



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG  
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, ECONOMICS AND LAW

Department of Business Administration

Management

Spring term, 2013

# Health promotion in workplaces with office environments

---

*An inspirational study about health promotion, leaders influence and employees' attitudes towards the subject.*

---

**Bachelor Thesis**

**Authors:**

Sanna Blixt 901211-2943

Josefin Holmström 870828-7902

**Tutor:**

Wajda Wikhamn

## Abstract

Our thesis aims to describe the importance of health promotion in workplaces with office environments. We want to shed light on the concept health promotion and open up people's eyes for the wideness of its meaning. With this thesis we investigate the manager's role to prevent unhealthiness and taking many varieties of health in consideration regarding the employees' wellbeing. We also look into the employees' attitudes and feelings towards health promotion and how it affects them. Health promotion open ups for opportunities to improve the employees' sense of coherence, their motivation and their health in different aspects. To analyze the connection between health promotion and sense of coherence we use Antonovsky's SOC model and regarding the connection between health promotion and motivation we use Herzberg's Two Factor theory. We have with the help from interviews with four managers and a health consultant and from 250 employees' survey answers come to our conclusions. One of them is that managers' attitudes are of big importance to make health promotion successful since employees consider their attitudes to be of great influence regarding health promoting activities. We believe that health promotion is and will be proved to be a part of a long term sustainable enterprise.

Keywords in our thesis:

- Health-promotion; is to be seen as the equivalent of the Swedish word *friskvård*
- External impacts; national regulations, rules and laws
- Leadership influence
- Health
- SOC; Sense of Coherence
- Motivation; Herzberg's Two Factor theory

## Acknowledgements

We would like to give a special thanks to our tutor Wajda Wikhamn for guidance and support and also for always having a smile on her face.

We would also like to give special thanks to Elin Timande (E.on Client Support), Göran Rönberg (Telecom Company), Jessica Strömberg (Tax office), The HR-manager (IT Consultant Company) and Ann Rullander (Hälsokliniken) for participating in our interviews and sharing their experience and knowledge with us. We also would like to thank all the employees at the studied organizations who took their time to answer our survey.

Josefin Holmström

Sanna Blixt

---

---

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	6
1.1 Problem discussion.....	7
1.2 Purpose.....	8
1.3 Research questions .....	8
1.4 Limitations .....	9
2. Theoretical framework .....	10
2.1 Health promotion in the workplace .....	10
2.2 National regulations, rules and laws.....	12
2.2.1 The Swedish Social Insurance Agency .....	12
2.2.2 The Swedish Tax Agency.....	13
2.2.3 The Working Environment Act.....	13
2.3 Leadership orientation in firms .....	13
2.4 Health within workplaces.....	15
2.4.1 Physical health.....	16
2.4.2 Mental health.....	16
2.4.3 Social health .....	17
2.4.4 Spiritual health .....	17
2.4.4.1 SOC - Sense of Coherence .....	18
2.4.4.2 SOC on the workplace.....	18
2.4.4.3 Criticisms of Antonovsky's SOC theory .....	20
2.5 Motivation theory .....	20
2.5.1 Herzberg's two factor theory .....	20
2.5.2 Criticism of Herzberg's two factor theory .....	21
3. Method .....	23
3.1 Research design.....	23
3.2 Literature review .....	23
3.3 Data collection.....	24
3.3.1 Interview construction.....	25
3.3.2 Survey construction.....	26
3.4 Analysis method.....	28
3.5 Subjectivity and objectivity.....	29
3.6 None-response .....	29

4. Empirical material .....	31
4.1 Qualitative results.....	31
4.1.1 Hälsokliniken – Health consultant.....	31
4.1.2 Organization 1 - E.on client support Sollefteå .....	33
4.1.3 Organization 2 - Telecom company .....	36
4.1.4 Organization 3 - IT consulting company.....	38
4.1.5 Organization 4 - Tax office .....	40
4.2 Quantitative result .....	42
5. Analysis.....	48
5.1 Health promotion in the workplace .....	48
5.2 National regulations, rules and laws.....	50
5.3 Health within workplaces.....	53
5.3.1 Physical-, mental- and social health .....	54
5.3.2 Antonovsky’s SOC-model.....	55
5.4 Motivation .....	56
5.4.1 Herzberg’s two factor theory.....	58
6. Conclusion.....	60
6.1 Practical implications .....	61
6.2 Future research .....	61
Bibliography .....	64
Literature .....	64
Scientific articles .....	65
Webb .....	66
Interview.....	68
Other resource .....	68
Appendix 1 .....	69
A. Interview guides for the four managers.....	69
B. Interview guide for the health consultant .....	70
Appendix 2 .....	71
Survey.....	71

