized his "good" intentions, the harder it became to question his authority.

If power is always exercised "for others," who gets to examine how it is used?

A second structural problem arises from the way servant leadership **moralizes authority rather than clarifying how power operates within organizations**. Because the model centers the leader's intention to serve, it shifts attention away from governance structures and toward personal virtue. Leaders are evaluated primarily on their humility, empathy, and dedication to others.

While these qualities are valuable, they do not substitute for systems that define decision rights, establish accountability, or distribute authority, and focusing too much on individual morality risks ignoring and thus perpetuating immoral systems.

And when leadership legitimacy rests on perceived virtue, critique becomes more difficult. Questioning a leader's decisions may feel like questioning their motives or character. In organizations that already emphasize mission and values (i.e. nonprofits), this dynamic can make accountability appear adversarial or ungrateful. The moral framing of leadership softens the *appearance* of power without changing its underlying distribution.

Empirical research on servant leadership has repeatedly documented a gap between rhetoric and experience. Leaders may describe themselves as empowering and service-oriented, yet decision-making authority often remains centralized. The language of service provides reassurance that power is being exercised benevolently, but it does little to alter the structural realities of organizational authority. As a result, servant leadership can function as a narrative that legitimizes power rather than as a framework that redistributes it.

Archetype – The Benevolent Autocrat

CEO Thomas spoke constantly about servant leadership, but he did not ask for consensus. He saw it as his responsibility to make the hard decisions others could not.

When staff pushed back, he listened patiently but reminded them that leadership required seeing the bigger picture. Not everyone could understand what was at stake. His authority was not framed as preference, but as obligation.

If leadership is a duty to decide for others, who gets to decide differently?

Closely related to this dynamic is the model's tendency to **reinforce paternalistic forms of leadership**. Servant leadership encourages leaders to act "for the good" of others, positioning them as caretakers of organizational well-being.

While this posture may be well intentioned, it can preserve traditional hierarchies by framing authority as protective rather than directive. Leaders continue to make key decisions, but those decisions are presented as acts of service rather than exercises of power.

This dynamic has important consequences for how disagreement is handled within organizations. Because servant leadership is morally framed, dissent can be interpreted as resistance to care or gratitude rather than as legitimate critique. Staff who challenge decisions may be perceived as misaligned with organizational values rather than engaged in healthy debate.

Over time, this dynamic discourages open dialogue and weakens participatory governance. Authority remains intact, but the social norms around questioning it become more restrictive.

Archetype – The Invisible Woman

Supriya noticed she was expected to be responsive in ways her male leadership peers were not. She checked in on team dynamics, mediated disagreements, remembered personal details, and made space for others' emotions. Her peers did not.

When she pulled back, the feedback was immediate: less engaged, less supportive, less of a team player. Her male colleagues were praised for focus and efficiency. Supriya was praised for care...until she stopped performing it.

When does care become a requirement, and for whom?

Another significant structural issue is the **inequitable distribution of emotional labor within organizations**. Servant leadership elevates traits such as empathy, attentiveness, relational maintenance, and emotional availability as central components of effective leadership.

These traits are undeniably valuable in collaborative environments. However, sociological and feminist scholarship has long demonstrated that emotional labor is not distributed evenly across workplaces.

Women, people of color, and other marginalized employees are often expected to perform greater amounts of relational work. They mediate conflict, mentor colleagues, absorb emotional tension, and maintain team cohesion. When servant leadership frames these behaviors as leadership virtues, it risks institutionalizing expectations that already fall disproportionately on certain groups.

The result is a form of moralized labor inequality. Emotional work becomes invisible because it is framed as virtue rather than as effort. Those who perform it most consistently may be praised for their "servant leadership," yet the additional time, energy, and psychological strain involved are rarely acknowledged structurally through compensation, staffing, or workload adjustments. Meanwhile, individuals who decline or limit such labor may be judged as insufficiently collaborative or insufficiently committed.

Archetype – The Burnt-Out Executive

Executive Director Maria modeled relentless service and personal sacrifice. She covered open roles when staff left, answered emails late into the night, and stepped in to fix problems before they surfaced. Over time, the organization become dependent on her availability.

When she eventually burned out and resigned, the organization discovered it had built no sustainable systems.

