

Reconceptualizing Workforce Wellbeing: The Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model

Pamayla E. Darbyshire *

College of Doctoral Studies, University of Phoenix, AZ, USA, 4035 S. Riverpoint Parkway, Phoenix, AZ 85040;
E-mail: usafrnped@email.phoenix.edu

(* Corresponding Author)



Cite This: <https://doi.org/10.65638/2978-882X.2026.2.04>

ABSTRACT: Workforce wellbeing is often conceptualized as an individual experience or as the outcome of discrete organizational practices. This paper offers a systems-oriented reconceptualization through the Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model (DWWM), which conceptualizes workforce wellbeing as an emergent organizational condition arising through the interaction of five organizational capabilities: adaptive leadership, organizational trust, learning and development, meaningful work, and organizational resilience. Drawing on systems theory, dynamic capabilities theory, and organizational wellbeing scholarship, the DWWM integrates these established capabilities within a framework that emphasizes interdependence, reciprocal relationships, feedback, and adaptation over time. The model does not propose five new determinants of wellbeing; rather, its theoretical contribution lies in explaining how relationships among established organizational capabilities may shape the conditions through which workforce wellbeing develops, is constrained, and is sustained. Four conceptual propositions specify expected relationships among the capabilities, the potential importance of their interaction, variation across organizational contexts, and the role of organizational resources in shaping capability–wellbeing relationships. The paper also identifies boundary conditions and potential unintended consequences, including work intensification and wellbeing washing. As a theory-based conceptual framework, the DWWM provides a basis for future longitudinal, multilevel, and mixed-methods research examining how organizational capabilities interact and how workforce wellbeing develops as an emergent condition of the organizational system.

Keywords: Systems theory, Dynamic capabilities theory, Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model.

1. INTRODUCTION

Workforce wellbeing has become an increasingly important organizational concern as industries respond to technological advancement, changing labor markets, workforce transformation, and persistent economic uncertainty (International Labor Organization [ILO], 2024; Leopold *et al.*, 2025; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2024). Workforce wellbeing influences not only individual health and functioning but also organizational effectiveness, sustainability, and adaptability. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2010) defines a healthy workplace as one that integrates physical and psychosocial working conditions, personal health resources, and organizational

processes, emphasizing the connection between worker wellbeing and organizational sustainability. Research in organizational psychology has likewise linked wellbeing with engagement, motivation, learning, adaptability, and broader organizational functioning (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Danna & Griffin, 1999; Grant *et al.*, 2007). Together, these perspectives suggest that workforce wellbeing is a multidimensional organizational concern rather than solely an individual psychological outcome.

Received: August 03, 2026

Accepted: September 02, 2026

Published: September 26, 2026

Existing frameworks offer valuable explanations of the factors that influence workforce wellbeing, but they emphasize different mechanisms and levels of analysis. Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory examines wellbeing through the relationship between job demands and resources and has been widely applied to burnout, work engagement, and organizational functioning (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Conservation of Resources (COR) theory focuses on how individuals acquire, retain, protect, and build valued resources, with particular attention to resource loss and gain (Hobfoll, 1989). The WHO Healthy Workplace Framework takes a broader approach by bringing together physical and psychosocial work conditions, personal health resources, and organizational processes (WHO, 2010). Positive organizational approaches emphasize meaning, flourishing, motivation, and other dimensions of positive functioning. Although these frameworks show that multiple organizational and individual factors shape workforce wellbeing, they explain less about how distinct organizational capabilities interact and change over time as conditions evolve.

Integrative frameworks offer useful points of comparison for the DWWM. JD-R theory focuses on the balance between job demands and resources and the motivational and health-related processes that follow. COR theory centers on resource loss, protection, and gain. The WHO Healthy Workplace Framework organizes wellbeing around physical and psychosocial work conditions, personal health resources, and organizational processes. Positive organizational approaches, including PERMA (Positive Emotion, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishment), emphasize dimensions of flourishing (Seligman, 2018). The DWWM does not replace these perspectives or suggest that its five capabilities are absent from them. Instead, it specifies a systems-level architecture in which organizational capabilities are interdependent, mutually influential, and continually shaped by changing conditions, with workforce wellbeing conceptualized as an emergent organizational condition. The DWWM therefore shifts the focus from identifying individual resources or dimensions of wellbeing to examining how emergent organizational conditions interact and adapt over time.