## 1. Introduction

*“Imagine a door that starts to squeak, for the same reason that the hinges of that door needs oil to make the door work well again, the joints of our bodies need movements to work well. The human bodies are made for movements and therefore an office environment can be seen as an unnatural way of life.”* (Ann Rullander, 2013-04-02)

It is hard to escape the fact that some of the most important resources in a company are the employees (Dibble, 1999). Therefore it is to see as logical that companies will need healthy and satisfied employees to have a well working organization. Nowadays the profit maximization is, as always, the top focus in organizations. We aim for the most effective employee and this could have a negative effect on the employees in the long term. For example it can produce harmful stress, psychological distress, and unhappiness (Brulin & Nilsson, 1997). The society are leaving the administrative- and social HR to apply a more strategic HR which according to Røvik (2008) means that we are moving closer to hard HR and further away from soft HR. Stress and unhappiness often lead to sick leaves and burned out employees. Stress, mental strains and exhaustion depression can be a consequence of the increased workload from the downsizing in the public sector and private industry (Andersson, Johrén & Malmgren 2004). There is no doubt that if the organizations most important resources are feeling sick, less motivated and are unhappy it will affect the company negatively. But what can we do to prevent it? One way, to achieve better health for the employees, is to offer them health promotion programs. The last couple of years we can see a wellness boom, an increase of peoples knowledge of the importance of having a good health (The Economist, 2007). The opportunities to use the health promotion are often offered but for everyone this may not be enough. Managers should show positive attitudes towards wellness as they have the ability to practice influence on the employees. A factor that makes our study relevant and increases the interest for the subject is all the attention that has been pointed towards people’s mental unhealthiness. The “sit and lie society” is another factor that makes the thesis more relevant and interesting. We lie down while we sleep, we take the car to a work where we are sitting still almost all the day, we take the car home to sit down in the couch and at last we go to bed to lie down again (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004).

## 1.1 Problem discussion

It is easier to see today's costs than the ones that may or may not occur in the future. The employers can easily see the costs of offering health promotion as it is a current expense. It can though be difficult to understand that today's costs are investments to prevent expenses in the future. The business economist Staffan Lundström assumes that one invested Swedish crown in health promotion will give you five crowns back (Angelöw, 2002). It seems that companies agree with him and that they believe in the profitability health-promotion brings. Due to the lack of research on higher levels treating the subject it is hard to prove if health promotion leads to more motivated, healthy and effective employees. This is the reason why we have chosen to investigate health promotion's connection to motivation further. Regarding health, human bodies are made for movements to keep the parts of the body operative. In an office environment the employees sit very still during a work day and therefore the working environment is to be considered as a threat against the employees' physical health (Arbetsmiljöverket, 2013). The threats do not only have to be in physical form, threats against a person's mental-, social- and spiritual health can also develop. All these factors of health are important and will be presented and analyzed in our thesis. Further in this part we present an example of one of the health factors to show the actuality of the problem.

Several articles published in May this year (2013) indicate the relevance to keep employees mentally healthy. Carlsson (2013) writes in his article, "Persons that are mental ill can be prescribed to go to work" [Translated from Swedish], about the increasing numbers of sick leaves caused by mental unhealthiness and how the government is trying to solve the problem by changing the rules for the sick insurance. Ulf Kristersson, social insurance minister, wants to make more people go to their work even if they are sick since he means that it is dangerous to not have daily routines and not feel needed. He states that employers have to get better in taking care of and treating employees with mental unhealthiness (Carlsson, 2013). In another article, "Persons that are mental ill should spit in the fits" [Translated from Swedish], Swedin (2013) writes about the costs of mental unhealthiness and how this type of unhealthiness has four doubled since the beginning of 2000. According to OECD's policy - better ideas for better lives (2013), the mental unhealthiness cost about 70 billion of Swedish crowns yearly in form of lost work effort and expenses. Swedin (2013) also raises criticism against the government's plans and Kristersson's statements. He thinks it is wrong that people who are

