THE QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE.

Exploring managers’ wellbeing, motivation and productivity.

Professor Les Worrall, Professor Cary Cooper, Dr Máire Kerrin, Analise La-Band, Anna Rosselli and Patrick Woodman

January 2016
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was carried out by Professor Cary Cooper and Professor Les Worrall. They were supported by Lysbeth Pias, Petra Wilton and Patrick Woodman at the Chartered Management Institute. The report was written by Analise La-Band, Anna Rosselli and Dr Máire Kerrin at Work Psychology Group supported by Patrick Woodman.

We would like to thank the 1,574 CMI members who took part in the comprehensive survey. In particular we want to thank those who gave us their time and insights during the invaluable interviews that served as background for the case studies:

- Evan Davidge
  Head of Reward, Arup
- Diane Foster
  HR Director, Flamingo
- Katy Garnell
  HR and Operations Manager, Loopdynamic
- Leyla Ohkai
  Head of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Imperial College London
- John Rawling
  Deputy Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development, Sunderland City Council

Work Psychology Group (WPG) is a well-established and highly respected international research-led consulting practice, with offices in the UK and in Australia. Led by Professor Fiona Patterson and Dr Máire Kerrin, WPG engages with organisations in the UK and internationally across all sectors at a strategic level to translate the very latest research into innovative, effective and sustainable solutions. WPG’s principal areas of activity are services relating to evaluation, organisational development and change, and bespoke selection and assessment. WPG’s senior and consultant psychologists are uniquely skilled in these areas and are committed to working in partnership with clients to ensure that their expertise benefits the needs of their client organisation.

FOREWORD

Ann Francke MBA CMI FCMgr
Chief Executive, CMI

The long-hours culture familiar to most managers has now given way to the ‘always-on’ culture. Connected devices, like smartphones, are driving more and more managers to regularly check their emails out of hours. According to the 1,574 managers we surveyed for our latest Quality of Working Life report, they’re working, on average, an extra 60 minutes every day on top of their contracted hours. In total this equals 29 days a year, which effectively cancels out the typical holiday entitlement of 28 days. This ‘always-on’ culture is having a deleterious effect on the health of managers. Many report suffering increased stress and associated problems, such as persistent headaches and insomnia. The impact on managers’ work is great: the longer the hours they put in, the less productive they say they become. This should be a big flashing warning light for employers.

Good, skilled managers know that they need to switch off and allow their employees to do the same. The report highlights the difference that good management makes to wellbeing, to engagement and ultimately to performance. The conclusion is inescapable: helping managers to strike the necessary work/life balance must be a priority for every organisation facing up to the challenge of improving productivity.

Good, skilled managers know that they need to switch off and allow their employees to do the same.

January 2016
The new normal: longer hours, digital presenteeism and stress

Extra working hours cancel out annual leave entitlement – managers’ contracted working hours have risen by one hour daily compared to 2012, which is equivalent to an additional 29 days extra each year. That’s more than a typical annual leave entitlement of 20 days plus eight bank holidays. What’s more, 92% of managers work longer than their contracted hours.

It’s hard to switch off – 61% of managers say that technology has made it difficult to switch off from work. Around one in five managers say they now check their email all the time outside of working hours; over half (54%) check frequently.

Time to turn off? Overall, 39% of managers agree that their employer should restrict out-of-hours email access – including 43% of those who say they check email all the time.

High connectivity, high stress – those who struggle to switch off from work and checking emails report lower personal productivity and job satisfaction levels, and they experience more frequent stress. 68% of those who rate themselves as less than 70% productive say that working hours are having a negative effect on their stress levels, although that’s fewer than in 2012 (59%). Stress was more than three times as common among those working long hours; 20% of those working over three hours a day extra said they are often stressed, compared to only 6% of those working no additional hours.

Workload and health – managers perceive their workload and the resulting long working hours to have a negative impact on their health. Many managers reported suffering from various health issues in the last three months. Insomnia and muscular aches topped the list – reported by 57% of managers, followed complaints such as headaches and constant irritability.

Long hours increase stress – 54% say that working hours are having a negative effect on their stress levels, although that’s fewer than in 2012 (59%). Stress was more than three times as common among those working long hours; 20% of those working over three hours a day extra said they are often stressed, compared to only 6% of those working no additional hours.

In spite of it all, managers are overall content with their jobs

Job satisfaction has improved – 67% of managers say that overall they’re satisfied with their jobs, substantially more than in 2012 (55%) or even 2007 (62%).

Why could this be? An increased “feel good factor” reflects the return of growth: 39% of managers report that their organisation is growing, up from 34% in 2012. But the evidence shows that management and business culture are key. 79% of managers feel that their line manager trusts them. Around three quarters (76%) say they’re proud to work for their employer, higher than in 2012 (64%). The same number believe in the values of their organisation and 61% feel fairly treated by their employer, up from 54%.

Methodology and Respondents

This report is based on an online self-report survey of 1,574 managers across the UK, comprising a wide range of roles and levels of seniority. The majority of the respondents represented private sector organisations (45%) and organisations employing over 1,000 people. There was an increase in female respondents (60% of respondents were male and 40% female, compared to 70% and 30% in the 2012 survey). The results were weighted to provide better comparability with the 2012 and 2007 surveys.

A more detailed description of the methodology and the profile of the current survey’s respondents can be found in the Appendices.

The questionnaire was thoroughly reviewed to reflect the changing world of work, although significant tracking elements were retained to allow comparison over time. Comparisons to 2012 are presented where relevant throughout the report. Note that when we say ‘2015’ we refer to the current research, which was conducted in the summer of 2015.
1. A CHANGING ORGANISATIONAL CONTEXT

Change is not as good as rest

Change risks undermining rising job satisfaction – most managers report that work has become more intense as a result of changes, with 78% reporting that the volume of work has increased and 67% that its pace has increased. 39% say that employee morale has dropped and 48% that levels of psychological wellbeing have fallen.

Change is the norm but is failing to deliver benefits – 97% of managers report that their organisation went through some form of change in the last 12 months, up from 92% in 2012. Yet only 27% of managers say productivity has increased as a result of change, just 20% report that decision-making has become faster and only 36% say that financial results have improved.

Confidence in senior leaders is low – only 28% of managers feel that senior managers in their organisation are managing change well. That’s even lower than the previous low point recorded in 2012 (30%). Overall, 52% of managers say they have trust and confidence in senior managers. That’s better than in 2012 but still a lower level than immediate line managers (62%).

The impact on absence – 26% of managers say that poorly managed change initiatives have resulted in increased absence levels, up from 23% in 2012.

Quality of management determines quality of working life

Line managers have a critical role to play in driving employee engagement, motivation and well-being.

Managers need to drive engagement – the five biggest drivers of engagement levels are a sense of achievement from work; feeling part of a team; the line manager relationship; the ability to decide how to get jobs done; and prospects for career advancement. Managers have a role to play in all of these.

