Collaborative Organizational Culture Models Which Promote Co-Creation With Employees For Well-Being And Development.

[1]Mariela Jacobo, *[2]Luis Felipe Miguel Llanos

[1]carolina.jacobo@tec.mx,
[2]luis.llanos@anahuac.mx

ABSTRACT

This article presents a theoretical proposal to achieve employee's collaboration in order to co-create well-being and development. It integrates organizational culture models, personal autodetermination to participate and develop community, creativity and innovation aspects, and capabilities' development to achieve instrumentality. It presents a review of the Competing Values Framework (CVF), Denison Organizational Culture Assessment (DOCS), Modern Ontological Personalism (POM), capabilities development approach and human flourishing. The scope of the research corresponds to preliminary theoretical, conceptual and methodological results to be continued in wider research about organizational culture.

Index Terms— collaborative culture; co-creation; personalism; flourishing; capabilities approach.

Introduction

By delving into the experience of a feeling of comfort and achievement of development of people in the company, an answer is found in the cultural characteristics of the organization, this being possible to decipher and typify, according to the literature in the field. This article highlights the contributions to the concept of organizational culture of the authors Edgar Schein, Daniel Denison, Kim Cameron, Robert Quinn, John Roghbaugh, Edgar Morin, y Daulatram Lund. (Cameron & Quinn, 2011b, 2011a; Lund, 2003; Morin, 2001; Schein, 2010). The research has been oriented to find cultural characteristics that have allowed the employee to participate in organizational culture co-creation (Ind & Coates, 2013) with the purpose of building personal and social well-being (Keyes, 1998; Seligman, 2011), motivating transcendence and to live personalism values in action (Sánchez García, 2016). However, the search for participation leads us to relate well-being and development with organization's capabilities, from the perspective of capacities and human flourishing. (Nussbaum, 2012). Then, it is proposed a cultural change as a result of including knowledge and expectations from employees through participation, collaboration, continuous improvement and innovation (OECD/Eurostat, 2018) as part of the desirable cultural characteristics. (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a).

This article aims to answer the following research questions related to the nature of organizational culture: from the organizational culture, how can spaces be created to promote well-being in the organization? How could organizational culture be an opportunity to generate job satisfaction and well-being? How can employees, as a stakeholder group, participate in their cultural evolution, through the introduction of co-creation strategies?

This article is presented in four sections. First, it presents the concept con organizational culture from different authors. Secondly, it highlights organizational cultural models that promote collaboration, exploring the authors Cameron and Quinn (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a) and Denison (Denison et al., 2012) and their relationship with job satisfaction proposed by Lund D. (Lund, 2003). Thirdly, it establishes the fundamentals of co-creation (Ind & Coates, 2013) the anthropological profile from Modern Ontological Personalism as a key for participation (Burgos, 2015), capabilities development (Nussbaum, 2012). Fourthly, a review of the impact on well-being from

the perspective of human flourishing (Keyes, 1998; Seligman, 2011). Finally, the conclusions for this article are shown.

I. **Methodology**

The scope of this work corresponds to preliminary results of a theoretical, conceptual and methodological approach. A literature review was carried out based on the identification of the main authors, an analysis of their contributions and a search in databases (Cué Brugueras et al., 2008) to compare information from different sources, generate meta-analysis, present a discussion and conclusions.

II. **Organizational Culture**

Based on Edgar Schein's conceptualization of organizational culture as learned patterns of beliefs, values, assumptions, and behavioral norms that manifest at different levels of observability (Schein, 2010), culture is a complex phenomenon requiring a model for understanding. Schein proposes a three-layer model considering observable aspects on the surface called artifacts, a second layer composed of beliefs and values, leading to a deeper layer concerning assumptions (Schein, 2010). According to Schein, there are external aspects that must be considered for the organization to survive, along with its culture. In this process, organizations face two archetypes: first, adaptation and survival in the external environment, and second, the integration of internal processes to ensure the capacity to continue, survive, and adapt (Schein, 2010).

It is relevant to contextualize culture within complexity. Culture can be understood as the hologram mentioned by Morin, for its evolution requires excursions or exits from the system (Morin, 2001). Morin argues for the necessity of interacting in open systems, creating a link to the environment. In his work Introduction to Complex Thought (2001), Morin states, "the system can only be understood by including the environment, which is both intimate and foreign to it and is part of itself while being, at the same time, exterior" (Morin, 2001: p. 45). This evolution faces the archetypes mentioned by Schein, where the organization challenges the integration of diverse elements, both internal and external, involving the development of capabilities to generate these processes and strategies that allow adaptation, as well as processes and strategies for excursions, both within and outside the entity.