very sick are being denied health insurance because they have run out of insurance days. In a third article, “Monica Armini: Rehabilitation is what is required – not work” [Translated from Swedish], more criticism against Kristersson’s beliefs is raised. Armine (2013) writes that rehabilitation is the solution, not to go back to work while you are still sick. Mental ill persons should meet other people, feel a sense of coherence and feel that the development of the personal health is progressing. The important daily routines are to go up in the morning, eat breakfast, get dressed, and make natural steps in the right direction. According to Armini (2013) stressing people to get healthy through the use of a limited health insurance time does obviously not work. Mental ill persons recover but there is no certain time for when this occurs. In Sweden people do not dare to report in sick before it has gone very far and those people need effective and individual adapted rehabilitation. Already stressed out individuals that have ended up in the health insurance system should be given some rest to heal and soon enough they will return to work with joy (Armini, 2013).

## 1.2 Purpose

The purpose with our thesis is to investigate the attitudes of employees and managers regarding health promotion programs and the contribution they have on health, coherence and motivation at work. Our study also aims to investigate to which extent managers can influence their employees based on their attitudes towards health promotion. All based on organizations with office environment.

## 1.3 Research questions

In order to fulfill the purpose of our thesis we aim to answer the following three research questions:

- What attitudes do the managers and employees have regarding health promotion programs?
- Do health promotion programs contribute to better coherence, motivation and health at work?
- How much do managers attitudes towards health promotion affect and influence their employees?



## 1.4 Limitations

Regarding health promotion the variables that have an effect on it and the outcomes it leads to are many. To limit our study we have therefore chosen to only investigate some of them. They are presented in our theoretical framework. In our study we have made an assumption regarding the word health based on what we consider as most important and reasonable from the literatures. The word health has many definitions and because of its wide perspective it is a concept hard to describe and define. We have therefore chosen to present a summarized version of health based on some of the definitions authors and scientist have made and what we consider is relevant for this study (please see theoretical framework). We are aware of that our presented definitions of health are not necessarily shared by everyone but to be able to do an analysis we need to put some limitations.

To form our empirical material we have chosen to focus our study on four different workplaces situated in two cities in the north of Sweden, all have an office environment. We are aware of that our study has limitations when it comes to generalized conclusions because of our choices to study only one geographic area and just a small number of organizations. The interviews were held with only one leader in each organization. This means that we only get one leader's perspective and not the perspective of the whole management group. That might give us a subjective opinion from the interviewed leader. The surveys have been sent out to a certain amount of employees on the offices where we have had the interviews. Thanks to our limitations we had the ability to look deeper into each case and therefore we can do a deeper analysis in the end that open ups to an interesting discussion.

## **2. Theoretical framework**

The structure of our theoretical framework is based on external- and internal impacts on health promotion, followed by the outcomes it can lead to. The first part of this chapter treats the definition of health promotion and its concept. This part is included to increase the reader's understanding of the term and to make the definition clearer. The second part treats the external factors that we consider have impacts on the offered health promotion. National regulations, rules and laws such as The Swedish Social Insurance Agency, The Swedish Tax Agency and The Working Environment Act are the external factors that are included in this part. They could all have an influence on why organizations choose to offer their employee health promotion and in which way they do it. The third part treats an internal factor, leadership orientation in firms, which also has an influence on what kind of health promotion that is offered. This part describes to which level managers' attitudes towards benefits like health promotion, and health in generally, affect employees and organizations. Finally we have the fourth- and the fifth part of our theoretical framework and these parts treat two outcomes of health promotion that we consider relevant. The outcomes we raise are health and motivation and both of them have been mentioned in earlier studies within the subject. Within health we have chosen to raise a theoretical model called SOC. This is a theory many use when analyzing similar subjects treating health and we consider it essential in our thesis. We expect that health promotion affects people's health but we do not know to which extent and therefore we considered it important to include this model. Regarding the effects health promotion has on motivation we chose to examine this by using Herzberg's two factor theory. This is a theory that has been well used for over 50 years by many scientists. We were not sure motivation would be affected by the offered health promotion but we had our reasons to believe so and we were curious to find out.

