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Overall scheme of the study

Well-being
- Managing
- Promoting

Well-being management practices and knowhow of superiors

Well-being of employees
- Human resource reports and Occupational health indicators

Productivity of work

Large employer; 6000 employees, 620 superiors, 40 units
Model for managing well-being

Management
- Managing structures, measures, reporting
  - Corporate strategy and functions
  - Functions and Resources of HR and superiors
  - Functions and Resources of Wellness Functions

Results
- Effective corporate climate
- Commitment
- Corporate image
- Results at Corporate level
- Results in Individual level
- Costs savings
- Work ability, effectiveness
- Health and wellness
- Connections with and influence on profitable business

Follow-up, innovations, development
Well-being management (WBM) procedures were studied in 40 units with formalised questionnaires answered by Human Resource managers.

Superiors’ competence in Well-being management was studied in 384 superiors divided 40 units and

- Internet questionnaire
- Importance of different areas of well-being at work
- Leadership capabilities in managing well-being at work
- Procedures of inner communication
- Competence in well-being management
  - The concreteness of the objectives
  - Use of measures
  - Role of superiors
  - Responsibilities of superiors
- Response rate was 62%
Well-being of employees

*Unit level indicators were utilized*

- **Human Resource Reporting**
  - Age, gender, education
  - Staff turnover, time spent in training, costs on training, occupational health, corporate fitness, etc

- **Personnel climate study**
  - Job satisfaction, stress, evaluations of leadership, competence, corporate climate, corporate image, trust on superiors, etc

- **Occupational health indicators**
  - Sick leave %, health-% (no sickness absences)
Productivity at unit level

- In operative units each work process had certain time bound criteria
- Work done was related to these criteria
- Productivity was calculated by dividing the sum of these processes by total working time

- Productivity was work done by the employees – more work, better productivity
Results
Managing well-being at unit level

The results demonstrated great variation between units for Strategic Wellness Management Index, SWMI, (52.9±9.2).

The employer had distinct policies in all areas of Well-being at work, but the everyday practices were different.
Managing well-being:
Practices in Human Resources and Superior work, Occupational healthcare

Mean = 61.21
Std. Dev. = 9.81

Mean = 49.88
Std. Dev. = 13.367
Sick leave
average 4,6 1,5% of working time in 40 units

- Active joint planning and reporting procedures in Occupational Health Services and activity in Health Promotion interventions correlated with lower sick leave
- Superior’s role in return to work process and activity of management in WBM steering group were related to higher absenteeism rates in working units
- This regression model explained 34,7% of the variation in sick leave in unit level.
WBM polices vs. role of superiors

(r=0.39, p<0.016)

Mean Role of superiors in managing well-being, responses

Role of superiors in managing well-being defined by HR-managers

Error bars: +/- 2 SE
Responsibility of superiors in WBM-processes

Responsibility of superiors in well-being processes; distribution of responses of 384 superiors

- Starting the early intervention: 49%
- Workload follow-up: 49%
- Follow-up of sick leave: 42%
- Follow-up of well-being of employees: 37%
- Activity in early intervention: 28%
- Executing the results of early intervention: 27%
- Activity in return to work process: 26%
Responsibility of superiors in WBM-processes

Responsibility of superiors in well-being processes; distribution of responses of 384 superiors

- Starting the early intervention: 49%
- Workload follow-up: 49%
- Follow-up of sick leave: 42%
- Follow-up of well-being of employees: 37%
- Activity in early intervention: 28%
- Executing the results of early intervention: 27%
- Activity in return to work process: 26%

Superior’s responsibility indicator in managing well-being
Superior’s responsibility indicator in managing well-being correlated with:

- job satisfaction \( (r=0.520, \ p<0.001) \),
- satisfaction with superiors leadership qualities \( (r=0.501, \ p<0.001) \)
- trust to immediate superior \( (r=0.527, \ p<0.001) \)
- These results from all units (40)
Superior’s responsibility indicator in managing well-being *correlated* with productivity
Business case for well-being

Well-being
Managing policies

Superiors practices

Well-being of employees

Productivity of work
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