Journal of the International Society for the Systems Sciences | 70th Meeting of the International Society for the Systems Sciences, Cyprus.
Wilby, J., Makar, J. and Laouris, Y. eds.

PRESSURE, INTEGRATION, AND BREAKDOWN: A BIOLOGICAL LENS ON HUMAN SYSTEMS

Sarah Baylous
Resilience Factor 360
Sbaylous2020@gmail.com

Abstract
Organizations invest significant resources in leadership development, coaching, consulting, organizational improvement, workforce development, wellbeing initiatives, and burnout prevention. These efforts help people learn, grow, adapt, and perform more effectively. This conceptual paper proposes an integrated framework grounded in the relationship between human biological function and organizational conditions. Drawing from nearly two decades of leadership experience, systems thinking, and insights informed by Somatic Experiencing, the paper argues that human function changes in response to conditions and that organizational function changes as well. Human biological function influences organizational function, while organizational conditions continuously shape human function in return.

Pressure is presented as a natural and necessary feature of complex systems. When pressure can move through healthy pathways, systems remain more capable of learning, adapting, integrating, contributing, and thriving. When pressure becomes blocked, concentrated, isolated, redirected, or unresolved, individuals and organizations increasingly reorganize around protection and survival rather than contribution. The framework examines the significant role of the unspoken, the difference between functioning and flourishing, the opportunity cost of silence and reactivity, the loss or absence of objectivity under strain, and the ways leadership behaviors influence individuals and systems.

The paper further proposes that leadership development, organizational development, coaching, consulting, and wellbeing efforts may be influenced by the organizational conditions in which they are applied. It concludes that sustainable organizational improvement requires attention not only to visible outcomes, but also to the upstream conditions shaping both human and organizational function.

Keywords
Complex Systems, Human Function, Organizational Conditions, Organizational Development, Somatic Experiencing

1 | Introduction
Organizations routinely invest substantial resources in leadership development, coaching, consulting, organizational improvement, workforce development, wellbeing initiatives, burnout prevention, and performance improvement. These efforts can help people learn, grow, adapt, and perform more effectively. Yet many organizations continue to experience familiar patterns of dysfunction. Trust erodes. Burnout returns. Turnover persists. Communication deteriorates. Conflict reappears. The interventions change while many of the outcomes remain familiar (Heifetz et al., 2009; Senge, 1990).

This paper begins with the observation that human function and organizational function change in response to conditions. Under supportive conditions, people create, innovate, connect, contribute, learn, and grow. Under different conditions, those same individuals may become cautious, withdrawn, reactive, exhausted, disengaged, or leave the organization altogether. These changes are often attributed to identity, personality, resilience, motivation, competence, leadership ability, or commitment. Yet the same person can thrive in one environment and deteriorate in another (McEwen, 1998; Sapolsky, 2004; Staw et al., 1981).

This raises an important question: how much of what organizations attribute to individual performance is actually shaped by the conditions in which people operate, and how much unrealized talent, contribution, and leadership potential remains unaccounted for when those conditions are not examined?

A common assumption is that burnout, disengagement, poor performance, or leadership breakdowns are primarily driven by individual deficiencies or isolated leadership failures (Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Staw et al., 1981). Individual differences matter, and accountability remains necessary. However, this perspective can overlook a more fundamental reality: workplace outcomes emerge through the ongoing interaction between people and the systems in which they operate.

People do not stop being human when they enter the workplace. They enter with the same biological systems they carry outside of work. Workplace conditions influence how individuals think, communicate, contribute, recover, create, lead, and relate to others. Likewise, pressures originating outside the workplace enter organizations through the people carrying them. Workplace and personal life exist in a continuous feedback loop (McEwen, 1998; Porges, 2011; Sapolsky, 2004).

Because many adults spend a significant portion of their waking lives inside organizational systems, workplace conditions have consequences beyond organizational performance. They influence relationships, families, communities, and civic life. Human and organizational systems continuously shape one another.

Organizations are complex systems that inevitably generate pressure. Competing priorities, limited resources, uncertainty, growth, conflict, change, and operational demands are not signs of dysfunction. They are natural features of complex systems. The critical question is not whether pressure exists, but whether it can move through the system in ways that support trust, communication, accountability, learning, healthy conflict, coordinated action, and resolution (Bertalanffy, 1968; Meadows, 2008; Senge, 1990).

When pressure moves through healthy pathways, individuals and organizations remain more able to respond, learn, and function. When pressure becomes blocked, bypassed, concentrated, redirected, isolated, or unresolved, predictable patterns begin to emerge. Attention shifts from contribution toward protection. Creativity narrows. Trust weakens. Participation declines. Communication becomes distorted. Energy that might otherwise support learning, leadership, innovation, and collaboration is increasingly allocated toward monitoring, prediction, vigilance, and self-protection.