Management style – more open, empowering management styles are connected to lower levels of stress, higher job satisfaction and greater personal productivity than more ‘command and control’ styles. The worst generate up to four times more stress than the best: as many as 28% of those whose line managers are secretive or suspicious in style report that they often feel stressed – compared to just 7% of those whose managers are empowering.

Increased job satisfaction – the best management styles drive job satisfaction levels up to 2.5 times higher than the worst. Where innovative, entrepreneurial and empowering management styles are found, more than 84% of managers are satisfied with their jobs. Where line managers are secretive and suspicious, fewer than 38% are satisfied.

Personal productivity – managers report being twice as productive where the best management styles prevail. Where managers are innovative, 43% of managers rate their personal productivity as 90% or better. Where managers are secretive or suspicious, only 20% score highly for personal productivity.

Organisational growth and decline – where organisations are growing, managers tend to be accessible, empowering and trusting. Declining firms are relatively more likely to have secretive, risk-averse and authoritarian managers.

A key driver for the survey in 2015 was to explore the changing organisational context, as the UK economy continues to recover from the recession which contributed to dismal findings in 2012.

Key Findings: There is a trend towards recovery, both in terms of organisations’ economic health and the working environment. There were fewer declining and more growing organisations. The public sector is still the sector where growth is lowest and decline is most prevalent.

Organisational change is even more common than before. Managers still report that it is being led poorly, resulting in a failure to deliver organisational benefits – and in negative impacts on employees.

Following the decline in 2012, there has been a 5% increase in those organisations growing or rapidly growing (31% and 8% respectively) in 2015.

Similar to 2012 trends, growth was more common in private sector organisations. Unsurprisingly, given the political context, there was less evidence of growth in the public sector. In fact, nearly half of public sector organisations (49%) – and almost a fifth of private sector organisations (17%) – are still in a state of decline.

We also asked managers whether their wider operating environment was growing or declining. The patterns largely reflect those of the organisational context. 37% of managers reported growth or rapid growth in their business’ operating environment, while 30% reported decline or rapid decline.
The Experience of Organisational Change

Organisational change has long been recognised as necessary to maintain a competitive edge. The Quality of Working Life series has tracked these changes—and what impact they have had.

No fewer than 97% of managers reported experiencing at least one form of organisational change, up even from the levels recorded in 2007 and 2012. As Figure 2 shows, the most common forms were cost reduction programmes, the implementation of new technology or systems, and culture change programmes.

Although cost has remained paramount, the results also offer some support for the notion of a climate of recovery. The implementation of new technology was identified by 60% of managers, 42% of managers reported the introduction of new products or services was more typical of rapidly growing organisations. As may be expected, those experiencing growth are investing, whilst those experiencing decline are focused on cost reduction.

Cost reduction was most common in declining and rapidly declining organisations (91%), whilst investment in new technology or systems and the introduction of new products or services was more typical of rapidly growing organisations. As may be expected, those experiencing growth are investing, whilst those experiencing decline are focused on cost reduction.

Different priorities emerge between key economic sectors too. As in 2012, change was most prevalent in the public sector. Cost reduction and organisational restructuring remain the most common forms of change activity—41-89% of respondents and 71-86% of respondents across all sectors experienced these forms of change respectively. Similarly to the not-for-profit sector, a key focus in the private sector was investment in the implementation of new technology and introducing new products and services, whilst a cost reduction approach remains present in the public sector (Table 2).

When organisational change activity is split by growth or decline (Table 1), organisational restructuring was one of the most prevalent activities across all organisations. This suggests organisations are still adjusting in order to find the most efficient ways to operate.

It is not surprising that, considering the trend towards growth and new forms of organisational change, a small increase in culture change programmes is evident (a 4% increase from 2012). As organisations adapt to new challenges in a slightly less austere financial environment, cultural change could offer a way of embedding new approaches and values that will provide a foundation for future success.

Different priorities emerge between key economic sectors too. As in 2012, change was most prevalent in the public sector. Cost reduction and organisational restructuring remain the most common forms of change activity—41-89% of respondents and 71-86% of respondents across all sectors experienced these forms of change respectively. Similarly to the not-for-profit sector, a key focus in the private sector was investment in the implementation of new technology and introducing new products and services, whilst a cost reduction approach remains present in the public sector (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organisational Change</th>
<th>Declining</th>
<th>Decline Rapidly</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Growing</th>
<th>Growing Rapidly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost reduction programmes</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of new technology / systems</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture change programmes</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed employees’ terms and conditions</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of new products/services</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy – voluntary</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy – compulsory</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsourcing</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayering</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment programmes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mergers/ acquisition</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsourcing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Organisational change activity by organisational growth/decline (Percentage agreement, with darker shades representing higher agreement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Sector</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>Not-for-Profit / Charity Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cost Reduction Programmes</td>
<td>Organisational Restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organisational Restructuring</td>
<td>Cost Reduction Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Redundancy – Voluntary</td>
<td>Culture Change Programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison of top five organisational change activities across sectors in 2015

1. CMI’s latest Future Forecast report (December 2015) has more on managers’ expectations about cost-cutting and redundancies in 2016. www.managers.org.uk/futureforecast
2. THE IMPACT OF THE CHANGING CONTEXT FOR ORGANISATIONS AND MANAGERS

Key Findings: Many managers report that change is having negative effects on financial performance, turnover and absenteeism. Only 27% of managers say productivity has increased as a result of change, just 20% report that decision making has become faster and only 36% say that financial results have improved.

Across all surveys conducted in the Quality of Working Life series since 1997, it has been clear that organisational change has a significant impact on managers’ experiences at work. We asked managers who had experienced change at work for their views on its impact on their organisation as a whole (Figure 3). Generally managers’ perceptions of the impact of change were not favourable, as has been the trend in previous surveys. However, there were some minor improvements in the results compared to 2012. 50% of managers did not think decision-making was any faster (54% in 2012) and only 27% of managers agreed that productivity had increased in 2015 (25% in 2012).

Worryingly, there was an increase in managers reporting that absence levels had increased (up from 23% in 2012 to 26%). It is concerning that a rising trend for absenteeism exists in what appears to be a healthier climate. This may be linked to working hours and the volume and pace of work, all of which are perceived to be increasing. Only just over a third (36%) agreed that organisational change has resulted in improved financial results. More managers thought employee turnover had increased (39% in 2012).

Managers in 2015 are more favourable toward senior management compared to previous years (Figure 4). Given the increased levels of organisational change, it is striking that the survey records a decline in the perceived effectiveness of senior leaders in managing change. Only 28% say change is managed well by senior leaders, down from 30% in 2012, which marked a low point. This continued decline highlights an area for attention. Senior management need to re-focus on involving managers in organisational change, allowing them to influence its direction and implementation.

In other ways however, managers’ views on senior leaders show some improvement.