Who was Maria serving?

Finally, servant leadership can inadvertently encourage **burnout as a leadership style**. Because the model valorizes selflessness and service, it creates a cultural environment in which overwork is interpreted as dedication rather than as a warning sign of systemic failure. Leaders who respond to every request, remain constantly available, and absorb institutional strain personally are often praised as exemplary servant leaders.

Over time, however, this dynamic becomes unsustainable. When organizations depend on personal sacrifice rather than on well-designed systems, they create fragile leadership structures that collapse when individuals inevitably reach their limits. Boundary-setting, delegation, and prioritization, the core competencies for sustainable leadership, can appear inconsistent with the ethos of endless service. Leaders may feel compelled to demonstrate commitment through personal depletion rather than through strategic clarity.

Operational Consequences for Secular Nonprofit Organizations

The cumulative effect of these dynamics is significant. Servant leadership does not simply encourage kindness or ethical awareness; it reshapes how organizations understand authority, labor, and responsibility. By locating ethical legitimacy primarily in personal virtue, it diverts attention from the structural conditions that make organizations healthy or unhealthy.

Once the servant leadership model is embedded in organizational culture, its structural limitations manifest in predictable institutional consequences that affect governance, workplace equity, strategic capacity, and leadership sustainability. For secular nonprofit organizations, where moral narratives about mission and service are already deeply embedded, these consequences can be particularly pronounced.

Board oversight and organizational governance systems weaken

Workplace inequities around emotional labor reinforced

Difficult decisions deferred or softened

Burnout and turnover increase

Governance Consequences

One of the most common and significant effects is a **breakdown of organizational governance**.

In theory, nonprofit governance depends on a clear division of responsibility between boards and executive leadership, with boards exercising fiduciary oversight and executives managing the operational execution of mission.

Servant leadership can blur this relationship by encouraging boards to place disproportionate trust in the moral intentions of leaders rather than in the strength of governance systems.

When executives are framed primarily as selfless servants of mission and community, questioning their decisions can feel uncomfortable or even disloyal. Board members may hesitate to exercise oversight that could be perceived as adversarial. Instead of relying on clearly defined governance processes (regular evaluation, structured accountability, and explicit decision rights) boards may rely on confidence in the leader's character. In these circumstances, governance gradually shifts from a system of institutional checks and balances to a relationship grounded in personal trust.

This dynamic can become especially complicated in organizations with significant philanthropic support. Donor influence is an unavoidable reality in many nonprofit environments, yet servant leadership rhetoric can obscure the ways in which donor priorities shape organizational decisions. Requests from major supporters may be framed as opportunities for stewardship or service rather than as expressions of power within the institution.

When authority is narrated primarily through moral language, it becomes harder to distinguish between mission-driven decisions and those driven by external influence.

Equality and Fairness Consequences

Beyond governance, servant leadership can also **reinforce nonprofit workforce inequities**. Structurally, the model valorizes forms of emotional and relational labor (i.e. empathy, responsiveness, conflict mediation, and team caretaking) that are already distributed unevenly across workplaces.

In many organizations, the operational consequence is that employees who are closest to communities served, who hold programmatic or operational roles, or who occupy marginalized social identities perform disproportionate amounts of this work.

And because servant leadership frames these behaviors as virtues rather than responsibilities, the labor involved often remains invisible at the structural level. It is rarely reflected in job descriptions, staffing models, or compensation structures. Instead, it becomes an implicit expectation that certain individuals will absorb the relational strain that accompanies mission-driven work.

Over time, this pattern reinforces existing inequalities, as those who carry the greatest emotional burden are also the least likely to receive recognition or relief from it.

Strategic Consequences

These dynamics also have consequences for organizational strategy. Servant leadership's emphasis on humility and harmony can make leaders reluctant to engage in the kinds of conflict that strategic decision-making often requires.

Nonprofit organizations regularly face difficult trade-offs: choosing which programs to expand or discontinue, determining where limited resources should be invested, or confronting underperforming initiatives. These decisions inevitably create tension among stakeholders who care deeply about the mission.