These changes are often felt long before they are measured. Metrics are frequently lagging indicators and may appear too late for meaningful intervention. Leaders and coworkers may notice that once-engaged employees become quiet or irritable. Doors that were once open begin to close. Meetings that once generated ideas become cautious and silent. Individuals who once contributed freely begin withholding information, avoiding risk, or simply trying to get through the day. Psychological safety declines, and triangulation, undermining, or indirect communication may become more common. The organization's vitality can fade before formal metrics indicate a problem, if they ever do (Edmondson, 1999; Mayer et al., 1995).

What remains unspoken is active whether it is acknowledged or not. It is carried, worked around, compensated for, and expressed indirectly through behavior, communication patterns, relationships, and culture. Over time, these responses become part of the environment itself. Culture is not merely the values an organization states. It is also the accumulated responses of the people living within it. When stated values and lived behaviors fall out of alignment, people often feel the incongruence even before it is formally named (Schein, 2010).

This paper proposes that recurring organizational challenges are often better understood through an examination of conditions than through subjective interpretations of individuals alone. It explores how pressure moves through complex human systems, how people and organizations change when pressure cannot move effectively, and how unseen conditions shape visible outcomes long before they appear in traditional metrics.

The consequences extend beyond burnout and turnover. Under supportive conditions, people often contribute more of themselves to the systems they inhabit. Creativity expands. Leadership potential emerges. Trust strengthens. Innovation becomes possible. Under chronically strained conditions, individuals may continue functioning while becoming increasingly constricted. They may meet expectations while directing more energy toward enduring, monitoring, protecting, and surviving.

Understanding this relationship may provide a more objective way to recognize emerging dysfunction, reduce unintended harm, strengthen leadership, and create conditions in which both people and organizations can flourish.

1.1 | Origins of the Inquiry

This work emerged from an unexpected direction. After nearly two decades in healthcare leadership, I believed I understood organizational function. I had worked across operations, strategy, workforce development, integrated care, finance, leadership, and organizational change. Like many leaders, I viewed burnout, turnover, communication problems, engagement challenges, and leadership effectiveness as organizational issues requiring organizational solutions.

What I had not fully appreciated was the role of human function within those systems. My introduction to Somatic Experiencing did not begin as a professional pursuit. It began through my own experience of burnout. As I continued my training and pursued certification, I began recognizing patterns that I had observed throughout my leadership career but had never connected.

At first, the question was how organizations could better support people experiencing burnout. I had cared deeply about the suffering I saw among staff, even while carrying strain myself. Looking back, I likely would have approached that suffering differently had I understood what I understand now. Burnout did not appear only as an individual struggle. It also appeared as a system signal.

The deeper the inquiry became, the harder it was to isolate burnout from the conditions producing it (Leiter & Maslach, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Individuals can learn ways to manage stress, recover more effectively, and work with their own responses. Yet those tools cannot compensate indefinitely for conditions that continue generating excessive unresolved pressure.

This realization shifted the inquiry away from burnout alone and toward a broader question: how might organizations identify where pressure is accumulating, where it is becoming trapped, and where conditions are contributing to unnecessary human and organizational harm?

The result was a bridge between body-based human understanding and organizational human systems. Somatic Experiencing, developed by Peter Levine, provided an important foundation for understanding how human beings respond to stress, overwhelm, and unresolved activation (Levine, 1997, 2010). The questions emerging from this work increasingly extended beyond individual recovery and into the conditions shaping human function across entire systems.

This paper does not argue that Somatic Experiencing alone explains organizational life. Rather, it proposes that the human biological system is a missing layer in many discussions of leadership, culture, burnout, wellbeing, and organizational performance. Organizations are not only structures, processes, and strategies. They are also composed of human biological systems operating simultaneously under shared conditions.

The theory presented here emerged from following that problem until it moved beyond the individual and into the system.

1.2 | Purpose of the Paper

The purpose of this paper is to propose a conceptual framework for understanding how organizational conditions influence human function, how pressure moves or becomes blocked within complex systems, and how these dynamics shape burnout, silence, contribution, leadership, wellbeing, life beyond work, and organizational vitality.

The paper is not intended to replace existing leadership, coaching, consulting, organizational development, emotional intelligence, or wellbeing approaches. Many of those approaches provide valuable tools, frameworks, and insights. Instead, this paper proposes that their effectiveness may depend in part on the conditions in which they are applied.

The central argument is that leadership knowledge and leadership function are not the same thing. Individuals can learn leadership principles, emotional intelligence concepts, communication frameworks, coaching models, conflict resolution techniques, and organizational tools. Under supportive conditions,

these capabilities may be readily accessible. Under pressure, the question becomes more complex: what remains available?

