

Leader wellbeing & performance: the proof

Why leader wellbeing is a high-leverage variable for organisations.

“You can’t separate leadership performance from leadership wellbeing. One enables the other - two sides of the same coin.”

THE EVIDENCE CHAIN

- 1

Leader wellbeing - single strongest driver of organisational wellbeing: 11x more impactful than employee stress-management programmes, 4x more impactful than wellbeing apps. *(WorkWell Leaders & National University of Singapore, 2025)*
- 2

Leadership capability - poorly managed leader stress impairs decision-making and degrades team dynamics. *(Dulal-Arthur et al., 2024; McQuaid & Williams, 2023; Harter, Schmidt & Keyes, 2003)*
- 3

Employee wellbeing & engagement - managers account for ~70% of the variance in team engagement, across 183,806 teams and 3.3 million employees. *(Harter et al., 2009, Gallup)*
- 4

Operational outcomes - wellbeing gains linked to ~10% productivity increases, positively correlated with productivity, customer loyalty and profitability. *(Oswald, Proto & Sgroi, 2015; Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002)*
- 5

Financial outcomes - workplace wellbeing positively associated with profitability and firm value; employee satisfaction portfolios outperform stock market benchmarks by ~2-3.5% annually. *(Edmans, 2011; De Neve et al., 2023)*

THE GLWS® DATA POINT: THE LEADER WELLBEING PAYOFF

Within the GLWS® Leader segment (n=3,342), leaders with high overall work wellbeing look very different to those with low wellbeing on the things that matter most to the business:

4.50 vs 2.56		3.31 vs 2.00		4.37 vs 3.56	
Considered quitting (higher = less often)		Burnout risk (higher = lower risk)		Trust in their boss	
ALSO HOLDS TRUE FOR					
Job satisfaction		HIGH WELLBEING AT WORK		LOW WELLBEING AT WORK	
		4.36		3.01	
Self-rated work performance		4.04		3.56	
Feel fully utilised, not under-utilised		3.86		3.21	
Overall life wellbeing		4.01		2.94	

High work wellbeing = rated 4-5 of 5; low = rated 1-2 of 5. All differences $p<0.001$; correlations $r=0.26$ to 0.59 . Sample sizes: $n=483-486$ (quitting, satisfaction, performance); $n=3,225-3,348$ (trust, utilisation, burnout risk, life wellbeing). Source: GLWS® benchmark dataset, independently validated by the University of Melbourne. This is a correlational analysis - it shows these outcomes move together with wellbeing, not that one causes the other.

“Leader wellbeing is not merely a deeply personal matter and HR concern. It is a strategic asset: measurable, manageable and directly linked to individual and business performance outcomes at every level of the organisation.”

Audrey McGibbon, CEO, EEK & SENSE