

# Lauve Wellbeing Leadership Scale (LWLS)

*A Framework for Measuring Community Leadership Through the Lauve Wellbeing Lens*

Based on 30 Years of Global Research by Dr Timothy Lynch

Lynch, T. (2024). *Physical Education and Wellbeing: Global and Holistic Approaches to Child Health and Academic Learning* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-72874-7>

Version 1.0 | November 2026

**LAUVE = Learning Approach Using Values Education**

---

*"It is not about the events, it is not about the intensity... it is about the consistency."*

*"Better Human Beings = Better performance."*

*"Do community members truly belong and feel valued  
- so that they can be their best?"*

# Executive Summary

The Lauve Wellbeing Leadership Scale (LWLS) is a formal academic rubric designed to measure and evaluate community leadership effectiveness through the comprehensive lens of Lauve Wellbeing theory. Grounded in 30 years of global research across six countries, this framework provides a systematic approach to assessing how leaders—whether in sporting, political, educational, or community contexts—embody and enact the principles of holistic wellbeing and values-based leadership.

The LWLS operationalizes the core theoretical foundations of Lauve Wellbeing: the LAUVE acronym (Learning Approach Using Values Education), five holistic dimensions (Physical, Social-Emotional, Cognitive, Spiritual, Community), three pillars (Community, Metacognition, Values), and nine OECD universal competencies (Reflection, Collaboration and cooperation, Learning to learn, Respect, Responsibility, Empathy, Self-regulation, Persistence, Trust). The scale comprises seven domains with 22 observable indicators, each assessed across four implementation levels derived from Sparkes (1991): Surface (Level 1), Developing (Level 2), Implementing (Level 3), and Deep-Transformative (Level 4).

This framework addresses a critical gap in leadership assessment by moving beyond narrow performance metrics to evaluate leaders' capacity to foster genuine belonging, collective understanding, and transformative change within their communities. The LWLS is applicable across diverse contexts - from sports coaches and school principals to political leaders and community organizers - and is extensible to institutional evaluation of universities, schools, clubs, and organizations.

---

# 1. Introduction: Grounding the Scale in Lauve Wellbeing Theory

## 1.1 The Lauve Wellbeing Framework

Lauve Wellbeing is an evidence-based framework that emerged from three decades of research conducted by Dr Timothy Lynch across six countries: the United Kingdom, Australia, Qatar, Brunei Darussalam, Saudi Arabia, and British Schools Overseas in Africa. The acronym LAUVE stands for Learning Approach Using Values Education - a framework that recognises wellbeing as far more than the absence of illness. True wellbeing integrates physical, emotional, cognitive, social, and spiritual dimensions that must be cultivated intentionally throughout community life.

The framework is built upon three curriculum pillars that emerged consistently across all research contexts: Community (belonging and authentic partnerships), Metacognition (thinking about learning and self-reflection), and Values (global citizenship through the nine OECD universal competencies). These pillars operate within five holistic dimensions of wellbeing and are underpinned by the recognition that surface-level implementation of values produces minimal impact, while deep implementation - characterised by leadership commitment, collective understanding, consistent enactment, and contextual adaptation - produces transformative outcomes.

## 1.2 The Nine OECD Universal Competencies

At the core of Lauve Wellbeing are nine universal competencies identified by the OECD as directly related to Learning Values. These competencies are not abstract ideals to be taught through lectures; they are lived values that individuals develop through authentic experiences. They form the operational foundation of the LWLS:

- 1. Reflection**
- 2. Collaboration and cooperation**
- 3. Learning to learn**
- 4. Respect**
- 5. Responsibility**
- 6. Empathy**
- 7. Self-regulation**
- 8. Persistence**
- 9. Trust**

## 1.3 Four Enabling Conditions for Deep Implementation

Research identifies four conditions required for deep rather than surface-level implementation - the distinction between transformative outcomes and tokenistic display. These conditions form the evaluative backbone of the LWLS rubric levels:

- 1. Genuine leadership commitment: The leader's authentic, visible, and sustained dedication to Lauve Wellbeing principles.**
  - 2. Collective understanding: Shared comprehension of values and wellbeing principles across all community members.**
  - 3. Consistent enactment: Embedding wellbeing values into all aspects of organisational life, not merely display boards or special events.**
  - 4. Contextual adaptation: Thoughtful tailoring of implementation to the unique culture, needs, and strengths of the specific community.**
-

## 2. The LWLS Seven Domains and 22 Indicators

The LWLS is organised into seven domains, each derived from the theoretical architecture of Lauve Wellbeing. Each domain contains three observable indicators (and Domain 4 has four), producing 22 indicators in total. The domains are mapped to the five holistic dimensions and three pillars of Lauve Wellbeing:

| Domain   | Domain Name                                           | Lauve Wellbeing Foundation                                               |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain 1 | Values Leadership                                     | Values Pillar   Nine OECD Universal Competencies                         |
| Domain 2 | Community Building and Belonging                      | Community Pillar   Social-Emotional Dimension                            |
| Domain 3 | Metacognition and Reflective Leadership               | Metacognition Pillar   Cognitive Dimension                               |
| Domain 4 | Social-Emotional Intelligence                         | Social-Emotional Dimension   Five OECD Competencies                      |
| Domain 5 | Physical and Holistic Wellbeing Advocacy              | Physical Dimension   Holistic Wellbeing                                  |
| Domain 6 | Purposeful and Spiritual Leadership                   | Spiritual Dimension   Purpose and Meaning                                |
| Domain 7 | Transformative Partnership and Sustainable Governance | Lynch (2016) Nine Building Blocks   Lynch (2024) Salutogenic Perspective |

## 2.1 Domain 1: Values Leadership

**Definition:** The capacity to articulate, model, and deeply implement the nine OECD universal competencies (Reflection, Collaboration and cooperation, Learning to learn, Respect, Responsibility, Empathy, Self-regulation, Persistence, Trust) across all aspects of leadership practice.

**Theoretical Grounding:** Values leadership addresses the core challenge identified by the OECD: that values and attitudes are 'intensely contested constructs' requiring explicit pedagogical attention and consistent modelling. Research demonstrates that surface-level values implementation - where values appear on display boards without genuine integration - produces minimal impact, while deep implementation characterised by leadership commitment and consistent enactment produces transformative outcomes.

**Indicators:**

**Indicator 1.1: Values Articulation and Communication.** The leader clearly articulates core values aligned with the nine OECD universal competencies and communicates them consistently across all contexts.