This paper therefore examines the conditions that influence what becomes available to individuals and organizations under pressure.

1.3 | Literature Review

This conceptual paper is informed by several bodies of scholarship that are often discussed separately: general systems theory, organizational learning, burnout, psychological safety, trust, adaptive leadership, stress physiology, and Somatic Experiencing. General systems theory established the importance of understanding systems as organized wholes rather than isolated parts (Bertalanffy, 1968). Systems thinking further emphasizes feedback, interdependence, leverage points, and the ways system behavior emerges from relationships among parts rather than from individual parts alone (Meadows, 2008; Senge, 1990).

Organizational learning theory provides an additional foundation for this inquiry. Argyris and Schön (1978) emphasized that organizations learn, or fail to learn, through patterns of action, feedback, inquiry, and correction. Senge (1990) similarly described learning organizations as systems capable of seeing patterns, questioning assumptions, and adapting over time. This literature supports the paper's focus on the conditions that determine whether information can move, whether feedback can be integrated, and whether a system can respond rather than repeat familiar patterns.

Burnout research also supports the importance of organizational conditions. Maslach and Leiter (2016) describe burnout as a multidimensional occupational phenomenon, while Leiter and Maslach (1999) identify workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values as major areas of worklife associated with burnout. This literature is important because it moves burnout beyond an exclusively individual frame and toward a broader understanding of person-environment fit, organizational context, and the conditions under which energy, engagement, and contribution become depleted.

Research on psychological safety, trust, and threat response provides further grounding for the framework. Edmondson (1999) showed that psychological safety supports learning behavior in work teams by reducing interpersonal risk around speaking up, asking questions, and acknowledging error. Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) define organizational trust through perceptions of ability, benevolence, and integrity. Staw, Sandelands, and Dutton (1981) describe threat-rigidity effects in which threat can narrow information processing and constrict behavior. Together, these bodies of work support the paper's argument that pressure, trust, safety, and information flow influence what remains available to people and systems under strain.

The biological dimension of the framework is informed by stress physiology, polyvagal theory, and Somatic Experiencing. McEwen (1998) explains that stress mediators can be protective in the short term while becoming damaging through repeated or prolonged activation. Sapolsky (2004) describes how chronic stress affects the body and behavior over time. Porges (2011) emphasizes the role of autonomic state, safety, communication, and self-regulation. Levine (1997, 2010) contributes a body-based understanding of unresolved activation and the importance of allowing physiological responses to move toward completion. This paper extends these insights into organizational life by proposing that human biological function is not separate from organizational function; it is one of the living conditions through which organizational systems operate.

While these bodies of literature provide important insights, they are often discussed separately. Systems theory examines interdependence and emergence (Bertalanffy, 1968; Meadows, 2008; Senge, 1990), organizational learning examines adaptation and feedback (Argyris & Schön, 1978; Senge, 1990), burnout research examines the relationship between people and workplace conditions (Leiter & Maslach, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 2016), and stress physiology examines how prolonged conditions influence human function (McEwen, 1998; Sapolsky, 2004). Somatic Experiencing contributes a body-based understanding of adaptation, regulation, and unresolved activation (Levine, 1997, 2010). The contribution of this paper is to integrate these domains into a single conceptual framework that examines how organizational conditions influence human function, how pressure moves through systems, and how those dynamics shape organizational outcomes.

Vickers' work provides an additional foundation for this inquiry. Vickers (1965) argued that human systems are shaped not only by decisions and actions, but also by the standards, relationships, and appreciations through which people interpret experience. Individuals and systems continuously evaluate what is important, acceptable, and worthy of attention. These processes influence perception, response, and adaptation over time. This perspective aligns closely with the present framework's emphasis on conditions, interpretation, and the ongoing interaction between human function and organizational function. While the literature reviewed above contributes important insights into systems, learning, burnout, trust, safety, and human adaptation, the framework proposed in this paper seeks to integrate those domains into a more unified understanding of how pressure, conditions, and human biological function shape organizational outcomes.

2 | Human Systems, Conditions, and Function

Human beings change and adapt in response to conditions. Sometimes that adaptation supports growth, creativity, learning, and contribution. At other times it supports protection, caution, withdrawal, or survival. The same individual can appear creative, confident, collaborative, innovative, and engaged under one set of conditions, yet become cautious, withdrawn, reactive, exhausted, or disengaged under another. The difference is often attributed to personality, attitude, motivation, competence, or resilience. Yet the person may not have changed nearly as much as the conditions surrounding them (McEwen, 1998; Porges, 2011; Sapolsky, 2004).