### **2.1 Health promotion in the workplace**

What we in Sweden call "friskvård" does not have a directly translation into English. Janlert (2000) explain that even if the concept has existed in Sweden during a lot of years there is no clear definition in English, it is unique for Sweden. According to Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004) the word "friskvård" can be internationally translated into "health promotion on the workplace" and that is the definition we have chosen to use. In Sweden health promotion is

nowadays associated mostly with physical activities but in fact it has a wider perspective. It has to do with much more that conduce to health on the workplace (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004). The benefit has an impact on individual- and group level with focus on life habits and lifestyles. This of course has an effect on organizational level as well. On an individual level the main goal is that every individual should feel happy about themselves, their lives and others. Another goal is to feel good and be able to front everyday demands and fulfill one's personal goals. On a group level health promotion can lead to increased coherence which in turn leads to a better psychosocial climate. On an organizational level health promotion can result in a well organized personnel that have an influence on the quality, effectively and productivity (Rydqvist & Winroth, 2003).

A common form of health promotion is to offer one hour wellness time a week to the employees during paid working hours. Some organizations also, or only, give the employees wellness allowance to use on different health activities, for example, massage or gym cards on fitness center. Help programs like the ones to quit smoking are also often offered within the health promotion (Angelöw 2002).

The European Network for Workplace Health Promotion (ENWHP) is a network within Europe of national occupational health and safety institutes and public health institutions. This network works to develop and promote good health practice. (ENWHP, 2013) In the *Luxembourg Declaration on Workplace Health Promotion in the European Union*, ENWHP describes, several work factors that can contribute to health on workplaces. According to this document workplace health promotion includes:

- *Company codes of conduct and guidelines that view employees not only as cost factors but as important success factors*
- *Company culture and management policies that include the participation of the employees and encourage them to assume responsibility*
- *Work organization that enables employees to balance the demands made by the job with their own personal skills and to control their own work and social support*
- *Personnel policies that incorporate health targets into all other areas of the company*
- *Integrated occupational health and safety services*
- *Inclusion of employees in health issues at all levels (participation)*

- *Systematic implementation of all measures and programs (project management)*
- *Linking risk reduction strategies with the development of safety factors and health potentials (comprehensive approach)*

In the declaration ENWHP recommend organizations to sign the document and in that way promise to follow their guidelines (ENWHP, 2007).

## **2.2 National regulations, rules and laws**

We here present three external factors that could affect health promotion in organizations. They could have an effect on the structure of the offered health promotion or they could also be the reasons to why organizations offer it at all. The factors we present are The Swedish Social Insurance Agency, The Swedish Tax Agency and The Working Environment Act.

### **2.2.1 The Swedish Social Insurance Agency**

Before 1992 Sweden had a system where The Swedish Social Insurance Agency paid the employees their sick pay. Because of that companies did not lose more than the labor for the days their employees were sick. But in year 1992 the law SjLL<sup>1</sup> was introduced. SjLL regulates the conditions for employers and employees during the sick pay period. According to the law the organizations are the ones that have to pay the employees their rightful sick-pay from the second- until the fourteenth day of a person's sick period. After that The Swedish Social Insurance Agency steps in to pay the remaining days, the ones that exceed the first 14 (Försäkringskassan, 2013). One of the purpose introducing this law was to prevent the current high sick leaves that existed within the companies and make the companies bring more effort when it came to taking care of their employees. Another purpose was to increase the employers' responsibility of keeping a good working environment and a good level on the employees' health (Arbetsgivarverket, 2002).

---

<sup>1</sup> SjLL= Lagen (1991:1047) om sjuklön

### **2.2.2 The Swedish Tax Agency**

Nowadays employers can offer their employees tax free health promotion both during working hours and outside work, as long it is offered in a lighter version and fulfill the criteria The Swedish Tax Agency allows. The employee can for example buy a year card on a fitness center and get compensation for this from his or her company against the receipt. The employers should be able to follow up how it has preceded (Skatteverkets ställningstagande 2007-05-25, dnr 131 242815-07/111).