Martin and Siehl introduce another level beyond Edgar Schein's model (Schein, 2010) to examine organizational culture. This level corresponds to managerial practices, such as training and development, recognition, performance feedback, communication, recruitment, among others (Martin & Siehl, 1983). They thus define a relationship between cultural development and managerial action. From this fourth level, the possibility of impacting through a counterculture, which the manager is capable to identify, is proposed. By creating a safe space for counterculture participation, the manager finds a strategy to enable dialogue that counters the dominant organizational culture. According to Martin and Siehl, managers can drive changes in the dominant culture by generating a safe space for listening to subcultures that represent opposing conceptions, fostering innovation and evolution (Martin & Siehl, 1983).

With all the above, the idea of the need for involvement of different stakeholder groups in the company is presented to lead organizational culture to an evolution that considers changes in both internal and external contexts (Schein, 2010). In other words, organizational culture can be impacted in its elements by the members who comprise it, through the practices promoted by management with employees (Martin & Siehl, 1983), fostering cultural innovation through co-creation strategies (Ind & Coates, 2013).

It is relevant to consider the suitable person in this co-creation project. We refer to a person who is responsible for their environment, acknowledging the importance of their participation considering the impacts it has, which also produces personal and social well-being (Vera, 2019). On the other hand, it is important to identify those cultural models that create conditions for employees to find opportunities to engage in co-creation for personal well-being. Below, we present an analysis of two models that typify collaborative and innovative organizational cultures, delving into the proposals of Quinn and Cameron (Cameron & Quinn, 2011b) and Denison (Denison et al., 2012).

III. **Organizational Cultural Models that Promote Collaboration**

A. **Organizational cultural models**

The models are introduced in chronological order starting with the Competing Values Framework proposed by Quinn and Rohrbaugh in 1983 (Cameron & Quinn, 2011b), followed by Denison's model from 1990 (Denison et al., 2012).

Quinn and Rohrbaugh propose the Competing Values Framework (CVF), which is one of the 50 most important

models in the history of business. It originates from empirical research on the factors that make an organization effective and is based on the sociological tradition where culture is understood as an attribute of the organization and can be measured separately from the organizational phenomenon (Cameron & Quinn, 2011b).

The CVF consists of two dimensions (external-internal orientation and flexibility-focus) resulting in 4 quadrants representing different ways of being, seeing, managing, and organizing a company, that is, different cultural manifestations that are diagonally opposed and exert competition or tension between them. Success lies in achieving a balance in experiencing the four cultures, which are related to the organization's strategy. The four cultural typologies are named as: clan, market, adhocratic, and hierarchical, the characteristics of each one is outlined (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a).

A company that is flexible and has an external orientation has an adhocratic culture, where there is observed capacity for change, adaptation to the environment, promotion of creativity, stakeholder participation to achieve innovation, and the launching of new products as a competitive advantage. In contrast, there is the hierarchical culture, characterized by rule establishment, procedures, focus on control, continuous improvement, and the pursuit of efficiency, with an internal and stable orientation. On the other hand, there is the quadrant of external and stable orientation, which is characterized by maintaining a goal-oriented approach, short-term vision, prevailing competitive spirit, called market culture. Lastly, there is the clan culture quadrant, which exerts tension contrary to the market, with an internal and flexible orientation. In these cultures, employee participation is fundamental, a long-term vision is developed, a sense of family is fostered, teamwork is encouraged, and empowerment is experienced (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a).

Quinn and Rohrbaugh establish a direct influence relationship between culture and success in executing the company's strategy, such that changing the strategy can generate changes in culture to adapt to the new context (Cameron & Quinn, 2011b). This discovery reveals possibilities for evolving a culture in the company that aligns with the strategy, derived from a vision of the future.

In order to identify the predominant culture type in the organization, Cameron and Quinn developed the Organizational Cultural Assessment Instrument (OCAI), which through the assessment of six dimensions: dominant characteristics, leadership style, employee management, strategic emphasis, and success criteria, offers companies a current view of the experience of the four cultural typologies and a desirable vision, thus establishing clear gaps to prepare the organization for the necessary cultural change, that is, according to the envisioned strategy (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a). It has been proven through research conducted by the authors that these six dimensions provide a conception of the type of culture that exists in the organization (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a).