No two individuals are identical. People differ in biological makeup, nervous system organization, experience, sensitivity, preference, capacity, and response patterns. Yet certain conditions consistently influence human function across those differences. Conditions such as trust, unpredictability, exclusion, connection, instability, uncertainty, support, loss of voice, and loss of influence shape how people communicate, contribute, participate, recover, and function.

Recovery is an important part of this equation. Difficult work, high expectations, and significant responsibility do not automatically create harm. Many people can carry substantial pressure when there are pathways for support, repair, shared understanding, and recovery. A demanding role may remain sustainable when a person feels trusted, supported, heard, and able to make sense of difficulty. The same role may become harmful when pressure is carried in isolation, undermining occurs, trust erodes, or there is no place for the accumulated strain to move (Leiter & Maslach, 1999; McEwen, 1998; Sapolsky, 2004).

Many of the conditions that influence human function are common features of organizational life. Chronic unpredictability, inconsistent expectations, exclusion, undermining behavior, unresolved conflict, shifting priorities, excessive control, lack of influence, and prolonged ambiguity require people to devote increasing amounts of energy toward understanding what is happening around them.

Not all of this effort is conscious. Human beings continuously scan their environments for information that may affect trust, predictability, belonging, influence, and stability, often without knowing they are doing so. Long before people can explain what they are noticing, if they can explain it at all, their attention, behavior, communication, participation, and energy may begin shifting in response. People may describe this as a gut feeling, tension, unease, reading the room, or simply sensing that something is off. There is not always precise language for felt experience, yet the body may already be responding (Levine, 1997, 2010; Porges, 2011; Sapolsky, 2004).

Human beings respond to far more information than is communicated explicitly. Tone, silence, inconsistency, exclusion, closed doors, shifting participation, incongruence between words and behavior, and changing patterns of interaction often influence behavior before individuals can articulate what they are noticing. The most influential information in a system is often unspoken.

Understanding does not automatically eliminate the effects of conditions. An individual may accurately recognize organizational dysfunction, understand the source of conflict, or know that criticism is unfair, yet still experience vigilance, tension, disrupted sleep, diminished patience, difficulty concentrating, reduced creativity, reduced energy for life outside work, or difficulty recovering from the workday. Human beings do not stop responding to conditions simply because they understand them.

Human beings are capable of functioning under strained conditions for extended periods of time. People can compartmentalize, suppress concerns, tolerate uncertainty, endure difficult environments, and continue meeting expectations despite significant strain. The ability to continue functioning, however, does not mean the conditions are without consequence. Suppression, endurance, and continued performance may keep work moving in the short term while increasing the cost to the person and the system over time (McEwen, 1998; Maslach & Leiter, 2016).

Functioning and flourishing are not the same thing. People can continue performing while becoming increasingly constricted. They attend meetings, complete projects, answer emails, supervise staff, and fulfill responsibilities. Yet the quality of participation changes. Energy becomes increasingly directed toward maintaining stability rather than expanding possibility.

As more energy becomes allocated toward monitoring, predicting, protecting, explaining, enduring, carrying unresolved strain, and navigating uncertainty, less remains available for creativity, contribution, learning, innovation, growth, leadership, and meaningful engagement.

The difference between flourishing and constriction is not necessarily capability. It is often the amount of a person that remains available to the system. Under supportive conditions, creativity, contribution, learning, leadership, innovation, healthy conflict, and collaboration become more available. Under chronically strained conditions, monitoring, protection, prediction, vigilance, withdrawal, silence, caution, and endurance increasingly dominate.

Supportive conditions do not eliminate pressure. They create pathways through which pressure can move. Individuals who feel supported, heard, trusted, and connected can think out loud, seek perspective, test assumptions, share responsibility, and integrate difficult experiences with others. Support does not necessarily reduce the amount of pressure. It changes how pressure is carried (Edmondson, 1999; Mayer et al., 1995).

Conditions do not determine character, nor do they eliminate personal responsibility. Individuals differ in integrity, judgment, accountability, maturity, and willingness to grow. Some situations require clear accountability, firm boundaries, and direct intervention. However, conditions influence what becomes available to individuals and organizations. Before concluding that a behavior reflects identity, it may be necessary to examine the conditions shaping the response.

When leaders allow gossip, triangulation, bypassing, or undermining to persist, those behaviors do not remain isolated. They begin shaping the conditions of the system. Trust weakens, predictability declines, and people become more cautious about how and where information moves. Understanding how conditions influence human function provides a foundation for understanding how pressure moves through complex systems and what occurs when pressure becomes trapped, concentrated, blocked, isolated, redirected, or unresolved (Edmondson, 1999; Mayer et al., 1995; Schein, 2010).

