STRATEGIC INTELLIGENCE REPORT

Behavioral Health & the Fourth Turning

Rent Security, Crisis Scenarios, and Strategic Positioning for EAP & Workforce Well-Being Firms

Performance Partners Southeast | The McPherson Group
James A. McPherson, M.B.A.
April 2025

This report is prepared for senior strategy and corporate development executives. It applies the Fourth Turning generational framework to the specific competitive and institutional dynamics facing Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and workforce well-being firms over the 2025–2030 crisis horizon.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States is in the Crisis phase of its current eighty-year generational cycle — what Strauss and Howe identified as the Fourth Turning. For Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and workforce well-being firms such as Carebridge, this moment is not merely a period of elevated demand. It is a structural inflection point that will determine which firms emerge as indispensable anchors of the next institutional order and which are marginalized by the very disruptions that should be expanding their market.

This report provides senior strategy executives with three things: a precise mapping of the rent sources that EAP and well-being firms currently capture; a range of five crisis scenarios over the 2025–2030 horizon and their differential impact on rent security; and a strategic posture framework for converting Fourth Turning disruption into durable competitive advantage.

> ***The most dangerous position for a large organization in a Fourth Turning is to be optimized. Efficiency is a Fourth Turning liability.***
>
> — James A. McPherson — The Fourth Turning & The Corporate Strategist

KEY FINDINGS

1. Behavioral health demand is a structural Fourth Turning beneficiary — but revenue architecture is not. EAPs face expanding need simultaneous with threats to the institutional delivery mechanism through which that need is monetized.
2. Five distinct crisis scenarios present over the 2025–2030 window, each with materially different implications for rent security. No single scenario is dominant; the most likely outcome is a blend, weighted by which macro forces accelerate fastest.
3. The clinician network, regulatory compliance infrastructure, and longitudinal outcomes data are the most durable rent sources. The per-employee contract model and pure human-delivery margins are materially at risk.
4. Antifragile positioning requires owning the AI triage layer, diversifying beyond employer-sponsored benefits, and building a regional anchor identity that competitors cannot replicate through brand management alone.
5. The firm that can answer the conversion option question — what is the one thing we could become that would make us indispensable to the next era — will be the category winner in 2030.

SECTION 1

The Fourth Turning: A Framework for Strategic Context

Strauss and Howe's generational theory identifies a recurring eighty-year saecular cycle in American history, comprising four sequential phases of approximately twenty to twenty-five years each. Each phase — the High, the Awakening, the Unraveling, and the Crisis — produces a distinctive social and institutional environment that shapes both the challenges organizations face and the strategies available to them.

We are currently in the Crisis phase of the Millennial saeculum (approximately 1946–2026+), signaled by three converging structural disruptions that are not coincidental but causally related: the 2008 financial collapse, which exposed systemic institutional failure; the COVID-19 pandemic, which simultaneously stress-tested every fragility in global supply chain and institutional architecture; and the fracturing of the post-World War II geopolitical order under pressure from multiple directions simultaneously.

Generational Archetypes and Current Alignment

At the onset of each Crisis, the four living generations occupy characteristic institutional roles that shape collective response. In the current Fourth Turning:

- Baby Boomers (Prophet/Idealist archetype): The elders and senior institutional leaders whose values-driven framework shaped the Awakening and Unraveling eras. Now aging out of primary organizational authority.
- Generation X (Nomad/Reactive archetype): The mature adults in senior management and operational leadership — pragmatic, skeptical of institutions, effective under pressure.
- Millennials (Hero/Civic archetype): The young adults ascending to institutional authority — collective-oriented, institution-building, increasingly driving major organizational and policy decisions.
- Generation Z (Artist/Adaptive archetype): The rising workforce — sensitive to process and equity, coming of age during the Crisis and shaped by it.

OPERATIVE IMPLICATION FOR EAP STRATEGY

Each generational archetype brings distinct expectations to the behavioral health relationship — as employees, as buyers, and as policymakers. The Multi-generational workforce (now spanning five generations, from Silent through Gen Alpha) is itself both the primary demand driver and the primary product delivery challenge for EAP and well-being firms.