With a lighter version means football, volleyball, different types of dancing, gym, tennis and other racket sports. Other types of activities that could be offered are stress treatments, tai chi, dietary counseling, office massage, foot care and quit smoking courses. Sports like chess and chorus that do not count to physical training are not comprised by the tax exemption. Neither more expensive sports like golf, nor nature experiences such as fishing, are included. These kinds of sports will be taxable. Health promotion within organizations needs to be offered to all the employees, regardless their type of employment, to not be taxable (Skatteverket, 2013).

### **2.2.3 The Working Environment Act**

The Working Environment Act includes laws that treat the manager's responsibility to prevent unhealthiness and accidents in the workplace and to achieve a good working environment. There are also rules about collaboration between the employer and employee. The working environment includes all factors and conditions at work: technical, physical, organization of work, social and the work content (Arbetsmiljöverket, 2013).

## **2.3 Leadership orientation in firms**

Leaders are trendsetters and the ones who establish norms on a workplace. They are to be seen as role models for the employees. It is important that leaders know how to make good examples and are aware of that actions are more powerful than words (Angelöw, 2002).

The quality of the employees becomes the vital factor in today's knowledge based organizations and the employees' motivation, competence and wellbeing are important for an organization's success. Managers should form a positive factor and create opportunities for

the employees to make it possible for them to develop those three components. She or he should promote health, make the business effective and be able to generate profit (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004). Central factors in a successful leadership are to support and encourage the employees. A leader can through appreciation contribute to hopefulness and positive changes. By showing that they care and by giving acknowledgement they strengthen others and open up for increased wellbeing and development. They can through appreciation strengthen the employees' self esteem and increase their understanding for how to contribute to development and success. This way the leaders create motivation and work joy that contributes to good efforts. Several studies confirm the appreciations' determinant significance to people's health and wellbeing. Persons who do not get response that shows them that they are doing a good job, experience a higher workload and they can therefore be hit by stress and illness (Anglöv, 2002). In an office environment where heavy lifts and rumble are no threats, the manager is most likely the prime work environment factor and he or she should be the creator of opportunities, not the one blocking them (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004).

Health promotion is a strategically important instrument in the HR-work and managers should use it as a tool since health can be seen as a resource, not only for the individuals but also for the organization and its results. In other words you can say that healthy leadership results in two winners: the employee and the organization (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004). Through human resource management health promotion can also be strategically used to unite management and employees in a corporate culture. Observed reasons to why managers choose to offer health promotion include keeping the workers healthy, reducing healthcare costs, retention, improving morale, recruitment and improving productivity (Ginn & Henry, 2003). A dilemma for the ones who work with health- and health promotion question are the fact that the persons who are in the biggest need of changing their lifestyles are the ones who are most difficult to reach. The managers' personal leadership and their competence to use health promoting tools are therefore central factors for the state of health on the workplace. If the managers show a clear and positive attitude they can affect the employees, in that way they are investing in the personnel's lifestyles (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004).

From studying these perspectives of leadership orientation, one can see that leadership has influence on offered health promotion and its outcomes. Therefore leadership is a variable that can be connected to all the other parts of our study.

## 2.4 Health within workplaces

Swedish national encyclopedia defines health as followed: “**Health**, a concept very hard to define, the meaning is wider than freedom from illness. A general extensive definition is therefore absent.” [Translated from Swedish]

The World Health Organization (WHO), founded in 1948, has had the following definition of health since its foundation: “**Health** is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity” (World Health Organization, 2006).

Another definition of health: “To possess **health** is to have the ability to accomplish things that are high prioritized in one’s life.” (Nordenfelt 1991, p.86) [Translated from Swedish]

Health is obviously a wide concept with many definitions and we will therefore clarify that our definition is only a short version of many important aspects.

According to Rydqvist & Winroth (2003) and Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004) there are three factors we have to keep in mind discussing health: the surrounding environment, heredity and lifestyle. The first and the last one we consider relevant for our thesis since health promotion could have an effect on them. The surrounding environment includes relations, type of practiced work, society and culture. It has a big influence on how we feel which in its turn is connected to the level of work effort we can handle. Organizations should keep their employees’ surrounding environments in mind since health, effectively and profitability is each other’s prerequisites. The employees’ work happiness, wellbeing and participation will affect their competence, motivation and engagement (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004). Regarding the type of lifestyle it includes all from food to motion, sleep and drugs. Andersson, Johren and Malmgren (2004) explain the big significance lifestyle has on health and Ljusenius and Rydqvist (2004) also enlighten this. They claim that the society have gone through some significant changes from being an agricultural society to being an industrial

society to what it is today, a knowledge society. The lifestyle we have today differs a lot from the ones we once had, but as individuals and biological creatures we have not change at all. The conditions that have change are of physical, mental and social aspects. All three of them are of importance when it comes to our state of health (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004).

