SERVANT LEADERSHIP THROUGH A RELIGIOUS LENS: A COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF ISLAMIC, CHRISTIAN, JEWISH, AND BUDDHIST TEACHINGS

Abdul Qayoom[*1], Juhary Ali[2], Qadar Bakhsh Baloch[3], Sourath Mahar[4], Faryal Raheem[5]

[*1]PhD Scholar, Asia e University, Malaysia
[2]Prof, Dean, of School of Management and School of Arts, Humanities
& Social Sciences & Deputy Vice Chancellor, Asia e university, Malaysia
[3]Absyn University Peshawar
[4]University of Sialkot
[5]Abasyn University Peshawar

Corresponding Author: *
Abdul Qayoom

ABSTRACT

Servant leadership is commonly presented in contemporary leadership literature as a modern ethical and people-centered leadership approach. However, its deeper philosophical and moral foundations remain underexplored. This review article critically examines servant leadership through a comparative religious lens, drawing on the teachings and ethical traditions of Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism. Using a qualitative, systematic review of theological texts and peer-reviewed scholarly literature, the study synthesizes how service-oriented leadership principles are embedded across these religious traditions despite their doctrinal differences. The analysis reveals a strong convergence around core leadership values, including humility, compassion, justice, moral accountability, and stewardship, which closely align with the foundational dimensions of servant leadership articulated by Greenleaf. Christianity emphasizes self-sacrificial service and humility through the life and teachings of Jesus Christ; Islam conceptualizes leadership as a divinely entrusted responsibility grounded in justice, compassion, and stewardship (khilāfah); Judaism frames leadership as ethical accountability and social repair (tikkun olam); and Buddhism advances leadership as compassionate action aimed at alleviating suffering through mindfulness and interdependence. The findings demonstrate that servant leadership is not merely a contemporary managerial construct but a historically rooted, ethically grounded leadership model with cross-cultural and cross-religious legitimacy. By integrating religious ethical frameworks into servant leadership theory, this study extends its conceptual foundations and underscores its relevance for ethical, sustainable, and socially responsible leadership in modern organizational contexts.

Keywords: *Servant leadership, ethical leadership, comparative religion, sustainability, stewardship, wellbeing*

INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades, leadership scholarship has undergone a substantial paradigm shift from authority-driven and control-oriented models toward approaches emphasizing ethics, humility, relational engagement, and social responsibility. Traditional leadership perspectives, rooted primarily in command, hierarchy, and efficiency, have increasingly been criticized for neglecting human wellbeing, moral accountability, and long-term societal consequences (Van Vugt & Ronay, 2014; Blyzniuk, T., & Blyzniuk,

O., 2024). In response, contemporary leadership discourse has gravitated toward value-based and ethically grounded models that prioritize service, empathy, stewardship, and collective welfare. Within this evolving landscape, servant leadership first articulated by Greenleaf (1970) has emerged as a prominent framework advocating that the primary motivation of leadership should be the desire to serve rather than the pursuit of power. Servant leadership emphasizes moral responsibility, humility, empathy,

stewardship, and commitment to the growth of others. While the construct is often presented as a modern leadership innovation, its ethical foundations appear deeply embedded in longstanding religious and spiritual traditions.

Despite growing empirical and theoretical attention to servant leadership, limited scholarship has systematically examined its philosophical and ethical roots across major world religions. Existing studies tend to address servant leadership within organizational or managerial contexts, often overlooking the religious and spiritual narratives that have historically shaped moral conceptions of leadership. Given contemporary challenges such as social fragmentation, declining organizational trust, environmental degradation, and sustainability concerns, revisiting servant leadership through a broader ethical and spiritual lens is both timely and necessary. Accordingly, this study aims to explore servant leadership through a comparative analysis of Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism. By synthesizing theological teachings and scholarly literature, the study seeks to demonstrate that servant leadership is not merely a contemporary managerial construct but a historically grounded, ethically supported leadership model with enduring cross-cultural relevance.

