

Leadership with Soul: A Human-Centered Framework for Well-Being, Purpose and Sustainable Organizational Performance

Ignacio Bonasa Alzuria*

Liderarte Factoría de Talento, Spain

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1014MG0189>

Received: 13 September 2026; Accepted: 18 September 2026; Published: 26 September 2026

ABSTRACT

Organizations increasingly need leadership models capable of reconciling performance with human sustainability. This conceptual integrative review introduces Leadership with Soul as a human-centered framework integrating purposeful direction, ethical congruence, relational presence, developmental enablement, courageous care, and sustainable stewardship. The term “soul” is used as a humanistic metaphor for dignity, conscience, meaning, relationship and purpose, not as a theological claim. The framework is positioned in relation to transformational, authentic, servant and ethical leadership. Its distinctive criterion is process legitimacy: leadership effectiveness should be evaluated not only by results achieved but also by the human conditions through which those results are produced and whether those conditions preserve future capacity. Six testable propositions link the framework to meaningful work, trust, psychological safety, learning, well-being and sustainable performance. The paper also identifies risks of conceptual redundancy and proposes discriminant-validity tests. Its contribution is an integrative leadership logic in which care is combined with accountability and performance is constrained by dignity and sustainability.

Keywords: human-centered leadership; purpose; ethical leadership; psychological safety; well-being; sustainable performance

INTRODUCTION

Leadership scholarship has generated influential accounts of transformation, authenticity, service and ethics. Yet organizations continue to face a recurrent practical contradiction: performance systems often celebrate outcomes while obscuring the human costs through which those outcomes were obtained. Burnout, silence, fear and chronic overload can coexist with short-term target achievement.

Leadership with Soul is proposed as a human-centered response to this contradiction. “Soul” functions here as a metaphor for the dimensions of organizational life that resist reduction to instrumental utility: dignity, conscience, meaning, relationship and purpose. The concept is deliberately secular and operational.

METHODOLOGY OF THE CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

A theory-building integrative review was used to position the proposed construct against adjacent leadership traditions. The analysis compared each tradition on its focal question, dominant mechanism, ethical emphasis, relational emphasis, developmental logic and treatment of human sustainability. The purpose was not to claim that existing theories are deficient, but to identify whether a coherent conceptual gap remains. Leadership with Soul is retained only to the extent that it adds the criterion of process legitimacy and sustainable human capacity. Future empirical research must demonstrate discriminant and incremental validity before the construct can be treated as distinct.

Positioning Against Adjacent Theories

Transformational leadership emphasizes inspiration and development; authentic leadership emphasizes self-awareness and relational transparency; servant leadership foregrounds service to followers; ethical leadership emphasizes normatively appropriate conduct. Leadership with Soul shares elements with all four. It should therefore not be defended through novelty of ingredients.

Its proposed distinctiveness lies in the criterion used to judge effectiveness. Results are necessary but insufficient. Leadership is sustainable when worthwhile outcomes are achieved through processes that preserve dignity, voice, learning, health and future capacity. This process-legitimacy criterion makes the means of performance part of the performance evaluation itself.

Table 1. Leadership with Soul and adjacent traditions

Tradition	Primary emphasis	Shared ground	Proposed added emphasis
Transformational	Vision and transformation	Purpose, development	Human sustainability of the performance process
Authentic	Self-awareness and congruence	Integrity, transparency	Process legitimacy beyond leader authenticity
Servant	Service to followers	Care, development	Care combined explicitly with accountability and performance
Ethical	Normative conduct	Ethical congruence	Integration with meaning, development and sustainable capacity
Leadership with Soul	Human-centered sustainable performance	Integrative	Means and ends evaluated together

Six Dimensions

Purposeful direction connects everyday work with a credible and socially defensible why. Ethical congruence aligns declared values, decisions and behavior. Relational presence requires attention, listening and recognition of others as persons rather than resources. Developmental enablement expands competence, autonomy and future capacity. Courageous care combines empathy with difficult truth, standards and accountability. Sustainable stewardship evaluates decisions through their longer-term effects on people, organization and society.