A group of persons on long-term sick leaves in connection with a motivational program has created a similar definition of health compared to how Ljusenius & Rydqvist and WHO defines it. The difference is that this group also includes spiritual health in its definition (Andersson & Berman, 2000 in Andersson, Johrén & Malmgren, 2004). The group's definition:

**Physical health:** Healthy body, good lifestyle, good health habits

**Mental health:** Healthily soul, happy thoughts, wellbeing, self-esteem, joy of life

**Social health:** Relations, social network, social support

**Spiritual health:** Coherence, place, support

#### 2.4.1 Physical health

The technological developments have made our society comfortable and very few people are at risk of being physically worn out prematurely. Instead we turn sick out of living to good which cause suffering and burden the health care resources. The human body is made for movements and physical activity and if we do not have the everyday exercises in our lives we will not feel well. The things that used to be our everyday exercises have been replaced by machines, cars, elevators, escalators, washing machines, computers, etc. The modern society has made us so physically inactive that it has become a risk for our health. Because of the lack of physical activity in our everyday life we nowadays need to exercises regularly to satisfy our bodies natural need of movements (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004).

#### 2.4.2 Mental health

Looking at the mental aspects a factor that has been recognized as relevant for organizational behavior is stress (Jackson & Carter, 2002). The human stress reactions that biologically make us threaten, run and fight when danger appears have changed. These days we rarely face those kinds of physical threats. Nowadays our stress reactions mostly just give us worries and



we react strongly on small details, imaginary threats. The society does not allow us to run every time we are in a threatening situation, such as a difficult work assignment. It does not allow us to act aggressive our hostile, or with other emotions for that matter, in given situations. We therefore store our stress reactions inside us and in the long run it leads to different types of repetitive stress injuries (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004). In today's world it is not an option to decrease stress by lower the demands since all organizational activity have to be done economically. Instead it is of importance that people learn how to control their stress, they are taught that stress is good for them (Jackson & Carter, 2002).

### 2.4.3 Social health

*“Remember that you unknowingly and unwillingly exert influence on everyone you get in touch with through your words, your behavior, your smile, yes even your silence, your whole personality.”*

P.Benoist-Hanapier

Social factors that affect us are connected to social psychology. Social psychology helps us to better understand and explain interaction between individuals' thoughts, feelings, behavior and the surrounding society (Rydqvist & Winroth, 2003). From a social aspect there has been a change in our lifestyles. The earlier knit groups, the big family who always stuck together and the stable work groups, are today a rare thing to see. The frequent reorganizations of today and all the social worries they bring have become a direct factor to illness in the working life (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004).

### 2.4.4 Spiritual health

Within spiritual health we talk about coherence, place and support (Andersson & Berman, 2000 in Andersson, Johrén & Malmgren, 2004). We have chosen to concentrate on coherence and to describe it further we present the SOC model. The model could also be connected to social health and we are aware of that the two concepts of health could overlap each other.

#### *2.4.4.1 SOC - Sense of Coherence*

The sociologist Aaron Antonovsky is the creator of the SOC theory, a cognitive concept. He saw health through a salutogenic perspective which means the health's origin. It is based on knowledge around factors that contribute to better health. Antonovsky (1991) explains the SOC concept as "Sense of Coherence" and its importance regarding health and movements toward a state of wellness. Through deep interviews, Antonovsky identified three important themes: *Comprehensibility*, *Manageability* and *Meaningfulness*. If a person has a high SOC that person will have high values on those three components.

*Comprehensibility* - Aim to which level a person experience inner and exterior stimulation as structure and rational tangible. Does a person experience the information that reach her or him as solid, structured and clear or the opposite?

*Manageability* - Aim to which level a person experience resources to be predictable and at disposition. They are within the person's control or controlled by a person he or she has trust in. If you feel manageability you can avoid the feeling that life treats you unfairly.