Within a culture shaped by servant leadership, leaders may feel **pressure to soften or defer decisions** in order to maintain relational harmony. Hard conversations are postponed, disagreements are reframed as misunderstandings, and strategic priorities are adjusted to accommodate competing expectations.

While these responses may preserve short-term cohesion, they can also produce long-term stagnation when organizations drift toward reactive decision-making, responding to immediate pressures rather than pursuing coherent strategic direction.

Staffing and Human Capital Consequences

Perhaps the most visible consequence of servant leadership in the nonprofit sector, however, is its relationship to **burnout and leadership turnover**. The model's emphasis on selflessness and service can gradually normalize a style of leadership built on personal sacrifice. Leaders who are constantly available, who absorb organizational strain, and who prioritize others' needs above their own are often praised as embodying the highest ideals of servant leadership.

Over time, this dynamic creates an implicit expectation that effective leadership requires extraordinary personal endurance. Executives may feel compelled to demonstrate commitment through long hours, constant responsiveness, and emotional availability to staff, donors, and stakeholders alike. What begins as dedication slowly becomes martyrdom.

The result is a growing disconnect between the values organizations claim to uphold and the experiences of the people who work within them. Nonprofits often speak eloquently about care, sustainability, and human dignity. Yet when leadership cultures reward exhaustion and

normalize overextension, those values are difficult to sustain in practice. Staff observe the gap between rhetoric and reality, and trust in institutional commitments begins to erode.

Burnout and turnover are therefore not merely personal outcomes: they are organizational signals. They indicate that leadership expectations have become misaligned with human capacity and structural support. When servant leadership is treated as a cultural ideal, these signals can be misinterpreted as individual shortcomings rather than as evidence of systemic design flaws.

* * *

Taken together, these consequences reveal an important truth: servant leadership does not simply influence how leaders behave. It shapes how organizations understand authority, responsibility, and care. When the model becomes deeply embedded in nonprofit culture, it can unintentionally weaken governance, exacerbate workplace inequities, constrain strategic decision-making, and accelerate leadership burnout.

For secular nonprofit organizations facing increasing complexity and accountability demands, these outcomes suggest that the costs of relying on servant leadership as a guiding philosophy may be higher than its advocates often acknowledge.

Toward a Post-Servant Leadership Framework

If servant leadership's central limitation lies in its tendency to moralize leadership rather than structure it, then moving beyond the model requires a corresponding shift in how organizations conceptualize ethical authority.

The alternative is not a return to rigid hierarchy or technocratic management. Rather, it is a framework that relocates ethical responsibility from the character of individual leaders to the design of the institutions they lead.

In such a framework, leadership is judged less by expressions of humility or self-sacrifice and more by the clarity, sustainability, and fairness of the systems leaders build and maintain.

Ground Leadership in Obligations and Outcomes

This shift begins with a reorientation toward **role ethics**. Within many servant leadership frameworks, the moral standing of the leader becomes central to evaluating leadership itself. Humility, empathy, and selflessness are treated as evidence of ethical legitimacy. While these traits may contribute to healthy relationships, they do not provide a reliable basis for governing complex organizations.

A role-based ethical approach instead grounds leadership in the obligations and responsibilities attached to specific positions. Leaders are evaluated according to how effectively they fulfill those responsibilities: making decisions within clearly defined authority, accepting accountability for outcomes, and stewarding organizational resources in ways that advance mission and institutional stability.

Viewing leadership through the lens of role ethics also helps decouple morality from personality. Leaders no longer need to perform self-effacement in order to signal their integrity. Instead, ethical leadership becomes visible through consistent behaviors: transparent decision-making, responsible delegation, and the willingness to subject one's actions to institutional oversight. This shift protects organizations from the risks associated with moral hero narratives while also protecting leaders from the pressure to embody virtue as a personal identity.

> “Servant leadership's emphasis on humility and harmony can make leaders reluctant to engage in the kinds of conflict that strategic decision-making often requires.”

Acknowledge Authority

A second component of a post-servant leadership framework involves **naming power explicitly rather than minimizing it rhetorically**. Servant leadership often attempts to soften authority by framing leaders primarily as servants of others.

While this gesture may be intended to counteract authoritarian tendencies, it can also obscure how authority actually functions. In practice, leaders still make decisions that affect resources, priorities, and people's livelihoods. Pretending that these decisions are not

exercises of power does little to democratize them; it merely makes the dynamics surrounding them less visible.