**Indicator 1.2: Values Modelling and Embodiment.** The leader personally embodies and models the nine universal competencies in daily interactions, decisions, and behaviours.

**Indicator 1.3: Values Integration and Enactment.** The leader systematically integrates values across all organisational structures, policies, and practices, ensuring consistent enactment.

## 2.2 Domain 2: Community Building and Belonging

**Definition:** The capacity to create environments where all community members genuinely belong and feel valued, establishing the psychological safety necessary for risk-taking, collaboration, and deep learning.

**Theoretical Grounding:** Community is one of the three pillars of Lauve Wellbeing, centering on belonging and authentic partnerships. Research across six countries confirmed that genuine belonging creates the foundation for all other dimensions of wellbeing and performance. The central question is: 'Do community members truly belong and feel valued—so that they can be their best?'

**Indicators:**

**Indicator 2.1: Inclusive Environment Creation.** The leader actively creates inclusive environments where diverse community members feel welcomed, valued, and psychologically safe.

**Indicator 2.2: Authentic Partnership Development.** The leader develops authentic partnerships across the community, fostering genuine collaboration and shared ownership.

**Indicator 2.3: Belonging Assessment and Responsiveness.** The leader regularly assesses whether community members truly belong and feel valued, responding adaptively to strengthen belonging.

## 2.3 Domain 3: Metacognition and Reflective Leadership

**Definition:** The capacity to engage in reflective practice, promote metacognitive thinking across the community, and foster continuous learning and improvement.

**Theoretical Grounding:** Metacognition is the second pillar of Lauve Wellbeing, focusing on thinking about learning. When individuals reflect on their own learning processes, they become more self-directed and engaged. Reflection is one of the nine OECD universal competencies and is fundamental to adaptive leadership.

**Indicators:**

**Indicator 3.1: Personal Reflective Practice.** The leader engages in systematic personal reflection on leadership decisions, actions, and their impacts on community wellbeing.

**Indicator 3.2: Metacognitive Culture Development.** The leader cultivates a culture where community members regularly reflect on their learning, growth, and contributions.

**Indicator 3.3: Learning-to-Learn Facilitation.** The leader facilitates opportunities for community members to develop metacognitive skills and become self-directed learners.

## 2.4 Domain 4: Social-Emotional Intelligence

**Definition:** The capacity to demonstrate and foster empathy, self-regulation, collaboration, respect, and trust - five of the nine OECD universal competencies - across all leadership contexts.

**Theoretical Grounding:** The social-emotional dimension is one of the five holistic dimensions of Lauve Wellbeing. Research documented significant declines in social relationships and mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic, highlighting the critical importance of social-emotional intelligence in leadership. These competencies are developed through authentic experiences rather than abstract instruction.

**Indicators:**

**Indicator 4.1: Empathy and Emotional Awareness.** The leader demonstrates empathy and emotional awareness in understanding and responding to community members' experiences and needs.

**Indicator 4.2: Self-Regulation and Emotional Modelling.** The leader models self-regulation in managing emotions, stress, and challenges, providing a consistent emotional anchor for the community.

**Indicator 4.3: Collaborative and Respectful Relationships.** The leader fosters collaboration, cooperation, respect, and trust through consistent relationship-building practices.

**Indicator 4.4: Crisis Community Leadership and Psychological Recovery.** The Leader applies evidence-based psychological recovery principles to support community members through crisis, loss, and disruption, proactively embedding safety, calm, efficacy, connectedness, and hope into community leadership practice

## 2.5 Domain 5: Physical and Holistic Wellbeing Advocacy

**Definition:** The capacity to recognise and advocate for the physical dimension as fundamental to holistic wellbeing, integrating movement, physical activity, and embodied learning across leadership practice.

**Theoretical Grounding:** Research across six countries confirmed that the physical dimension is not peripheral to learning and wellbeing but fundamental. UNESCO defines quality physical education as 'the most effective means of providing all children and youth with the skills, attitudes, values, knowledge and understanding for lifelong participation in society.' Physical activity creates naturally occurring situations that require collaboration, respect, responsibility, self-regulation, and persistence.

**Indicators:**

**Indicator 5.1: Physical Dimension Recognition.** The leader recognises and articulates the physical dimension as fundamental to holistic wellbeing and performance.

**Indicator 5.2: Movement and Physical Activity Integration.** The leader integrates opportunities for movement, physical activity, and embodied learning into organisational practices.

**Indicator 5.3: Holistic Health Advocacy.** The leader advocates for holistic health approaches that integrate physical, emotional, cognitive, social, and spiritual dimensions.

## 2.6 Domain 6: Purposeful and Spiritual Leadership

**Definition:** The capacity to articulate and enact a clear sense of purpose, meaning, and connection that transcends individual interests and serves the collective good.

**Theoretical Grounding:** The spiritual dimension is one of the five holistic dimensions of Lauve Wellbeing, addressing purpose, meaning, and connection. Research demonstrates that leaders who articulate clear purpose and foster meaningful connections create environments where community members can reach their full potential. The word 'Lauve' itself reflects a developing relationship on the journey to love, requiring consistent respect, care, responsibility, reflection, and trust.

**Indicators:**

**Indicator 6.1: Purpose Articulation and Alignment.** The leader articulates a clear, compelling purpose that aligns with community values and transcends individual interests.

**Indicator 6.2: Meaning-Making and Connection.** The leader facilitates meaning making and fosters connections between individual contributions and collective purpose.

**Indicator 6.3: Ethical and Values-Centred Decision-Making.** The leader consistently makes decisions guided by ethical principles and core values, even when facing competing pressures.

## 2.7 Domain 7: Transformative Partnership and Sustainable Governance

Domain 7 is grounded in the Nine Building Blocks framework (Lynch, 2016) and the 'Best Start' conceptual framework (Lynch, 2016), integrated with the UN Sustainable Development Goals alignment and transformative partnership principles presented across both source texts. It addresses the structural, resource, governance, and contextual dimensions of community leadership that distinguish effective partnership-builders from transformative community architects.

**Definition:** The capacity to build, resource, govern, and sustain transformative multi-stakeholder partnerships; to create transparent accountability systems with measurable indicators; and to navigate political and social contexts with strategic intelligence and principled integrity.

**Theoretical Grounding:** Building Blocks 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 (Lynch, 2016, p. 30); 'Best Start' framework pillars of Partnerships, Social Justice, and Problem Solving (Lynch, 2016); Transformative partnerships built upon principles and values, shared vision, and mutual accountability (Lynch, 2016, p. 20); the Salutogenic perspective on multi-dimensional health across community, environmental, and social contexts (Lynch, 2016; Lynch, 2024).