The historical record of the last Fourth Turning — the Depression and World War II — is unambiguous on one strategic point: the organizations that emerged from the Crisis stronger were not the ones that predicted it most accurately. They were the ones that had built, through deliberate strategic choices, the adaptive capacity, the community embeddedness, and the workforce depth that allowed them to convert the disruption into advantage.

> ***Ford did not survive World War II by being efficient. It survived by being convertible.***
>
> — The Fourth Turning & The Corporate Strategist, The McPherson Group

SECTION 2

Anatomy of the EAP Rent Structure

Before stress-testing scenarios, it is essential to name the rent sources that firms like Carebridge currently capture with precision. The strategic analysis changes materially depending on which rents are under pressure, from which direction, and over what time horizon.

EAP and workforce well-being firms capture rents from a specific configuration of the post-World War II institutional order — one that emerged from wartime wage controls, was reinforced by Cold War-era tax policy, and was refined during the Unraveling era of deregulation and managed care. Every one of these rent sources is now under some degree of Fourth Turning pressure.

Rent Source Analysis

Rent Source	Durability	Primary Threat Vector
Clinician network & clinical credibility moat	**HIGH**	Telehealth platforms and AI agents commoditizing lower-acuity delivery
Regulatory compliance infrastructure (ERISA, HIPAA, Parity)	**HIGH**	Regulatory restructuring toward public delivery models
Outcomes data and longitudinal population health analytics	**HIGH**	New entrants capturing data at the point-of-care triage layer
Employer HR team trust and embedded relationships	**MEDIUM**	Generational buyer succession shifts decision-maker preferences and evaluation criteria
Per-employee contract revenue model	**AT RISK**	Employer-sponsored benefits fracture; mass displacement reduces covered workforce
Pure human-delivery margins (no AI integration)	**AT RISK**	AI cost-structure advantage of competitors compresses margins from below

The Five Structural Rent Sources in Detail

1. Employer-Sponsored Benefits Architecture

The foundational assumption of the EAP business model — that large employers are the primary delivery vehicle for behavioral health services — is itself a product of the Unraveling era. The tax exclusion for employer-sponsored benefits, the ERISA framework, and the Mental Health Parity Act collectively created a regulatory environment that institutionalized employer intermediation of behavioral health delivery. This architecture is now under political and economic pressure from multiple directions simultaneously.

2. Insurance Intermediation and the Managed Behavioral Health Layer

The carved-out managed behavioral health model — a distinct contractual and billing layer between employer, insurer, and clinical provider — captures significant administrative and care-management rent. This layer depends on complexity that new entrants are actively working to arbitrage away through direct-to-employer and direct-to-consumer models.

3. Regulatory Compliance Infrastructure

ERISA, HIPAA, Mental Health Parity, and the complex credentialing and reporting requirements that surround behavioral health service delivery create a substantial barrier to entry that incumbents benefit from. This is one of the most durable rent sources, though it is vulnerable to regulatory restructuring in the kind of institutional realignment that historically follows a Fourth Turning Crisis.

4. Clinician Network and Clinical Credibility Moat

The persistent shortage of licensed behavioral health clinicians — psychiatrists, licensed clinical social workers, licensed professional counselors, and doctoral-level psychologists — constitutes a supply constraint that supports pricing and creates a barrier to rapid competitive entry. This is the most durable rent source in the near term, but it is under pressure from AI-enabled service delivery at the lower-acuity end of the utilization spectrum.

5. Longitudinal Population Health Data

EAP and well-being firms that have been operating at scale accumulate multi-year, population-level behavioral health data that is increasingly valuable for risk stratification, outcomes prediction, and employer population health management. This data asset is undermonetized by most incumbents and represents a significant potential source of durable competitive differentiation.

SECTION 3

Five Crisis Scenarios: 2025–2030

The following five scenarios are not mutually exclusive. The most likely outcome over the 2025–2030 window is a combination of elements from multiple scenarios, weighted by which macro forces accelerate fastest. The strategic value of scenario analysis in a Fourth Turning is not prediction but preparation — ensuring the organization has adaptive capacity across the widest range of plausible futures.

Scenario	Key Trigger	Rent Security	Strategic Posture
Mental Health Mandate Era	Crisis-driven political expansion of behavioral health coverage and employer spending	HIGH	Invest in outcomes measurement; premium pricing on measurable workforce ROI
Employer Benefits Fracture	Legislative restructuring moves behavioral health toward public/quasi-public delivery	THREATENED	Diversify beyond per-employee EAP model; build government-sector contracting capacity
AI Bifurcation of Market	AI commoditizes low-acuity delivery; firms compete on triage intelligence and data	MIXED	Own the triage layer and longitudinal data; avoid over-pivoting to AI at cost of clinical credibility
Geopolitical / Economic Shock	Major disruption spikes acute demand while straining employer financial capacity	VOLATILE	Build clinician depth and flexible contracting; develop government emergency procurement capability
Generational Buyer Succession	Millennial HR leadership demands outcomes data; Gen Z employees require digital-first access	CONDITIONAL	Speak outcomes fluently; integrate across benefits ecosystem; serve digital-native employees without sacrificing clinical depth

Scenario 1: The Mental Health Mandate Era

Probability	**Rent Security: HIGH**
Moderate-High as partial outcome	Demand expansion creates pricing power; incumbent clinical infrastructure becomes more, not less, valuable

The Fourth Turning's crisis dynamics are themselves powerful demand drivers for behavioral health services. Employee disengagement — at its lowest recorded level in twelve years, with only 21% of

global employees engaged in 2024 — is a leading indicator of the mental health strain, absenteeism, and presenteeism that EAPs sell against. Geopolitical anxiety, AI-driven workforce displacement, and economic instability are all demand accelerants that operate independently of each other.

In this scenario, political pressure following crisis events accelerates mental health parity enforcement, expands behavioral health mandates, and may channel significant public investment into behavioral health infrastructure as part of a broader institutional reconstruction effort analogous to the New Deal programs of the last Fourth Turning's recovery phase.

- Employers, facing multi-generational workforce tension and a documented engagement crisis, increase per-employee spending on EAP and integrated well-being platforms.
- Premium pricing against measurable workforce outcomes (absenteeism reduction, turnover cost avoidance, disability claim reduction) becomes achievable at scale.
- Clinical credibility and population data assets are amplified, not commoditized, as evidence requirements rise.

RISK WITHIN THIS SCENARIO

Demand growth attracts aggressive new entrants — telehealth platforms, AI-driven mental health apps, and health system competitors all move upstream into EAP-adjacent territory. Commoditization pressure on the lower-acuity tier is simultaneous with premium opportunity at the higher-acuity end. The firms that can serve the full utilization spectrum without cost-structure compromise will capture disproportionate share.

Scenario 2: Employer-Sponsored Benefits Architecture Fractures

Probability	**Rent Security: THREATENED**
Moderate; increasing over 5-year horizon	The per-employee contract model is directly exposed if the employer ceases to be the primary benefits intermediary

The Fourth Turning historically produces not just institutional stress but institutional reconstruction — the replacement of the frameworks through which economic life is organized. The employer-sponsored benefits model is one of the most consequential Unraveling-era assumptions underlying the EAP business model. It emerged from World War II-era wage controls and was never designed as a permanent or philosophically coherent delivery architecture for healthcare.

Fracturing could arrive via several distinct routes, each with different speed and political dynamics:

- Legislative restructuring: A major political realignment produces expanded public coverage for behavioral health — expanded Medicaid scope, a behavioral health public option, or state-level single-payer experiments that effectively bypass employer intermediation.
- Workforce displacement: Massive AI-driven reduction in the number of full-time equivalent covered employees reduces the per-employee revenue base faster than new employer relationships can be added.
- Employer financial stress: A significant economic disruption leads a critical mass of mid-market and small employers to reduce or eliminate voluntary benefits, contracting the total addressable market from below.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVE

Firms that have built government-sector contracting capacity, community-based delivery models, and direct-to-individual revenue channels will be positioned to survive a fracturing of the employer-sponsored benefits architecture. Firms whose entire revenue model assumes employer intermediation will not.