Evolution of Servant Leadership Theory:
The theoretical development of servant leadership represents a critical departure from traditional leadership paradigms that emphasized authority, charisma, or transactional exchange. Greenleaf's (1970) seminal work, *The Servant as Leader*, proposed that authentic leadership originates from a genuine commitment to serve others, with leadership emerging as a natural extension of service. This perspective reframed leadership as a moral and relational process rather than a positional or power-based phenomenon. Subsequent scholars expanded Greenleaf's conceptualization by identifying key dimensions of servant leadership. Spears (1998) articulated ten core characteristics, including empathy, listening, awareness, persuasion, stewardship, and commitment to the growth of people. Empirical research later linked servant leadership to positive organizational outcomes such as trust, team cohesion, ethical climate, and employee

wellbeing (Halawi & Van Dierendonck, 2025). However, much of this literature remained anthropocentric, focusing primarily on interpersonal and organizational outcomes. More recent scholarship has broadened servant leadership's ethical scope by incorporating concerns for sustainability, environmental stewardship, and social responsibility. Ferdig (2007) and Del Baldo (2018) argued that ethical leadership must extend beyond human-centered service to include responsibility for ecological systems and future generations. This expanded understanding aligns servant leadership with emerging sustainability-oriented leadership frameworks.

Religious Foundations of Ethical and Servant-Oriented Leadership:
Although servant leadership is often framed as a contemporary theory, its core values resonate strongly with ethical teachings embedded within major religious traditions. Christianity emphasizes humility, self-sacrificial service, and stewardship, exemplified in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ (Wilkes, 1998; Firestone, 2024). Leadership within Christian theology is framed not as domination but as service motivated by love, compassion, and moral responsibility. Islam conceptualizes leadership through the principle of *khilāfah*, which positions human beings as trustees responsible for justice, balance, and stewardship of the earth (Faisal, 2024). Islamic leadership ethics stress consultation (*shūrā*), justice (*'adl*), compassion (*raḥmah*), and accountability, closely mirroring servant leadership principles (Ruhullah & Ushama, 2025). Judaism frames leadership as ethical obligation and communal responsibility. The concept of *tikkun olam* (repairing the world) underscores leadership as a moral duty to promote justice, social welfare, and environmental responsibility (Dorff, 2007; Blidstein, 1995). Similarly, Buddhist philosophy presents leadership as compassionate action aimed at alleviating suffering, grounded in mindfulness, interdependence, and ethical conduct (Marques, 2019; Sutamchai, 2021).

Despite theological differences, these traditions converge on core moral values humility, compassion, justice, stewardship, and service suggesting a shared ethical foundation that predates and informs contemporary servant leadership theory.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework:
Drawing on Greenleaf's servant leadership theory and the ethical teachings of Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism, this study proposes a conceptual framework positioning servant leadership as a morally grounded and sustainability-oriented leadership model. The framework conceptualizes servant leadership as emerging from deeply embedded ethical values shaped by religious traditions, which subsequently influence leadership behaviors and outcomes. At the core of the framework are shared moral virtues humility, empathy, compassion, justice, stewardship, and moral accountability. These virtues inform servant leadership behaviors such as ethical decision-making, empowerment of followers, community orientation, and responsibility toward environmental sustainability. In turn, these behaviors contribute to individual wellbeing, organizational trust, social cohesion, and sustainable leadership outcomes. Figure 1 illustrates this conceptual linkage by demonstrating how ethical principles derived from religious traditions collectively reinforce the foundational dimensions of servant leadership. Rather than privileging a single religious narrative, the framework emphasizes convergence across traditions, supporting the universality and cross-cultural legitimacy of servant leadership.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework Linking Religious Ethical Traditions to Servant Leadership Principles and Outcomes

Contribution of the Study:
This study makes three key contributions to leadership scholarship. First, it advances servant leadership theory by systematically situating its core principles within the ethical and philosophical traditions of major world religions, thereby addressing a critical gap in the literature that has largely treated servant leadership as a modern, secular construct. Second, by integrating religious ethics with contemporary leadership discourse, the study extends servant leadership beyond interpersonal and organizational outcomes to include moral responsibility, social cohesion, and environmental sustainability. Third, the comparative and integrative framework offered in this study provides a cross-cultural foundation for understanding servant leadership as a universally relevant ethical leadership model, offering theoretical value for leadership, ethics, and sustainability research across diverse cultural and institutional contexts.

2. Methodology

Research Design: This study adopted a qualitative systematic literature review design to examine the ethical and philosophical foundations of servant leadership as reflected in Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism. A qualitative review approach was considered appropriate because the objective of the study was not to test empirical hypotheses but to synthesize theoretical, theological, and normative insights across disciplines. Systematic literature reviews are widely recognized as suitable for theory development, conceptual integration, and advancement of knowledge in leadership and organizational studies (Kunisch et al., 2018; Graebner et al., 2012).