3 | Pressure, Movement, and Blocking

Pressure is the energy generated within a system when demands, needs, priorities, constraints, responsibilities, expectations, limited resources, uncertainty, and competing perspectives interact. Human systems are never without energy. People bring different levels, qualities, and directions of energy into every interaction. Pressure emerges when that energy meets the realities of organizational life (Bertalanffy, 1968; Meadows, 2008).

Pressure is a natural feature of life and of complex systems. It is not inherently harmful. Pressure accompanies growth, change, responsibility, learning, conflict, decision making, and organizational function itself. A system without pressure does not move. The question is not whether pressure exists. The question is what happens to it (Bertalanffy, 1968; Meadows, 2008; Senge, 1990).

In organizational systems, pressure emerges naturally within and between departments, leaders, teams, boards, staff, priorities, timelines, finances, operations, and strategy. Pressure itself is not the problem. In healthy systems, pressure moves. Questions are raised, conflict is addressed, concerns are discussed, decisions are made through a wider lens, responsibilities remain clear, and information reaches the people who need it.

Healthy conflict plays an important role in this process. Conflict is not inherently harmful. Differing perspectives, competing priorities, disagreement, and functional tension are natural features of complex systems. In many cases, conflict carries information necessary for learning, adaptation, integration, and sound decision making (Argyris & Schön, 1978; Edmondson, 1999; Senge, 1990).

The problem is not conflict. The problem occurs when conflict cannot move through accountable pathways toward clarity, integration, decision, or repair. Conflict may continue circulating without resolution, disagreement may become unsafe, alternative perspectives may become intolerable, or pressure may lose its pathways. When pressure cannot move effectively, it does not disappear. It accumulates, concentrates, redirects, isolates, and searches for another outlet. When it exceeds available capacity, it can contribute to burnout, withdrawal, reactivity, silence, turnover, and other system effects.

Pressure that cannot move begins reorganizing the system. This is where understanding the implications of blocking becomes important. Blocking occurs when information, concerns, accountability, conflict, feedback, decisions, or pressure can no longer move through the pathways necessary for integration.

Exhibit 1. Common Blocking Patterns and System Effects

Blocking Pattern	System Effect
Bypassing established roles	Pressure and accountability move around rather than through the appropriate function.
Bottlenecks in decision making	Pressure accumulates while people wait too long for direction, permission, or clarity.
Gossip replacing direct communication	Information becomes distorted and trust weakens.
Triangulation	Concerns move through indirect channels rather than accountable pathways.
Failure to route concerns appropriately	Pressure concentrates in the wrong location and function becomes personalized.
Avoidance of conflict	Necessary information remains unaddressed, decisions become delayed or distorted, and people may be blindsided outside the appropriate forum.

Blocking is not simply a communication problem. Blocking traps pressure or routes it through the wrong channel, creating confusion and loss of predictability. As pressure accumulates, increasing amounts of human energy become devoted to understanding, predicting, monitoring, protecting, and compensating for what is no longer moving effectively through the system (Meadows, 2008; Schein, 2010; Staw et al., 1981).

This creates secondary consequences. People begin working around the system. Questions go unasked. Concerns remain unspoken. Information becomes distorted. Trust weakens. Participation narrows. Alternative perspectives disappear. Significant meeting time may be devoted to discussion without real movement because some parts of the system are shut down, excluded, or unable to act.

Over time, unresolved pressure often becomes concentrated in particular individuals, teams, or functions. One department becomes viewed as the problem. One leader becomes viewed as difficult. One employee becomes viewed as resistant. One team becomes viewed as dysfunctional. Yet the concentration of pressure does not necessarily indicate the source of the problem. It may indicate where pressure has accumulated.

This distinction matters because organizations often focus on the visible location of pressure rather than the pathways that allowed pressure to become trapped in the first place. Pressure can move, integrate, and resolve, or it can accumulate until individuals and organizations begin reorganizing around it.

Understanding where pressure moves, where it becomes trapped, where it is rerouted, and where it accumulates provides a foundation for understanding many outcomes commonly observed in organizations.

4 | Constriction, Burnout, Silence, and Opportunity Cost

Pressure that cannot move does not simply remain where it originated. It accumulates, concentrates, redirects, and eventually influences how individuals and organizations function. One common consequence of prolonged unresolved pressure is constriction (McEwen, 1998; Staw et al., 1981).

Constriction occurs when increasing amounts of human energy become devoted to monitoring, predicting, protecting, enduring, explaining, carrying, and surviving. As this occurs, less energy remains available for creativity, contribution, innovation, learning, leadership, connection, and growth (Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Staw et al., 1981).