From the above, the promotion of a clan and adhocratic culture is taken as a reference, thus opening possibilities for the co-creation of organizational culture that promotes employee participation for its evolution towards well-being. The development of this culture in its different dimensions opens the door to participation for the creation of well-being spaces that align with strategic planning needs.

On the other hand, let's review the proposal of Daniel Denison's model (Denison et al., 2012). Denison defines culture as the way things are done, it is the framework that guides people's actions in organizations when they are not observed, it is the logic, the code, and the result of a set of learnings that have been transferred from generation to generation (Denison et al., 2012). For Denison, culture impacts companies' performance in four ways: by creating direction and mission, building a high level of flexibility and adaptability, developing participation and commitment of people in the company, and providing consistency based on a set of core values (Denison et al., 2012).

Based on the above, the model has been defined to measure organizational culture consisting of four characteristic traits: mission, adaptability, participation, and consistency, accompanied by a culture survey as an instrument, which we can find as Denison Organizational Culture Survey (DOCS) (Denison Consulting, 2023; Denison et al., 2012).

It is important to understand these four traits and the aspects that integrate them, as it is in these definitions where the opportunity for the construction of a collaborative culture lies, allowing, even demanding, employee participation in the evolutionary cultural process. The mission trait corresponds to the clarity organizations have about the direction they pursue, i.e., their purpose, which allows for the generation of strategies and goal setting. The mission trait includes three aspects: strategic intent and direction, goals and objectives, and vision (Denison et al., 2012).

The second trait is adaptability, which complements the previous trait as it refers to the degree of flexibility and

response of the organization to changes in the environment. The aspects it contemplates are: creating changes, customer focus, and business learning (Denison et al., 2012).

The third trait is participation, which lies in the commitment and empowerment of people in the organization, building a sense of teamwork and developing human capabilities. This trait stands out for the construction of collaborative cultures, which require people's participation in decision-making about their work, understanding their feelings towards work, and developing a connection with the organization's goals. The aspects that integrate it are: empowerment, team orientation, and skills development.

Lastly, consistency is presented as a trait, referring to the greater effectiveness of organizations when they are consistent and well-integrated, behavior has a clear guide of action in a set of values, and people must be trained for the implementation of such values, leading to consistency between what defines the company and people's actions. The aspects that integrate this trait are: core values, agreement and coordination, and integration.

The construction of this model is based on adapting to the external environment and the development and integration of internal aspects. From this, the model establishes two intersecting axes, the axis of stability and flexibility, and the internal and external focus, thus giving rise to four quadrants that give rise to the four traits (Denison et al., 2012).

1.1 Dialogue between the presented organizational culture models

We will seek to establish relationships between both presented models and find the traits, characteristics that allow and/or demand collaboration from the organization's people to achieve cultural evolution to address the archetypes mentioned by Schein, adaptation and survival in the external environment and the integration of internal processes (Schein, 2010). The construction of both models is based on a series of tensions and contradictions that must be managed in organizations. According to Edgar Schein, there is a prevailing need for an organization to adapt to external and internal aspects, and a tension generated by the stability and flexibility desired by the organizational dynamics (Schein, 2010).

Both models thus define four quadrants that allow typifying and measuring organizational culture. Each of these models is accompanied by a tool to measure culture, a questionnaire that integrates items formulated from behaviors that participants can identify in the organization. From the application of this tool, a type of culture is established as in the OCAI and/or traits in the DOCS. Both models propose an evolution of culture based on the identification of results obtained from their tools, defining a reference, and establishing areas of opportunity for the organization to propose a development plan, evolution, and adaptation (Cameron & Quinn, 2011b; Denison Consulting, 2023).

Similarly, the participation of people in the company is implied both to identify the characteristics of the current culture and to define evolution strategies.

For the research being conducted on this topic, the aspects mentioned below are recovered. From the CVF, the two types of cultures that focus on people and their development are taken, which become key to defining competitive advantages, these are clan culture and adhocratic culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a). On the other hand, from the Denison model, participation and adaptability traits are taken, which consider an internal and external focus, and the organization's flexibility to integrate external needs, generate changes, based on a learning process that involves empowerment, skills development, and teamwork, which involves people in the organization (Denison et al., 2012).

1.2 Relationship between Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction

Daulatram Lund (2003) examines the impact of organizational culture on job satisfaction, resulting in job satisfaction levels varying according to the type of culture, with a focus on flexible and internal cultures accentuating satisfaction (Lund, 2003). Lund's research shows a more positive relationship between clan and adhocracy cultures and generating job satisfaction, drawing from the CVF model. In this sense, drawing from the Denison model, a direct relationship with job satisfaction is visualized from the participation and adaptability quadrants, which maintain a previously established relationship between both models (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a; Denison et al., 2012; Lund, 2003).

The relationship of the previously mentioned cultural models establishes a cultural context open to collaboration and participation, implying conditions for co-creation, which can be directed towards personal well-being by members of the organization, considering their collaborative traits. In this sense, the relationship between

organizational culture and the co-creation of job satisfaction is woven.

From the proposed models, aspects implying employee participation for the development, evolution, and adaptation of organizational culture are rescued, and the typification and/or predominant traits related to external, internal, and flexible focus are related to employee satisfaction. Now it will be important to relate the concept of job satisfaction to well-being and the impact of co-creating the employee's own well-being in the company.

IV. **Co-creation**

Introducing Co-creation as "a shift in organizational thinking as a value-definer for a more participatory process where people and organizations together generate and develop meaning" (Ind & Coates, 2013, p. 86).

According to Ind and Coates (2013), the concept of co-creation has been used from the perspective of collaboration between the customer and the company as a methodology to generate products, services, marketing, and processes that meet their needs (Ind & Coates, 2013). This concept is adopted for the purposes of the research, proposing co-creation as a participation strategy that allows for an impact on the construction of organizational culture to generate well-being in the individuals involved.

The introduction of co-creation strategies with stakeholders implies integrating the different points of view, feelings, and knowledge of the participants, turning the organization into an open system that allows adaptation to internal needs and changes, previously mentioned as the integration archetype from the model proposed by Edgar Schein (Schein, 2010), or the "excursions" by Morin (Morin, 2001) generated by collaboration and integration of previously reviewed internal aspects.

By implementing co-creation strategies in the organization, innovative practices are introduced that allow adaptation. In this case, the purpose of integrating employee participation in co-creation (Ind & Coates, 2013) is to develop an organizational culture that positions them as a source of evolution itself, to generate well-being and development for the company and its employees. Similarly, it is important to highlight that the generation of value is considered inherent to innovation, as self-discovery implies an opportunity not considered or seen by those involved, thereby implicating development (OECD/Eurostat, 2018).

As part of achieving the introduction of co-creation strategies, three relevant aspects are proposed: one is the self-determination of the individual to participate in these processes, second is the required creativity involving an innovation process, and third is the development of the capacities available in the organization for their instrumentality.

A.   **Self-determination**

It is important to consider that individuals in organizations are part of innovation processes when the organization establishes the means, i.e., resources, structures, policies, processes, and procedures deliberately, involving them in a common goal. However, it is crucial that the employee is interested in participating in this process of building personal and social well-being, finding a sense of transcendence in being part of it freely. It will be important for the employee to have the competencies, knowledge, and skills for co-creation, but it is crucial that they find that sense of self-determination to carry it out.

Drawing from Karol Wojtyla's Modern Ontological Personalism, here the priority is established as the person, where the human person is above all relationships. This allows us to focus on and give the corresponding importance to the fact that the person in the organization defines their involvement in a social context, which happens under the personalistic structure, a methodology proposed by Karol Wojtyla to reach the experience of personal value, which consummates the integration of the person and transcendence in a community space.

I present an analysis of the personalist structure from the anthropological proposal of Modern Ontological Personalism by Karol Wojtyla with the aim of integrating self-determination as the definitive element to achieve employee participation in co-creation strategies within the organization.

The personalist structure integrates seven elements, which correspond to both internal (self-possession and self-

mastery) and external aspects to the person (self-determination, transcendence, integration, self-realization, and personalist value). The internal aspects relate to self-possession and self-mastery; these elements are inclusive, meaning there is no self-mastery without first going through self-possession (Burgos, 2015; Sánchez García, 2016). When we talk about self-possession, we refer to the process in which a person becomes aware of themselves, taking ownership of their existence and thus becoming masters of themselves (Burgos, 2015; Sánchez García, 2016).

Self-possession involves both objective and subjective aspects. The objective aspects refer to external factors such as actions and circumstances surrounding the person, including the organization in this case. The subjective aspects, on the other hand, occur within the person and include thoughts, emotions, desires, and motivations (Burgos, 2015; Sánchez García, 2016). It is the capacity for self-possession that supports a person's choice to self-determine and reach out to others, integrating themselves into participation (Burgos, 2015; Sánchez García, 2016).

Taking this into consideration, we move on to the next element, which is self-mastery, involving self-government and reflective consciousness. As individuals develop the capabilities and faculties to govern themselves, they act consciously and freely (Sánchez García, 2016). It is through this process that one achieves self-determination, which I emphasize as the fundamental element for involving employees in co-creation strategies within the company.

According to Burgos (2015), self-determination lies in "...the capacity that every person, every human being, has to decide who they want to be and achieve it through their actions" (Burgos, 2015: p. 21). This is how the participation of employees in co-creation processes is proposed, by self-determining themselves through their own will and freedom to improve the cultural context, motivated by transcendence from a tripartite structure integrated in a harmonious connection between the corporeal, psychic and spiritual.

Hence, the pursuit of personal well-being implies a connection with both the objective aspects of self-possession that reside in the environment and the subjective aspects that delve into the internal aspects of the individual. The personalist action encompasses all elements of the structure: self-awareness, self-mastery, engagement with others, and transcendence from integral moral experience. Achieving individual participation in improving their context leads the person to live out the personalist value in action, where their participation and realization are consummated with others (Burgos, 2015).

Therefore, the organization becomes a community space for participation, where the individual realizes themselves and participates in the realization of others, in this case, the generation of a context that promotes personal well-being and development, as well as that of the organization. The organization is the space where individuals act, their community of action, defined by the collective purpose of a group (Wojtyla, 2014). However, being part of it does not guarantee participation. Thus, as an important element in this research, it becomes relevant to understand what is required for employees to participate in well-being and development co-creation strategies. Participation from a personalist perspective involves taking action for the common good, allowing the individual to realize themselves in that action, both objectively and subjectively (Wojtyla, 2014). The organization could then become a space for the construction of a participatory community where individuals can realize themselves in a personalist action, contributing to the common good.

Personalism also finds resonance in organizational culture that promotes participation. In this regard, summarizing the characteristics of previously reviewed organizational culture models, an organization with a clan culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a) can develop a community of participation when the context promotes authentic attitudes such as solidarity (Wojtyla, 2014) observed in teamwork, establishing a common purpose, cooperation, a sense of family-belonging, and individual development. Similarly, an adhocratic culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a) can develop a community of participation by promoting constructive opposition (Wojtyla, 2014), inviting employees to question the current operations of the organization, fostering both external and internal perspectives to propose improvements and leverage creativity for evolution and adaptation to new needs.

As part of the attitudes that foster a community of participation, it is necessary to introduce a sense of dialogue, understood as "...that which can be used to constitute and consolidate human solidarity, also through opposition" (Wojtyla, 2014: p. 408). Viewed from this perspective, co-creation strategies (Ind & Coates, 2013), by definition, integrate communication among stakeholders for value creation and improvement as a common goal.

Achieving employee participation in co-creating workplaces that generate well-being is a relevant objective for this research. To accomplish this, it is necessary for the company to delve into the need to establish co-creation strategies from a personalist perspective, placing the employee as the most important element at the center of the organization, promoting a community of participation where employees can realize themselves in personalist action, encompassing both external and internal aspects, and fostering dialogue in culturally congruent contexts that stimulate creativity, as highlighted below.

B.   Creativity

Starting from the need for creative employee participation to generate new cultural perspectives, the Oslo Manual (2018) defines creativity as "the ability to generate and use new knowledge and new solutions" (OECD/Eurostat, 2018:108). Co-creation processes require creativity from those involved in the issue, their participation in understanding it, divergent thinking for generating ideas, and communicating these ideas to create joint solutions (OECD/Eurostat, 2018).

In this line of thought, the introduction of employee knowledge and experiences becomes a crucial input for the process. However, the organization must be willing to develop capabilities that enable employees to find opportunities to carry out these processes (Nussbaum, 2012).

C.   Capabilities

Regarding organizational capacity development for instrumentality, a capabilities approach, management or administrative competencies development, and human resource skills are crucial. The Oslo Manual proposes two approaches to innovation, internal and external. We will focus on the internal approach and the competencies it entails, aligning them with Martha Nussbaum's capabilities theory to construct a theoretical proposal that provides direction for enabling and instrumentalizing co-creation in the organization.

The proposal of instrumentality comprises the capabilities approach, the development of management and/or administrative competencies, human resource skills, and how the company manages them, including the ability to design, develop, and adopt technological tools and data management. We will delve into human resource skills and how processes related to them are managed (OECD/Eurostat, 2018).

We start by revisiting the capabilities theory and the concept of freedom development by Amartya Sen, Nobel Prize winner in economics in 1998, motivated by reducing inequalities and seeking social justice. It is essential for individuals in the organization to develop capabilities to make contributions to a cultural context that allows for human development, while pursuing economic development as a mean to achieve its own ends. Capabilities are not merely generated by desire; it is necessary to have a just environment that offers possibilities for the development of these capabilities and generates opportunities—here, the organization itself acts as the provider (Colmenarejo, 2016).

Furthermore, we integrate Martha Nussbaum's proposal from the perspective of central human capabilities as an enabler of co-creation, innovation, cultural evolution, and well-being. This approach is considered to construct a clear reference on the competencies that build well-being in individuals and organizations and how the context should enable individuals to flourish in this regard.

Nussbaum establishes ten central capabilities for a dignified and prosperous life: Life, Physical Health, Bodily Integrity, Senses, Imagination and Thought, Emotions, Practical Reason, Affiliation, Other Species, Play, and

Control over one's environment (Nussbaum, 2012). To integrate employee participation in co-creation strategies in the organization, the following capabilities are proposed as related enablers from this perspective:

1. Senses, Imagination, and Thought: The ability to use senses, imagination, thought, and reasoning, in a formed manner, for the production of work (Nussbaum, 2012). This relates to the creativity required in the co-creation process.
2. Emotions: The capacity to develop attachment to things and people, oneself, and others, attending to emotional development (Nussbaum, 2012). Employees participate with their knowledge, emotions, feelings in the co-creation process, developing a sense of belonging with the organization and people, considering individual and collective emotions.
3. Affiliation: Refers to the ability to see the situation of others, live with others, recognize, and show interest in human beings (Nussbaum, 2012). Co-creation processes require empathy to recognize current problems and the impacts they trigger, regarding well-being and development of individuals in the organization.
4. Control over one's environment: "In the workplace, being able to work as human beings, exercising practical reason and maintaining valuable and positive relationships of mutual recognition with other workers" (Nussbaum, 2012: p.55). This capability is directly related to the research purpose, which is the search for an organizational context that promotes employee participation in creating a culture of well-being and development.

Regarding the article's objective, it aims for individuals collaborating in the organization to be involved in co-creating the culture that governs their behavior in the organization, leading them to generate proposals that impact a culture of well-being and development.

From here, we take Nussbaum's ideas regarding the individual as both, a means and an end in themselves; this is called the principle of each person as an end (Nussbaum, 2012). This principle considers human dignity, their individuality that makes them different from the whole, which needs to be imprinted on that whole as part of what composes and gives it a social identity (Colmenarejo, 2016).

On the other hand, The Oslo Manual (2018) mentions organizational and management skills, as well as those of human resources and management, emphasizing fundamentally that the organization must have competencies in managing resources, people, financial aspects, knowledge, and other tangible and intangible assets. The following required managerial competencies are enumerated (OECD/Eurostat, 2018):

1. Change management: refers to the organization and management's ability to lead change, which requires responsibility, learning, alignment, and creativity (OECD/Eurostat, 2018).
2. Dynamic management capabilities: refers to the management's ability to respond to internal and external challenges, as well as implementing strategic changes, requiring managerial cognition, social capital, and managerial human capital (OECD/Eurostat, 2018).

Moreover, it is necessary to have a prepared workforce to carry out innovation processes as they constitute the source of creativity, from expert knowledge, considering that they have ideas about improvement and change obtained from direct interaction with stakeholders. Beyond having tertiary education, including secondary education, with learning activities for specialized fields at a high level of complexity (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2022), experience in the field and formal education in the area they work in are crucial. The human resource must comprise a diverse group, with the following characteristics (OECD/Eurostat, 2018):

1. Cognitive skills, idea generation, and reasoning.
2. Adaptability and flexibility in the face of change.

Additionally, the following competencies are added (OECD/Eurostat, 2018):

1. Social skills.
2. Complex problem-solving skills in a current and complex environment.

3. Technical skills for the design, implementation, and use of technological machinery and systems.
4. System skills.

Adding to the above, an employee prepared to participate in innovation and continuous improvement processes must also incorporate work values and those related to entrepreneurship, creativity, autonomy, and teamwork (OECD/Eurostat, 2018).

We have covered managerial competencies, those of employees, and it is necessary to review human resource management practices that include recruitment policies to attract creative individuals, training and development of the aforementioned skills, establishment of incentives that promote idea generation, as well as providing promotion and growth opportunities linked to them (OECD/Eurostat, 2018).

After presenting the above concepts, it is essential to contextualize and justify the approach used to address innovation, putting the individual experiencing personalist value (Burgos, 2015; Sánchez García, 2016) at the center and generating opportunities to impact their participation community (in the organization) (Wojtyla, 2014), ensuring that the organization has the capabilities (Colmenarejo, 2016) for the person to freely participate in co-creating their own and others' well-being within a community of participation.

V. **Personal Well-being and Development**

Regarding personal well-being, it is approached from the perspective of positive psychology, which seeks the constant development of the individual, defining well-being and happiness based on experiences, the present, and the construction of their future.

As Contreras and Esguerra mention, Seligman (2005) defines positive psychology as "the scientific study of positive experiences, individual positive traits, the institutions that facilitate their development, and the programs that help improve individuals' quality of life while preventing or reducing the incidence of psychopathology" (Contreras & Esguerra, 2006: p.313).

We will be revisiting this theory as a relevant foundation for this research, also considering Keyes's perspective on Social Well-being, thus leading the individual to seek well-being from both individual and social impacts (Vera, 2019).

Well-being and happiness are influenced by individuals' interactions in different contexts that either allow or neutralize individual development, growth, and expansion. For Keyes, Social Well-being is the assessment we make of circumstances and functioning within society and is composed of five factors: social integration, social acceptance, social contribution, social actualization, and social coherence. From the perspective of social psychology, we consider a comprehensive view of individuals' well-being in the organization, as well as the satisfaction that involves their contribution to creating an appropriate cultural context (Vera, 2019).

Building well-being from the reviewed organizational culture models, which promote collaboration, creativity, and development, enables capabilities in the organization so that individuals can participate freely in co-creating their own and others' well-being within a community of participation.

2. Conclusion

This article aims to identify models of organizational collaborative cultures that promote employee collaboration so that they have the conditions to engage in the co-creation of personal well-being and development. This has been approached through the following research questions: How can organizational culture create spaces to promote well-being in the organization? In what way could organizational culture be an opportunity to generate job satisfaction and well-being? How can employees, as stakeholders, participate in their cultural evolution through the introduction of co-creation strategies?

Regarding the question related to organizational culture as a mean to create spaces for well-being in the organization, two models were reviewed: Kim Cameron and R.E. Quinn's Competing Values Framework and the one proposed by Daniel Denison. Both models establish cultural characteristics that promote collaboration and can be measured through instruments developed to identify employees' perceptions (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a;

Denison et al., 2012).

In relation to the second research question that links organizational culture, job satisfaction, and well-being, these aspects were related to job satisfaction by Daulatram Lund, who shows how levels of job satisfaction vary according to the type of culture. Lund found a more positive relationship between clan and adhocracy with job satisfaction, based on the CVF model, as well as with the participation and adaptability quadrants proposed by Daniel Denison (Cameron & Quinn, 2011a; Denison et al., 2012; Lund, 2003).

From these models, cultural conditions are established to introduce co-creation strategies in the organization, which are an opportunity for employees to participate and contribute from their knowledge and experiences to a common project. In this sense, the third question focuses on achieving employee participation in co-creation strategies, addressing three fundamental aspects: self-determination, creativity, and the development of organizational capabilities. These aspects involve the personalist approach, creativity related to open innovation and co-creation processes, and the development of capabilities and organizational competencies, referring to Martha Nussbaum's capabilities approach, management and administrative competencies, and human resource development (Burgos, 2015; Ind & Coates, 2013; León Guevara, 2015; Nussbaum, 2012; OECD/Eurostat, 2018; Sánchez García, 2016).

Lastly, personal well-being is integrated from Seligman's positive psychology perspective, which is achieved through constant personal development based on experiences, the present, and expectations. Speaking of personal well-being from the perspective of human flourishing implies the development of capabilities in the organization that enable participation for the common good (Contreras & Esguerra, 2006; Keyes, 1998; Seligman, 2011).

These conclusions lead to new research questions regarding the design, implementation, and development of co-creation strategies that enable cultural evolution towards a culture of personal well-being.

REFERENCES

[1] Burgos, Juan Manuel (2015). "El personalismo ontológico moderno II. Claves antropológicas", en Quién: Revista de Filosofía Personalista, 7–32.
[2] Cameron, Kim, & Quinn, Robert. (2011a). Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework. (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
[3] Cameron, Kim, & Quinn, Robert. (2011b). "The Competing Values Culture Assessment: The OCAI -- Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument", en Kim S. Cameron and University of Michigan. <https://www.boomhogeronderwijs.nl/media/8/download_pdf_culture_assessment_workbook.pdf>.
[4] Colmenarejo, Rosa (2016). "Enfoque de capacidades y sostenibilidad. Aportaciones de Amartya Sen y Martha Nussbaum", en Ideas y Valores, 65(160), 121-n/a. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/enfoque-de-capacidades-y-sostenibilidad/docview/1788528374/se-2 >.
[5] Contreras, Francoise & Esguerra, Gustavo (2006). "Psicología positiva: una nueva perspectiva en psicología", en Diversitas, 2, 311–319.
[6] Cué Brugueras, M., Díaz Alonso, G., Díaz Martínez, A. G., & Valdés Abreu, M. de la C. (2008). "El artículo de revisión", en Revista Cubana de Salud Pública, 34, 0.
[7] Denison Consulting. (2023, March 26). Encuestas de cultura organizacional ¿qué tan alineada está cultura organizacional? < https://Denisonconsulting.Com/Es/Culture-Surveys/>.
[8] Denison, Daniel, Hooijberg, Robert, Lane, Nancy & Lief, Colleen (2012). Leading Culture Change in Global Organizations: Aligning Culture and Strategy. Wiley.
[9] Ind, Nicholas & Coates, Nick (2013). "The meanings of co-creation", en European Business Review, 25(1), 86–95. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/09555341311287754
[10] Keyes, Corey Lee M. (1998). "Social well-being", en Social Psychology Quarterly, 61(2), 121–140. https://doi.org/10.2307/2787065

[11] León Guevara, J. (2015). "LA PERSONA VISTA DESDE EMMANUEL MOUNIER Y SU REPERCUSION EN LA MISION EDUCATIVA", en Aula: revista de ensenanza e investigacion educativa, 21, 177+. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A545432003/IFME?u=uan&sid=bookmark-IFME&xid=c15502e4>

[12] Lund, Daultram B. (2003). "Organizational culture and job satisfaction", en The Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 18(2/3), 219–234. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/0885862031047313

[13] Martin, Joanne & Siehl, Caren (1983). "Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis", en Organizational Dynamics, 12(2), 52–64. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(83)90033-5

[14] Morin, Edgar (2001). Introducción al pensamiento complejo. Gedisa.

[15] Nussbaum, Martha (2012). Crear capacidades: Propuesta para el desarrollo humano. Paidós.

[16] OECD/Eurostat. (2018). Oslo Manual 2018 (4th ed.). OECD. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304604-en

[17] Sánchez García, Cipriano (2016). Construcción de comunidad en tiempos posmodernos dos polacos en diálogo: Zygmunt Bauman y Karol Wojtyla (Primera edición.). Siglo XXI Editores.

[18] Schein, Edgar (2010). Organizational Culture and Leadership. (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

[19] Seligman, Martin (2011). La auténtica felicidad, Ediciones B, México.

[20] Vera, A. (2019). "Flourishing: the path to prosperity", en {PSOCIAL} Journal of Research in Social Psychology, 5(2). <https://publicaciones.sociales.uba.ar/index.php/psicologiasocial/article/view/4547>

[21] Wojtyla, K. (2014). Persona y acción, Palabra. Madrid.

Translation assisted by artificial intelligence.