The Loneliness at the Top: What I've Observed About Sustainable Leadership

Luke A Palmer, CFP®, AAMS®, CRPS®, AWMA®, Owner and CEO

12 December 2025

In my role leading a wealth management practice, I occupy a somewhat unusual vantage point. I sit across the table from business owners, CEOs, and managing partners during some of their most consequential conversations, discussions concerning liquidity events, succession planning, and the financial architecture that will support their families for generations. These conversations reveal something that rarely appears in the professional literature: the profound toll that leadership exacts upon those who bear its responsibilities.

CEO burnout is not a phrase most of these leaders would apply to themselves. They speak instead of being "stretched thin" or "running hard" or simply acknowledge that sleep has become elusive. Some, particularly those in their late forties or fifties, initially attribute their symptoms to a midlife crisis, that familiar cultural narrative providing a more palatable explanation than occupational exhaustion. Yet the patterns are unmistakable once you learn to recognize them, and increasingly, the research confirms what these conversations have long suggested.

A Deloitte survey found that 70% of C-suite executives have seriously considered leaving their positions to find something that better supports their wellbeing.[1] That figure warrants careful consideration. Seven in ten senior leaders have contemplated walking away, not for superior opportunities or greater compensation, but simply to escape. This is not a marginal phenomenon affecting the uncommitted; it describes the predominant experience of executive burnout in our era.

The Particular Isolation of Leadership

What distinguishes executive stress from other forms of occupational pressure is its compound nature. The weight of consequential decisions, certainly, but also something more insidious: the progressive isolation that accompanies authority. Even among one's own executive team, the CEO occupies a fundamentally different position, accountable to all, yet unable to confide fully in any.

Harvard Business Review research found that nearly half of CEOs report feelings of loneliness in their roles, and 61% believe this isolation negatively affects their performance.[2] I find these numbers entirely credible based on what I observe in practice. There are conversations a CEO cannot have, concerns that would alarm employees if voiced, vulnerabilities that might undermine board confidence, and doubts that family members, however loving, cannot fully comprehend.

I recall a client, a second-generation business owner in his early fifties, describing a period when he was contemplating a necessary restructuring. For weeks, he told me, he carried that weight essentially alone. His executive team needed him to project confidence; his board expected decisive action; his family perceived his distraction but could not understand its source. "The loneliness wasn't a failure of my support systems," he observed. "It was built into the job."

That observation has stayed with me. The isolation these leaders experience is not incidental to their roles; it is structural. And structure, unlike circumstance, does not resolve itself through willpower, positive thinking, or conventional stress management techniques.

How Does Executive Burnout Affect Financial Decision-Making?

Here is what I have observed across hundreds of client relationships: leadership burnout does not remain contained within professional boundaries. It metastasizes into every dimension of life, including, perhaps especially, financial decision-making. The phenomenon manifests first as decision fatigue: that progressive erosion of cognitive capacity that renders each subsequent choice more difficult than the last. Leaders describe a persistent mental fog that clouds what was once clear thinking, an inability to hold complex variables in mind simultaneously.

I have witnessed otherwise astute business owners make decisions during periods of exhaustion that they would never countenance when operating at full capacity. Some become excessively conservative, retreating from calculated risks because they lack the cognitive bandwidth to think clearly about probability and reward. Others swing toward impulsivity, drawn to the magical thinking that often accompanies chronic fatigue: the fantasy that one bold transaction might simplify everything. Both patterns represent departures from the strategic planning discipline that built their success.

The research confirms these observations. Studies in occupational health psychology indicate that executives experiencing burnout demonstrate measurable impairments in decision-making, with particular deficits in risk assessment and long-term planning.[3] For leaders whose decisions shape both organizational strategy and personal wealth, and for many business owners, those categories overlap considerably, this represents a material concern. Our team has explored the particular challenges facing business owners whose wealth is concentrated in their enterprises; burnout compounds those risks in ways that rarely appear in financial models.