A healthier approach treats power as an unavoidable feature of organizational life that must be exercised transparently and responsibly. Leaders are expected to acknowledge the authority they hold, explain how decisions are made, and create mechanisms through which those decisions can be questioned or revisited. Power, in this sense, becomes a responsibility rather than a moral liability. By making authority visible, organizations allow employees and stakeholders to understand where decisions originate and how accountability operates.

Center Accountability

This emphasis on transparency naturally leads to a renewed appreciation for **governance as an ethical system**. In servant leadership cultures, ethics are frequently located in the intentions of leaders rather than in the procedures that regulate institutional behavior.

Yet durable organizations depend on governance structures that make accountability routine rather than exceptional. Boards establish oversight, define strategic direction, and ensure that executives are evaluated through agreed-upon processes. When these mechanisms function well, ethical responsibility becomes embedded in institutional design rather than dependent on personal virtue.

Reframing governance in this way also changes how organizations interpret accountability. Instead of viewing oversight as a sign of distrust, it becomes an expression of care for the institution and its stakeholders. Leaders are not expected to prove their moral worthiness through endless service; they are expected to participate in systems that subject everyone (including themselves) to clear standards and review.

Professionalize Care

A post-servant leadership framework must also confront the question of **care within organizations**. One of the legitimate insights of servant leadership is that workplaces are not purely transactional environments. Human relationships matter, and leadership that ignores the emotional dimensions of work can produce alienation and disengagement. The challenge lies in ensuring that care does not become synonymous with personal sacrifice.

In practice, this means relocating care from individual behavior to organizational design. Workloads are structured to reflect realistic expectations. Emotional labor such as mentoring, conflict mediation, and community engagement is recognized as legitimate work rather than informal goodwill. Compensation structures and staffing models reflect the full range of labor required to sustain mission-driven organizations. When care is embedded structurally rather than morally, it becomes more equitable and more sustainable.

Advance the Mission

Finally, a post-servant leadership approach reclaims **strategy as an ethical practice**. Nonprofit leaders frequently face difficult choices about priorities, resource allocation, and programmatic direction. These decisions inevitably involve competing values and constituencies. Servant leadership's emphasis on harmony can make leaders hesitant to confront such tensions directly, yet avoiding conflict rarely resolves it.

> Ethical organizations are built...through systems that distribute responsibility, clarify authority, and support sustainable human effort.

Ethical leadership requires the ability to articulate clear priorities, tolerate disagreement, and make decisions that may disappoint some stakeholders while advancing the broader mission. Strategic clarity is not a betrayal of service; it is an expression of responsibility to the organization's purpose and to the communities it seeks to support. Leaders who approach strategy with openness, transparency, and a willingness to engage difficult conversations model a form of accountability that does not rely on personal sacrifice as proof of commitment.

* * *

The most meaningful alternative to servant leadership is not another personality-driven model but a structural one. Ethical organizations are built not through the cultivation of morally exceptional leaders, but through systems that distribute responsibility, clarify authority, and support sustainable human effort. In such environments, leadership becomes less about embodying virtue and more about designing institutions capable of carrying out their missions with integrity over time.

Moving On from Servant Leadership

For many nonprofit organizations, servant leadership has become less of a formal doctrine than an embedded cultural assumption. It appears in leadership training programs, job descriptions, performance evaluations, and board conversations, often without being explicitly named. As a result, moving beyond servant leadership does not simply involve adopting a new leadership philosophy. It requires a **deliberate process of organizational change**: a change that examines how expectations about leadership are encoded in language, governance, and incentives.

Leadership Language

The first step in this process often begins with **a careful examination of how leadership is described within the organization** itself. Moralized language surrounding leadership is frequently embedded in everyday documents: executive job descriptions that emphasize selflessness or humility, evaluation criteria that reward leaders for "going above and beyond," or governance policies that frame leadership primarily in terms of service and sacrifice. While these phrases may appear harmless, they subtly shape expectations about how leaders should behave and how success should be measured.