**Indicators:**

**Indicator 7.1: Strategic Partnership and Resource Mobilisation.** The leader strategically identifies, cultivates, and sustains multi-stakeholder partnerships that combine the right resources and skills, prioritise inclusiveness and social justice, seek innovative and diversified funding solutions, and create comparative advantage for the community. (Building Blocks 2, 4, 5; 'Best Start' Partnerships pillar; Lynch, 2016)

**Indicator 7.2: Monitoring, Accountability, and Adaptive Learning Systems.** The leader establishes transparent, systematic mechanisms for monitoring, reporting, and evaluating community outcomes against clear and measurable indicators. The leader learns from results, openly acknowledges mistakes, and adapts leadership behaviour and partnership practices accordingly. (Building Block 6; Lynch, 2016)

**Indicator 7.3: Contextual Intelligence and Governance.** The leader demonstrates sophisticated awareness of political and social contexts, identifies structural problems including systemic barriers and issues of corruption or inequity, engages in capacity building, aligns community goals with global frameworks (e.g., UN SDGs), sets principled minimum standards for partnerships, and designs leadership approaches according to the nature and complexity of the problem. (Building Blocks 7, 8, 9; UN SDG alignment; Lynch, 2016)

## 3. The Four-Level Rubric: From Surface to Deep-Transformative

The LWLS employs a four-level rubric derived from Sparkes' (1991) implementation stages and adapted to reflect the four enabling conditions for deep implementation identified in Lauve Wellbeing research: genuine leadership commitment, collective understanding, consistent enactment, and contextual adaptation.

### 3.1 Level 1: Surface Implementation

**Characteristics:** Leadership practices are performative rather than genuine. Values may be articulated but are not consistently embodied or enacted. Community members do not experience genuine belonging. Reflection is absent or superficial. The physical dimension is neglected or viewed as peripheral. Purpose is unclear or disconnected from daily practice.

**Enabling Conditions:** None of the four enabling conditions are present. Leadership commitment is absent or inconsistent. Collective understanding is lacking. Enactment is sporadic or performative. Contextual adaptation is not considered.

**Impact:** Minimal impact on community wellbeing or performance outcomes. Surface-level implementation produces no sustained change.

### 3.2 Level 2: Developing Implementation

**Characteristics:** Leadership practices show emerging awareness and inconsistent application. Values are articulated but not yet deeply understood or consistently modeled. Some community members experience belonging while others remain marginalized. Reflection occurs occasionally but is not systematic. The physical dimension receives some attention but is not integrated holistically. Purpose is articulated but not yet fully enacted.

**Enabling Conditions:** One or two enabling conditions are partially present. Leadership commitment is emerging but inconsistent. Collective understanding is developing among some community members. Enactment is inconsistent across contexts. Contextual adaptation is beginning to be considered.

**Impact:** Some positive impact on community wellbeing and performance, but outcomes are inconsistent and not sustained.

### 3.3 Level 3: Implementing

**Characteristics:** Leadership practices demonstrate systematic integration across multiple dimensions. Values are clearly articulated, understood, and consistently

modeled. Most community members experience genuine belonging. Reflection is systematic and informs continuous improvement. The physical dimension is recognized as important and integrated into practices. Purpose is clear and guides decision-making.

**Enabling Conditions:** Three enabling conditions are substantially present. Leadership commitment is genuine and consistent. Collective understanding is developing across the community. Enactment is consistent across most contexts. Contextual adaptation is thoughtfully applied.

**Impact:** Measurable positive impact on community wellbeing and performance outcomes. Changes are sustained over time.

### 3.4 Level 4: Deep-Transformative Implementation

**Characteristics:** Leadership practices are transformative, creating lasting change in community culture and outcomes. Values are deeply embedded in all aspects of organizational life and lived authentically by the leader and community. All community members genuinely belong and feel valued. Reflection is embedded as a cultural norm. The physical dimension is fully integrated as fundamental. Purpose is deeply shared and enacted consistently.

**Enabling Conditions:** All four enabling conditions are fully present. Leadership commitment is unwavering and visible. Collective understanding is shared across the entire community. Enactment is consistent across all contexts and dimensions. Contextual adaptation is sophisticated and responsive.

**Impact:** Transformative impact on community wellbeing and performance outcomes. The community reaches its full potential. Changes are deeply embedded and self-sustaining.

---

## 4. Complete LWLS Rubric: All Domains and Indicators

The following rubric tables provide detailed descriptors for each of the 22 indicators across the four implementation levels. Assessors should score each indicator from 1 to 4 based on which level descriptor most accurately reflects the leader's current practice.

### Domain 1: Values Leadership

#### Indicator 1.1: Values Articulation and Communication

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | Values are absent, unclear, or inconsistently communicated. The leader does not articulate connections to the nine OECD universal competencies. Communication is sporadic or performative.                                              |
| 2 — Developing          | Values are articulated but not clearly connected to the nine OECD universal competencies. Communication is inconsistent across contexts. Some community members understand the values while others do not.                              |
| 3 — Implementing        | Values are clearly articulated and explicitly connected to the nine OECD universal competencies. Communication is consistent across most contexts. Most community members understand and can articulate the values.                     |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | Values are deeply articulated, clearly connected to the nine OECD universal competencies, and communicated consistently across all contexts. All community members understand, articulate, and embody the values in their own practice. |

## Indicator 1.2: Values Modelling and Embodiment

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not consistently model the nine universal competencies. Behaviors often contradict stated values. Community members observe disconnection between words and actions.                                                                                         |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader models some of the nine universal competencies in some contexts. Behaviors occasionally contradict stated values. Community members observe inconsistency between words and actions.                                                                              |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader consistently models most of the nine universal competencies across most contexts. Behaviors generally align with stated values. Community members observe strong alignment between words and actions.                                                             |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader authentically embodies all nine universal competencies across all contexts. Behaviors consistently align with stated values even under pressure. Community members observe unwavering alignment between words and actions, inspiring their own values embodiment. |

## Indicator 1.3: Values Integration and Enactment

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | Values are not integrated into organizational structures, policies, or practices. Enactment is absent or performative (e.g., values appear on display boards but not in daily practice).                                                               |
| 2 — Developing          | Values are integrated into some organizational structures, policies, or practices. Enactment is inconsistent, with some areas showing integration while others do not.                                                                                 |
| 3 — Implementing        | Values are systematically integrated into most organizational structures, policies, and practices. Enactment is consistent across most areas, with clear processes for values-based decision-making.                                                   |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | Values are deeply embedded in all organizational structures, policies, and practices. Enactment is consistent across all areas and dimensions. Values-based decision-making is the cultural norm, with sophisticated processes for ensuring alignment. |