Review Approach and Scope: The review followed an integrative and interpretive synthesis approach, allowing for the combination of leadership theory, religious ethics, and sustainability scholarship. Rather than restricting the inquiry to a single academic domain, the study employed an interdisciplinary perspective to capture the moral and ethical dimensions of leadership embedded within religious traditions. This approach aligns with contemporary calls in leadership research to engage broader cultural, ethical, and philosophical contexts beyond organizational boundaries. The scope of the review was deliberately confined to four major religious traditions: Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism. These traditions were selected due to their historical influence on moral reasoning, leadership ethics, and social organization. Together, they represent both theistic and non-theistic worldviews, enabling meaningful comparative analysis while maintaining conceptual coherence.

Data Sources and Search Strategy:

A comprehensive and systematic search strategy was implemented to identify relevant scholarly and theological sources. Major academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, JSTOR, and SpringerLink, were searched. The search process employed combinations of keywords such as *servant leadership*, *ethical leadership*, *religious leadership*, *Christian leadership ethics*, *Islamic leadership*, *khilāfah*, *tikkun olam*, *Buddhist leadership*, *compassion*, *humility*, *stewardship*, and *sustainability*. To ensure both conceptual depth and scholarly credibility, the review included peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, edited volumes, and authoritative theological texts. Preference was given to sources published in reputable journals and academic presses that explicitly addressed leadership ethics, moral responsibility, and service-oriented leadership models. The initial search yielded over 130 sources, which were subsequently screened for relevance and quality.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:

Clear inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied to enhance methodological rigor and transparency. Sources were included if they: (a) examined servant leadership or closely related ethical leadership constructs; (b) offered theoretical, philosophical, or theological insights relevant to leadership values; (c) focused on Christianity, Islam, Judaism, or Buddhism; and (d) were published in peer-reviewed journals or academically credible outlets. Sources were excluded if they were purely devotional without scholarly interpretation, lacked relevance to leadership ethics, or did not contribute meaningfully to servant leadership discourse.

PRISMA-Style Flow of Literature Selection:

This review followed a structured and transparent literature selection process consistent with **PRISMA guidelines for systematic and integrative reviews**, adapted for a qualitative, conceptual synthesis.

An initial comprehensive search was conducted across major academic databases, including **Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, JSTOR, and Springer Link,** covering the **time period from 2000 to 2025.** The search strategy employed combinations of keywords related to *servant leadership*, *ethical leadership*, *religious leadership*, *Christian leadership ethics*, *Islamic leadership*, *khilāfah*, *tikkun olam*, *Buddhist leadership*, *compassion*, *humility*, *stewardship*, and *sustainability*. This initial search yielded **approximately 130 records.** Following the removal of duplicate records and non-scholarly sources, **104 unique records** remained. Titles and abstracts were then screened for relevance to servant leadership, ethical leadership, and religious or philosophical foundations of leadership. During this screening phase, **46 records** were excluded due to lack of relevance, conceptual overlap without theoretical contribution, or absence of a clear connection to leadership ethics. The remaining **58 articles and**

scholarly sources were subjected to full-text assessment. During this phase, **26 sources** were excluded because they were purely devotional in nature, lacked analytical depth, focused narrowly on religious doctrine without leadership implications, or did not contribute meaningfully to servant leadership theory. Ultimately, **32 high-quality sources** met all inclusion criteria and were retained for **final qualitative synthesis.** These sources comprised peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, edited volumes, and authoritative theological and leadership texts. The selected literature formed the basis for the **thematic analysis and comparative synthesis** across Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism.

Data Analysis and Thematic Synthesis:

The analysis followed a deductive thematic synthesis process. Greenleaf's servant leadership theory served as the primary analytical lens, particularly its emphasis on humility, empathy, stewardship, moral accountability, and service to others (Greenleaf, 1970; Spears, 1998). Textual data from the selected sources were systematically reviewed and coded to identify recurring ethical values and leadership principles within each religious tradition. Following initial coding, cross-tradition comparisons were conducted to identify patterns of convergence and divergence. Ethical themes such as compassion, humility, justice, responsibility toward others, and environmental stewardship emerged consistently across traditions. These themes were then mapped onto the core dimensions of servant leadership to assess conceptual alignment. This iterative process facilitated abstraction beyond descriptive comparison, enabling higher-order theoretical integration.

Development of the Conceptual Framework:

Findings from the thematic synthesis informed the development of the conceptual and theoretical framework presented in this study. The framework positions religious ethical teachings as foundational antecedents shaping moral identity and virtues, which subsequently influence servant leadership behaviors and leadership outcomes. Contextual factors such as cultural orientation and organizational embeddedness were incorporated to acknowledge variation in how ethical principles are enacted across different settings. The framework was refined through repeated analytical iterations to ensure internal coherence and theoretical alignment. Rather than privileging a single religious tradition, the framework emphasizes convergence across traditions, reinforcing the universality and cross-cultural legitimacy of servant leadership as an ethical leadership model.