Scenario 3: AI Bifurcation of the Market

Probability	**Rent Security: MIXED — depends on triage layer ownership**
HIGH as structural force; already underway	AI commoditizes low-acuity delivery; clinical credibility moat intensifies at the complex-case end

This is arguably the most structurally certain scenario over the 2025–2030 horizon. AI-enabled behavioral health tools — conversational agents, clinical decision support systems, asynchronous coaching platforms — are already demonstrably commoditizing the lower end of EAP service delivery. The fourth turning adds two pressures that substantially amplify this dynamic:

- AI-driven workforce displacement creates a massive new population of anxious, underemployed, or reskilling workers who need behavioral health support but may not have employer-sponsored EAP coverage — creating demand outside the incumbent revenue architecture.
- The political and social pressure on organizations to be seen as humane in their AI deployment creates demand for well-being services as a legitimizing offset — but may also accelerate AI adoption within clinical service delivery.

The likely structural outcome is bifurcation: AI handles the high-volume, low-acuity end of the utilization spectrum — stress, financial anxiety, lifestyle coaching, psychoeducation, and early-stage symptom management — while licensed human clinicians are concentrated on complex, high-acuity, and high-liability cases. The strategic rent capture question is: who owns the triage layer that routes clients between these modalities, and who captures the data generated by that routing?

THE TRIAGE LAYER IMPERATIVE

The firm that owns the AI-powered intake and triage function — the first point of contact that assesses acuity, routes to the appropriate modality, and captures longitudinal population data — owns the most strategically valuable position in the bifurcated market. This position is more valuable than owning either the AI delivery or the human delivery layer in isolation, because it captures information from both.

Scenario 4: Geopolitical and Economic Shock

Probability	**Rent Security: VOLATILE — revenue and demand decouple in shock scenarios**
Moderate-High; episodic in nature	Clinician depth and flexible contracting become survival-critical differentiators

Every previous Fourth Turning has produced at least one major geopolitical rupture and the large-scale social disruption that accompanies it. The PPSE report notes that even short of direct military conflict,

significant geopolitical shocks — trade war escalation, financial crisis, infrastructure attack, or pandemic recurrence — would spike acute behavioral health demand simultaneously with disrupting the administrative and financial infrastructure through which EAPs deliver services and collect revenue.

The worst-case revenue risk in this scenario is a demand-revenue decoupling: acute utilization surges precisely when employers under financial stress are most likely to suspend or renegotiate EAP contracts, when clinicians are unavailable or displaced, and when the administrative infrastructure supporting claims and case management is strained.

- Organizations with deep clinician relationship networks (not just credentialed rosters but genuine, managed relationships) will be able to surge capacity when demand spikes.
- Flexible contracting mechanisms — per-event pricing alongside per-employee-per-year arrangements — provide revenue stability when employers face financial stress.
- Government emergency procurement capacity — the ability to contract with FEMA, DoD, HHS, or state emergency management — represents a revenue channel that activates precisely when commercial channels are most stressed.

Scenario 5: Generational Buyer Succession

Probability	**Rent Security: CONDITIONAL — evaluation criteria are shifting faster than most incumbents recognize**
HIGH; gradual and already underway	Incumbent advantage based on relationship tenure will erode; outcomes fluency becomes the new moat

As Millennials (the Hero/Civic generational archetype) ascend to senior HR and C-suite roles, they bring materially different expectations to the behavioral health vendor relationship. The Millennial generation, shaped by the Unraveling era's institutional skepticism and coming of age during the current Crisis, evaluates vendors on demonstrable outcomes rather than brand tenure and administrative smoothness.

Simultaneously, Gen Z employees (the Artist/Adaptive archetype) are entering the workforce with dramatically different behavioral health relationships — higher help-seeking rates, significantly lower stigma, digital-first access expectations, and a willingness to generate utilization that previous generations suppressed.

- Millennial HR buyers will demand outcomes data at a level of granularity and rigor that most incumbent EAPs have not built their data infrastructure to produce. Utilization rates and EAP Advisor satisfaction scores will not be sufficient.
- Gen Z employee utilization patterns will stress clinical capacity in firms that have not built digital delivery infrastructure — but will also generate the data depth that enables the longitudinal population analytics that Millennial buyers will demand.
- The evaluation criteria shift creates a window for well-capitalized new entrants to displace incumbents on merit even where incumbents have long-standing employer relationships. Contract renewal cycles are the moment of maximum vulnerability.

SECTION 4

Strategic Posture: The Antifragile EAP Firm

Nassim Nicholas Taleb's concept of antifragility — things that gain from disorder rather than merely surviving it — is the operative strategic target for EAP and well-being firms in the Fourth Turning. The goal is not resilience in the passive sense of weathering disruption. It is the active capacity to convert Fourth Turning disruption into competitive advantage that firms optimized for the prior Unraveling-era environment cannot replicate.