This distinction matters because organizations rarely encounter wellbeing-related conditions in isolation. Leadership decisions can influence trust, trust can affect people's willingness to learn, collaborate, and adapt, and learning can strengthen employees' competence and capacity to respond to change. Meaningful work can reinforce commitment and persistence, while

organizational resilience shapes how the organization, as a system, responds to disruption. These interdependencies suggest that organizational conditions associated with workforce wellbeing operate as an interconnected system, in which changes in one capability can alter the conditions under which the others function. The DWWM therefore addresses a conceptual gap between frameworks that identify determinants or resources associated with wellbeing and a systems-oriented explanation of how organizational capabilities may interact, reinforce, constrain, and renew one another over time.

The five capabilities incorporated into the Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model—adaptive leadership, organizational trust, learning and development, meaningful work, and organizational resilience—were selected using four conceptual criteria. First, each capability operates primarily at the organizational or organizationally mediated level rather than representing only an individual psychological state. Second, each has established theoretical or empirical relevance to workforce wellbeing or organizational functioning. Third, each represents a distinct organizational function: leadership provides direction and coordination; trust supports relational confidence and cohesion; learning and development enables capability renewal; meaningful work connects individual contributions with purpose; and resilience supports adaptation during disruption. Fourth, each capability can both influence and be influenced by the others, making reciprocal interaction theoretically plausible within a systems framework. These criteria distinguish the five capabilities from other workplace conditions, such as compensation, work-life balance, inclusion, autonomy, and psychological safety, which may influence wellbeing but are not treated as foundational capabilities within the DWWM.

Building on this selection logic, the Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model reconceptualizes workforce wellbeing as a multidimensional organizational condition that includes both hedonic dimensions, such as satisfaction and positive affect, and eudaimonic dimensions, such as meaning, purpose, growth, competence, and effective functioning (Danna & Griffin, 1999; Huppert, 2009; Rosso *et al.*, 2010). In the DWWM, workforce wellbeing is not equivalent to any single capability, nor is it simply the sum of five independent organizational practices. Instead, it is a system-level condition that emerges and is sustained when the relationships among adaptive leadership, organizational trust, learning and development, meaningful work, and organizational resilience support healthy functioning, meaningful

participation, adaptation, and sustained capacity over time. This distinction is central to the model: the five capabilities represent interacting components of the organizational system, while workforce wellbeing represents an emergent property of that system. The model therefore shifts the conceptual focus from asking whether individual organizational practices improve wellbeing to examining how relationships among organizational capabilities may contribute to the development, maintenance, and renewal of workforce wellbeing.

The DWWM integrates three complementary theoretical perspectives to explain this process. Systems theory provides the foundation for understanding organizations as interconnected systems in which outcomes emerge through relationships among components, feedback processes, and interactions with changing environments (Meadows, 2008; Senge, 2006; von Bertalanffy, 1968). Dynamic capabilities theory explains how organizations sense changing conditions, adapt, renew resources, and reconfigure capabilities in response to environmental demands (Teece, 2007; Teece *et al.*, 1997). Organizational wellbeing scholarship provides the empirical foundation for identifying organizational conditions associated with healthy, meaningful, adaptive, and sustainable work environments. The DWWM brings these perspectives together without treating them as interchangeable: systems theory explains the model's structure and feedback logic, dynamic capabilities theory addresses organizational adaptation and renewal, and wellbeing scholarship helps identify the organizational capabilities through which these processes may be expressed.

Accordingly, this paper develops the Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model as a theory-based conceptual framework for understanding workforce wellbeing as an emergent organizational condition. The paper establishes the theoretical foundations and definition of workforce wellbeing, explains the distinct function of each capability, examines their proposed reciprocal relationships and feedback processes, and develops propositions for future empirical evaluation. It also considers boundary conditions and potential unintended consequences, including work intensification and wellbeing washing.

This body of scholarship supports treating the five domains as theoretically relevant organizational capabilities. The DWWM does not assume, however, that evidence concerning each capability individually establishes the reciprocal relationships proposed among them. Those relationships constitute the model's

conceptual contribution and require explicit propositions and future empirical evaluation.

Together, systems theory, dynamic capabilities theory, and organizational wellbeing research provide complementary foundations for the DWWM. Systems theory informs the model's emphasis on relationships, feedback, and interdependence. Dynamic capabilities theory contributes the focus on organizational adaptation and renewal, while organizational wellbeing research provides the basis for identifying the capabilities examined in the model.