Rigor and Trustworthiness:

To enhance rigor and trustworthiness, the review adhered to established standards for qualitative synthesis, including systematic source selection, transparent analytical procedures, and reflexive interpretation. Triangulation across multiple disciplines and source types minimized interpretive bias. Scholarly neutrality was maintained by avoiding doctrinal advocacy and respecting the distinct theological contexts of each tradition.

Methodological Limitations:

Despite its strengths, this study has limitations. As a conceptual review, the findings are interpretive rather than empirical. Additionally, restricting the analysis to four religious traditions may limit generalizability. Future research employing empirical, mixed-method, or longitudinal designs could further validate and extend the proposed framework.

4. Results:

The qualitative synthesis of the reviewed literature yielded several consistent and recurring findings regarding the ethical and philosophical foundations of servant leadership across Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism. Analysis of the selected sources revealed strong convergence across these religious traditions in their conceptualization of leadership as a moral responsibility grounded in service to others.

Convergence of Ethical Foundations Across Religious Traditions:

Across all four traditions, leadership was consistently framed as an ethically anchored responsibility rather than a position of authority or control. The literature demonstrated that leadership legitimacy was derived from moral conduct, accountability, and commitment to the welfare of others. Despite theological differences, the traditions converged on shared ethical foundations, including humility, compassion, justice,

stewardship, and responsibility toward the community and broader society. Christianity emphasized leadership rooted in humility and self-sacrificial service, drawing on the life and teachings of Jesus Christ as a model of servant-oriented leadership. Islamic sources consistently framed leadership through the concept of *khilāfah*, identifying stewardship, justice, compassion, and accountability as defining characteristics of legitimate leadership. Judaic literature highlighted leadership as an ethical obligation centered on justice and communal responsibility, particularly through the principle of *tikkun olam*. Buddhist scholarship conceptualized leadership as compassionate action aimed at alleviating suffering, grounded in mindfulness, ethical conduct, and interdependence.

Moral Virtues as Antecedents of Servant Leadership:

The analysis indicated that moral identity and virtues functioned as foundational antecedents to servant leadership behavior. Across traditions, humility and compassion emerged as central virtues shaping leadership orientation. Humility was consistently associated with restraint of ego, moral self-regulation, and openness to serving others. Compassion was identified as a motivating force guiding leaders toward care for the vulnerable, empathy in decision-making, and commitment to collective wellbeing. Justice and moral accountability were also prominent across the reviewed literature. Leadership was portrayed as inseparable from ethical judgment, fairness, and responsibility for consequences affecting individuals, communities, and social systems. These virtues aligned closely with established servant leadership dimensions, reinforcing their theoretical coherence.

Servant Leadership Behaviors and Domains:

Findings further indicated that ethical virtues translated into identifiable servant leadership behaviors across five core domains: ethical conduct, empowerment of others, relational orientation, community building, and stewardship. Leaders operating within these traditions were depicted as prioritizing the growth and wellbeing of followers, fostering trust, and promoting inclusive and participatory practices. Service-oriented leadership behaviors were consistently linked to moral intention rather than instrumental or performance-driven motives.

Outcomes at Individual, Organizational, and Societal Levels:

The literature revealed that servant leadership behaviors were associated with positive outcomes at multiple levels. At the individual level, findings consistently pointed to enhanced follower wellbeing, trust, engagement, and prosocial behavior, including organizational citizenship behaviors. At the organizational level, servant leadership was associated with ethical climates, relational trust, and sustainable performance. At the societal level, leadership grounded in service and stewardship was linked to social cohesion, justice-oriented practices, and environmental sustainability. Environmental responsibility emerged as a notable outcome across traditions, particularly within Islamic, Judaic, and Buddhist sources. Stewardship of natural resources and concern for ecological balance were repeatedly identified as integral components of ethical leadership rather than peripheral concerns.

Cross-Tradition Consistency and Variability:

While the ethical foundations of servant leadership demonstrated strong convergence, the findings also revealed contextual variability in emphasis and expression. The degree to which service was framed as divine obligation, moral covenant, or individual ethical discipline varied across traditions. However, these differences did not undermine the shared moral orientation toward service-based leadership. Instead, they reinforced the adaptability of servant leadership principles across diverse cultural and religious contexts.

Table 1: Convergent Ethical Foundations of Servant Leadership Across Religious Traditions

Ethical Dimension	Christianity	Islam	Judaism	Buddhism
Humility	Self-sacrificial leadership modeled by Jesus Christ	Moral restraint and accountability before God	Humility as prerequisite for justice and ethical authority	Ego reduction and self-discipline
Compassion	Love, care for the marginalized	*Raḥmah* (compassion) toward all beings	Communal care and social responsibility	Alleviation of suffering
Justice	Moral responsibility and fairness	*'Adl* (justice) as leadership obligation	Ethical justice and *tikkun olam*	Ethical conduct and right action
Stewardship	Responsible care for others and creation	*Khilāfah* (trusteeship of earth)	Social and environmental responsibility	Interdependence with nature
Moral Accountability	Service-oriented moral leadership	Leadership as trust (*amānah*)	Ethical covenant and obligation	Ethical mindfulness

Note. *The table illustrates convergence in ethical foundations despite theological differences.*

Table 1 synthesizes ethical teachings from Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism into a comparative framework that highlights substantive convergence in core moral values underlying servant leadership. By organizing diverse theological perspectives around shared ethical dimensions such as humility, compassion, justice, stewardship, and moral accountability, the table reduces conceptual fragmentation in the literature and demonstrates that servant leadership is grounded in enduring moral traditions rather than being a culturally bounded or contemporary construct.

Table 2: Alignment of Religious Ethical Values with Servant Leadership Dimensions

Religious Ethical Value	Corresponding Servant Leadership Dimension
Humility	Ethical leadership, self-awareness
Compassion	Empathy, healing, relational orientation
Justice	Moral responsibility, ethical decision-making
Stewardship	Sustainability orientation, long-term responsibility
Service to Others	Empowerment, follower development
Moral Accountability	Integrity, trust-building

Note. *Mapping was conducted using Greenleaf's servant leadership framework and subsequent conceptual extensions.*

Table 2 advances theoretical clarity by explicitly mapping religious ethical values onto established servant leadership dimensions derived from Greenleaf's framework. This alignment strengthens construct validity by showing how abstract moral principles translate into recognizable leadership behaviors, such as ethical decision-making, empowerment, relational orientation, and sustainability-focused stewardship. The table thus serves as a conceptual bridge between ethical philosophy and leadership theory, reinforcing servant leadership's coherence as an integrated ethical leadership model.

Table 3: Observed Outcomes of Servant Leadership Across Levels

Level of Outcome	Key Findings
Individual (Followers)	Wellbeing, trust, engagement, organizational citizenship behaviors
Organizational	Ethical climate, relational trust, sustainable performance
Societal	Social cohesion, justice-oriented practices, environmental sustainability

Note. Outcomes are synthesized from recurring themes across reviewed literature.

Table 3 extends the theoretical integration by synthesizing outcomes of servant leadership across individual, organizational, and societal levels. By demonstrating consistent links between servant leadership and follower wellbeing, ethical organizational climates, social cohesion, and environmental sustainability, the table illustrates the multi-level impact of ethically grounded leadership. This synthesis underscores servant leadership's relevance not only for organizational effectiveness but also for broader societal and sustainability-oriented leadership outcomes.

5. Discussion

The present study set out to examine servant leadership through a comparative religious lens, with the aim of identifying shared ethical foundations across Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism. The findings extend existing servant leadership scholarship by demonstrating that the core principles of servant leadership humility, compassion, justice, moral accountability, and stewardship are not merely contemporary managerial ideals but are deeply embedded in long-standing religious and ethical traditions. This supports the growing scholarly view that servant leadership represents a morally grounded leadership paradigm rather than a context-specific organizational technique.

Consistent with Greenleaf's (1970) original conceptualization, the findings reaffirm that authentic leadership emerges from a desire to serve rather than to exercise power. The convergence of ethical values across religious traditions strengthens the theoretical legitimacy of servant leadership as a universal ethical framework. Previous empirical and conceptual studies have largely emphasized servant leadership's interpersonal and organizational outcomes, such as trust, engagement, and follower development (Spears, 1998; Halawi & Van Dierendonck, 2025). The present study complements and extends this literature by situating these outcomes within broader moral and spiritual narratives that have shaped leadership ideals for centuries.

The alignment between Christian teachings and servant leadership observed in this study is consistent with prior scholarship emphasizing humility, self-sacrifice, and stewardship as central to ethical leadership (Wilkes, 1998; Firestone, 2024). Christianity's emphasis on leadership through service and moral responsibility mirrors Greenleaf's assertion that the legitimacy of leadership lies in its capacity to uplift others. This reinforces earlier arguments that servant leadership resonates strongly with Christian ethical traditions while remaining applicable in secular organizational contexts (Karthikeyan, 2024).