> ***Businesses that see the Fourth Turning as a once-in-a-generation transformation, not just a temporary disruption, will be positioned to thrive.***
>
> — PPSE Leadership Overview of the Fourth Turning

Strategic Imperative 1: Own the Triage Layer

The most strategically valuable position in the bifurcating behavioral health market is the AI-powered triage function — the initial point of contact that assesses acuity, routes to the appropriate modality (AI-delivered or human clinical), and accumulates longitudinal population data across the entire utilization spectrum.

- Build or acquire an AI-powered intake and assessment capability that can route at scale across the full acuity spectrum from lifestyle coaching to acute crisis intervention.
- Resist the temptation to use AI primarily as a cost reduction mechanism. The firms that eliminate human clinical capacity to reduce costs will destroy the clinical credibility moat that makes the triage function authoritative.
- Design the data architecture from the triage layer outward: every interaction should generate structured population health data that compounds in value over time and becomes the basis for outcomes reporting, risk stratification, and employer population health management.

Strategic Imperative 2: Diversify the Revenue Architecture

The per-employee-per-year EAP contract model is the dominant revenue architecture of the Unraveling era. Its vulnerability in the Fourth Turning is not primarily competitive — it is structural. The employer-sponsored benefits framework itself is under institutional pressure.

- Build government-sector contracting capacity before it is needed. FEMA, DoD, HHS, state emergency management, and correctional systems all represent EAP-adjacent behavioral health procurement channels that activate in disruption scenarios where commercial revenue is most at risk.
- Develop community-based and public health partnership models that operate outside the employer-intermediated revenue structure. These channels also build the regional anchor identity that is itself a competitive moat.
- Invest in outcomes-based contracting capability. The shift from utilization-based to outcomes-based contracting is inevitable as Millennial buyers demand evidence. Firms that have built the

data infrastructure and contracting experience will lead the transition; firms that resist it will be forced into it from a disadvantaged position.

Strategic Imperative 3: Build the Regional Anchor Identity

The most durable large organizations of the mid-twentieth century — the last Fourth Turning's recovery phase — were those with genuine roots in place. The regional anchor identity, characterized by genuine community investment and a perception that organizational success and community success are intertwined, generates a form of social license and employee loyalty that national brand management cannot replicate.

For EAP firms, regional anchor status is both a competitive differentiator and a revenue strategy. The firm that has invested in local clinician pipelines through community college and graduate school partnerships, that shows up at workforce development tables, and that is seen as genuinely embedded in regional economic life is building a moat that competitors without local roots cannot quickly replicate.

- Assess regional anchor status explicitly: does the employer community in key markets believe that organizational success and their community's success are intertwined? If not, identify the specific investments that would change that perception.
- Invest in local clinician pipelines as a strategic workforce imperative, not a recruitment tactic. Partnerships with graduate clinical training programs, community college behavioral health pathways, and licensed clinical social work field placement programs build supply-chain depth that becomes a differentiator in clinician-constrained markets.

Strategic Imperative 4: Build Outcomes Fluency at the C-Suite

The generational buyer succession scenario makes outcomes measurement not a marketing differentiator but a contract survival prerequisite. Millennial HR buyers will not renew contracts whose value cannot be demonstrated in the language of business outcomes — absenteeism, turnover, disability claims, productivity, and total cost of care.

- Elevate outcomes measurement to a C-suite strategic priority with dedicated investment, clear metrics, and executive accountability — the same BCG reskilling framework that the Corporate Strategist paper recommends for workforce investment applies directly here.
- Build the data infrastructure to generate outcomes reporting at the employer population level, not just aggregate utilization statistics. This is the capability that Millennial buyers will require and that will differentiate the category winner.
- Develop a board-level narrative that frames behavioral health investment as a workforce productivity and human capital strategy, not a benefits cost. This reframe positions EAP spending as an asset investment rather than a liability, and survives cost reduction pressure better.

SECTION 5

Strategic Action Checklist

The following checklist translates the scenario and posture analysis into specific, sequenced actions. It is organized by the four strategic imperatives and designed to be briefed to a senior leadership team or board.