Rather than simply listing factors associated with workforce wellbeing, the DWWM proposes that the relationships among its five capabilities may strengthen, constrain, or alter one another over time. These relationships are theoretical propositions rather than established empirical findings and provide the basis for the model's propositions and future testing.

The DWWM was formulated through conceptual synthesis and deductive reasoning, integrating insights from the three theoretical perspectives rather than relying on expert opinion, empirical factor analysis, or data-driven selection. The capabilities were selected because they operate at the organizational or organizationally mediated level, have established relevance to wellbeing or organizational functioning, serve distinct organizational functions, and can plausibly influence and be influenced by one another within a systems framework. These criteria provide the conceptual rationale for the model's architecture and its proposed relationships.

■ 2. THE DYNAMIC WORKFORCE WELLBEING MODEL

The Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model (DWWM) conceptualizes workforce wellbeing as an emergent organizational condition arising from five organizational capabilities: adaptive leadership, organizational trust, learning and development, meaningful work, and organizational resilience. Each capability represents a distinct organizational function and can influence and be influenced by the others. The model therefore treats the five capabilities as interconnected components of an organizational system rather than as independent predictors of wellbeing.

The DWWM does not assume a fixed sequence or equal influence among the five capabilities. Their relationships may vary across organizations and over time as conditions change.

Workforce wellbeing is conceptualized as an emergent condition of these interactions rather than as another capability or as their simple sum. Figure 1 presents the capabilities as an interconnected system; the two-way connections represent proposed reciprocal relationships, not a required sequence or evaluated causal pathways. The model does not assign fixed weights or thresholds to the capabilities.

2.1. Adaptive Leadership

Adaptive leadership is an organization's capacity to recognize, interpret, and respond to complex and changing conditions through learning, flexibility, collaboration, and problem solving (Heifetz *et al.*, 2009; Uhl-Bien *et al.*, 2007; Yukl, 2013). Unlike leadership approaches that emphasize stability through established routines and procedures, adaptive leadership addresses challenges for which existing practices may be insufficient. It emphasizes mobilizing people to examine assumptions, learn from changing conditions, and develop responses when established approaches no longer provide adequate solutions. Within the DWWM, adaptive leadership functions as a coordinating organizational capability that helps create conditions for collective adaptation.

Research indicates that leadership behaviors can influence employee wellbeing and organizational functioning by shaping communication, participation, support, learning, and responses to change (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Heifetz *et al.*, 2009). Adaptive leadership is particularly relevant when challenges are ambiguous, complex, or evolving because it emphasizes shared problem solving, experimentation, learning, and adjustment rather than reliance on established routines (Heifetz *et al.*, 2009; Uhl-Bien *et al.*, 2007). These practices may foster trust, psychological safety, knowledge sharing, and employee involvement, but these outcomes are distinct from adaptive leadership itself. Within the DWWM, adaptive leadership refers to the process of mobilizing and coordinating people to respond collectively to changing conditions.

The coordinating role of adaptive leadership is important to the DWWM because organizational adaptation requires more than identifying change; it requires people to engage with that change and adjust their actions accordingly. Leaders can support this process by communicating clearly, involving employees in problem solving, encouraging experimentation, allocating resources, and responding consistently as conditions



Figure 1: Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model: Five Interdependent Organizational Capabilities.

Note: Connections among the five capabilities represent proposed reciprocal relationships rather than a fixed sequence or predetermined causal pathways. Workforce wellbeing is conceptualized as an emergent organizational condition associated with interactions among the capabilities (Teece, 2007; Teece *et al.*, 1997; von Bertalanffy, 1968). (The order of the following narratives does not indicate linear movement). Figure created by the author and is not adapted from any published model.

evolve. These practices create opportunities for the other organizational capabilities to operate, while the effectiveness of leadership may itself be influenced by trust, learning, meaningful work, and organizational resilience. The DWWM therefore does not position adaptive leadership as the primary cause of workforce wellbeing. Instead, it treats leadership as one interconnected capability within a system in which organizational conditions can influence one another over time.

■ 2.2. Organizational Trust

Organizational trust refers to the shared expectation that leaders, colleagues, and organizational processes will demonstrate competence, integrity, reliability, and fairness (Mayer *et al.*, 1995; Rousseau *et al.*, 1998). Trust reduces uncertainty by giving employees greater confidence that people and organizational systems will act consistently and appropriately. This confidence can support cooperation, information sharing, participation, and collaboration, particularly during organizational change (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Within the DWWM, organizational trust functions as a relational and organizational condition that supports the effective functioning of the broader system.

Organizational trust is related to psychological safety but is not synonymous with it. Psychological safety concerns whether individuals believe they can speak up with ideas, questions, concerns, or mistakes without fear of interpersonal or professional consequences (Edmondson, 1999). Trust, in contrast, concerns expectations regarding the reliability, integrity, competence, and fairness of people and organizational processes. Maintaining this distinction matters in the DWWM because psychological safety may be an outcome associated with trustworthy organizational conditions, but it is not itself a component of organizational trust.

Research links organizational trust with cooperation, employee engagement, knowledge sharing, and organizational effectiveness (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Trust can be particularly important during periods of uncertainty, when employees must exchange information, participate in change, and work through problems collectively. When trust is low, employees may become more cautious, withhold information, or become less willing to participate in organizational change. Within the DWWM, trust therefore functions as a relational condition that can enable learning, collaboration, participation, and adaptation

rather than as a direct or independent cause of workforce wellbeing.

■ 2.3. Learning and Development

Learning and development refer to the ways organizations help individuals and teams acquire, share, apply, and strengthen knowledge and skills (Argyris & Schön, 1978; Marsick & Watkins, 2003; Noe *et al.*, 2014). This extends beyond formal training to include knowledge sharing, reflection, feedback, experimentation, skill development, and learning through everyday work. As work environments change, learning and development can help employees and organizations update their knowledge and capabilities in response to changing technologies, job demands, and workplace conditions. Within the DWWM, learning and development function as an organizational capability that renews knowledge and skills and supports continued adaptation.

Research indicates that learning and professional development are associated with employees' skills, motivation, adaptability, and organizational commitment (Bandura, 1986; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Noe *et al.*, 2014; OECD, 2024). Opportunities to develop knowledge, skills, and resources can strengthen employees' confidence in addressing changing work demands. Conversely, limited learning opportunities may constrain skill development and make adaptation more difficult. Learning and development therefore extend beyond training activities to include the organizational conditions that enable people and teams to acquire, apply, and share knowledge.

Within the DWWM, learning and development play a distinctive role because they provide a mechanism for renewing organizational knowledge and capabilities. Learning allows organizations to examine existing practices, incorporate new knowledge, develop alternative responses, and adjust as conditions change. It also gives employees and teams a basis to expand their capacity to contribute to organizational adaptation. The DWWM treats learning and development as an ongoing organizational process rather than a discrete intervention, with its broader relationships to trust, leadership, meaningful work, and resilience addressed in the model's dynamic interactions.

■ 2.4. Meaningful Work

Meaningful work refers to the extent to which individuals experience their work as purposeful, significant, and connected to goals or contributions they value (Rosso *et*

al., 2010; Steger *et al.*, 2012). Unlike the other DWWM capabilities, meaningful work is experienced primarily at the individual level. However, organizational structures, leadership practices, relationships, opportunities for learning and growth, and clarity of organizational purpose can shape that experience. Within the DWWM, meaningful work serves as the mechanism through which organizational purpose and conditions become personally significant to workers.

Research consistently associates meaningful work with engagement, intrinsic motivation, psychological wellbeing, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Allan *et al.*, 2019; Rosso *et al.*, 2010; Steger *et al.*, 2012). Meaningful work also supports persistence and constructive engagement by helping individuals understand their work as worthwhile and connected to personally or collectively valued purposes. These effects should not be understood as automatic outcomes of organizational messaging. Employees' values, identities, experiences, and perceptions of whether organizational practices align with stated purposes shape whether they experience work as meaningful. When organizational practices contradict communicated values or when work provides limited opportunities for contribution and growth, claims of meaningfulness may have limited credibility.

Within the DWWM, meaningful work therefore occupies a distinctive position between organizational conditions and individual experience. Organizations can create conditions that support meaningful work, but the experience of meaning remains shaped by individual values, needs, and circumstances. The model treats meaningful work as an important component of workforce wellbeing while recognizing that its experience is shaped by individual interpretation and organizational context.

■ 2.5. Organizational Resilience

Organizational resilience refers to an organization's capacity to anticipate, respond to, and recover from disruption while maintaining or renewing effective functioning (Duchek, 2020; Hartwig *et al.*, 2020; Lengnick-Hall *et al.*, 2011; Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003). Resilience is not simply the ability to withstand difficult circumstances. It also involves learning from disruption, adjusting practices, and developing new capacities as conditions change. Within the DWWM, organizational resilience represents the capability to absorb disruption while continuing to adapt and renew organizational functioning.

Research suggests that resilient organizations are better positioned to respond to uncertainty, disruption, and

changing environmental conditions (Duchek, 2020; Lengnick-Hall *et al.*, 2011; Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003). Resilience can involve anticipation of potential challenges, coping with unexpected events, and learning from experience to improve future responses (Duchek, 2020). These processes depend not only on organizational resources but also on people and teams' ability to coordinate, share knowledge, and adjust their actions as circumstances change.

Within the DWWM, organizational resilience provides the capacity to sustain adaptation over time. It helps organizations respond to disruption without treating each challenge as an isolated event and creates opportunities to learn from experience and renew organizational practices. Resilience does not mean that organizations or workers should absorb increasing demands. Sustainable resilience requires attention to the resources and organizational conditions that make adaptation possible. The DWWM therefore treats resilience as an organizational capability that supports continued functioning and renewal while recognizing that its relationship with the other capabilities is dynamic and context dependent.

■ 3. DYNAMIC INTERACTIONS

What distinguishes the DWWM is not simply the identification of five capabilities, but the relationships among them. The capabilities operate as connected parts of an organizational system, so a change in one may alter the conditions in which the others operate through ongoing feedback and mutual influence (Meadows, 2008). Workforce wellbeing therefore emerges from how the system functions as a whole rather than from the independent effects of each capability.

A central feature of the model is the potential for feedback loops to reinforce relationships among organizational capabilities over time (Meadows, 2008). For example, as employees develop knowledge and skills, they may become more confident and capable, strengthening their experience of meaningful work and expanding the organization's capacity to respond to challenges. These changes may, in turn, create conditions that support more effective leadership and further learning, producing an ongoing cycle of adaptation. Figure 2 illustrates these proposed feedback relationships within the DWWM. Rather than presenting a linear sequence, the figure emphasizes how changes in one capability may influence the others over time.

These feedback processes reinforce the view of workforce wellbeing as a changing organizational



Figure 2: Reinforcing Feedback Cycle within Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model: Continuous Feedback and Adaptation.

Note: Bidirectional arrows (black arrows) between capabilities represent proposed reciprocal relationships rather than fixed causal pathways. The dotted-colored circular arrows represent continuous feedback and adaptation across the system, indicating that changes in one capability may influence others over time. The circular nature can move both ways, as a bidirectional entity. Arrows (color bi-directional) connecting capabilities with workforce wellbeing represent the proposed relationship between the capabilities and the emergent organizational condition. These relationships may vary in strength and direction across organizational contexts and over time. Figure created by the author and is not adapted from any published model.

condition rather than a fixed outcome or the simple sum of separate initiatives. The DWWM therefore directs attention to the relationships among capabilities and the conditions that allow those relationships to support sustainable wellbeing over time.

4. DISCUSSION

The DWWM's central contribution is its focus on the relationships among adaptive leadership, organizational trust, learning and development, meaningful work, and organizational resilience. It does not claim that these are new wellbeing factors. Rather, it proposes that their interactions may be as important as the capabilities themselves, with changes in one potentially reinforcing or constraining others depending on organizational conditions.

This perspective suggests that similar wellbeing initiatives may produce different results across organizations because the surrounding conditions and relationships are not the same. This is a theoretical implication of the DWWM rather than an established empirical finding. Organizations differ in their structures, resources, histories, leadership practices, and external pressures, all

of which may influence how the five capabilities interact. For example, learning and development may support growth and adaptation in one organization but increase work demands in another when employees lack sufficient time, staffing, or resources. The DWWM therefore emphasizes the conditions and relationships surrounding organizational practices rather than assuming that the same intervention will produce the same outcome across settings.

The DWWM also suggests that challenges may arise when organizations attempt to strengthen individual capabilities in isolation. For example, efforts to build resilience could unintentionally place greater responsibility for adapting on employees without addressing the organizational sources of stress or disruption. Similarly, organizations may promote wellbeing, trust, learning, or resilience without changing the underlying conditions that shape employees' experiences, creating a form of wellbeing washing. These possibilities reinforce the model's central premise: sustaining workforce wellbeing requires attention not only to individual capabilities but also to the resources, conditions, and relationships through which those capabilities interact.

The DWWM provides a basis for future research to examine these proposed relationships. Longitudinal and multilevel studies could assess whether changes in one capability are associated with changes in others, whether feedback processes can be observed over time, and under what conditions particular combinations of capabilities are associated with workforce wellbeing. These research directions provide a basis for evaluating and refining the model across organizational contexts. The following propositions summarize the central relationships proposed by the DWWM:

Proposition 1. The five DWWM capabilities are interrelated, such that changes in one capability may strengthen or constrain the functioning of the others.

Proposition 2. Workforce wellbeing is more strongly associated with the interaction among the five DWWM capabilities than with the development of any single capability in isolation.

Proposition 3. The strength and nature of relationships among the five DWWM capabilities vary according to organizational resources, external pressures, and contextual conditions.

Proposition 4. The relationship between the DWWM capabilities and workforce wellbeing depends, in part, on whether organizations provide adequate resources and avoid shifting disproportionate responsibility for adaptation onto individual workers.

■ 5. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THEORY AND PRACTICE

The DWWM's theoretical contribution is to bring established organizational capabilities into a single systems-oriented architecture. Rather than treating each capability as an independent contributor to wellbeing, the model proposes that their effects may depend on their relationships with one another and with the broader organizational context. This shifts attention from isolated organizational factors toward the conditions through which wellbeing may develop and change over time.

A second contribution is integrating systems theory and dynamic capabilities theory into a unified framework for understanding workforce wellbeing. Systems theory provides a way to understand how wellbeing may emerge from interactions among interconnected organizational capabilities. In contrast, dynamic capabilities theory explains how those capabilities can be renewed and adapted in response to changing internal and external conditions. Together, these perspectives shift attention

from isolated interventions toward the adaptive processes of feedback, learning, and organizational renewal that may support workforce wellbeing over time. This reconceptualization positions workforce wellbeing as a system-level organizational condition and extends existing scholarship beyond approaches that emphasize discrete organizational practices or individual employee outcomes.

The DWWM also offers practical guidance for organizational leaders. Rather than focusing primarily on separate wellbeing programs, the model encourages leaders to strengthen the organizational capabilities that support adaptation and sustainable functioning. Investments in adaptive leadership, trust, learning and development, meaningful work, and resilience should be viewed as interconnected elements of a broader system rather than as competing priorities. This perspective can help leaders design wellbeing strategies that address both employees' experiences and the organization's capacity to adapt to changing conditions.

The DWWM positions workforce wellbeing as an organizational strength rather than solely as an employee outcome. Organizations that develop strong connections among the five capabilities are better positioned to navigate industry uncertainty, managing change, and maintaining effective functioning over time. By treating workforce wellbeing as an adaptive organizational capability, the model provides a basis for future research, examining changes in organizational processes that relate to both workforce wellbeing and organizational effectiveness.

■ 5.1. Strengths

The primary strength of the Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model is its systems-based approach. Rather than treating adaptive leadership, organizational trust, learning and development, meaningful work, and organizational resilience as separate issues, the model considers them interconnected capabilities within a larger organizational system. This approach builds on existing research by shifting attention from individual practices to the relationships among capabilities and how those relationships may support workforce wellbeing over time.

A second strength is the model's interdisciplinary foundation. The DWWM brings together systems theory, dynamic capabilities theory, organizational behavior, leadership research, and wellbeing scholarship, perspectives that are often examined separately. Integrating these perspectives provides a broader basis

for examining workforce wellbeing across different organizational settings, particularly during periods of technological change, workforce transition, and uncertainty.

The model is also practical in its orientation. Rather than framing workforce wellbeing as a collection of separate programs, the DWWM encourages leaders to consider how organizational actions in one area affect the conditions in which other capabilities operate.

■ 5.2. Limitations

The DWWM has several important limitations. First, it is a conceptual framework that has not yet been empirically evaluated. Although the model draws on established theory and research, empirical studies are needed to examine whether the five capabilities interact as proposed and whether the model applies across different organizations, industries, and cultural contexts. Second, the model necessarily simplifies organizational complexity by focusing on five foundational capabilities. Other factors, including organizational structure, national culture, labor market conditions, technological maturity, and regulatory environments, may also shape these relationships and should be considered in future research.

The DWWM may also operate differently across organizational contexts. Organizations with limited resources may have less capacity to invest in learning, development, or adaptation. During periods of severe crisis, immediate survival may take precedence over longer-term wellbeing. In highly informal or loosely structured organizations, leadership, trust, and development may also take different forms. These circumstances represent potential boundary conditions for the model rather than problems that the model itself is expected to resolve.

The model carries potential risks if its capabilities are treated as separate organizational targets rather than interconnected parts of a system. For example, emphasizing continuous learning may increase work demands when employees are expected to develop new skills without adequate time, staffing, or resources. Similarly, efforts to build resilience could shift responsibility for managing disruption onto individual workers rather than addressing organizational conditions. These possibilities reinforce the need to examine not only whether a capability is present, but also how it interacts with the broader organizational system.

A related concern is wellbeing washing, in which organizations promote language around wellbeing, trust, learning, or resilience without making meaningful

changes to the employees' experience. The DWWM should therefore not be used to maximize each capability independently. Instead, it highlights the conditions, limits, and potential unintended consequences that shape how the capabilities interact. Finally, the strength, direction, and development of these relationships over time remain unknown. Multimethod research is suggested to determine how workforce wellbeing develops and changes, and which feedback processes may support its sustainability.

■ 5.3. Future Research

The Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model provides a foundation for several directions for future research. An important first step is to develop valid and reliable measures of the five organizational capabilities and the feedback processes proposed by the model. Clear operational definitions will allow researchers to examine whether workforce wellbeing functions as an emergent organizational condition and how the five capabilities interact over time.

Longitudinal research will be particularly important for examining the dynamic relationships proposed by the DWWM. Because feedback processes unfold over time, cross-sectional studies (a single snapshot in time) may not capture how changes in one capability influence the others. Following organizations across different periods and conditions could help researchers examine how leadership changes relate to trust, how learning and development may contribute to resilience, and how these relationships collectively relate to workforce wellbeing during both stable and disruptive periods.

Research should also examine the model across different organizational contexts. Comparisons among public, private, nonprofit, and healthcare organizations, as well as organizations of different sizes and industries, could help identify conditions that strengthen or constrain the relationships proposed by the model. Cross-cultural research could further examine how national culture, institutional environments, and employee expectations shape these relationships.

Mixed-methods research may provide another useful approach. Quantitative studies can examine the strength, direction, and persistence of relationships among the five capabilities. At the same time, qualitative research can provide insight into how employees and leaders experience the processes through which those relationships develop. Combining these approaches could provide a more complete understanding of both the

model's structural relationships and their lived organizational experience.

Emerging organizational analytics and digital technologies may also provide new ways to examine workforce wellbeing as it changes over time. Ongoing employee feedback, organizational network analysis, and workforce analytics could help researchers identify changes in organizational capabilities and examine potential feedback processes. Such approaches should be used carefully, particularly when they involve employee data, but they may provide opportunities to refine the model and examine its dynamics in organizational settings.

Future research could also apply systems-based methods, including longitudinal structural equation modeling, cross-lagged panel models, multilevel modeling, system dynamics, and agent-based modeling, to examine the reciprocal and changing relationships proposed by the DWWM. Ultimately, empirical evaluation using longitudinal and, where feasible, real-time data will be necessary to determine whether workforce wellbeing functions as an emergent organizational condition and to identify the conditions under which relationships among the five capabilities most support both workforce wellbeing and organizational functioning.

■ 6. CONCLUSION

Workforce wellbeing is often understood either as an individual experience or as the outcome of discrete organizational practices. The Dynamic Workforce Wellbeing Model (DWWM) offers a broader systems-based perspective by conceptualizing workforce wellbeing as an emergent organizational condition that develops through the interaction of adaptive leadership, organizational trust, learning and development, meaningful work, and organizational resilience. The contribution of the DWWM is therefore not the identification of new organizational capabilities, but the integration of established capabilities into a dynamic framework that emphasizes their interdependence, feedback, and responsiveness to changing organizational conditions.

The DWWM brings these five capabilities together as a connected system rather than as separate contributors to wellbeing. Their value lies in how they collectively shape the conditions of work and influence the organization's ability to sustain wellbeing as circumstances change. This framing suggests that workforce wellbeing is not something an organization simply implements; it is

something that develops through the ongoing interaction of organizational capabilities and conditions.

Ultimately, the DWWM offers a shift in perspective: workforce wellbeing is not simply something organizations provide through individual programs, nor is it solely an individual responsibility. It is a condition that develops through the interaction of organizational capabilities and the circumstances in which people work.

The DWWM brings these relationships together within a single dynamic framework, providing a more integrated way to understand how workforce wellbeing can develop, be constrained, and be sustained over time. Its central contribution is therefore a shift from viewing wellbeing as a collection of organizational practices to understanding it as an emergent condition of the organization itself.

■ CONFLICTS OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The author declares no conflict of interest.

■ FUNDING AND ETHICS STATEMENT

No external funding support the development of this manuscript. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was not required for this study, as no human subjects were actively engaged, and no identifiable personal data was collected or analyzed. The research aligns fully with the journal's commitment to scholarly transparency, originality, and evidence-based interdisciplinary rigor.

■ GENERATIVE AI STATEMENT

Generative AI tools were used during manuscript preparation to support language editing, organization, and clarity. AI-assisted tools were also used to identify opportunities for improving readability and consistency, and to assist in identifying relevant sources for the manuscript. The author reviewed, evaluated, and revised all AI-assisted suggestions and retains full responsibility for the content, interpretation, analysis, and conclusions presented in the manuscript.

■ REFERENCES

- Allan, B. A., Batz-Barbarich, C., Sterling, H. M. & Tay, L. (2019). Outcomes of meaningful work: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56(3), 500–528. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12406>
- Argyris, C. & Schön, D. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Addison-Wesley.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational*

- Health Psychology, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Danna, K. & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 357–384. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(99\)00006-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(99)00006-9)
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611–628. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611>
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13, 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- Fulmer, C. A., & Gelfand, M. J. (2012). At what level (and in whom) we trust: Trust across multiple organizational levels. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 1167–1230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312439327>
- Grant, A. M., Christianson, M. K., & Price, R. H. (2007). Happiness, health, or relationships? Managerial practices and employee well-being trade-offs. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(3), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2007.26421238>
- Hartwig, A., Clarke, S., Johnson, S., & Willis, S. (2020). Workplace team resilience: A systematic review and conceptual development. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 10(3–4), 169–200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386620919476>
- Heifetz, R. A., Linsky, M., & Grashow, A. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Harvard Business Press. <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/publications/practice-adaptive-leadership-tools-and-tactics-changing-your-organization-and-world#citation>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources. A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *The American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.44.3.513>
- Huppert, F. A. (2009). Psychological well-being: Evidence regarding its causes and consequences. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 1(2), 137–164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2009.01008.x>
- International Labor Organization (ILO). (2024). *World employment and social outlook: Trends 2024, the global employment trends for youth*. <https://www.ilo.org/publications/flagship-reports/world-employment-and-social-outlook-trends-2024>
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E. & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3), 243–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001>
- Leopold, T. A., Di Battista, A., Jatava, X., Sharma, S., Li, R., & Grayling, S. (2025). *Future of jobs report 2025: Insight report January 2025*. World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-future-of-jobs-report-2025/>
- Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (2003). Demonstrating the value of an organization’s learning culture: The dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 5(2), 132–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422303251341>
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258792>
- Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in systems: International best seller*. In D. Wright (Ed.). Chelsea Green Pub.
- Noe, R. A., Clarke, A. D. M., & Klein, H. J. (2014). Learning in the twenty-first-century workplace. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 245–275. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091321>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *OECD Employment Outlook 2024*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/088d4f56-en>
- Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 91–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2010.09.001>
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 393–404. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.926617>
- Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. (2nd ed.). Doubleday/Currency.
- Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The work and meaning inventory (WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20(3), 322–337. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711436160>
- Sutcliffe, K. M. & Vogus, T. J. (2003). Organizing for resilience. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 94–110). Berrett-Koehler.
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and micro-foundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5131710>
- Teece, D.J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(4), 298–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002>
- von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.
- World Health Organization. (2010). *Healthy workplaces: A model for action: For employers, workers, policymakers and practitioners*. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241500241>
- Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. (8th ed.). Prentice-Hall.

©2026 Pamayla E. Darbyshire. Published by Wellbeing Futures: Innovation, Policy and Research. This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited. (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)