A thoughtful audit of leadership language can therefore reveal how deeply servant leadership assumptions are embedded in institutional culture. When organizations review their policies and documentation with this lens, they often find that leadership is described more in terms of personal virtue than in terms of observable responsibilities. Replacing these formulations with clearer descriptions of role-based competencies helps shift leadership evaluation away from moral posture and toward professional practice.

Leadership Training and Support

Language alone, however, cannot reshape organizational culture without corresponding changes in how leaders are trained and supported. Leadership development programs within the nonprofit sector have historically emphasized personal growth, empathy, and mission commitment. While these qualities remain valuable, they are insufficient preparation for navigating the structural complexities of contemporary organizations. Transitioning away from servant leadership therefore requires rethinking the content of leadership development itself.

Training that equips leaders with systems thinking, power literacy, and boundary-setting skills can significantly change how leadership is practiced. Systems thinking helps leaders recognize patterns and interdependencies within organizations, allowing them to address root causes rather than repeatedly compensating for structural weaknesses. Power literacy enables leaders to understand how authority operates within institutions and how it can be exercised transparently and responsibly. Boundary-setting, meanwhile, reframes the ability to prioritize, delegate, and decline requests as essential leadership competencies rather than as signs of insufficient dedication.

Board Governance

Equally important is the role of board governance in supporting this transition. Boards play a critical role in shaping leadership culture, particularly through how they define executive expectations and evaluate performance. In many nonprofit organizations, boards unintentionally reinforce servant leadership norms by praising extraordinary personal effort and rewarding leaders who absorb institutional strain through long hours and constant availability. They must too be ideologically aligned with these changes and ready to support them.

Moving beyond this pattern requires boards to **engage more intentionally with the structural dimensions of leadership**. Clarifying decision rights between boards and executives helps reduce the ambiguity that often encourages leaders to shoulder responsibility informally. Evaluating executives based on the sustainability and effectiveness of organizational systems (rather than on heroic personal performance) also sends a clear signal about what kinds of leadership behaviors the institution values.

Communication

Because servant leadership is often deeply intertwined with an organization's identity, the transition away from it should not occur quietly or implicitly. Leaders and boards benefit from communicating the change openly, explaining why the organization is reexamining its leadership assumptions and what it hopes to achieve by doing so.

Framing the shift in terms of equity, transparency, and sustainability can help staff and stakeholders understand that the goal is not to abandon care or mission commitment, but to build structures that allow those values to endure without relying on personal sacrifice.

Clear communication also helps address an important emotional dimension of this transition. Many leaders who identify with servant leadership do so out of genuine dedication to the organizations they serve. Acknowledging that commitment while explaining the structural limitations of the model can prevent the conversation from becoming a critique of individuals rather than of organizational design.

Organizational Incentives

Ultimately, the success of any leadership transition depends on whether organizational incentives reinforce the intended changes. When institutions continue to reward behaviors associated with self-sacrifice (e.g. constant availability, absorbing excessive workloads, or resolving systemic problems through personal effort) the underlying culture remains unchanged.

Aligning incentives with sustainable leadership practices is therefore essential. Performance evaluations that prioritize strategic clarity, effective delegation, and system improvement signal that leaders are expected to strengthen institutions rather than exhaust themselves in service of them. Recognition practices that highlight collaborative achievements rather than individual heroics reinforce the idea that leadership is a collective endeavor. Workload management tools, realistic staffing models, and explicit boundaries around availability further demonstrate that organizational care extends to the people responsible for carrying out the mission.

* * *

Transitioning away from servant leadership is not a single decision but an ongoing process of institutional recalibration.

By examining how leadership expectations are embedded in language, training, governance, and incentives, organizations can gradually replace moralized leadership narratives with structures that support accountability, equity, and sustainability.

In doing so, they move closer to a leadership culture that honors the nonprofit sector's ethical aspirations without requiring leaders to prove their commitment through personal sacrifice.

Conclusion

Servant leadership has endured within the nonprofit sector largely because it resonates with the moral language of mission-driven work. In organizations dedicated to service, community, and social good, the idea that leaders should lead by serving others feels intuitively right.

Yet **moral resonance should not be mistaken for structural effectiveness**. Leadership models must ultimately be judged not only by the values they express, but by the organizational conditions they produce.