- More managers feel that senior managers have trust and confidence in them (up from 62% in 2012 to 77% in 2015).
- 52% of managers reflected positively on their trust and confidence in their organisation’s senior managers (an increase of 9%). It is still concerning that only around half of managers feel this way.

Attitudes towards senior management can be differentiated by business size. Those in microbusinesses (1-10 employees) report higher levels of trust and confidence in senior management (86%) than those in larger businesses. Trust was lowest in organisations with more than 500 employees; organisations with both 501-1,000 employees and over 1,000 employees showed comparable levels (45% and 46% respectively).

Reflecting patterns emerging in 2012, perceptions of senior management were more favourable in the charity/ not-for-profit and private sectors than in the public sector. This may have been unsurprising in 2012 considering the government’s austerity measures. However in the current context, when such measures are still apparent in the public sector, it is interesting to note that these managers reported the largest improvement in trust and confidence in senior management (up from 30% in 2012 to 42% in 2015).

Although disappointing, the low trust and confidence overall could be a reflection of the perception that senior managers are responsible for poor management of change. If there is little faith that the process will be managed well, it is unlikely that organisations will gain the necessary support to move ahead effectively – even where change is associated with investment.

A continued feeling that change is not well managed in organisations suggests senior managers need to be more innovative in identifying different approaches for achieving change that will enable them to sustain recovery and growth. Allowing managers more scope in delivering change may improve perceptions of change management, and further improve feelings of empowerment and trust.

---

1 Results are not directly comparable over time: the 2012 survey referred to improvement in ‘profitability’ and the 2015 survey referred to improvement in ‘financial results’. This was changed to make the question more relevant to non-profit-seeking organisations.
The Personal impact of Organisational Change

Key Findings: Managers believe that morale and sense of job security are still the areas where organisational change has had the most impact on employees. The majority of managers felt the volume and pace of work had increased – although their job satisfaction has improved. Line managers have a critical role to play in driving employee engagement, motivation and wellbeing. The most worrying finding is the large proportion of managers who are wary about taking time off due to illness.

The focus of The Quality of Working Life research is to understand the impact of changing work environments on employees. How does change impact on a manager’s job satisfaction and working life? As in previous surveys, we asked managers who had experienced some form of organisational change about the perceived impact on employees (Figure 5). In 2015 the effect of change was largely comparable to 2012, with minimal improvements in some areas. Organisational change is still considered to have the most significant effect on morale, sense of job security and motivation. These negative feelings are likely to be linked to the fact that less than a third of managers believe that senior managers are able to manage change well.

Managers in 2015 felt that the volume and pace of work had increased as a result of organisational change. Although based only on managers’ perceptions of work rather than an objective measure, it is still an important finding when we consider the implications for managers’ wellbeing: a sense of needing to work harder and faster has direct consequences for the experience of stress.

The results suggest that change has not negatively influenced managers’ feelings towards their employers, despite their negative opinions on change management. It is possible that areas such as job satisfaction, perceived fairness and a sense of pride have been restored or exceed pre-financial crisis levels. Slightly fewer managers reported that they would leave their organisation if they could find another job and slightly more indicated that they wouldn’t. These changes suggest engagement has improved and may not be the source of rising absenteeism, which could instead be due to the changing nature of work and longer hours worked.

Whilst the improvement in managers’ job satisfaction is welcome it is still disappointing to find that 43% of managers feel wary about taking time off for illness. This figure represents the largest element of discontent across measures of satisfaction and engagement. The result is more pronounced for women: almost 10% more women than men – 48% and 40% respectively. This may require further investigation by

---

CASE STUDY

Imperial College London

CREATING A CULTURE SHIFT

Leyla Okhai – Head of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion at Imperial College London

“If people are happy and positive in the workplace you’re going to see innovation and great results. Why wouldn’t you want that?”

Leyla joined Imperial’s Organisation Development department in 2012 initially to support disabled members in the 8,000-strong workforce. At the time the College was starting to increase health and wellbeing awareness among staff.

The aim was to change the culture – from the rather ‘closed’ community that characterises traditional academia to a more open culture in which there is space to talk about issues that might stand in the way of healthy and happy personnel that are satisfied in their job. “The first step was to start the conversation with staff – making them comfortable talking about things that were affecting them.”

Three years on Leyla says the change is striking: “A culture shift has started to take place, driven by the message sent out by the Equality and Inclusion team to managers and leaders: staff health, happiness and job satisfaction matter.”

It’s empowering for staff to know they have a support network to fall back on, and they can play an active role in encouraging colleagues to use it. Leyla: “Culture change doesn’t happen overnight. But the fact that the senior leadership team has recognised the importance of it has caused a shift.”

Leyla trained as a Mental Health First Aid instructor in May 2013 and delivered pilot training in June and July of that year. This resulted in a high level of interest and appetite to discuss mental wellbeing further. It also led to her putting together an action plan for the Time to Change Pledge to be signed. The pledge was signed by the College’s Vice-Provost of Education at the time, who spoke openly about her family’s experiences with mental ill health. Her leadership encouraged others break down the stigma and continue the conversation. “Now that senior leaders have opened up and mental health is an important issue, others have bought into it. It’s created a shift in thinking.”

There are now 150 mental health first aiders who give advice and support to colleagues. They are trained on an ongoing basis to talk to people who are experiencing stress or mental ill health in the workplace – they signpost, guide and advise. Leyla has also set up Conversation Cafés, where staff come together to listen to a colleague’s mental health journey, and set up a high level mental health steering group to drive awareness and uptake of the support available to academic staff.

Imperial also has a wide range of systems and initiatives in place to promote staff wellbeing. There are a lot of examples, from an in-house occupational health team to healthy living courses that include nutritional and weight loss advice. We also have a helpline for managers, maternity and paternity workshops and an in-house mediation service to resolve conflicts before they reach a crisis point. Imperial also host a number of events, such as National Stress Awareness Day, Mental Health Awareness Day and an ongoing Reclaim Your Lunch Break campaign.

Staff feedback on the initiatives has been very positive. Courses are always oversubscribed; interest in becoming a volunteer is increasing. The latest staff survey showed that 80% of staff are proud to work for Imperial. Leyla is confident that a positive shift in attitudes toward health and wellbeing is occurring – and that it is here to stay.

The 2012 survey statement referred to ‘Employees’ being wary of taking time off, whilst the 2015 survey statement referred to 1 feel wary, ...
organisations. Women may be more reluctant to take time off for fear of other negative outcomes (e.g. limited career progression) rather than concerns over work-life balance. In this area their attitudes are more similar to those of men: half of female managers agreed that their organisation helped them to balance home and work commitments, similar to the figure for men (47%).

The extent to which managers felt motivated to “do their best” for their organisation was similar to 2012. Whilst managers were more engaged with their organisations in 2015, creating a sense of motivation still presents a challenge to organisations. This shouldn’t be overlooked as motivation is a pre-requisite for productivity, influencing future stability and growth. Similarly, organisations should consider managers’ concerns regarding taking time off and the impact of this on their sense of satisfaction at work and their productivity if working during a period of poor health.