This shift is often gradual and difficult to recognize. People continue showing up. Projects continue moving. Meetings continue occurring. Responsibilities continue being fulfilled. From the outside, the organization may appear functional. Yet the quality of participation begins changing. Questions go unasked. Ideas go unshared. Initiative declines. Disagreement becomes increasingly rare. Curiosity narrows. Risk taking decreases. The system can erode from the inside out long before significant decline becomes visible. This is why conditions often dismissed as soft skills may be foundational indicators of organizational health (Edmondson, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Staw et al., 1981).

A person may continue performing effectively while becoming increasingly constricted. Deadlines are met, tasks are completed, and expectations are fulfilled. Yet the amount of the individual available to the system begins shrinking. The difference is not necessarily capability. The difference is availability.

Creativity may still exist but no longer be expressed. Leadership may still exist but no longer be exercised. Ideas may still exist but no longer be shared. Potential may still exist but no longer enter the system. This distinction is important because organizations often interpret visible performance as evidence that conditions are acceptable.

Over time, unresolved pressure frequently produces recognizable outcomes. Burnout is one example. Turnover is another. Disengagement, silence, withdrawal, diminished trust, cynicism, and emotional exhaustion may emerge as well. These outcomes are often treated as primary organizational problems. From an upstream perspective, however, they may be better understood as downstream manifestations of conditions that have been active for months or years (Leiter & Maslach, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 2016).

One of the most significant consequences of constriction is opportunity cost. Organizations routinely measure turnover, productivity, absenteeism, financial performance, and engagement scores. These measures are important, but they may underestimate the true cost of strained conditions. The greatest losses are often invisible (Edmondson, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Senge, 1990).

The cost includes unrealized leadership, unrealized creativity, unrealized contribution, unrealized innovation, unrealized collaboration, and unrealized trust. Individuals functioning in survival-oriented states often become increasingly transactional. Work becomes focused on completion, maintenance, protection, and endurance. Individuals functioning under supportive conditions often contribute beyond transactional requirements. They identify opportunities, improve systems, mentor others, solve problems, strengthen relationships, generate ideas, and create value beyond their formal role.

The difference is not simply performance. The difference is the amount of human potential available to the system.

Silence represents a particularly important form of opportunity cost. Every concern left unspoken, question left unasked, idea left unshared, challenge left unexplored, and perspective withheld represents information that never enters the system. Organizations rarely measure the value of what was never contributed.

Over time, these losses accumulate. Conversations become more cautious. Curiosity declines. Participation narrows. Trust weakens. Innovation slows. The heart of the organization becomes harder to find. The color begins to fade. What was once a place of contribution, creativity, growth, and connection increasingly becomes a place of maintenance, endurance, and survival.

The opposite is also true. When conditions support trust, contribution, healthy conflict, predictability, communication, and movement of pressure, people often bring more of themselves to the system. Creativity expands. Contribution expands. Leadership emerges. Learning accelerates. Relationships strengthen. Human potential becomes more available.

Organizations frequently measure the costs of failure while overlooking the value of flourishing. Yet flourishing may represent one of the greatest unrealized opportunities available to complex human systems.

5 | Objectivity, Distortion, and Leadership Conditions

Organizations often strive to make objective decisions. Yet the conditions operating within a system influence what information is seen, what information is ignored, and how people interpret what they observe. One significant risk of prolonged unresolved pressure is the gradual loss of objectivity (Argyris & Schön, 1978; Staw et al., 1981).

As pressure accumulates, trust weakens, participation narrows, and perspectives become increasingly limited. Information that once moved freely becomes constrained. Questions become less likely to be asked. Alternative viewpoints become more difficult to express. Individuals become increasingly cautious about what they say, how they say it, and to whom they say it (Edmondson, 1999; Mayer et al., 1995; Staw et al., 1981).

As this occurs, organizations become increasingly vulnerable to distortion. Distortion occurs when information entering a system no longer reflects the reality of the system itself. Information may become filtered, selective, incomplete, or personalized. Influence may become concentrated among a smaller number of voices. Leaders may begin making decisions using a narrower range of information while believing they possess a complete picture (Argyris & Schön, 1978; Senge, 1990; Staw et al., 1981).

One way distortion emerges is through the subjectivization of function. Organizations consist of different functions that serve different purposes. Operations, finance, human resources, compliance, clinical care, quality improvement, governance, and leadership often carry different priorities and perspectives. Tension between these functions is not inherently problematic. In many cases, it is necessary.

Healthy systems tolerate this tension because it provides information necessary for integration and sound decision making. Problems emerge when functional disagreement becomes personalized. A financial concern becomes evidence that someone is resistant. An operational concern becomes evidence that someone is difficult. A compliance concern becomes evidence that someone is inflexible. A differing perspective becomes evidence that someone is negative. The function becomes attached to the person. At that point, the system begins losing objectivity.

Necessary information is no longer evaluated on its merits. It is increasingly evaluated according to who delivered it. Structural conditions become personal narratives (Weick, 1995). Responses become identities (Staw et al., 1981; Weick, 1995).

One risk of prolonged unresolved pressure is that responses to conditions become interpreted as characteristics of the individual. As people become more cautious, withdrawn, reactive, protective, silent, controlling, or disengaged, observers often conclude that these behaviors reflect who the person is. The alternative possibility receives less attention: the conditions may be shaping what is currently available to that individual.

This does not eliminate accountability or personal responsibility. Individuals differ in integrity, judgment, maturity, accountability, and character. Conditions do not determine behavior. However, conditions influence what becomes available to individuals and organizations.

A person functioning under chronically strained conditions may appear very different than the same person functioning under supportive conditions. Before making judgments about character, motivation, competence, attitude, or potential, it may be necessary to evaluate the conditions surrounding the individual.

The question is not simply, 'Who is this person?' The question is also, 'What conditions are shaping what is currently available to them?'

Leadership conditions play a significant role in this process. Leaders influence trust, predictability, communication, accountability, participation, psychological safety, conflict tolerance, the movement of information, and the movement of pressure. As a result, leaders exert disproportionate influence over the conditions in which others operate (Edmondson, 1999; Heifetz et al., 2009; Mayer et al., 1995).

This influence does not require malicious intent. Many organizational distortions emerge gradually. A leader may begin hearing from a smaller number of people. Alternative perspectives may become less available. Disagreement may become increasingly uncomfortable. The range of information entering the system narrows. Over time, a leader's reality may become increasingly shaped by proximity rather than objectivity.

Leaders also become vulnerable to distortion when they remain too long within one narrative, department, function, or set of voices without returning to a broader organizational view. Healthy leadership requires moving close enough to understand the lived reality of staff while also stepping back far enough to see the whole system. When leaders lose that movement, they may unintentionally amplify one part of the system while pressure builds elsewhere (Heifetz et al., 2009; Senge, 1990; Staw et al., 1981).

When proximity to power becomes more influential than contribution to the system, organizations begin rewarding access, agreement, and alignment rather than integration of information. The result is not merely poor decision making. The result is increasing distortion. The system loses access to the information necessary to remain healthy.

Healthy systems require more than good intentions. They require conditions that support objectivity, pathways through which information can move, and leaders who tolerate disagreement, seek alternative perspectives, and remain curious about what may be missing from their current understanding.

Objectivity does not require the absence of perspective. It requires the willingness to examine conditions before assigning identity, blame, motive, or meaning.

6 | Implications for Leadership, Organizational Development, Coaching, Consulting, and Wellbeing

The preceding chapters have explored how organizational conditions influence human function, how pressure moves through systems, and how unresolved pressure shapes both individual and organizational outcomes. This perspective suggests a different approach to organizational improvement.

Many organizational interventions focus on visible outcomes. Burnout, turnover, disengagement, conflict, communication problems, leadership challenges, workforce instability, and declining performance become the focus of attention. While these outcomes are important, they are often downstream manifestations of conditions that have been active long before the outcomes themselves become visible (Leiter & Maslach, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Senge, 1990).

An upstream approach begins with different questions. Instead of asking only, 'What is wrong with this person?' it asks, 'What conditions are shaping what is currently available to them?' Instead of asking only, 'How do we fix this outcome?' it asks, 'What conditions are producing this outcome?' This shift does not eliminate accountability, responsibility, performance expectations, or organizational standards. Rather, it broadens the lens through which organizational challenges are understood.

The purpose is not to excuse behavior. The purpose is to improve understanding.

Many leadership, coaching, consulting, and organizational development approaches provide valuable tools, frameworks, and insights. These efforts contribute meaningfully to individual and organizational growth. This paper does not argue against those approaches. Rather, it proposes that their effectiveness may depend in part on the conditions in which they are applied (Heifetz et al., 2009; Senge, 1990).

Individuals can learn leadership principles, emotional intelligence concepts, communication frameworks, coaching models, conflict resolution techniques, and organizational tools. Under supportive conditions, these capabilities may be readily accessible. The question becomes more complex under pressure. When uncertainty increases, pressure accumulates, trust erodes, or conditions become chronically

strained, individuals often have less access to the flexibility, perspective, curiosity, and reflection required to consistently apply what they know (McEwen, 1998; Staw et al., 1981).

The issue is not simply whether leadership concepts have been learned. The issue is what remains available under pressure and whether system conditions support the continued use of those capabilities (McEwen, 1998; Staw et al., 1981).