## Domain 2: Community Building and Belonging

### Indicator 2.1: Inclusive Environment Creation

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The environment is not inclusive. Many community members do not feel welcomed or valued. Psychological safety is absent. Diversity is not acknowledged or celebrated.                                                                                                 |
| 2 — Developing          | The environment is somewhat inclusive. Some community members feel welcomed and valued while others remain marginalized. Psychological safety is inconsistent. Diversity is acknowledged but not fully celebrated.                                                    |
| 3 — Implementing        | The environment is actively inclusive. Most community members feel welcomed and valued. Psychological safety is present in most contexts. Diversity is acknowledged and celebrated through systematic practices.                                                      |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The environment is deeply inclusive. All community members genuinely feel welcomed, valued, and psychologically safe. Diversity is celebrated as a core strength. Inclusion is embedded in all practices and continuously strengthened through responsive adaptation. |

### Indicator 2.2: Authentic Partnership Development

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                             |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | Partnerships are absent or superficial. The leader operates in isolation or maintains hierarchical control. Community members have no genuine voice or ownership.      |
| 2 — Developing          | Some partnerships are developing. The leader occasionally seeks input but maintains primary control. Some community members have voice and ownership in limited areas. |
| 3 — Implementing        | Authentic partnerships are systematically developed. The leader shares leadership and decision-making. Most community members have genuine voice and shared ownership. |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | Authentic partnerships are deeply embedded across the community. Leadership is genuinely shared. All community members have voice,                                     |

| Level | Descriptor                                                                                     |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       | ownership, and agency. Partnerships extend beyond the immediate community to broader networks. |

### Indicator 2.3: Belonging Assessment and Responsiveness

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not assess whether community members belong and feel valued. No mechanisms exist for gathering feedback. Responsiveness to belonging needs is absent.                                                                                       |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader occasionally assesses whether community members belong and feel valued. Some mechanisms exist for gathering feedback. Responsiveness to belonging needs is inconsistent.                                                                         |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader regularly assesses whether community members belong and feel valued through systematic mechanisms. Responsiveness to belonging needs is consistent, with clear processes for addressing concerns.                                                |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader continuously assesses whether all community members belong and feel valued through multiple sophisticated mechanisms. Responsiveness is immediate and adaptive. The community itself takes ownership of strengthening belonging for all members. |

## Domain 3: Metacognition and Reflective Leadership

### Indicator 3.1: Personal Reflective Practice

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not engage in reflective practice. Decisions are made without reflection on impacts. Learning from experience is absent.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader occasionally engages in reflective practice. Some decisions are informed by reflection on impacts. Learning from experience is inconsistent.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader systematically engages in reflective practice. Most decisions are informed by reflection on impacts. Learning from experience is consistent and documented.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply embeds reflective practice in all aspects of leadership. All decisions are informed by sophisticated reflection on impacts across multiple dimensions. Learning from experience is continuous, documented, and shared to benefit the community. At the deepest level, the leader employs systematic reflexive methods — including first-person autoethnographic reflection on high-stakes decisions — to generate insights that benefit the wider community (Lynch, 2026). |

### Indicator 3.2: Metacognitive Culture Development

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | A metacognitive culture is absent. Community members do not reflect on their learning, growth, or contributions. Reflection is not valued or facilitated.                                                                |
| 2 — Developing          | A metacognitive culture is emerging. Some community members occasionally reflect on their learning, growth, or contributions. Reflection is valued but not systematically facilitated.                                   |
| 3 — Implementing        | A metacognitive culture is systematically developed. Most community members regularly reflect on their learning, growth, and contributions. Reflection is valued and facilitated through clear structures and processes. |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | A metacognitive culture is deeply embedded. All community members continuously reflect on their learning, growth, and contributions. Reflection is                                                                       |

| Level | Descriptor                                                                                                      |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       | a cultural norm, with sophisticated structures that enable deep metacognitive thinking and collective learning. |

### Indicator 3.3: Learning-to-Learn Facilitation

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not facilitate learning-to-learn opportunities. Community members are not supported in developing metacognitive skills or becoming self-directed learners.                                                                                                                        |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader occasionally facilitates learning-to-learn opportunities. Some community members are supported in developing metacognitive skills. Self-directed learning is emerging but not systematic.                                                                                              |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader systematically facilitates learning-to-learn opportunities. Most community members are supported in developing metacognitive skills and becoming self-directed learners through clear processes.                                                                                       |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply embeds learning-to-learn facilitation across all contexts. All community members develop sophisticated metacognitive skills and become highly self-directed learners. The community itself becomes a learning organization with continuous improvement embedded in its culture. |

## Domain 4: Social-Emotional Intelligence

### Indicator 4.1: Empathy and Emotional Awareness

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader demonstrates limited empathy or emotional awareness. Community members' experiences and needs are not understood or acknowledged. Emotional responses are dismissive or absent.                                                                                       |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader demonstrates some empathy and emotional awareness. Community members' experiences and needs are sometimes understood and acknowledged. Emotional responses are inconsistent.                                                                                          |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader consistently demonstrates empathy and emotional awareness. Most community members' experiences and needs are understood and acknowledged. Emotional responses are appropriate and supportive.                                                                         |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply demonstrates empathy and emotional awareness across all contexts. All community members' experiences and needs are understood and acknowledged with sophistication. Emotional responses are highly attuned, supportive, and foster emotional growth in others. |

### Indicator 4.2: Self-Regulation and Emotional Modelling

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not model self-regulation. Emotional responses are reactive, unpredictable, or inappropriate. The leader does not provide emotional stability for the community.                                  |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader sometimes models self-regulation. Emotional responses are occasionally reactive or inappropriate. The leader provides inconsistent emotional stability for the community.                              |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader consistently models self-regulation. Emotional responses are generally appropriate and measured. The leader provides consistent emotional stability for the community.                                 |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply models self-regulation across all contexts, even under extreme pressure. Emotional responses are consistently appropriate, measured, and constructive. The leader provides unwavering emotional |

| Level | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       | stability and teaches self-regulation skills to community members. The leader demonstrates rational detachment in crisis or life-threatening situations, applying evidence-based de-escalation principles under extreme duress to protect and stabilise the community (Lynch, 2026). |