Job Satisfaction and Seniority

Managers’ perceptions of their organisation differed by levels of seniority: Directors and above perceive the impact of change to have been more positive in relation to motivation, morale, job security and sense of organisational life. Figure 7 shows that managers working at these more senior levels have far more positive perceptions of their organisations compared with those at lower levels. These patterns are also apparent in relation to experiences of change. Directors and above perceive the impact of change to have been more positive in relation to motivation, morale, job security and sense of psychological wellbeing than other levels. They are also less likely to acknowledge the downside of change (e.g. impact on absenteeism).

Such differences lead to questions around senior managers’ sensitivity to the changes of effect on the workforce. Productivity

Concern over productivity has plagued organisations for a number of years, with evidence showing that the UK lags behind many of its competitors – making the 'productivity challenge' a particular focus for policy-makers in 2016. With further insight in this area, organisations can begin to identify means for improving productivity and ultimately organisational performance.

We asked managers how productive they felt in their job over the last three months. As shown in Figure 8, and in a similar pattern to 2012, there were comparable proportions of managers reporting 100% productivity and those reporting less than 70% productivity.

Levels of productivity were found to relate to wellbeing outcomes. The largest proportion of managers reporting no stress at all over the previous three months were those who reported their productivity as being at 90-99% (35% of managers). Perhaps not unexpectedly, managers experiencing stress most often (27%) were those who reported their productivity as being below 70%.

Although we cannot determine the cause and effect, it would be reasonable to suggest that a feeling of reduced productivity could cause feelings of stress and vice versa. This provides further reason for organisations to manage stress in the workplace if the productivity ‘gap’ is to be closed.

Figure 7: Feelings about the organisation compared by levels of management

Figure 8: Self-reported productivity – ‘Over the last three months, roughly how productive have you been?’

CASE STUDY

Healthy body; healthy mind. Exercise produces endorphins, reduces stress and improves energy. And that’s the sort of thing we want our guys to have in the fast-paced and high pressured environment they work in.”

Loopdynamic is a small, European technology headhunting business in London with around 30 employees. It’s young and it’s fast-paced. Employees have daily KPIs that need to be met and they are expected to deliver.

Katy: “Like other recruitment businesses, we’re no different in that respect. But we know that that the traditional way of working – everyone in their own little pods talking on the phone without interacting – doesn’t work.”

So Loopdynamic are doing things differently. From the very beginning in 2011 the company has focused on integrating fitness and wellbeing in the company strategy. This is how it became part of the DNA of the business.

Because the company is small, employee health and wellbeing is easy to shape into what its people want. Where some companies would encourage its employees to move around the office, Loopdynamic have taken it to the next level strongly emphasising physical fitness both within and outside the sales floor.

Employees are encouraged to include gym time in their working day – everyone is offered a corporate membership at a local gym. If they go at lunch time, they get a 90 minute lunch break – instead of the customary hour. Often a whole group of colleagues will go together.

“Although we cannot determine the cause and effect, it would be reasonable to suggest that a feeling of reduced productivity could cause feelings of stress and vice versa. This provides further reason for organisations to manage stress in the workplace if the productivity ‘gap’ is to be closed.”
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Positive management styles were more prevalent in growing organisations. Whilst such styles were also commonplace in even the rapidly declining organisations, this may be outweighed by the presence of more negative styles. The prominence of a secretive management style may explain the distinct lack of trust in senior management in these organisations – only 12% of managers in rapidly declining organisations agreed that they had trust and confidence in senior management. This style is characterised by a lack of open communication and may also influence beliefs about how well change is managed, further highlighting the impact of ineffective management.
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Understanding the impact of different management styles will enable managers to identify effective approaches for engaging with their direct reports, benefiting individual wellbeing and organisational performance.
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Although we can’t say if one causes the other, it is interesting to consider the association between more constructive styles of management and increases in job satisfaction, engagement and confidence in senior management.

Perceptions of Line Managers

Key Findings: Managers were more positive about the mutual trust between employees and line managers. Discontent was most apparent in relation to talent development activities. Managers felt their personal development was not taken seriously (28%) and a third reported feelings that their manager had not received appropriate training.

In previous reports the impact of line manager relationships on job satisfaction has been highlighted. The quality of line management relationships in particular is identified as having a key influence on job satisfaction – so we expanded the survey questions on the line manager relationship.

Perceptions of line managers were generally positive with small improvements (Figure 10). Strikingly, nearly two thirds of managers (62%) reported that their line management relationship had a positive impact on their wellbeing.

With some concerns existing over the level of trust in senior management, a sense of mutual trust and confidence was much more apparent between respondents and their line managers. Two thirds of managers agreed that their organisation’s approach to management and leadership development consisted of trained for new line managers (66%) and support for ongoing development (69%). However, there was discontent with the provision of talent management and development activities: 28% of managers do not think their line manager takes their personal development seriously and 36% do not receive regular feedback. Although more managers agreed than disagreed in both cases, the disagreement from almost a third of the workforce in relation to each area suggests there is still room for improvement. Organisations may benefit from a renewed focus on appropriate initiatives to equip managers with the skills needed to perform effectively, particularly considering the impact of poor management style on productivity.

Table 3: Prevalence of management style by growing/declining organisations (Percentage agreement, with darker shades representing higher agreement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Declining Rapidly</th>
<th>Declining</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Growing</th>
<th>Growing Rapidly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrecive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-averse</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensual</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merger/acquisition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offshoring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe my line manager has trust and confidence in me
My line manager treats me with dignity and respect
My line manager listens to my ideas
My line manager involves me in decisions that affect me
I have trust and confidence in my line manager
I could talk to my line manager about issues such as stress
Overall, I think my line manager is managing my work group well
My line manager makes clear how our organisational priorities translate to my everyday work
I believe my line manager has had appropriate management training
My line manager takes my personal development seriously
My line manager gives me regular feedback about my performance

Figure 10: Perceptions of line managers

The Personal Impact of Management Style

Key Findings: More open, empowering management styles are connected to lower levels of stress, higher job satisfaction and greater personal productivity than more ‘command and control’ styles. The worst management styles generate up to four times more stress than the best. The best management styles drive job satisfaction levels up to 2.5 times higher.

We also reviewed the impact of different management styles on stress, job satisfaction and productivity. We found that those who viewed their managers as having a positive management style also reported more positive outcomes such as less stress, higher job satisfaction and higher productivity. Figure 11 shows that managers reported experiencing higher levels of stress when their line managers demonstrated more negative management styles characterised by, for example, suspicion (70%) versus trust (41%).

Managers with positive line managers report higher job satisfaction than those with negative line managers (Figure 12). An innovative management style was found to be the strongest driver of engagement, with a suspicious style most likely to reduce it.

Similarly, higher productivity was reported by those who identified their line managers as having positive rather than negative management styles (Figure 13).

Figure 11: Self-reported experience of stress by management style.

Figure 12: Self-reported Job Satisfaction by Management Style

Figure 13: Self-reported productivity by management style.
**Management Style and Engagement Levels**

As in 2012, we developed an engagement index based on five items within the questionnaire. The engagement index was utilised to explore the impact of management styles on levels of employee engagement. Further highlighting the impact of managerial styles on employee outcomes, Figure 14 shows the link between positive styles of management (e.g. empowering) and higher levels of employee engagement. Likewise, lower engagement is associated with more negative managerial styles. Given that engagement may be a key factor in motivating employees to ‘go the extra mile’ at work, these findings reinforce the importance of management style.

Organisations should consider how to create more positive management styles via training and development initiatives and support their managers to adapt these styles as required. They should also recognise that some styles may be more appropriate in particular organisational contexts (e.g. the need for innovative management during rapid growth).

What’s the main driver of employee engagement?

Analysis of the results makes clear that ‘intrinsic’ factors (e.g. sense of achievement, feelings of belonging to a team) are more critical than ‘extrinsic’ ones (e.g. reward) – see Table 4.

This has powerful implications. If employees are more engaged by their colleagues/line manager relationships, through role autonomy and trusting sense of enrichment at work, gained employees are more engaged by their team (e.g. reward) – see Table 4.

Table 4: Top five drivers and inhibitors of engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Drivers</th>
<th>Engagement Inhibitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The sense of achievement you get from your job</td>
<td>1. Your ability to decide how to get jobs done yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your sense of feeling part of a team</td>
<td>2. The amount of training you have received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your relationship with your line manager</td>
<td>3. Your sense of feeling part of a team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your ability to decide how to get jobs done yourself</td>
<td>4. Your relationship with your line manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Your prospects for career enhancement</td>
<td>5. Your sense of achievement you get from your job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A good work-life balance and sufficient time for non-work activities are important to ensure people are able to recover from the demands of work. Having little time to renew energy is associated with negative outcomes, both at work (e.g. reduced job satisfaction) and personally (e.g. increased risk of burnout). We explored changes in working hours and the extent to which they leave managers feeling overloaded. The following section looks at managers’ working hours and the impact of connectivity in an increasingly digital era.

Key Findings: Managers’ contracted working hours have risen by one hour daily compared to 2012, which is equivalent to an additional 29 days extra each year. That’s more than the typical annual leave entitlement. Overall, 92% of managers work longer than their contracted hours. This pattern has resulted in a third of managers feeling ‘overloaded’ and a perception that long working hours are something they have ‘no choice’ about.

This year’s survey found comparable results to previous years with regards to working hours. The average number of contracted hours was 38, an increase of one hour from 2012, with the most commonly reported actual hours worked being 41-48 hours (38%; see Figure 15). Unsurprisingly, then, 92% of managers reported working over their contracted hours (90% in 2012), with 77% saying this was an hour or more in excess of their contracted hours on an average day (see Figure 16).

4. MANAGERS’ WORKING HOURS IN A DIGITAL ERA

![Figure 14: Managerial styles and levels of engagement](image)

![Table 4: Top five drivers and inhibitors of engagement](table)

![Figure 15: Summary of actual hours worked in 2015](chart)

![Figure 16: Summary of excess hours worked in 2015](chart)
If a manager works just one extra hour daily, this equates to 29 extra days per year, which is more than the typical annual leave entitlement.

Table 5 shows that those at a higher job level (e.g. Director) reported working more hours in excess of their contracted hours compared to those at a junior level. In fact, the pattern demonstrated is that increasing management seniority is associated with longer working hours.

Similarly to 2012, 42% of managers report they have a lot to do but are not overloaded compared to 40% in 2012 (Figure 17). However a third of managers still report feeling overloaded by having too much work. Only around a quarter of managers feel they have the capacity to do more work or that they have the right amount of work to do. This means most managers are working at maximum capacity. This has implications for organisations’ reliance on management to drive forward improvement to sustain recovery and growth.

As shown in Figure 18, only about half of managers feel that they choose to work additional hours, and the majority feel that it is a necessity given their deadlines. These findings are unsurprising given the high proportion of managers reporting that there has been a significant increase in the volume and pace of work.

Where positive management styles (e.g. accessible and trusting) were reported, there were similar proportions of managers not working in excess of their contracted hours and of those working more than three hours extra. It is reassuring that these styles are associated with an avoidance of excessive hours – and it may be that the 54% of managers who choose to work more feel empowered and enthused to do so. Whilst this offers a more encouraging explanation, we should not forget the harmful impact excessive hours can have, even if managers feel this is their choice.

### Table 5: Average excess hours worked per day by seniority level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seniority Level</th>
<th>No extra hours</th>
<th>15 minutes</th>
<th>1 hour</th>
<th>1.5 hours</th>
<th>2 hours</th>
<th>3 hours</th>
<th>More than 3 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Manager</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Manager</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 17: Managers’ feelings about their working hours**

- **I have a lot to do but do not feel overloaded**: 35%
- **I have too much work to do and feel overloaded**: 24%
- **I have the capacity to do more work**: 17%
- **I have about the right amount of work to do**: 48%

- **It is necessary in order to meet deadlines**: 63%
- **I do it by choice**: 44%
- **I have no choice because of the volume of work**: 45%
- **I have to keep up with work emails**: 54%
- **It is the only time available to think**: 36%
- **Job cuts in my organisation have increased my volume of work**: 22%
- **It is necessary to get ahead in this organisation**: 45%
- **I feel pressurised to do it because I feel insecure in my job**: 25%
- **I feel pressurised to do it by my line manager**: 43%

**Figure 18: Reasons managers work beyond their contracted hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of stress</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>30 minutes</th>
<th>1 hour</th>
<th>1.5 hours</th>
<th>2 hours</th>
<th>3 hours</th>
<th>More than 3 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>More than 3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: Job satisfaction by average excess hours worked each day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of stress</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>30 minutes</th>
<th>1 hour</th>
<th>1.5 hours</th>
<th>2 hours</th>
<th>3 hours</th>
<th>More than 3 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>More than 3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7: Experience of stress by average excess hours worked each day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, I am satisfied with my job</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>30 minutes</th>
<th>1 hour</th>
<th>1.5 hours</th>
<th>2 hours</th>
<th>3 hours</th>
<th>More than 3 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 19: The effects of working hours**

The Impact of Working Hours

Key Findings: 54% say that working hours are resulting in greater stress levels, although that’s slightly fewer than in 2012 (59%). Stress was more than three times as common among those working long hours: 20% of those working over three hours. A day extra said they are often stressed, compared to only 6% of those working no additional hours. However, 67% of managers say that overall they’re satisfied with their jobs, substantially more than in 2012 (55%) or even 2007 (62%).

As shown in Figure 19, we asked managers about the effect of their working hours.

Around half of managers reported a negative impact on exercise, stress levels, social life, psychological and physical health. The negative effects were generally either reduced or similar to the 2012 findings. This may be considered a reflection of positive trends emerging elsewhere, however it continues to present a consistent message regarding the need for managers to adopt a better work-life balance.

There was no significant difference between men and women in the reported effect of working hours. The only factor that did show a more pronounced difference was managers’ relationships with their children where – perhaps surprisingly – 44% of male managers reported negative effects compared to 36% of female managers.

As shown in Table 6, the majority of managers who said they did not work in excess of their contracted hours ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that there were satisfied with their job (67%). However, the overall picture in relation to job satisfaction may be more complex; there are also high levels of satisfaction among those who do work over their contracted hours.

For instance, over half of those managers who typically work 30 minutes or an hour more still agree (53% and 52% respectively) that they are satisfied with their job. This starts to decline slightly with an increase in excess hours. The fact that 54% of managers working in excess of contracted hours by their own choice and 42% reporting that they have a lot to do but are not overloaded might explain why job satisfaction is not lower.

With a clearer pattern emerging, those working less overtime reported less stress (Table 7). This may be unsurprising when a large proportion of managers feel their excess hours are a function of necessity, but it does reinforce the need for managers to find ways of managing workload within their contracted hours.

We also explored the impact of working hours on productivity. Among managers reporting the highest average working hours per week (60 hours or more), 100% productivity was reported just as often as productivity of less than 70%
People put an awful lot of psychological and intellectual effort into the success of their business, and a good business should be able to reciprocate that. That’s what constitutes the modern-day psychological contract.

Arup is a glut, employee-owned firm of designers, planners, engineers, consultants and technical specialists with over 4,000 employees across the UK.

A few examples of their impressive work include the Sydney Opera House and the London Aquatics Centre. The company prides itself on making a sustainable and positive difference in the world, which starts close to home – with making sure Arup’s employees are in the best position possible, both mentally and physically, to do their job and enjoy it.

The first step

Arup’s health and wellbeing approach was triggered by the realisation that large parts of its workforce were very hard-working and dedicated – but at the same time lacked understanding about the impact of their working life on their health. There was a culture of excessive working and poor life balance.

Head of Reward Evan Davidge: “We were spending a lot of money looking after and caring for our people, but we had no clear objectives and a disjointed approach. It wasn’t sustainable.”

A new health and wellbeing approach

Arup wanted the approach to be holistic – get away from the disjointed and fragmented approach that had been characteristic of how wellbeing had been managed in the business until then. In the new ‘Total Reward’ proposition, employees’ quality of life sits alongside the quality of their work environment, a strong focus on people and personal development, and recognition for their work.

“Employees have an independent spirit that is reflected in their work. Our sustainable health and wellbeing strategy empowers them to harness this spirit for the benefit of shaping a better world together.” Health and wellbeing sits inside the People function, but, as an integrated part of the organisation, aligned to the business values of shaping a better world and the core purpose.

A key focus was to introduce technology that would help employees take control of their own health and wellbeing.

The challenges: winning management buy-in

Of course, all change attracts opposition. First reactions from senior leaders to the new Total Reward proposition were that it was a ‘soft proposition’, employees’ quality of life sits alongside the quality of their work environment, a strong focus on people and personal development, and recognition for their work.
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Technology might not be the cause of pressure to working beyond contracted hours, but it certainly facilitates longer hours. A balanced view about the value of technology and the need to restrict access may be reflective of the digital culture, in which working and non-working lives are becoming entangled. Organisations need to balance the benefits and drawbacks of a digital era, enabling employees to use the flexibility that remote access allows, whilst not losing sight of the impact on working hours and wellbeing.

Interestingly, there was a general trend for those who reported checking their emails more frequently outside of working hours to feel more productive than those who checked less frequently (Table 9). The least productive managers are accessing emails ‘never’ and ‘all the time’ to a similar degree.

This trend could be more associated with managers’ sense of control rather than productivity per se. Perhaps managers who check emails outside their working hours most frequently feel more ‘in control’ of their workload (or at least, their inboxes) and therefore feel more productive. If so then, in practical terms, managers should be seeking to identify coping strategies. For example, effective scheduling and prioritisation of responsibilities are likely to enhance feelings of control. Regular short breaks may result in more, rather than less, productivity as individuals feel ‘recharged’ and better able to manage the tasks at hand.

The theory that a sense of control is paramount is reinforced by Figure 23 which shows that the more frequently managers check emails outside of working hours, the more likely they are to ‘disagree’ that organisations should restrict out-of-hours access. However, it is notable that 43% of those who check all the time also agree with this – perhaps a need for stronger boundaries?

![Table 9: Levels of productivity by frequency of checking emails (Percentage agreement, with darker shades representing higher agreement.)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100% productive</th>
<th>90-99% productive</th>
<th>80-89% productive</th>
<th>70-79% productive</th>
<th>Less than 70% productive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only in emergencies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 22: Agreement with restricted email access by frequency of email checking out-of-hours](image)

![Figure 23: Productivity by agreement with ‘technology has made it hard for me to switch off from work’](image)

**Difficulty ‘Switching Off’ in the Digital World**

**Key Findings:** 61% of managers say that technology has made it difficult to switch off from work. Many of them experience lower productivity and job satisfaction and more stress.

With technology at our fingertips it is perhaps not unusual for managers to remain connected to work, for example catching up on emails and scheduling during the daily commute. However this ability to remain connected rather than ‘switch off’, even when away from the work environment, may impact managers’ wellbeing and performance, particularly where this behaviour is driven by a need to feel ‘on top of things’ at work.

We considered the impact in relation to three outcomes: productivity, job satisfaction and the experience of stress.

Those who feel that technology makes it harder to switch off tended to experience lower productivity and job satisfaction and more stress. This may be linked to a feeling of control or reliance on technology to manage workload. For example, are managers who are more satisfied and unaffected by technology in terms of switching off also those that did not perceive technology as a key factor in controlling or managing their workload?

Over a third of managers (34%) who rated their productivity at less than 70% agreed that technology makes it hard for them to switch off. In contrast, only 22% of managers who rated their productivity as 100% perceived technology in the same manner. This was similar for managers with the highest reported levels of job satisfaction. For those managers experiencing stress ‘often’, a larger proportion (23%) reported that technology had an impact on their ability to switch off than those who did not feel this way (8%).

Technology may be facilitating a trend for excessive working and an increasing tendency to spend time on work, particularly emails, outside of normal contracted hours. The negatives should be a reason for employers to look the impact of technology. Organisations should look to understand how employees communicate and whether this can be adapted to reduce the consequences of an ‘always on’ culture amongst managers.
5. MOTIVATION AND WELLBEING

Key Findings: Motivation remains largely unchanged since 2012 despite more positive trends observed elsewhere. Motivation remains higher in the private sector and in organisations experiencing growth.

As in other reports, we asked managers to report how motivated they felt on a typical Monday morning (Figure 24).

Motivation remains at a similar level to 2012, with 61% feeling motivated or highly motivated. Especially given the finding that job satisfaction has increased overall, it is important to note there was an increase in the percentage of managers feeling not very motivated or not motivated at all (28%, up from 24% in 2012). Motivation still appears to be a challenge for many managers.

Unsurprisingly, managers working in organisations experiencing the highest levels of growth reported feeling the most motivated (82%) compared with those managers in rapidly declining organisations who reported feeling more demotivated (67%). Whilst not unexpected, it is important to recognise the impact of such demotivation on employee wellbeing. Organisations in tough environments should still monitor the health and wellbeing of their workforce, particularly if further decline is anticipated.

Figure 24: Self-reported motivation – “How motivated do you feel on a Monday morning?”

Wellbeing at Work

Key Findings: Like in 2012, the majority of managers report some negative impact on their wellbeing in the previous three months, with sleep loss topping the list. They also agree that workload can have an adverse effect on wellbeing. Managers believe that both organisations and they as individuals bear the responsibility of making sure employees are healthy and happy in their jobs.

We asked managers about the extent to which they had experienced health issues in the previous three months (Figure 25). The results were largely comparable to 2012. 57% reported experienced insomnia or sleep loss often or sometimes in the previous three months, or muscular problems. Half reported experiencing stress – something which was more commonly experienced in women (18%) than men (10%).

Factors Perceived to Influence Wellbeing

Managers were asked to rate the extent to which a number of factors influence their wellbeing (Figure 26). There were improvements across several, although there was a slightly more negative perception about the impact of workload.

Managers were also asked about the perceptions of their organisation’s wellbeing responsibilities (Figure 27). Over half of managers felt that their organisations provided enough support for their employees’ wellbeing and the majority (around 90%) also recognised wellbeing as something they were responsible for in respect of their own teams.

Figure 25: 2012/2015 comparison of health and wellbeing outcomes in previous three months

*Items introduced in the 2015 survey, comparable 2012 data is unavailable; 2012 data for other items is shown in lighter shading.

Figure 26: Factors influencing wellbeing, in ascending order of negative outcomes

Figure 27: Perceptions of organisational responsibility for wellbeing

“For this item ‘strongly disagree’ should be considered as positive and ‘strongly agree’ as negative.
The results of this survey show significant challenges continue to face the public sector. At an organisational level, decline is more common than in other sectors and cost reduction is the main focus of organisational change activity. So how has the behaviour and wellbeing of managers in this sector been affected?

Overall we found that senior management is still viewed in a less favourable light than in the private sector. However, there were some small improvements compared to 2012, and in fact trust and confidence in senior managers was most improved in the public sector (42% in 2015 up from 30% in 2012).

Motivation was lowest amongst public sector workers (54%) when compared with the private (63%) and charity/not-for-profit (68%) sectors; over a third of public sector managers feel demotivated. Despite this there was only a 5% difference between public and private sector managers regarding whether they felt motivated to do their best for their organisation. That’s encouraging given the resilience likely to have been required of many in the public sector in recent years.

Given the motivation gap, it is not surprising to note that it was more common for public sector managers to report working at less than 70% productivity. Figure 28 shows a breakdown of the self-reported productivity over the last three months reported by managers in the four organisational sectors.

In the current public sector climate, it is particularly important for organisations to consider how change activity can be managed to maximise levels of motivation and productivity.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Empower your people, promote productivity

The most powerful drivers of job satisfaction are intrinsic to the job, flowing from the sense of satisfaction it offers, the quality of team and line manager relationships and the opportunities for development. Managers have a key role to play. They need to be empowered – and in turn empower their teams – to perform.

Give autonomy – make managers masters of their destiny. Employees should have the freedom, trust and autonomy to make their own decisions about how they work. Show trust in their judgement. Hold people accountable for the outcomes of their work, but do not be prescriptive about how they work.

Job design – ensure jobs and the processes behind them are structured to enable role autonomy and also to give people opportunities to be part of a team, another key driver of satisfaction.

Tailor reward and recognition strategies – recognise values-based behaviour and reward it accordingly. Recognise what people have done to achieve results. If managers are working the equivalent of a typical annual leave entitlement in excess hours, is an extra day of holiday truly going to be perceived as an incentive?

Recognise employees’ value – a sense of achievement is fundamental to job satisfaction and engagement, so design recognition strategies to enhance employees’ sense of value.

– Telefonica’s recognition scheme is based on a mobile app, which has allowed colleagues to recognise one another across the Telefónica network. It has achieved increased workforce motivation and job satisfaction as well as improved peer-to-peer relationships.

Support personal and professional development – provide employees with clarity about how they can progress their careers and support their development, aligning with business needs.

Encourage innovation – managers have a responsibility to create environments in which innovation is encouraged not stifled. Invite employees to freely share ideas for using their time more productively and test possibilities quickly.

– Google’s famous “20% projects” allow engineers to spend time on projects that interest them to stimulate thinking. The same dedication may not be realistic in all businesses but the principle of dedicated time to innovate could be beneficial. Try dedicating the last 10 minutes of monthly meetings to an open discussion of new ideas, insights and suggestions.

Encourage regular “walkabouts” to stimulate conversations with colleagues on other teams or in other areas of the business.

Review communication policies to reduce unnecessary emails. Could emails to colleagues on the same office floor or in the same building be banned in favour of phone calls and face-to-face interactions?

– The French IT services company Atos banned internal emails back in 2011 as part of a ‘Zero email’ initiative. Seek the views of employees on how they work.

2. Switch off: avoid digital presenteeism

Mobile technology can empower employees and help organisations become more agile, but organisations need to avoid developing a culture of digital presenteeism. Just because people can be ‘always on’ doesn’t mean they should be.

Give employees licence to switch off. This may mean encouraging them to turn mobile phones off after a specific time. Leaders should set expectations about working hours and out-of-hours contact. Firms like JP Morgan and Barclays have introduced ‘protected weekend’ policies to discourage logging in and working outside the working week.

Review communication policies to reduce unnecessary emails. Could emails to colleagues on the same office floor or in the same building be banned in favour of phone calls and face-to-face interactions?

– The French IT services company Atos banned internal emails back in 2011 as part of a ‘Zero email’ policy; whilst boasting a reduction in disruption and email overload by 60%, such change requires adaptation in employee behaviours and a wider cultural shift, as recognised by Atos bosses.

Consider restricting remote access to company servers. Some companies go so far as to turn email servers off out of working hours; one, Daimler, has installed software to automatically delete emails sent to staff whilst they are on holiday.

3. Develop better line managers

The role of line managers is key. How they manage has a hugely powerful impact on people throughout an organisation. So, when it comes to improving the quality of working life – and improving the management of change – you need to develop managers with the capacity to empower and engage.

Provide more regular feedback – ensure managers seek feedback on how colleagues perceive their management style and behaviour. This shouldn’t only be in the annual appraisal: catch-ups with line managers should be an opportunity for feedback. Ask questions like as ‘how am I performing in relation to X?’ or ‘What could I do differently to be more effective?’ Then jointly develop personal development plans.

Understanding personal management styles – Provide management and leadership development that helps managers to reflect on their own behaviours and the impact of their actions. For example, 92% of Chartered Managers say that becoming Chartered increased their self awareness.

Provide opportunities for feedback, formal and informal, for example through mentoring schemes or 360° feedback programmes.

Avoid the accidental manager syndrome – new managers need appropriate development to learn how to manage and lead. Selection for promotion in management roles should be based on management behaviour and team leadership capabilities. Look at how people get results, not just the results themselves.

Create more opportunities to learn – identify opportunities for leadership which are not tied to formal management positions. Give people the chance to practice skills and build confidence through managing specific projects or leading processes.

4. Improve change management

Managers’ assessment of how senior leaders are managing change is at a low point. Too many managers say change initiatives are failing to deliver business benefits. With change becoming the norm across nearly all organisations, addressing this should be a priority.

Culture change needs leadership – behaviour needs to be role-modelled throughout the management hierarchy from the top, with senior managers committed to empowering and trusting their people.

Improve communication – be transparent and create channels for two-way communication. How effective are your organisation’s upward and downward communication mechanisms? Ensure senior leaders regularly receive news from the ‘frontline’. Seek the views of employees and involve them in shaping change.

Produce trust – senior managers need to reflect on how their actions might affect employee trust and confidence.

– senior managers need to reflect on how their actions might affect employee trust and confidence.

Measure, prioritise and monitor – ensure you have the data on wellbeing you need to assess what problems you face and the areas that action should focus. Monitor and report on progress.

Tackle taboos – improving wellbeing means tackling any stigma that may be attached to discussion of health, whether it’s stress and mental health or physical illness. Start conversations and provide information that makes it easier to ask for help.

Engage managers – managers can have a direct impact on the motivation, engagement and ultimately on the wellbeing levels of the people they work with. They need to be informed and engaged on quality of working life and wellbeing issues. Don’t leave it to HR.

5. Improve wellbeing

For many managers, long hours and the pressure of work continue to create stress and squeeze out time for exercise or their personal life. Improving health and wellbeing may need dedicated action across an organisation to change the culture and reshape negative attitudes. Management buy-in is vital.

Make the business case – win buy-in and support from managers by showing the costs of poor health and wellbeing and the benefits of improvement.

– regularly monitor and review the impact of change. Has it improved wellbeing and engagement and ultimately on the pressure of work continue to create stress and squeeze out time for exercise or their personal life. Improving health and wellbeing may need dedicated action across an organisation to change the culture and reshape negative attitudes. Management buy-in is vital.

Define goals in terms of behaviours – define the changes you want to achieve through change, but look at these in terms of employee attitudes and behaviour, not just business performance outcomes.

Measure and monitor the impact on people – regularly monitor and review the impact of change. Has it delivered the anticipated business benefits – if not, what can be done? How has it affected employees and what opportunities are there for improvement?
APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE OVERVIEW

The fieldwork for the study was conducted in July 2015 and as in previous studies the CMI membership database was used as a sampling frame. As in 2007 and 2012, the 2015 survey was distributed and completed entirely online.

Consistent with previous reports and based on some variation in respondents based on their level in the organisation, a decision was taken to weight the 2015 data so that it reflected the structure of the 2007 survey. In addition, statistics in the figures and tables presented in the report are rounded to the nearest whole number resulting in totals greater than 100% in some cases.

In the 2015 sample, 60% of respondents were male and 40% female, reflecting an increase in female respondents this year (70% and 30% in 2012). Similar to the 2012 age profile, the majority of respondents in the 2015 sample were aged 40-59 years (66%).

Minor changes to the 2015 survey expanded the number of business sector categories compared with 2012. However, the distribution of responses still showed similar patterns to the 2012 results; there was a decrease in the proportion of respondents describing their sector as ‘Other’ (down from 12% in 2012 to 9% in 2015), which may be explained by the inclusion of addition categories such as ‘Telecommunications and Post’ and ‘Creative/media’ (representing 0.6% each in 2015).

The distribution of responses was mostly similar across the regions between 2012 and 2015 with the majority of respondents based in London (17%), the South East (14%) and the South West (11%). There were minor variations observed in regional representation with the largest change being a reduction in respondents based in the South East (down from 18% in 2012) and small increases in respondents based in other regions e.g. Yorkshire & the Humber (up from 5% in 2012 to 7% in 2015).

Respondents were asked to indicate the status of their organisation with the following breakdown revealed for the 2015 sample: 45% worked in the public sector, 45% worked in profit or charity organisation, 38% worked in the private sector.


APPENDIX B – FULL PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>2015 (%)</th>
<th>2012 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you…? Male Female</td>
<td>59.6: 40.4</td>
<td>69.7: 30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How old are you? Under 30 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-65 Over 65</td>
<td>6.4: 20.0: 34.4: 31.6: 5.6: 2.1</td>
<td>2.4: 12.0: 35.1: 39.0: 8.9: 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your job level? Director or above Senior manager Manager Junior manager</td>
<td>12.5: 31.8: 38.7: 16.9</td>
<td>19.2: 30.8: 37.4: 12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your job level? Full time Part time</td>
<td>92.6: 7.4</td>
<td>91.6: 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you employed on a… Permanent contract Temporary contract Zero hour contract Self-employed Agency worker</td>
<td>92.2: 3.2: 0.2: 4.0: 0.4</td>
<td>89.7: 4.5: n/a: 5.4: 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many employees does your organisation have? 1-10 11-50 51-250 251-500 501-1000 More than 1,000</td>
<td>5.7: 8.6: 14.3: 8.9: 8.4: 54.1</td>
<td>7.0: 8.1: 12.9: 15.8: 15.8: 56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the status of your organisation? Charity/not for profit Social enterprise Public sector Listed public company Private limited company Partnership Family-owned business Co-operative Mutual Other</td>
<td>12.6: 0.5: 38.2: 11.4: 28.9: 1.9: 2.9: 0.3: 1.5: 1.9</td>
<td>N/A: N/A: N/A: N/A: N/A: N/A: N/A: N/A: N/A: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the status of your organisation? Charity/not for profit Public Private Other</td>
<td>12.6: 38.2: 45.0: 4.2</td>
<td>9.7: 41.9: 48.4: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In which region is your principal place of work? East of England London East Midlands West Midlands South East South West North East North West Yorkshire and The Humber Northern Ireland Scotland Wales Other</td>
<td>5.9: 16.7: 4.7: 9.8: 13.5: 11.3: 3.7: 8.2: 6.8: 1.1: 8.2: 3.7: 6.3</td>
<td>8.0: 16.0: 5.5: 9.1: 17.5: 10.7: 2.5: 9.3: 4.5: 1.3: 7.2: 2.4: 6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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