In this sense, understanding conditions may function as connective tissue between many existing approaches. It helps explain why effective interventions sometimes succeed, why they sometimes fail, and why individuals may perform very differently under different circumstances despite possessing the same knowledge and capabilities (Argyris & Schön, 1978; Edmondson, 1999; Senge, 1990).

Pressure reveals not only what people know, but how they function when conditions become difficult. Leaders who remain capable of perspective taking, curiosity, integration, and thoughtful action under strain often become a source of steadiness for others. Leaders who become overwhelmed by pressure may unintentionally amplify the strain already present within the system. Burnout can be worsened when the people trying to solve it are also adding pressure to the system (Heifetz et al., 2009; Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Staw et al., 1981).

The question is not whether leaders experience pressure. The question is whether they primarily help the system metabolize pressure or become another source of it.

From this perspective, organizational assessment begins shifting upstream. Attention is directed toward trust, pressure movement, blocked pathways, communication flow, participation, healthy conflict, role integrity, information movement, support structures, leadership behaviors, and organizational conditions (Edmondson, 1999; Mayer et al., 1995; Meadows, 2008).

The goal is not the elimination of pressure, conflict, or tension. These are necessary features of complex human systems. The goal is creating conditions in which pressure can move, conflict can be integrated, information can travel, and people can contribute more of themselves to the system (Bertalanffy, 1968; Edmondson, 1999; Meadows, 2008).

This is not a choice between human wellbeing and organizational performance. It is not a choice between leadership development and organizational development. It is not a choice between people and results. Human flourishing and organizational performance are not competing outcomes. Under supportive conditions, they often reinforce one another.

7 | Conclusion

Organizations devote substantial effort to improving leadership, strengthening culture, increasing engagement, reducing burnout, supporting wellbeing, and improving performance. Yet many continue to struggle with recurring patterns of turnover, disengagement, conflict, diminished trust, workforce instability, and unrealized potential (Leiter & Maslach, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Senge, 1990).

This paper argues that many of these outcomes are better understood through the conditions that produce them. Pressure is an inevitable feature of complex systems. The critical question is not whether pressure exists, but whether it can move (Bertalanffy, 1968; Meadows, 2008).

When pressure moves through healthy pathways, individuals and organizations remain capable of learning, adapting, integrating information, resolving conflict, and functioning effectively. When pressure becomes blocked, bypassed, concentrated, isolated, redirected, or unresolved, people and organizations begin changing in predictable ways (Bertalanffy, 1968; Meadows, 2008; Senge, 1990).

This perspective also suggests a more cautious approach to interpretation. People operating under chronically strained conditions may appear very different than the same people operating under supportive conditions. Responses may be mistaken for identities. Structural conditions may become personal narratives. Necessary functions may become personalized conflicts. Before concluding that a behavior reflects character, motivation, competence, attitude, or potential, it may be necessary to evaluate the conditions shaping what is currently available to the individual (McEwen, 1998; Sapolsky, 2004; Staw et al., 1981).

The goal is not simply healthier individuals, stronger leaders, or more effective organizations. The goal is creating conditions in which human beings and organizations can flourish together.

Such conditions do not eliminate pressure, conflict, disagreement, or complexity. They allow those realities to move, integrate, and contribute to the health of the system rather than becoming trapped within it.

Understanding the relationship between conditions, pressure, human function, and organizational function may provide a more objective foundation for leadership, organizational development, wellbeing, and the creation of environments in which people are able to contribute more fully to the systems they inhabit.

References

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Addison-Wesley.

Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). General system theory: Foundations, development, applications. George Braziller.

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world. Harvard Business Press.

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (1999). Six areas of worklife: A model of the organizational context of burnout. Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, 21(4), 472–489.

Levine, P. A. (1997). Waking the tiger: Healing trauma. North Atlantic Books.

Levine, P. A. (2010). In an unspoken voice: How the body releases trauma and restores goodness. North Atlantic Books.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. World Psychiatry, 15(2), 103–111. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 709–734. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335

McEwen, B. S. (1998). Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators. New England Journal of Medicine, 338(3), 171–179. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199801153380307

Meadows, D. H. (2008). Thinking in systems: A primer. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Porges, S. W. (2011). The polyvagal theory: Neurophysiological foundations of emotions, attachment, communication, and self-regulation. W. W. Norton & Company.

Sapolsky, R. M. (2004). Why zebras do not get ulcers: The acclaimed guide to stress, stress-related diseases, and coping (3rd ed.). Henry Holt and Company.

Schein, E. H. (2010). Organizational culture and leadership (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. Doubleday/Currency.

Staw, B. M., Sandelands, L. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1981). Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26(4), 501–524. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392337

Vickers, G. (1965). The art of judgment: A study of policy making. Chapman & Hall.

Weick, K. E. (1995). Sensemaking in organizations. Sage Publications.