Triage Layer and AI Integration

- Conduct a build-buy-partner assessment of AI-powered intake and triage capability within the next 90 days.
- Map current data architecture against the longitudinal population analytics requirements of outcomes-based contracting.
- Establish a clinical AI governance framework that preserves clinical credibility while enabling AI-assisted service delivery at scale.
- Identify the point of maximum AI leverage that does not cannibalize the clinical credibility moat — and draw the line explicitly before market pressure forces a reactive decision.

Revenue Architecture Diversification

- Audit current revenue concentration by channel: per-employee contract, insurance carve-out, government, and direct. Map concentration risk against the five crisis scenarios.
- Identify the minimum viable government-sector contracting capability and the investment required to build it.
- Evaluate one outcomes-based contracting pilot with a sophisticated Millennial HR buyer in the next contract cycle.
- Build a financial model that shows the cost of revenue architecture fragility alongside the cost of diversification investment — present both to the board.

Regional Anchor Investment

- Select two to three markets where regional anchor identity is most achievable and most strategically valuable. Concentrate community investment in those markets rather than distributing thinly across all geographies.
- Engage senior clinical and operational leaders in genuine civic participation in anchor markets — workforce development boards, community college advisory committees, regional economic development convenings.
- Fund a clinician pipeline investment in each anchor market — a specific, named partnership with a graduate clinical training program or community college behavioral health pathway.

Outcomes Capability and Buyer Succession Preparation

- Conduct a buyer succession analysis: what percentage of current EAP contracts are controlled by Millennial HR leaders, and what is the expected transition timeline for the remainder?
- Map current outcomes reporting capability against the anticipated requirements of Millennial buyers — identify the specific gaps and the investment required to close them.
- Develop a Gen Z employee engagement strategy for the EAP product — specifically addressing digital access, stigma reduction, and utilization encouragement — and pilot it with a willing employer partner.

CONCLUSION

The Conversion Option Question

The PPSE Leadership Overview of the Fourth Turning identifies two internal traits that will allow institutions and firms to survive and thrive in the coming years: the ability to understand complexity — to have a cultural and historical imagination — and the capacity to act with enough care and engagement to execute on that understanding.

For EAP and workforce well-being firms, the cultural and historical imagination required is the recognition that the current moment is not a difficult quarter or a challenging competitive environment. It is a structural inflection point of the kind that occurs once every eighty years in American institutional life — and that the organizations on the right side of that inflection are positioned for decades of durable advantage.

> ***This moment is not about surviving. It is about creating new paradigms and co-shaping the future.***
>
> — PPSE Leadership Overview of the Fourth Turning

The Corporate Strategist paper frames the decisive strategic question as the conversion option: what is the one thing your organization could become that would make it indispensable to the next era's most durable demand? For EAP and well-being firms, the demand is not in question. The behavioral health crisis will intensify throughout the remaining years of the Fourth Turning and into the subsequent High. The question is which institutional delivery mechanism survives, which firms are positioned to serve the need through whatever mechanism prevails, and which have optimized themselves so completely for the current architecture that they cannot adapt.

The firm that can answer the conversion option question honestly — and build the adaptive capacity, the data infrastructure, the regional anchor identity, and the revenue architecture diversification required to execute it — will be the category winner when the next High arrives.

THE BOTTOM LINE FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION

Behavioral health demand is a Fourth Turning structural beneficiary. Revenue architecture is not. The firms that treat these as separate problems — capturing demand growth while deferring revenue architecture reform — will find that the window for proactive adaptation closes faster than their planning cycles anticipated. The time to build the conversion option is before the disruption makes it obvious.

About the Authors

This report was prepared by Performance Partners Southeast and The McPherson Group. James A. McPherson, M.B.A., holds a B.A. in Classics with honors from Johns Hopkins University, studied leadership and organizational goals in Homer's Iliad as a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Lausanne, and completed his M.B.A. at Duke University with a concentration in Strategy & Decision Science.

PPSE advises leaders, institutions, and communities on navigating large-scale disruption by integrating historical case studies, ancient philosophical frameworks, and adaptive systems thinking into a methodology for crisis leadership and institutional resilience.

Website: PerformancePartnersSoutheast.com | **LinkedIn:** James A. McPherson | **Substack:** James A. McPherson