### Indicator 4.3: Collaborative and Respectful Relationships

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not foster collaboration, cooperation, respect, or trust. Relationships are transactional, hierarchical, or characterized by conflict. Community members do not trust the leader or each other.                                                                                                              |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader sometimes fosters collaboration, cooperation, respect, and trust. Relationships are developing but inconsistent. Some community members trust the leader and each other.                                                                                                                                          |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader consistently fosters collaboration, cooperation, respect, and trust. Relationships are strong and characterized by mutual respect. Most community members trust the leader and each other.                                                                                                                        |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply fosters collaboration, cooperation, respect, and trust across all contexts. Relationships are deeply authentic and characterized by profound mutual respect. All community members trust the leader and each other. Trust and collaboration are cultural norms that extend beyond the immediate community. |

## Indicator 4.4: Crisis Community Leadership and Psychological Recovery

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | Leader shows no awareness of psychological recovery principles; crisis events not recognised as requiring structured support; safety, calm, and belonging not actively considered.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 2 — Developing          | Emerging awareness of psychological recovery needs; some crisis situations partially supported; no systematic approach to embedding safety, calm, efficacy, connectedness, or hope.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 3 — Implementing        | Consistently applies psychological recovery principles in crisis; all five elements (Safety, Calm, Efficacy, Connectedness, Hope) intentionally structured into leadership responses; evidence-based community support provided.                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | Deeply and proactively embeds all five elements of psychological recovery (Safety, Calm, Self- and Community Efficacy, Connectedness, Hope) as foundational leadership practices in both crisis and everyday community life; recovery frameworks (e.g., Hobfoll et al., 2007) applied with sophistication and adapted to context; builds community resilience extending beyond crisis response into sustained wellbeing (Lynch, 2022). |

## Domain 5: Physical and Holistic Wellbeing Advocacy

### Indicator 5.1: Physical Dimension Recognition

| Level            | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface      | The leader does not recognise the physical dimension as important to wellbeing or performance. Physical activity is viewed as peripheral or recreational. The connection between movement and holistic wellbeing is not understood. |
| 2 — Developing   | The leader shows emerging recognition of the physical dimension. Physical activity is viewed as somewhat important but not fundamental. The connection between movement and holistic wellbeing is partially understood.             |
| 3 — Implementing | The leader clearly recognises and articulates the physical dimension as important to holistic wellbeing and performance. Physical activity is viewed as                                                                             |

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                         | valuable. The connection between movement and holistic wellbeing is understood and communicated.                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply recognises and articulates the physical dimension as fundamental to holistic wellbeing and performance. Physical activity is viewed as essential, not optional. The connection between movement and holistic wellbeing is deeply understood, communicated, and advocated for across all contexts. |

## Indicator 5.2: Movement and Physical Activity Integration

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not integrate movement or physical activity into organisational practices. Opportunities for embodied learning are absent. The physical dimension is neglected.                                                                                                                                                        |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader occasionally integrates movement or physical activity into some organisational practices. Opportunities for embodied learning are limited. The physical dimension receives some attention.                                                                                                                                  |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader systematically integrates movement and physical activity into organisational practices. Opportunities for embodied learning are regularly provided. The physical dimension is valued and supported.                                                                                                                         |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply integrates movement and physical activity across all organisational practices. Opportunities for embodied learning are embedded in the culture. The physical dimension is recognised as fundamental, with sophisticated integration that connects movement to cognitive, social-emotional, and spiritual dimensions. |

### Indicator 5.3: Holistic Health Advocacy

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not advocate for holistic health. Health is viewed narrowly (e.g., absence of illness) or neglected entirely. The five dimensions (Physical, Social-Emotional, Cognitive, Spiritual, Community) are not integrated.                                                                |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader shows emerging advocacy for holistic health. Health is viewed somewhat broadly but not fully holistically. Some of the five dimensions are acknowledged but not integrated.                                                                                                             |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader consistently advocates for holistic health approaches. Health is viewed holistically, integrating most of the five dimensions. Advocacy is visible and supported by organisational practices.                                                                                           |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply advocates for holistic health approaches across all contexts. Health is viewed comprehensively, fully integrating all five dimensions (Physical, Social-Emotional, Cognitive, Spiritual, Community). Advocacy is unwavering, sophisticated, and creates lasting cultural change. |

## Domain 6: Purposeful and Spiritual Leadership

### Indicator 6.1: Purpose Articulation and Alignment

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | Purpose is absent, unclear, or disconnected from community values. The leader does not articulate a compelling vision. Individual and collective purposes are not aligned.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 2 — Developing          | Purpose is emerging but not fully clear or compelling. The leader articulates some vision, but it is not consistently connected to community values. Individual and collective purposes are partially aligned.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 3 — Implementing        | Purpose is clear, compelling, and aligned with community values. The leader consistently articulates a vision that transcends individual interests. Individual and collective purposes are substantially aligned.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | Purpose is deeply clear, profoundly compelling, and fully aligned with community values. The leader articulates a transformative vision that transcends individual interests and inspires collective action. Individual and collective purposes are completely aligned, creating powerful synergy. The leader demonstrates passionate leadership — a deep-rooted belief in better opportunities and alternative outcomes — communicated with clarity and conviction, sustaining momentum even in the face of institutional resistance (Lynch, 2022). |

### Indicator 6.2: Meaning-Making and Connection

| Level          | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface    | The leader does not facilitate meaning making or connection. Community members do not understand how their contributions connect to collective purpose. Work feels disconnected or meaningless.     |
| 2 — Developing | The leader occasionally facilitates meaning making and connection. Some community members understand how their contributions connect to collective purpose. Work feels meaningful in some contexts. |

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader consistently facilitates meaning making and connection. Most community members understand how their contributions connect to collective purpose. Work feels meaningful across most contexts.                                                       |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply facilitates meaning making and connection across all contexts. All community members understand and feel how their contributions connect to collective purpose. Work feels deeply meaningful, creating profound engagement and fulfillment. |

### Indicator 6.3: Ethical and Values-Centred Decision-Making

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not make decisions guided by ethical principles or core values. Decisions are reactive, expedient, or self-serving. Competing pressures consistently override values.                                                                                                                |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader sometimes makes decisions guided by ethical principles and core values. Decisions are occasionally values-aligned but competing pressures often override values.                                                                                                                          |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader consistently makes decisions guided by ethical principles and core values. Decisions are generally values-aligned even when facing competing pressures. Ethical reasoning is visible and explained.                                                                                       |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply and consistently makes all decisions guided by ethical principles and core values, even under extreme pressure. Decisions are unwavering in values alignment. Ethical reasoning is sophisticated, transparent, and models values-centred decision-making for the entire community. |

## Domain 7: Transformative Partnership and Sustainable Governance

### Indicator 7.1: Strategic Partnership and Resource Mobilisation

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not build multi-stakeholder partnerships. Partnerships are absent or entirely informal. Resources for community wellbeing are not sought or mobilised. Social justice and inclusiveness are not considered in partnership decisions.                                                                               |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader is developing some partnerships but they are limited in scope, resources, and inclusiveness. Funding sources are narrow or ad hoc. Some attention is given to inclusiveness but social justice and comparative advantage are not systematically considered.                                                             |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader systematically builds multi-stakeholder partnerships that combine relevant resources and skills. Funding sources are diversified. Inclusiveness and social justice are considered. Partnerships create measurable advantage for the community and are professionally managed.                                           |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader deeply architects transformative multi-stakeholder partnerships that are strategically resourced, diversely funded, and deeply inclusive, with social justice at the core. Comparative advantage is maximised. Professional management systems are in place. Partnerships are self-sustaining and continuously renewed. |

### Indicator 7.2: Monitoring, Accountability, and Adaptive Learning Systems

| Level            | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface      | The leader has no systems for monitoring or evaluating community outcomes. There are no measurable indicators. Accountability is absent. Mistakes are not acknowledged or learned from. Transparency is not practiced.         |
| 2 — Developing   | The leader has some informal monitoring practices but they lack robustness, consistency, and measurable indicators. Accountability is developing but inconsistent. Some learning from experience occurs but is not systematic. |
| 3 — Implementing | The leader has established systematic monitoring and evaluation processes with clear and measurable indicators. Reports are transparent and shared                                                                             |

|                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                         | with stakeholders. Mistakes are acknowledged and changes to practice are made consistently.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader has built sophisticated, transparent, multi-source monitoring and accountability systems with robust measurable indicators. Results are shared openly with all stakeholders. Mistakes are acknowledged with integrity. Adaptive learning from results drives continuous improvement and is embedded as a cultural norm. |

### Indicator 7.3: Contextual Intelligence and Governance

| Level                   | Descriptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Surface             | The leader does not consider political or social context in leadership decisions. Structural barriers and governance issues are not identified or addressed. Community goals are not aligned with global frameworks. Governance standards for partnerships are absent.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2 — Developing          | The leader shows some awareness of political and social context but does not systematically address it. Some structural barriers are identified. Goals are partially aligned with broader frameworks. Governance standards are emerging but inconsistent.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 3 — Implementing        | The leader consistently demonstrates awareness of political and social contexts, identifies key structural barriers, and works to address them through capacity building. Community goals are aligned with global frameworks (e.g., UN SDGs). Clear governance standards for partnerships are established and maintained.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 4 — Deep-Transformative | The leader demonstrates highly sophisticated contextual intelligence, proactively identifying systemic problems, corruption, and inequity, and engaging in principled capacity building. Community goals are deeply aligned with global frameworks and the Lauve Wellbeing vision. Governance standards are exemplary, transparent, and model best practice for other communities and institutions. The leader actively promotes distributed leadership through the equitable distribution of power and control across all partners, consistent with the Spectrum of Power framework (Huxham and Vangen, 2004; Lynch, 2022). |

## 5. Scoring System and Leadership Profiles

### 5.1 Raw Score Calculation

The LWLS comprises 7 domains with 3 indicators each (4 in Domain 4), for a total of 22 indicators. Each indicator is scored on a 4-point scale (1 = Surface, 2 = Developing, 3 = Implementing, 4 = Deep-Transformative).

**Raw Score Formula:** Sum of all 22 indicator scores | Minimum: 22 | Maximum: 88

**Domain Score Formula:** Sum of 3 indicator scores within the domain (4 in Domain 4) | Min: 3 | Max: 12 (16 in Domain 4)

### 5.2 LWLS Percentage

The LWLS percentage provides a standardised metric for comparing leadership effectiveness across contexts.

$$\text{LWLS Percentage} = (\text{Raw Score} / 88) \times 100$$

### 5.3 Leadership Profile Categories

Based on the LWLS percentage and pattern of domain scores, leaders are classified into four leadership profile categories aligned with the four implementation levels:

| LWLS %  | Leadership Profile         | Characteristics                                                                                  |
|---------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 0–25%   | Surface-Level Leader       | Performative practices; values not embodied; belonging absent; no enabling conditions present.   |
| 26–50%  | Developing Leader          | Emerging awareness; inconsistent application; 1–2 enabling conditions partially present.         |
| 51–75%  | Implementing Leader        | Systematic integration; consistent practices; 3 enabling conditions substantially present.       |
| 76–100% | Deep-Transformative Leader | Transformative culture; all enabling conditions fully present; community reaches full potential. |

#### Profile 1: Surface-Level Leader (LWLS 0–25%)

**Characteristics:** Leadership practices are predominantly performative. Values are not genuinely embodied or enacted. Community members do not experience belonging. Reflection is absent. The physical dimension is neglected. Purpose is unclear. None of the four enabling conditions are present.

**Development Priority:** Fundamental leadership development is required across all seven domains. Focus should begin with Domain 1 (Values Leadership) and Domain 2 (Community Building and Belonging) to establish foundational conditions for growth.

#### Profile 2: Developing Leader (LWLS 26–50%)

**Characteristics:** Leadership practices show emerging awareness and inconsistent application. Values are articulated but not deeply understood or consistently modeled. Some community members experience belonging while others remain marginalized. One or two enabling conditions are partially present.

**Development Priority:** Strengthen consistency across all domains. Focus on developing collective understanding (Domain 2) and systematic reflective practice (Domain 3) to move toward implementing level.

#### Profile 3: Implementing Leader (LWLS 51–75%)

**Characteristics:** Leadership practices demonstrate systematic integration. Values are clearly articulated, understood, and consistently modeled. Most community members experience genuine belonging. Three enabling conditions are substantially present.

**Development Priority:** Deepen implementation to achieve transformative impact. Ensure all four enabling conditions are fully present and extend practices to reach all community members across all contexts.

#### Profile 4: Deep-Transformative Leader (LWLS 76–100%)

**Characteristics:** Leadership practices are transformative, creating lasting change in community culture. Values are deeply embedded and lived authentically. All community members genuinely belong and feel valued. All four enabling conditions are fully present.