Theoretical Propositions

P1. Purposeful direction will be positively associated with meaningful work and engagement when employees perceive the purpose as credible rather than rhetorical.

P2. Ethical congruence and relational presence will strengthen interpersonal trust.

P3. Relational presence and courageous care will positively predict psychological safety, particularly when leaders respond constructively to dissent and error.

P4. Developmental enablement will increase learning behavior and adaptive capacity through autonomy and competence.

P5. Sustainable stewardship will weaken the negative association between performance pressure and employee well-being by reducing practices that externalize performance costs onto workers.

P6. The configuration of all six dimensions will predict sustainable performance beyond adjacent leadership constructs if Leadership with Soul possesses incremental validity.

Theoretical Contribution

The framework makes three claims that can be falsified. First, process legitimacy is not reducible to leader benevolence: it requires accountability and sustainable results. Second, care and performance are not opposites; the relevant question is whether performance practices preserve future human capacity. Third, the framework should explain variance in sustainable outcomes beyond established leadership measures. If it does not, the construct should be treated as an integrative practitioner language rather than a distinct scientific construct.

Managerial Implications

Leadership assessment can be translated into observable questions: Does the leader explain purpose without manipulating it? Do decisions remain coherent when incentives change? Can employees disagree safely? Are difficult conversations conducted with respect? Does performance leave people more capable or more depleted? These questions shift evaluation from charisma and output toward process quality and sustainability.

Limitations And Research Agenda

Conceptual overlap is the principal limitation. Future research should develop a parsimonious item pool and test confirmatory factor models against authentic, servant, transformational and ethical leadership. Multi-source designs are essential to avoid leader self-report bias. Longitudinal and multilevel studies should test whether psychological safety, meaningful work and learning climate mediate relationships with well-being and sustainable performance.

CONCLUSION

Leadership with Soul proposes a demanding rather than sentimental form of human-centered leadership. Care without accountability is insufficient, and performance without human sustainability is incomplete. Leadership becomes the discipline of achieving worthwhile results through conditions that preserve dignity, meaning, learning and the capacity to continue contributing.

Conceptual Model At A Glance

Leadership with Soul is modeled as six leader practices that influence meaningful work, trust, psychological safety and learning, which in turn support well-being and sustainable performance. Process legitimacy is the framework's differentiating criterion.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES	MEDIATORS	OUTCOMES
Purpose • Ethics • Presence • Development • Courageous care • Stewardship	Meaning • Trust • Psychological safety • Learning	Well-being + sustainable performance

Process Legitimacy As The Core Differentiator

The most distinctive claim of Leadership with Soul is that leadership outcomes cannot be evaluated independently from the processes through which they are produced. Process legitimacy asks whether the path to performance respects dignity, permits voice, supports learning and preserves future human capacity. This criterion differs from judging a leader solely by intentions, traits or short-term results.

A leader may achieve demanding targets while creating fear, silence or chronic depletion. Conventional performance indicators can reward this pattern until delayed costs appear through turnover, health problems,

ethical failures or loss of adaptive capacity. Process legitimacy brings those hidden costs into the definition of effectiveness rather than treating them as externalities.

This idea also prevents the framework from collapsing into generalized kindness. Legitimate processes can include difficult decisions, demanding standards and corrective feedback. The question is not whether leadership feels comfortable, but whether people are treated as persons with agency and whether accountability is exercised without unnecessary humiliation, manipulation or depletion.

Care, Courage And Accountability

Human-centered leadership is sometimes criticized for implying softness. Courageous care rejects that interpretation. Care becomes organizationally meaningful when it includes the willingness to name problems, protect standards and make difficult trade-offs. Avoiding a necessary conversation may feel compassionate in the moment while ultimately harming the individual, team or institution.

Courageous care therefore combines empathy with clarity. It asks leaders to understand the human consequences of decisions while remaining accountable for purpose and performance. This dual requirement is particularly important during restructuring, conflict, failure or ethical tension, when purely relational or purely instrumental responses are both inadequate.