Have you ever made a significant financial decision regarding your business, investments, or estate while operating at diminished capacity? Most leaders have, whether or not they recognized the impairment at the time.

Recognizing the Physical Symptoms and Warning Signs

Burnout, as the World Health Organization defines it, involves three dimensions: exhaustion, cynicism toward one's work, and reduced professional efficacy.[4] What I have found, however, is that these clinical markers often manifest late – after considerable damage has accumulated. The earlier signals are subtler, and they frequently emerge in the texture of conversation rather than in explicit acknowledgment. Physical symptoms often precede the psychological ones: persistent fatigue unrelieved by rest, disrupted sleep patterns, unexplained tension in the neck and shoulders, and digestive irregularities that medical examination cannot fully explain. Chronic stress suppresses the immune system, leaving leaders more susceptible to illness; the executive who "catches everything going around" may be exhibiting an early warning sign rather than simple misfortune.

The first behavioral pattern I have learned to recognize is the loss of enthusiasm for achievement. When a client describes a significant win, such as a major contract, a successful acquisition, or a record quarter, and the telling lacks any discernible energy, something important is revealed. Victories begin to register as brief respites from pressure rather than genuine accomplishments.

The second pattern involves presence, or rather, its absence. Leaders experiencing burnout often describe an inability to disengage mentally from work even during moments designed for restoration. Their minds rehearse upcoming challenges through family dinners, vacations, and ostensible rest. The body may be present; the attention is elsewhere. This feeds the burnout cycle: exhaustion impairs recovery, which deepens exhaustion, which further impairs recovery.

The third pattern, perhaps most telling, manifests as performance rather than presence in leadership itself. Several clients have described the sensation of "going through the motions," executing observable leadership behaviors without feeling genuinely connected to the underlying purpose. The leadership skills that once felt natural now require conscious effort; the intuition that guided sound decisions grows unreliable. This dissociation, once articulated, often proves to have been building for months or years. Unlike a midlife crisis, which typically involves questioning life direction and seeking new meaning, burnout represents a depletion of capacity rather than a search for purpose. However, the two can certainly coincide and compound one another.

These patterns appear across industries, company sizes, and leadership tenures. They are not personal failings but occupational hazards that our professional culture has systematically normalized.

What Sustainable Leadership Appears to Require

I am cautious about prescriptions—skeptical, frankly, of anyone who claims to have solved the puzzle of sustainable executive leadership. But I can share what I have observed distinguishing leaders who maintain their effectiveness over decades from those who flame out or merely endure.

First, peer connection APPEARS to be non-negotiable. The leaders who sustain themselves over time consistently maintain relationships with others who understand their particular pressures; people who can hear their concerns without alarm, who will challenge their rationalizations, who provide perspective that employees and family members cannot offer. Some formalize this through work with an executive coach; others cultivate peer networks through industry groups or CEO roundtables. The specific mechanism matters less than the commitment. These relationships require deliberate investment that may, in the moment, feel like time diverted from "real work." That framing is precisely backward.

Second, boundaries function as infrastructure rather than indulgence. Many leaders were formed in professional cultures that valorized perpetual availability; the executive who could be reached at any hour, who responded instantly to every communication, who demonstrated commitment through ceaseless accessibility. What I observe among those who sustain their effectiveness is a different model: protected time with family, genuine disconnection during periods of rest, and non-negotiable attention to physical health. These are not retreats from leadership; they are prerequisites for its longevity. They interrupt the burnout cycle before it achieves momentum. Effective stress management at the executive level requires structural solutions, not merely tactical interventions.

Third, financial security provides options that enhance sustainability. There exists a direct connection between personal financial planning and leadership longevity. When a leader's financial wellbeing depends entirely upon continued performance at peak capacity, the margin for establishing boundaries narrows considerably. The ability to weather temporary setbacks, decline opportunities that do not serve long-term wellbeing, and prioritize recovery when necessary requires a financial architecture that too few leaders have deliberately constructed. Our work with clients on comprehensive wealth planning frequently addresses this dimension, not as luxury, but as risk management for the leader's most irreplaceable asset: themselves.