**Development Priority:** Sustain deep-transformative leadership and extend impact beyond the immediate community. Share practices and mentor other leaders. Continue adaptive refinement to maintain excellence.

## 6. Institutional Application

### 6.1 Adapting LWLS for Institutions

The LWLS is designed to be extensible from individual leaders to institutions (universities, schools, clubs, organizations). When applying the LWLS at the institutional level, the assessment shifts from evaluating an individual leader to evaluating the collective leadership practices and organizational culture of the institution.

Institutional Adaptation Process:

- 1. Reframe Indicators for Institutional Context:** Each indicator is reframed to assess institutional practices rather than individual leader behaviors. For example: Individual: 'The leader clearly articulates core values...' — Institutional: 'The institution clearly articulates core values through its leadership team, policies, and communications...'
- 2. Assess Multiple Leadership Levels:** Institutional assessment should evaluate leadership practices at multiple levels: Governance/Board, Executive/Senior leadership, Middle management/Department, and Frontline leadership (e.g. teachers, coaches, team leaders).
- 3. Evaluate Systemic Integration:** Institutional assessment focuses on how deeply values, belonging, metacognition, social-emotional intelligence, physical wellbeing, and purpose are integrated into organizational structures and policies, resource allocation and budgeting, hiring and professional development, curriculum and programs, physical spaces, and communication systems.
- 4. Gather Multi-Source Evidence:** Institutional assessment requires evidence from: document analysis (policies, strategic plans, communications), observations of practices, surveys and interviews with diverse stakeholders, and outcome data (wellbeing metrics, performance indicators, retention rates).

### 6.2 Institutional Scoring and Benchmarking

Institutional LWLS Score is calculated using the same formula as individual assessment (sum of 22 indicator scores, maximum 88 points, converted to percentage). Institutions are classified into the same four categories based on their LWLS percentage.

Benchmarking Applications:

- 1. Internal Benchmarking:** Track institutional LWLS scores over time to monitor progress and evaluate the impact of leadership development initiatives.
- 2. Comparative Benchmarking:** Compare LWLS scores across departments, campuses, or organizational units to identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement.

**3. External Benchmarking:** Compare institutional LWLS scores with peer institutions to understand relative positioning and identify best practices.

Institutional Development Priorities:

**Surface-Level Institutions (0–25%):** Require fundamental organisational transformation. Priority should be establishing genuine leadership commitment at governance level and developing collective understanding of Lauve Wellbeing principles across the institution.

**Developing Institutions (26–50%):** Require systematic capacity building. Priority should be strengthening consistency of enactment across all levels and contexts, and developing sophisticated processes for contextual adaptation.

**Implementing Institutions (51–75%):** Require deepening and extending. Priority should be ensuring all four enabling conditions are fully present across all organisational units and reaching all community members.

**Deep-Transformative Institutions (76–100%):** Require sustaining excellence and extending impact. Priority should be maintaining deep implementation, continuously adapting to changing contexts, and sharing practices with other institutions.

---

## 7. Practical Application Guide

### 7.1 Application in Sporting Contexts

**Context:** Sports coaches, athletic directors, club presidents, national sporting organisation leaders.

**Relevance:** Research demonstrates that 'better human beings equal better performance' in sporting contexts. The physical dimension is central to sport, but Lauve Wellbeing extends beyond physical performance to integrate values, belonging, metacognition, social-emotional intelligence, and purpose.

**Application Process:**

- 1. Self-Assessment:** The coach or sporting leader completes the LWLS self-assessment, scoring themselves on all 22 indicators.
- 2. Multi-Source Feedback:** Gather feedback from athletes, assistant coaches, parents, and administrators using adapted LWLS indicators.
- 3. Evidence Collection:** Document specific examples of leadership practices across the seven domains—values taught and modeled, whether athletes genuinely belong, how reflection is practiced, how empathy and trust are built, holistic physical integration, and team purpose beyond winning.
- 4. Score Calculation:** Calculate raw score, LWLS percentage, and identify leadership profile category.
- 5. Development Planning:** Based on the profile category, create a targeted development plan focusing on priority domains.

**Sporting Context Example:** A football coach with an LWLS score of 45% (Developing Leader) shows strength in Domain 5 (Physical Wellbeing) but weakness in Domain 2 (Community Building) and Domain 3 (Metacognition). Development priorities: creating inclusive environments where all players feel valued, implementing systematic reflection practices, and developing authentic partnerships that give players voice in team decisions.

### 7.2 Application in Political Leadership

**Context:** Elected officials, government administrators, policy makers, political party leaders.

**Relevance:** Political leadership fundamentally concerns community wellbeing and collective flourishing. The Lauve Wellbeing framework provides a holistic lens for evaluating whether

political leaders genuinely serve community needs across all five dimensions (Physical, Social-Emotional, Cognitive, Spiritual, Community).

Application Process:

- 1. Public Assessment:** Citizens, community organisations, and independent evaluators assess political leaders using the LWLS rubric.
- 2. Policy Analysis:** Evaluate how policies and decisions reflect the six LWLS domains—are policies guided by the nine OECD competencies? Do they foster belonging for all citizens? Does the leader demonstrate reflective practice?
- 3. Stakeholder Feedback:** Gather input from diverse community members, particularly marginalized groups, to assess whether all citizens genuinely belong and feel valued.
- 4. Score Calculation and Public Reporting:** Calculate LWLS scores and publish results to inform citizens and create accountability.

Political Context Example: A mayor with an LWLS score of 38% (Developing Leader) shows strength in Domain 1 (Values Articulation) but weakness in Domain 2 (Community Building) and Domain 6 (Purposeful Leadership). Development priorities: inclusive decision-making, addressing systemic barriers to belonging, articulating a compelling vision beyond political divisions, and making decisions guided by ethics even when politically difficult.

### 7.3 Application in Educational Leadership

Context: School principals, superintendents, university presidents, department heads, teacher leaders.

Relevance: Educational leadership is the primary context from which Lauve Wellbeing emerged through 30 years of research. The framework directly addresses the challenge of implementing values education and holistic wellbeing in schools.

Application Process:

- 1. Comprehensive Assessment:** School leaders complete self-assessment and gather feedback from teachers, students, parents, and governing bodies.
- 2. Whole-School Evaluation:** Assess how leadership practices align with the whole-school approach required for deep implementation—are all four enabling conditions present? Do all students and staff genuinely belong?

- 3. Evidence Collection:** Document practices across all seven domains, including how the nine OECD competencies are integrated across the curriculum and how physical education is positioned.
- 4. Score Calculation and Action Planning:** Calculate LWLS scores and develop school improvement plans targeting priority domains.