Future research could examine whether courageous care predicts trust more strongly than supportive behavior alone, particularly when employees receive unfavorable decisions. Perceived fairness, explanation quality and respectful treatment may mediate this relationship.

Leadership With Soul In High-Pressure Environments

The framework becomes most testable where pressure is high. Under stable conditions, many leaders can appear relational and values-driven. Scarcity, deadlines and uncertainty reveal whether purpose, ethics and human sustainability remain operative constraints or disappear when they become inconvenient.

In high-pressure settings, purposeful direction can reduce noise by clarifying what must be protected. Ethical congruence can prevent expedient misconduct. Relational presence can keep weak signals and dissent visible. Developmental enablement can distribute judgment rather than centralize every decision. Sustainable stewardship can prevent temporary urgency from becoming permanent operating culture.

This suggests a contingency proposition: the value of Leadership with Soul may be especially visible under conditions of sustained performance pressure, because these conditions increase the temptation to externalize costs onto employees. Longitudinal designs could compare teams exposed to similar pressure but different leadership configurations.

Operationalization And Empirical Testing

Construct development should begin with behavioral indicators rather than inspirational language. Items might assess whether leaders connect decisions to credible purpose, explain value conflicts, invite dissent, provide developmental autonomy, address difficult issues respectfully and consider the long-term human consequences of performance practices.

Discriminant validity is non-negotiable. Measures should be tested alongside authentic, ethical, servant, transformational and spiritual leadership. If the six dimensions do not form a coherent higher-order construct or fail to add predictive value, Leadership with Soul should remain an integrative practice framework rather than be presented as a distinct theory.

Strong tests would use employee ratings, leader behavior observations and objective or archival outcomes. Psychological safety, meaningful work and learning behavior are plausible mediators; burnout, turnover and sustainable performance are relevant outcomes. Multi-wave designs would reduce common-method bias and help establish temporal ordering.

Purpose Without Propaganda

Purpose is powerful precisely because it can be abused. Organizations can invoke a noble mission to justify sacrifice, suppress dissent or ask employees to accept conditions that would otherwise be challenged. Leadership with Soul therefore distinguishes credible purpose from rhetorical purpose.

Credibility depends on congruence between language, resource allocation and difficult decisions. Employees observe what leaders protect when trade-offs become real. If a stated commitment to people disappears whenever quarterly pressure rises, purpose becomes symbolic rather than governing. Conversely, leaders build credibility when they acknowledge tensions rather than pretending that every decision benefits everyone.

Purposeful direction should therefore be measured through perceived credibility, not merely frequency of communication. Research can examine whether credible purpose predicts meaningful work while rhetorical purpose predicts cynicism. This distinction is central to a human-centered model because meaning cannot be sustainably manufactured through slogans.

Voice, Dissent And The Ethics Of Listening

Relational presence is not demonstrated by availability alone. A leader can hold frequent meetings while remaining psychologically closed to information that challenges identity or strategy. The stronger test is what happens when an employee disagrees, reports bad news or questions a favored decision.

Listening has an ethical dimension because leaders control consequences. Employees assess whether speaking creates learning or punishment. Psychological safety therefore depends less on invitations to “speak up” than on repeated evidence that dissent is processed fairly.

Leadership with Soul treats dissent as a resource for stewardship. Leaders do not have to accept every recommendation, but they should make disagreement discussable, explain decisions and protect respectful challenge. This behavior links relational presence with ethical congruence and adaptive performance.

Sustainable Performance As A Longitudinal Outcome

Short-term performance can be produced through practices that are not repeatable. Excessive overtime, fear-based control and heroic crisis management may generate impressive immediate output while eroding health, trust and learning. A sustainable leadership model therefore requires longitudinal outcomes.

Sustainable performance can be conceptualized as the capacity to deliver valued results repeatedly while maintaining or renewing the human and organizational resources required for future performance. Relevant indicators include retention, absence, learning behavior, error reporting, internal mobility, health and the stability of performance after periods of pressure.

This definition creates a demanding empirical test. Leadership with Soul should not be supported merely because employees report liking their leader. It should predict a pattern in which human outcomes and performance remain jointly viable over time.

Recent Human-Centered Management Evidence

The recent human-centered organization literature provides both support and a challenge for Leadership with Soul. Townsend and Romme (2024) synthesize a fragmented field around dignity, well-being, justice, common-good purpose, positive work experience, team structures and participatory practices. Importantly, their review notes that leadership remains comparatively underdeveloped within the human-centered organization literature. This gap creates space for a leadership-level framework, but it also means that Leadership with Soul must demonstrate more than semantic proximity to humanistic values.

A 2025 systematic review of leadership, human-centered management, organizational culture and workplace well-being similarly identifies ethical values, inclusion, psychological safety and balanced demands and

resources as recurring pathways linking human-centered management to employee outcomes. These findings reinforce several dimensions of the proposed framework while making discriminant validity more demanding. Leadership with Soul cannot claim novelty merely because it values dignity or well-being; those ideas already have substantial intellectual ancestry.

Its stronger differentiator is the conjunction of six behavioral dimensions with process legitimacy and sustainable performance. The framework asks whether leadership preserves dignity, voice, learning and future capacity while pursuing legitimate performance goals. That criterion can be tested against established leadership constructs and against broader human-centered management practices.

Theory Competition And Incremental Validity

A mature theory should specify what evidence would show that it is unnecessary. Leadership with Soul would add limited scientific value if its measures were empirically indistinguishable from ethical, servant, authentic, transformational or spiritual leadership, or if it failed to explain outcomes beyond those constructs.

Future validation should therefore use confirmatory factor analysis and structural models that include competing leadership measures in the same sample. Incremental prediction should be tested for psychological safety, meaningful work, learning behavior, burnout, retention and sustainable performance. Multilevel designs are preferable because leadership is experienced individually but also creates shared team climates.

A second test concerns process legitimacy. If process legitimacy predicts long-term outcomes after controlling for leader warmth, ethics and inspirational behavior, it may represent a distinctive contribution. If it does not, the framework should be presented as an integrative managerial philosophy rather than a new leadership theory. Stating this boundary strengthens rather than weakens the conceptual proposal.

The Construct Redundancy Challenge

Leadership with Soul faces a demanding burden of proof because leadership scholarship already contains transformational, authentic, servant, ethical, spiritual, compassionate and human-centered traditions. Novel terminology is not a theoretical contribution. The framework is defensible only if it identifies a distinctive organizing principle, specifies observable behaviors and demonstrates incremental explanatory value.

Recent evidence makes this challenge sharper. Ramachandran et al.'s systematic review of compassionate leadership (2024) shows a substantial literature linking compassion-oriented leadership with employee and organizational outcomes. Townsend and Romme (2024) similarly synthesize the emerging human-centered organization around dignity, justice, well-being, common-good purpose, positive work experience and participation. Leadership with Soul therefore cannot claim ownership of dignity, care, purpose or well-being.

Its proposed contribution is instead the integration of six behavioral dimensions under the criterion of process legitimacy: whether results are produced through conditions that preserve dignity, voice, learning and future human capacity. This shifts evaluation from "Did the leader achieve the target?" to the dual question "Was the target achieved, and was the process humanly and organizationally renewable?"

Adjacent Theories And Discriminant Boundaries

Transformational leadership explains inspiration, intellectual stimulation and motivation toward collective goals; Leadership with Soul adds an explicit constraint that transformational energy should not legitimize depletion or silence. Authentic leadership emphasizes self-awareness and relational transparency; the present framework is less concerned with leader self-consistency than with the legitimacy of processes experienced by others. Servant leadership prioritizes service and follower development; Leadership with Soul retains developmental concern while explicitly preserving organizational accountability and performance. Ethical leadership emphasizes normatively appropriate conduct; process legitimacy broadens evaluation toward voice, learning and sustainability even when conduct is formally ethical.