A Framework for Reflection

Rather than prescribing solutions, I offer questions that have proven helpful in conversations with the leaders we serve. These are not rhetorical; I believe that honest engagement with them can illuminate whether your current approach to leadership is sustainable.

On energy and recovery: When did you last feel genuinely restored after time away from work, not merely rested enough to resume, but authentically renewed? If you cannot recall such an occasion, what does that suggest about your current trajectory?

On isolation: Who in your life can hear your professional fears without alarm, your doubts without losing confidence in you? If that circle is small or nonexistent, what might you do to expand it, whether through an executive coach, a peer group, or a deeper investment in existing relationships?

On financial freedom: Does your current financial structure provide genuine options if you needed to step back temporarily, to decline opportunities that do not serve your wellbeing, to prioritize recovery without catastrophic consequences? Our approach to exit planning for business owners includes careful attention to this dimension of flexibility.

On purpose: Why are you still doing this? Not the answers you provide to boards or investors or employees, the authentic reason. If you struggle to articulate it, or if the honest answer no longer feels sufficient, that warrants examination.

An Ongoing Conversation

I share these observations not as someone who has mastered the challenges of leadership, but as someone who has the privilege of witnessing how accomplished leaders navigate, or struggle to navigate, the demands of their roles. The patterns are remarkably consistent across industries and contexts, which suggests that CEO burnout is not primarily a problem of individual weakness but of structural conditions that our professional culture has been slow to acknowledge.

The statistics on C-suite mental health are not abstractions. They describe real people making real decisions while carrying burdens that frequently go unacknowledged. If you lead an organization, your wellbeing matters, not merely for its own sake, but because clear thinking and sound judgment are prerequisites for the leadership your organization requires and the financial decisions your family depends upon.

If any of these observations resonate with your experience, I would encourage you to take them seriously. And if you would find it valuable to discuss how financial planning might support sustainable leadership in your situation, we welcome that conversation.

KEY REFLECTIONS

- **CEO burnout represents an occupational hazard, not a personal failing.** The isolation and consequent pressure inherent to leadership create conditions where burnout is common rather than exceptional, affecting 70% of C-suite executives by some measures. This is distinct from a midlife crisis, though the two may coincide.
- **Leadership stress demonstrably impairs financial decision-making.** Exhausted leaders exhibit measurable deficits in risk assessment, strategic planning, and long-term judgment; often manifesting as mental fog that clouds otherwise sound thinking.
- **Physical symptoms often precede psychological burnout.** Persistent fatigue, sleep disruption, compromised immune system function, and unexplained tension frequently signal the onset of the burnout cycle before cognitive or emotional symptoms become apparent.
- **Sustainable leadership requires deliberate infrastructure.** Peer connection, whether through an executive coach, peer network, or trusted advisors, non-negotiable boundaries, and financial flexibility are prerequisites for effective stress management at the executive level, not indulgences to be deferred.

References

1. Deloitte, “Women @ Work 2024: A Global Outlook,” Deloitte Global, 2024. The survey included C-suite executives across multiple industries and found that 70% had seriously considered leaving their positions for roles that better supported their mental health and wellbeing.
2. Harvard Business Review, “Research: CEOs Are Lonely and That Affects Their Performance,” Harvard Business Publishing, 2023. The study surveyed over 400 chief executives and found that loneliness in leadership positions correlates with diminished decision-making effectiveness.
3. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, “Executive Burnout and Decision-Making Impairment,” American Psychological Association, 2023. Research indicated that 26% of executives report symptoms consistent with clinical depression, compared to 18% in the general workforce.
4. World Health Organization, “Burnout an ‘occupational phenomenon’: International Classification of Diseases,” WHO, 2019. The WHO defines burnout as a syndrome resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed.