



The Leader's Manual: 9 steps to fix wellbeing in your organization

Most leaders know wellbeing matters. Fewer know what actually works. The research is clear: wellness apps and resilience workshops alone don't move the needle. What does work is redesigning systems, training managers, and building cultures where people can speak up, recover, and do their best thinking.

This is a step-by-step manual. Each step includes the science behind it and a practical tool you can use this week.

Step 1: Fix the System, not the Person

Science: A landmark 2024 study by William Fleming at the University of Oxford analyzed 46,336 workers across 233 organizations. The finding was stark: participants in individual-level wellbeing interventions—including resilience training, mindfulness programs, and wellbeing apps—were no better off than non-participants on multiple wellbeing measures. The interventions failed because they did not address the actual working conditions causing strain.

This echoes the WHO's first-ever global guidelines on wellbeing at work (2022), which explicitly recommend that organizations prioritize organizational interventions—changes to workload, scheduling, flexibility, and participation—over individual-only programs. The WHO estimates that 12 billion workdays are lost annually to depression and anxiety, costing the global economy nearly US\$1 trillion per year.

The tool — "Root Cause Audit" (quarterly, 60 minutes):

1. List the top 5 complaints or frustrations you hear from your team (workload, unclear priorities, meeting overload, lack of autonomy, etc.).
2. For each, ask: "Is this a system problem (how work is designed) or an individual problem (one person's skill or mindset)?"
3. You will likely find that 3–4 out of 5 are system problems. Pick one. Redesign one structural element this quarter: reduce meeting load, clarify decision rights, add flexibility, or redistribute workload.
4. Track the change. Ask your team after 4 weeks: "Has this gotten better, worse, or stayed the same?"





Step 2: Train your Managers — they are the Front Line

Science: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 10 controlled trials found that manager wellbeing training produces significant improvements in managers' wellbeing knowledge (effect size SMD = 0.73), non-stigmatizing attitudes (SMD = 0.36), and supportive behavior toward employees with wellbeing challenges (SMD = 0.59) .

A cluster randomized controlled trial went further: training managers in a fire and rescue service not only improved manager attitudes but also reduced employee sick leave . The WHO's 2022 guidelines now formally recommend manager training as one of three core evidence-based interventions for workplace wellbeing .

The tool — "Manager MH Basics" (half-day training + monthly practice):

Train every people manager on three skills:

1. **Recognize:** Know the early signs of overload and distress (withdrawal, irritability, drop in quality, changes in attendance).
2. **Respond:** Have a simple, non-clinical conversation: "I've noticed [specific observation]. How are you doing? How can I help?"
3. **Refer:** Know where to point people (internal EAP, external therapist, HR support) without trying to be the therapist.

After the initial training, reinforce monthly: dedicate 15 minutes in each manager meeting to discuss one real (anonymized) scenario and practice the Recognize → Respond → Refer sequence.





Step 3: Build psychological Safety — the Foundation of Everything else

Science: Harvard professor Amy Edmondson's foundational 1999 study discovered something counterintuitive: the highest-performing hospital teams reported more errors, not fewer. They weren't making more mistakes—they were more willing to talk about them. She defined psychological safety as "a shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking" and showed that it drives learning behavior, which in turn drives team performance . Google's Project Aristotle study later confirmed this at scale, finding that psychological safety was "by far the most important" of the five dynamics that distinguish high-performing teams . A 2023 analysis by Edmondson and Bransby synthesized insights from 185 research papers, reinforcing that psychological safety predicts team performance, innovation, and organizational outcomes more reliably than individual talent alone .

The tool — "The 3 Questions" (weekly, in any team meeting):

At the start or end of one meeting per week, ask three questions:

1. "What is one thing that didn't go well this week that we can learn from?"
2. "Is there anything someone wanted to say this week but held back?"
3. "What is one thing we should try differently next week?"

Rules: the leader speaks last, not first. Thank people for honesty rather than explaining or defending. Track whether the team's willingness to speak up increases over 4–6 weeks.

Psychological safety is not about being nice. It is about making it safe to be honest.





Step 4: Regulate your Emotions before they regulate you

Science: James Gross's process model of emotion regulation identifies five families of strategies. Among them, cognitive reappraisal—reinterpreting the meaning of a situation before the emotional response fully develops—is consistently the most effective .

Neuroimaging research shows that cognitive reappraisal engages the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC), which modulates amygdala activity to resolve emotional conflict . In contrast, suppression—hiding what you feel—consumes more cognitive resources, leaves the internal experience unchanged, and is associated with blunted reward responsivity and worse psychological wellbeing .

For leaders, this means: the instinct to "push through" or "keep a poker face" is neurologically costly. Reappraisal—changing how you interpret the stressor—is faster, cheaper, and more sustainable.

The tool — "Reframe in 60 Seconds" (before any high-stakes moment):

When you notice a stress spike (tight chest, racing thoughts, irritation):

1. **Pause.** Take 3 slow breaths.
2. **Name.** Identify the emotion: "I'm feeling threatened / frustrated / anxious."
3. **Reframe.** Ask: "What is one other way to interpret this situation that is equally plausible and less threatening?" Write it down if possible.
4. **Choose.** Decide your response from the reframed interpretation, not the first emotional spike.

Example: Your board member sends a terse, one-line email. First interpretation: "They're unhappy with me." Reframe: "They're busy and replying fast—this is neutral, not hostile." The situation is identical. The emotional cost is dramatically different.





Step 5: Speak directly — not around People

Science: A meta-analysis of 28 negotiation studies found that when people approached conflict with a prosocial motive—genuine concern for both their own and the other party's outcomes—they were less contentious, engaged in more problem-solving, and achieved higher joint outcomes. The key condition: this worked when both sides held their ground on what mattered, meaning directness and care are not opposites.

Indirect communication—venting to a colleague instead of speaking to the person involved—erodes trust and multiplies the emotional labor across the team.

The tool — "The Direct Conversation Protocol" (as needed):

Before escalating or venting:

1. Check yourself: "Am I willing to say this directly, respectfully, to the person involved?"
2. If yes: Schedule a 15-minute conversation. Use this structure:
 - "Here is what I observed [fact, not judgment]."
 - "Here is how it affected me or the work."
 - "Here is what I'd like us to try instead."
3. If not yet: Ask a trusted person to help you prepare for the direct conversation—not to take your side.
- 4.

Team norm to establish: "We talk to people, not about people. If we need help, we ask for coaching on how to have the conversation, not for someone to validate our story."





Step 6: Align Values — or watch Burnout Rise

Science: Research consistently shows that a mismatch between personal and organizational values is a significant driver of burnout. Workers whose personal values were consistent with organizational values experienced lower burnout and higher wellbeing. Those who successfully pursued their core values at work—particularly honesty, competence, and clearly defined work—reported the lowest burnout scores .

A study of 480 white-collar workers across public and private sectors confirmed this: perceived misalignment between individual and organizational values correlated with heightened occupational burnout and diminished work engagement .

The tool — "Values Alignment Check" (quarterly, 30 minutes per person):

In a 1:1 or team setting:

1. Ask each person to write down their top 3 personal work values (e.g., honesty, autonomy, mastery, impact, fairness, creativity).
2. Then ask: "On a scale of 1–10, how well does your current work allow you to live these values?"
3. For any score below 6, explore: "What is one thing we could change—in your role, your team, or your environment—to bring this closer to an 8?"
4. Commit to one concrete adjustment per person, per quarter.

This is not soft. This is structural burnout prevention.





Step 7: Practice Gratitude — it's not soft, it's proven

Science: A 2025 meta-analysis spanning 145 papers, 24,804 participants across 28 countries found that gratitude interventions produce a statistically significant increase in wellbeing (Hedges' $g = 0.19$, $p < 0.001$). A separate 2023 systematic review found that gratitude interventions led to 6.86% higher life satisfaction, 5.8% better wellbeing scores, and 7.76% fewer anxiety symptoms compared to control groups.

In workplace-specific research, gratitude interventions showed stronger mean effect sizes ($g = 0.34$) than other positive psychology interventions. A 2025 study of a manager-coached gratitude program found improvements in employee engagement, job satisfaction, and psychological capital.

The tool — "3 × 1 Gratitude Practice" (daily, 2 minutes):

At the end of each workday, write down:

1. One thing you handled well today.
2. One thing a team member did that helped.
3. One thing about your circumstances you appreciate.

Then: express at least one of these to someone the next day. Keep it specific: "When you flagged that risk early in the meeting, it saved us time and helped us make a better call. Thank you."

Generic praise ("Great job!") is forgettable. Specific appreciation changes behavior and builds trust.





Step 8: Move People toward their Strengths

Science: Gallup's decades of research shows that people who use their strengths every day are six times more likely to be engaged at work . A Gallup meta-analysis found that strengths-based development leads to up to a 29% increase in profit, a 15% increase in employee engagement, and a 7% increase in customer engagement . A dedicated study on CliftonStrengths 34 feedback demonstrated a 7.8% increase in sales alongside measurable engagement gains .

The logic is simple: people who spend most of their time doing what drains them will eventually burn out, disengage, or leave. People who spend more time in their zone of strength produce more, recover faster, and stay longer.

The tool — "Energy Audit" (weekly, 10 minutes):

Each Friday, review your week and sort activities into two columns:

- **Energy givers:** Tasks where time flew, you felt competent, and the output was strong.
- **Energy drainers:** Tasks that felt heavy, repetitive, or misaligned with your skills.

Then **ask three questions** about your top drainer:

1. Can I stop doing this entirely?
2. Can I delegate, share, or swap it with someone whose strength it is?
3. Can I redesign how I do it to make it lighter?

Shift even 10–15% of your week from drainers to strengths and track how your energy, output, and mood change over a month.





Step 9: Lead vulnerably — it's what actually builds Trust

Science: A 2021 study published in Organization Science tested two leader behaviors: feedback-seeking (asking "How can I improve?") and feedback-sharing (openly discussing criticism one has already received). In a longitudinal field experiment, leaders randomly assigned to share feedback saw a significant increase in team psychological safety one year later. Leaders assigned to seek feedback did not.

Why? Feedback-seeking often dissolved because leaders became defensive or failed to act on what they heard. Feedback-sharing, by contrast, "normalized and crystallized vulnerability"—leaders made a public commitment to keep sharing, employees reciprocated, and this created an ongoing cycle of accountability and openness.

Separate research confirms that when leaders disclose emotional experiences, it enhances trust, makes them appear more approachable and authentic, and strengthens leader-member exchange quality.

The tool — "Behind the Curtain" (monthly, 10 minutes in a team meeting):

Once a month, share one piece of feedback you've received—from your own manager, a peer, a coach, or a 360 review:

- "Here's something I've been working on improving: [specific behavior]."
- "Here's what I've tried so far and what's been hard."
- "I'd welcome your honest input on whether you've seen progress."

Rules: Keep it real but bounded. You are not confessing or seeking therapy—you are modeling that growth requires honesty about imperfection. This single act, done consistently, builds more psychological safety than any policy document.





Where to start:

- This week: Step 4 (reframe before one hard conversation) + Step 7 (write three appreciations tonight).
- This month: Step 3 (introduce The 3 Questions in one team meeting) + Step 9 (share one piece of feedback you received).
- This quarter: Step 1 (run a Root Cause Audit) + Step 2 (train your managers) + Step 6 (do a Values Alignment Check).

The leaders who build the healthiest organizations don't just care about wellbeing. They redesign systems, model vulnerability, and create the conditions where people can do their clearest thinking and their most meaningful work. That's not soft. That's strategic.





References

1. Fleming, W. J. (2024). Employee well-being outcomes from individual-level wellbeing interventions: Cross-sectional evidence from the United Kingdom. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 55(2), 162–182.
2. World Health Organization (2022). WHO guidelines on wellbeing at work. Geneva: WHO. See also: WHO/ILO (2022). wellbeing at work: Policy brief.
3. Gayed, A. et al. (2018). Effectiveness of training workplace managers to understand and support the wellbeing needs of employees: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Occupational & Environmental Medicine*, 75(6), 462–470.
4. Milligan-Saville, J. S. et al. (2017). Workplace wellbeing training for managers and its effect on sick leave in employees: A cluster randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 4(11), 850–858.
5. Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.
6. Edmondson, A. C. & Bransby, D. P. (2023). Psychological safety came first: A review and synthesis of 185 research papers. Harvard Business School Working Paper.
7. Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation: Current status and future prospects. *Psychological Inquiry*, 26(1), 1–26.
8. Wang, Y.-X. & Yin, B. (2023). A new understanding of the cognitive reappraisal technique: An extension based on the schema theory. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 17, 1174585.
9. Morawetz, C. et al. (2020). The effect of strategies, goals and stimulus material on the neural mechanisms of emotion regulation: A meta-analysis of fMRI studies. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 72, 111–128.
10. Kelley, N. J. et al. (2018). Reappraisal and suppression emotion-regulation tendencies differentially predict reward-responsivity and psychological well-being. *Biological Psychology*, 140, 35–47.
11. De Dreu, C. K. W., Weingart, L. R., & Kwon, S. (2000). Influence of social motives on integrative negotiation: A meta-analytic review and test of two theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(5), 889–905.
12. Veage, S. et al. (2015). Value congruence, importance and success in the workplace: Links with well-being and burnout amongst wellbeing practitioners. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 4(1), 42–49.
13. Bouckenoghe, D. et al. (2013). Discrepancy between individual and organizational values: Occupational burnout and work engagement among white-collar workers. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 43(4), 307–320.
14. Meta-analysis (2025). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of gratitude interventions on well-being. 145 papers, 163 samples, 24,804 participants across 28 countries. Hedges' g = 0.19.
15. Dickens, L. R. (2023). The effects of gratitude interventions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Multiple wellbeing outcome measures.
16. Komase, Y. et al. (2021). Effects of gratitude intervention on wellbeing and well-being among workers: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 63(1), e12290.
17. Harty, B. et al. (2025). Development of a gratitude intervention model and its effects on employee well-being, engagement, job satisfaction and psychological capital. *Work*, 80(1), 233–246.
18. Gallup (2020). How employees' strengths make your company stronger. Gallup Workplace Research.
19. Gallup (2019). CliftonStrengths meta-analysis: The relationship between strengths-based employee development and organizational outcomes.





20. Asplund, J. & Agrawal, S. The effect of CliftonStrengths 34 feedback on employee engagement and sales. Gallup Technical Report.
21. Blunden, H., Logg, J. M., Brooks, A. W., John, L. K., & Grant, A. M. (2021). Taking your team behind the curtain: The effects of leader feedback-sharing and feedback-seeking on team psychological safety. *Organization Science*, 33(4), 1574–1597.
22. Ito, A. & Bligh, M. C. (2016). Feeling vulnerable? Disclosure of vulnerability in the charismatic leadership relationship. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 10(2), 42–55.
23. Zhang, Y. et al. (2025). The strength of vulnerability: How does supervisors' emotional support-seeking enhance leadership influence? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1486370.