Spiritual leadership is the closest semantic risk because it already links vision, hope/faith, altruistic love, calling and membership. The present framework therefore uses “soul” metaphorically rather than theologically and does not posit spirituality as a causal mechanism. Compassionate leadership overlaps through noticing and responding to suffering, but courageous care in this framework includes difficult accountability and does not define leadership primarily through suffering. Humanistic management provides the broad normative foundation; Leadership with Soul proposes a leader-level behavioral architecture within that larger tradition.

These boundaries are hypotheses, not declarations. If empirical measures collapse into existing constructs, the framework should be treated as an integrative practice model rather than a distinct theory.

Process Legitimacy: From Metaphor To Testable Core

Process legitimacy can be operationalized through four questions. Did people retain meaningful voice? Were they treated with dignity during difficult decisions? Did the process preserve learning and error-reporting capacity? Did the method of achieving results maintain rather than systematically consume future human capacity?

This criterion produces testable divergence from outcome-only leadership evaluation. Two leaders may achieve identical financial or operational results while differing markedly in turnover, psychological safety, error concealment, recovery and subsequent performance. A process-legitimacy measure should predict these downstream differences after controlling for established leadership styles.

The construct also avoids equating humane leadership with low standards. Legitimate processes can involve restructuring, performance correction and unpopular decisions. The requirement is not comfort; it is accountable treatment of persons as agents rather than expendable inputs. That distinction is central if “soul” is to function as a scientific metaphor rather than branding.

Research Design For A High-Burden Validation Test

A credible validation program should begin with qualitative item generation from employees and leaders, followed by expert content validation. Confirmatory factor analyses should compare a six-factor higher-order model with plausible alternatives. Discriminant tests should include transformational, authentic, servant, ethical, spiritual and compassionate leadership rather than selecting only weak comparators.

Incremental validity should then be examined using multi-source and multi-wave designs. Psychological safety, meaningful work, trust and learning behavior are plausible mediators; burnout, turnover, health, error reporting and sustainable performance are relevant outcomes. Team-level aggregation should be justified statistically rather than assumed.

A particularly strong design would compare teams facing similar performance pressure. If Leadership with Soul predicts better preservation of learning, health and subsequent performance without sacrificing legitimate results, the theory gains support. If it predicts only leader liking or overlaps almost completely with existing constructs, its scientific claims should be narrowed.

Declarations

Funding: Author to confirm before submission.

Conflict of interest: Author to confirm before submission.

Data availability: No empirical dataset was generated or analyzed for this conceptual article.

Ethics statement: Ethical approval was not required because the article does not involve human participants, animals, or identifiable personal data.

REFERENCES

1. Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
2. Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595–616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
3. Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002>
4. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
5. Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L. (2018). Advances in subjective well-being research. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2, 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0307-6>
6. Diniz, P., Marques, I. C. P., & Pereira, Â. M. (2025). Leadership, human-centered management and organizational culture: Pathways to well-being and innovative work based on a systematic review. *Sustainability*, 17(24), 11181. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su172411181>
7. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
8. Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693–727. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001>
9. Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 393–417. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.24351328>
10. Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. Paulist Press.
11. Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>
12. Keyes, C. L. M. (2002). The mental health continuum: From languishing to flourishing in life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 43(2), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3090197>
13. Qamar, F., Afshan, G., & Rana, S. A. (2024). Sustainable HRM and well-being: Systematic review and future research agenda. *Management Review Quarterly*, 74, 2289–2336. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-023-00360-6>
14. Ramachandran, S., Balasubramanian, S., James, W. F., et al. (2024). Whither compassionate leadership? A systematic review. *Management Review Quarterly*, 74, 1473–1557. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-023-00340-w>
15. Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 91–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2010.09.001>
16. Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>
17. Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish*. Free Press.
18. Townsend, M., & Romme, A. G. L. (2024). The emerging concept of the human-centered organization: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Humanistic Management Journal*, 9, 53–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41463-024-00168-w>
19. World Health Organization. (2022). WHO guidelines on mental health at work. World Health Organization.