Educational Context Example: A principal with an LWLS score of 62% (Implementing Leader) shows strength in Domain 1 (Values Leadership) and Domain 3 (Metacognition) but weakness in Domain 5 (Physical Wellbeing). Development priorities: elevating the status of physical education, recognising the physical dimension as fundamental to academic learning, integrating movement across the curriculum, and advocating for holistic health.

#### 7.4 Application in Community Leadership

Context: Non-profit directors, community organisers, religious leaders, neighbourhood association leaders, youth program coordinators.

Relevance: Community leadership encompasses diverse contexts where the Lauve Wellbeing framework's emphasis on belonging, values, and holistic wellbeing is directly applicable.

Application Process:

- 1. Participatory Assessment:** Community leaders engage community members in collaborative assessment using the LWLS rubric.
- 2. Context-Specific Adaptation:** Adapt indicators to reflect the specific community context while maintaining fidelity to core Lauve Wellbeing principles.
- 3. Multi-Stakeholder Evidence:** Gather evidence from diverse community members, particularly those who have been historically marginalised.
- 4. Collaborative Scoring and Planning:** Calculate LWLS scores collaboratively and develop community-driven action plans.

Community Context Example: A youth program director with an LWLS score of 54% (Implementing Leader) shows strength in Domain 4 (Social-Emotional Intelligence) and Domain 5 (Physical Wellbeing) but weakness in Domain 3 (Metacognition) and Domain 6 (Purposeful Leadership). Development priorities: implementing systematic reflection, developing a clearer shared purpose, facilitating meaning-making, and strengthening ethical decision-making processes.

## 8. Conclusion and Future Directions

The Lauve Wellbeing Leadership Scale (LWLS) provides a comprehensive, theoretically grounded framework for measuring and developing leadership effectiveness across sporting, political, educational, and community contexts. By operationalizing the core components of Lauve Wellbeing theory—the LAUVE acronym, five holistic dimensions, three pillars, nine OECD universal competencies, and four enabling conditions for deep implementation - the LWLS offers a systematic approach to assessing whether leaders genuinely foster belonging, embody values, promote metacognition, demonstrate social-emotional intelligence, advocate for physical wellbeing, and articulate purposeful vision.

The framework's four-level rubric, derived from Sparkes' (1991) implementation stages and adapted through 30 years of global research, distinguishes surface-level performance from deep-transformative leadership. This distinction is critical: research demonstrates that surface-level implementation produces minimal impact, while deep implementation characterised by genuine leadership commitment, collective understanding, consistent enactment, and contextual adaptation produces transformative outcomes in both wellbeing and performance.

The LWLS addresses a fundamental challenge identified across six countries: values and attitudes are 'intensely contested constructs' that require explicit attention and sophisticated implementation. By providing clear indicators, detailed rubrics, and practical application guidance, the LWLS enables leaders and institutions to move beyond performative values statements toward genuine, deep implementation that creates lasting change.

The framework's extensibility from individual leaders to institutions enables comprehensive assessment at multiple levels. Institutional application of the LWLS can drive systemic transformation by evaluating how deeply Lauve Wellbeing principles are embedded in organizational structures, policies, resource allocation, and cultural practices.

### Future Research Directions

- 1. Validation Studies:** Conduct empirical validation of the LWLS across diverse contexts to establish reliability, validity, and predictive power for wellbeing and performance outcomes.
- 2. Longitudinal Impact Studies:** Examine long-term outcomes of leadership development interventions based on LWLS assessment, tracking changes in community wellbeing, performance, and sustainability.
- 3. Cross-Cultural Adaptation:** Investigate how the LWLS performs across diverse cultural contexts and develop culturally responsive adaptations while maintaining core theoretical fidelity.

**4. Institutional Transformation Studies:** Document case studies of institutions using the LWLS to drive systemic change, identifying facilitators and barriers to deep implementation.

**5. Integration with Existing Frameworks:** Explore connections between the LWLS and other leadership frameworks, identifying complementarities and unique contributions.

The Lauve Wellbeing Leadership Scale offers evidence-based pathways for measuring, developing, and sustaining transformative leadership. By asking the fundamental question - 'Do community members truly belong and feel valued so that they can be their best?' - the LWLS provides a compass for leaders committed to creating environments where all individuals can reach their full potential. Grounded in 30 years of research demonstrating that when leaders deeply implement Lauve Wellbeing principles, communities flourish, the LWLS provides the roadmap for this journey across all contexts.

---

## Document Information and References

**Title:** Lauve Wellbeing Leadership Scale (LWLS): A Framework for Measuring Community Leadership Through the Lauve Wellbeing Lens

**Version:** 1.0

**Date:** November 2026

**Theoretical Foundation:** Grounded in 30 years of global research across six countries (United Kingdom, Australia, Qatar, Brunei Darussalam, Saudi Arabia, British Schools Overseas in Africa)

**Endorsements:** Aligned with international best practices endorsed by the International Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Dance and Sport (IAHPEDS) and UNESCO

**Contact:** For more information about Lauve Wellbeing and the LWLS, visit <https://www.lauvewellbeing.com/>

---

## References

- [1] Lynch, T., Hamilton, X.D., Wu, C., Li, Y., Soukup, G.J., & Goff, W. (2026). Lauve Wellbeing: The Power of Values and the Physical Dimension for Community Health and Development. How 30 Years of Global Research Led to Lauve Wellbeing. Springer Nature Research Communities. <https://communities.springernature.com/posts/how-30-years-of-global-research-led-to-lauve-wellbeing>
  - [2] Lynch, T. (2026). Lauve Wellbeing Platform. <https://www.lauvewellbeing.com/>
  - [3] Lynch, T. (2024). Physical Education and Wellbeing: Global and Holistic Approaches to Child Health and Academic Learning (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-72874-7>
  - [4] Lynch, T. (2016). Introduction. In The Future of Health, Wellbeing and Physical Education: Optimising Children's Health through Local and Global Partnerships (pp. 1–24). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
  - [5] Lynch, T. (2026). De-escalation under duress: A civilian encounter during the westfield bondi junction mass stabbing attack. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 34, e70179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.70179>
  - [6] Lynch, T. (2022). Leading school recovery from the impact of Covid-19: two birds, one stone. Education 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2022.2068638>
-

*"It is not about the events, it is not about the intensity...  
it is about the consistency."*

*"Better Human Beings = Better performance."*

*"Do community members truly belong and feel valued –  
so that they can be their best?"*