Servant leadership is best understood not as a universal leadership framework, but as a theological metaphor that migrated into secular organizational contexts without sufficient scrutiny. Its language of humility, sacrifice, and service reflects particular moral traditions that, while meaningful in some settings, do not necessarily provide a durable foundation for governing complex, pluralistic institutions. When adopted as a leadership norm in secular nonprofits, the model can obscure power, blur governance responsibilities, and normalize forms of labor and sacrifice that are neither equitable nor sustainable.

Moving beyond servant leadership does not require abandoning kindness or empathy. Rather, it involves relocating those values from the personal identity of leaders to the structures through which organizations operate. **When care is embedded in governance systems, accountability processes, and thoughtful organizational design, it becomes more durable and more evenly distributed.** Ethical leadership ceases to depend on personal sacrifice and instead becomes a feature of institutional practice.

Secular nonprofit organizations operate in environments defined by complexity, competing priorities, and diverse communities of stakeholders. Leadership frameworks suited to this reality must be capable of acknowledging power openly, distributing responsibility fairly, and sustaining the people who carry out the work. The future of nonprofit leadership therefore lies not in moralized self-sacrifice, but in institutions designed to balance mission with clarity, equity, and resilience.

Let's stay connected:

Visit seagullpartners.net or follow us on LinkedIn.

This content represents the opinion of Seagull Partners and does not constitute a formal consulting engagement or professional contractual relationship.

Appendix - Servant Leadership in Explicitly Christian Organizations

The critique presented in this paper is directed at the use of servant leadership as a universal leadership framework within secular organizations. It is not intended as a critique of Christian theology or of leadership models developed within explicitly Christian institutional contexts. Those things still exist.

Servant leadership emerged from moral and theological traditions that emphasize humility, sacrifice, and service to others. Within organizations that explicitly identify as Christian, these principles may align directly with the institution's stated theological commitments. In such contexts, servant leadership functions not merely as a management philosophy but as an expression of shared religious identity and moral purpose.

When leaders and participants within an organization openly affirm the same theological framework, the language and expectations embedded in servant leadership may feel both coherent and meaningful. Leadership practices grounded in shared faith commitments can provide a powerful sense of moral orientation and communal responsibility.

The concerns raised in this paper arise primarily when servant leadership is exported beyond those contexts and presented as a culturally neutral or universally applicable leadership model. In secular nonprofit organizations—where employees, stakeholders, and communities represent a wide range of religious, cultural, and philosophical traditions—leadership frameworks derived from a specific theological tradition may inadvertently privilege certain values while marginalizing others.

The argument, therefore, is not that Christian leaders must abandon principles that are meaningful within their faith tradition. Rather, it is that organizations operating in pluralistic environments should exercise caution when adopting leadership models that carry implicit theological assumptions.

A more productive approach may be to distinguish clearly between leadership models grounded in shared religious commitments and those designed for pluralistic institutional contexts. Doing so allows faith-based organizations to remain authentic to their traditions while enabling secular institutions to adopt leadership frameworks that are culturally inclusive and structurally robust.

References

Chait, Ryan & Taylor. *Governance as Leadership : Reframing the Work of Nonprofit Boards*. Wiley, 2004.

Eva, Nathan, Mulyadi Robin, Sen Sendjaya, Dirk van Dierendonck and Robert C. Liden. "Servant Leadership: A systematic review and call for future research." *The Leadership Quarterly* (2019).

Fletcher, Joyce K. "The paradox of postheroic leadership: An essay on gender, power, and transformational change." *Leadership Quarterly*, 15 (2004): 647-661.

Greenleaf, Robert K. *The Servant as Leader*. Robert K. Greenleaf Publishing Center, 1970.

Greenleaf, Robert K. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Paulist Press, 1977.

Heifetz, Ronald Abadian, Alexander Grashow, & Martin Linsky. *The Practice of Adaptive Leadership : Tools and Tactics for Changing Your Organization and the World*. Harvard Business Press, 2009.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. *The Managed Heart : Commercialization of Human Feeling*. University of California Press, 1983.

Liu, Helena. "Just the Servant: An Intersectional Critique of Servant Leadership." *Journal of Business Ethics* 156 (2019): 1099-1112.

Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*. SAGE Publications, 2003.