Similarly, the Islamic conception of leadership as *khilāfah* underscores stewardship, justice, and accountability as fundamental leadership obligations. These findings align with prior studies highlighting the compatibility between Islamic leadership ethics and servant leadership principles, particularly in relation to justice (*'adl*), compassion (*raḥmah*), and consultation (*shūrā*) (Faisal, 2024; Ruhullah & Ushama, 2025). By framing leadership as a trust (*amānah*) rather than a privilege, Islamic teachings reinforce servant leadership's emphasis on moral accountability and long-term responsibility.

Judaism's focus on ethical responsibility and social repair through *tikkun olam* further strengthens the moral foundations of servant leadership identified in this study. Previous research has emphasized Judaism's contribution to ethical leadership through its emphasis on justice, communal welfare, and accountability (Dorff, 2007; Blidstein, 1995). The present findings extend this literature by demonstrating how Judaic ethics align closely with servant leadership's concern for societal wellbeing and sustainable social systems.

Buddhism's contribution to servant leadership discourse is particularly notable in its emphasis on

compassion, mindfulness, and the alleviation of suffering. Consistent with prior scholarship, Buddhist leadership ethics emphasize inner moral discipline, reduction of ego, and interdependence as foundations for ethical action (Marques, 2019; Sutamchai, 2021). These principles align with servant leadership's focus on empathy, healing, and ethical awareness, suggesting that servant leadership is equally compatible with non-theistic ethical frameworks.

An important contribution of this study lies in extending servant leadership beyond human-centered outcomes to include environmental stewardship and sustainability. Prior leadership research has increasingly emphasized the need for ethical leadership models that address ecological degradation and long-term societal challenges (Ferdig, 2007; Del Baldo, 2018). The convergence of religious teachings on stewardship and care for creation observed in this study reinforces the argument that servant leadership is well positioned to address sustainability concerns as a moral obligation rather than a strategic choice.

Despite differences in theological orientation, the convergence observed across traditions supports the universality and cross-cultural legitimacy of servant leadership. This finding responds directly to critiques that servant leadership may be culturally bounded or overly idealistic. Instead, the evidence suggests that servant leadership reflects deeply rooted ethical values shared across civilizations, enhancing its relevance in diverse organizational and cultural contexts. However, the study also acknowledges that religious traditions vary in how service is conceptualized whether as divine command, ethical covenant, or individual moral discipline. These differences suggest that while servant leadership principles are universal, their expression may be shaped by cultural and institutional contexts. This insight aligns with stewardship theory and social learning theory, which emphasize the role of values and socialization processes in shaping leadership behavior (Fry, 2003).

Overall, the discussion highlights servant leadership as an ethically resilient leadership model grounded in enduring moral traditions. By integrating religious ethics with contemporary leadership theory, this study contributes to a more holistic understanding of servant leadership and provides a robust conceptual foundation for future empirical research.

Implications
Theoretical Implications: This study strengthens the theoretical legitimacy and conceptual foundations of servant leadership by situating the construct within enduring ethical traditions rooted in major world religions. The demonstrated alignment between the moral values of ancient religious traditions and the core principles of servant leadership reinforces its claim as a universal, cross-cultural leadership framework rather than a narrowly defined managerial approach. By highlighting the role of spiritual and ethical narratives in shaping leadership values, the findings contribute to a broader theoretical understanding of how moral virtues such as humility, compassion, justice, and stewardship inform ethical leadership orientations across diverse cultural and institutional contexts.

Methodological Implications:
From a methodological perspective, the findings underscore the need for more diverse and integrative research designs in servant leadership scholarship. Future studies would benefit from mixed-method approaches, including ethnographic investigations and narrative case analyses, to capture how specific religious and cultural traditions influence the enactment of servant leadership behaviors in practice. In addition, longitudinal and cross-cultural empirical research designs are recommended to examine the stability, evolution, and causal pathways of servant leadership over time, thereby strengthening the generalizability and robustness of existing theoretical claims.

Limitations
Despite its theoretical contributions, this study is subject to several limitations. First, the research adopted a qualitative, conceptual review approach and did not include empirical data. As such, the findings are interpretive and rely on existing literature rather than direct observation or measurement of leadership behavior. While this approach is appropriate for theory development, it limits the ability to draw causal inferences.

Second, the study focused exclusively on four religious traditions Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism. Although these traditions represent major ethical and philosophical systems, other influential

traditions such as Hinduism, Confucianism, Sikhism, and Taoism were not included. Their exclusion may limit the generalizability of the findings and the broader claim of universality.

Third, theological and ethical concepts such as humility, compassion, and service may vary in meaning across historical and cultural contexts. Despite efforts to maintain analytical consistency, the interpretation of these constructs may oversimplify nuanced doctrinal differences. Finally, the reliance on secondary sources introduces the potential for publication bias and interpretive subjectivity.

Future Research Directions

Future research can build on this study in several important ways. First, empirical studies using quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-method designs are needed to examine how religiously informed ethical values translate into observable servant leadership behaviors across organizational settings. Longitudinal studies could further explore how moral identity and leadership orientation develop over time.

Second, future research should expand the comparative framework to include additional religious and philosophical traditions, such as Hinduism, Confucianism, and indigenous belief systems, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of servant leadership's ethical foundations. Such expansion would enhance cross-cultural validity and theoretical richness.

Third, contextual factors such as organizational culture, national culture, and institutional norms warrant closer examination as potential moderators influencing the enactment of servant leadership. Comparative cross-national studies could offer valuable insights into how servant leadership is expressed differently across cultural contexts.

Finally, future research should explore the relationship between servant leadership and sustainability outcomes more explicitly, particularly in relation to environmental stewardship and social responsibility. Integrating servant leadership with sustainability and ethical governance frameworks may yield practical implications for leadership development, policy formulation, and organizational change initiatives.

6. Conclusion

This study examined servant leadership through a comparative religious lens, drawing on ethical teachings from Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism to explore its philosophical and moral foundations. The synthesis of the reviewed literature demonstrates that servant leadership is not a contemporary managerial innovation but a leadership paradigm deeply embedded in enduring religious and ethical traditions. Across all four traditions, leadership is consistently framed as a moral responsibility grounded in service, humility, compassion, justice, and stewardship.

The convergence of these ethical principles reinforces the conceptual robustness and cross-cultural legitimacy of servant leadership theory. By situating servant leadership within long-standing moral frameworks, the study extends Greenleaf's original proposition and strengthens its relevance for contemporary organizational, societal, and environmental challenges. Importantly, the findings highlight that servant leadership aligns with both theistic and non-theistic ethical systems, underscoring its universality and adaptability across diverse cultural and institutional contexts.

Moreover, the study contributes to leadership scholarship by extending servant leadership beyond interpersonal and organizational outcomes to include broader concerns such as social cohesion and environmental sustainability. By integrating religious ethical perspectives into servant leadership theory, the study offers a holistic and ethically grounded understanding of leadership that responds to growing demands for moral accountability and sustainable leadership practices in modern organizations.

REFERENCES

Alemu, B. A. (2025). Cultivating a culture of sustainability: The role of organizational values and leadership in driving sustainable practices. *Business Ethics and Leadership, 9*(1), 79–94.

Baldelomar, C. (2025). Spiritual leadership: An exploration of values, purpose, and influence in modern organizations. In *The Palgrave encyclopedia of leadership and organizational change* (pp. 1–5). Springer Nature.

Ben-Hur, S., & Jonsen, K. (2012). Ethical leadership: Lessons from Moses. *Journal of Management Development, 31*(9), 962–973.

Blidstein, G. J. (1995). Tikkun olam. *Tradition: A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought, 29*(2), 5–43.

Blyzniuk, T., & Blyzniuk, O. (2024). Contemporary theories of leadership: A cross-cultural analysis. *Economy and Society*, (66).

Boeske, J. (2023). Leadership towards sustainability: A review of sustainable, sustainability, and environmental leadership. *Sustainability, 15*(16), 12626.

Case, S. S. (2023). Judaism and ecological discourse: What a Jewish religious perspective offers to contemporary sustainability dialogue. In *Faith traditions and sustainability: New views and practices for environmental protection* (pp. 177–207). Springer.

Del Baldo, M. (2018). The ethical and moral-based dimension of leadership in CSR-oriented strategies and sustainable entrepreneurship. In *Sustainable entrepreneurship* (pp. 195–220). Routledge.

Dorff, E. N. (2007). *The way into tikkun olam (repairing the world).* Jewish Lights.

Drewes, D. (2021). The problem of becoming a bodhisattva and the emergence of Mahāyāna. *History of Religions, 61*(2), 145–172.

Fabjański, M., & Brymer, E. (2017). Enhancing health and wellbeing through immersion in nature: A conceptual perspective combining the Stoic and Buddhist traditions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8,* 1573.

Fahm, A. O. (2025). *Ethical foundations and guidelines in Islamic psychology.* Taylor & Francis.

Faisal, A. (2024). The concept of stewardship (khilāfah) in Islam and its implications for environmental sustainability. In *IICASS–Ibn Khaldun International Conference on Applied and Social Sciences* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 41–44).

Faisal, M. S., & Hashmi, S. J. A. (2025). The Quran and environmental ethics: A call for sustainable living in modern times. *ASSAJ, 3*(01), 496–508.

Ferdig, M. A. (2007). Sustainability leadership: Co-creating a sustainable future. *Journal of Change Management, 7*(1), 25–35.

Firestone, S. (2024). Humility and leadership. In *Leading with humility, hope, and humor: Christian perspectives on how to lead in challenging times* (pp. 7–27). Springer Nature.

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(6), 693–727.

Graebner, M. E., Martin, J. A., & Roundy, P. T. (2012). Qualitative data: Cooking without a recipe. *Strategic Organization, 10*(3), 276–284.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader.* Greenleaf Center.

Halawi, Y. S., & Van Dierendonck, D. (2025). A context-specific coaching practice: An introduction to servant leadership coaching. In *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 241–265). Springer Nature.

Hanif, S. (2024). Islamic perspectives on environmental ethics: Balancing modern progress with sustainability. *International Journal of the Universe and Humanity in Islamic Vision and Perspective, 1*(2), 23–34.

Karthikeyan, C. (2024). Integrating biblical wisdom into experiential servant leadership education: A literature review. *International Journal of Research Culture Society, 8*(2), 48–65.

Kelly, B. (2025). Conclusions: Buddhism, psychiatry, mindfulness. In *Buddhism and psychiatry: Moving beyond mindfulness in mental health care* (pp. 83–89). Springer Nature.

Kunisch, S., Menz, M., Bartunek, J. M., Cardinal, L. B., & Denyer, D. (2018). How to conduct rigorous and impactful literature reviews? *Organizational Research Methods, 21*(3), 519–523.

Le, L. T. (2022). How can Buddhist education help adolescents develop moral behavior? *Religious Education, 117*(2), 138–153.

Maguate, G. (2024). Understanding sustainable leadership: A review and forward outlook. *SSRN Electronic Journal.*

Marques, J. (2019). How Buddhist thinking fits in leadership. In *Lead with heart in mind: Treading the noble eightfold path for mindful and sustainable practice* (pp. 17–33). Springer.

Morsch, G., & Nelson, D. (2006). *The power of serving others: You can start where you are.* Berrett-Koehler.

Okpala, C., & Caldwell, C. (2019). Humility, forgiveness, and love—The heart of ethical stewardship. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership, 12*(2), Article 10.

Phan, H. P., Ngu, B. H., Chen, S. C., Wu, L., Shih, J. H., & Shi, S. Y. (2021). Life, death, and spirituality: A conceptual analysis for educational research development. *Heliyon, 7*(5), e07086.

Rahman, K., Ahmed, K., Chaudhary, A. I., Nadeem, K. A., Shukla, N., Simon, S., & Anwer, S. M. (2024). The role of religions in fostering peace, harmony, and justice. *Policy Perspectives, 21*(2), 155–193.

Rahman, M. A. (2025). The significance of religious values in forming sustainable life and economic progress. *International Journal of Scientific Interdisciplinary Research, 6*(1), 60–87.

Ruhullah, M. E., & Ushama, T. (2025). Leadership in Islam: A spiritual and theological doctrine. *Fikroh: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Pendidikan Islam, 18*(1), 54–74.

Spears, L. C. (1998). Introduction: Tracing the growing impact of servant leadership. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 1–12). Wiley.

Sutamchai, K. (2021). *The influence of mindfulness on ethical leadership: A study of Buddhist mindfulness practices among organisational leaders in Thailand* (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Manchester.

Thakadipuram, T. (2023). Serving the greater goodness. In *Leadership wholeness* (Vol. 1, pp. 187–227). Springer.

Van Vugt, M., & Ronay, R. (2014). The evolutionary psychology of leadership: Theory, review, and roadmap. *Organizational Psychology Review, 4*(1), 74–95.

Waldron, W. S. (2000). Beyond nature/nurture: Buddhism and biology on interdependence. *Contemporary Buddhism, 1*(2), 199–226.

Wilkes, C. G. (1998). *Jesus on leadership.* Tyndale House.