*Meaningfulness* - also called motivation component by Antonovsky. What kind of things and areas that is important in life for each individual. In what expansion a person thinks life has a meaningful implication.

The three components should not be seen as independent but as in relation to each other. Antonovsky believes that if a person can find existence in all the three components, which is the same as feeling coherence, that person can manage to front complications in life in a better and easier way (Antonovsky, 1991).

#### *2.4.4.2 SOC on the workplace*

Antonovsky's theory *Sense of Coherence* can guide us when it comes to health promotion seen from the following question: "What conditions are to apply to preserve and enhance health?" An example on how we can connect the SOC theory to workplaces is described in the following table from Hanson's book *Hälsopromotion i arbetslivet* (p.126). It contains different factors that can higher the sense of coherence on a workplace.

*Table 2.1 SOC translated into an everyday level on the workplace*

<b>Comprehensibility</b>	<b>Manageability</b>	<b>Meaningfulness</b>
<b>Knowledge of</b>	<b>Resources and support</b>	<b>Motivation</b>
Surroundings	Material and tools	Visions
Branch	Humans	Aims
Company history	Clear organization	Reasonable salary
Company organization	Clear guidelines	Benefits
Work content		
<b>Work environment</b>	<b>Influence opportunities</b>	<b>Values</b>
The own part	Work pace	Ethics and morality
Changes	Work planning	Central values
	Decisions	Fair treatment
<b>Feedback from</b>		
Managers	<b>Competence</b>	<b>Positive experiences</b>
Colleagues	Professionalism	Relations to colleagues
Clients	Social competence	Relations to managers
		Nice environment
	<b>Strength</b>	Humor
	Physical strength	Variation in work
	Mental strength	Recreational activities
	Distancing	Self-esteem
	Pauses	

To achieve a higher level of health at work health promotion should, according to Hanson (2004), be developed into an effective strategy where the idea and focus are clear. A guiding theory showing what types of factors are good for our health and how the process towards higher health should be formed is required. SOC is a very useful model and has shown to be reliable as an explanation to health in many scientific studies. Thanks to the model's three concepts, comprehensibility, manageability and meaningfulness, it is relative easy to use

when you translate it to practical activities. With the help of further subheadings, like the ones in table 2.1, you can form the theory from a certain context, like a workplace. With an everyday level of SOC it gets easier to discuss and understand the contents of the model (Hanson, 2004).

#### ***2.4.4.3 Criticisms of Antonovsky's SOC theory***

Antonovsky's SOC theory has been criticized from different aspects. One of them is the fact that there is yet nothing that can prove the theory's stability overtime (Eriksson & Lindström, 2006). Another criticism is that Antonovsky put too much focus on the use of rational reasoning in his theory. There is a lack of attention when it comes to how the different things that happen to us in life affect us and also when it comes to the important influences emotional elements have on us during stress coping processes (Geyer, 1997).

### **2.5 Motivation theory**

Some people think that motivation is something you can create but that is not quite correct. What you can create are opportunities that satisfy needs or you can create unpleasantness. The motivation itself you find inside you. All human behaviors, except reflexes, are controlled by our motivation, which we partly can be aware of and partly not. According to Ljusenius and Rydqvist high motivation means that there are unsatisfied needs and strong emotions in movements. The needs can be of different importance to us, for example depending on age and sex, and they can both interact or work against each other with constant changing results. Needs that regularly are fulfilled have a limited affect on our behavior while the needs that seldom get satisfied have a higher meaning for us (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004). When it comes to motivation on workplaces there are many theories to apply. One of them is Herzberg's two factor theory which has been used by several reputable researchers on the subject motivation.

#### **2.5.1 Herzberg's two factor theory**

During the 60s an American man called Frederic Herzberg developed a theory within the motivation science and this theory is still relevant now a days. He realized that different factors that surround us in our ordinary life also have different effects on us (Jönsson &

Strannegård, 2009). In his study he discovered that people's happiness often is linked to how satisfied they are with their work assignments, what kind of opportunities there is for personal development and how big success they can achieve through their work assignments. The results also showed that the underlying effect of unhappiness and dissatisfaction not only depending on the work assignment but also on external circumstances (Herzberg, 1966). Therefore he created his two factor theory in which he sorts the different factors into two groups, depending on what kind of effects they have on us. One group includes hygiene factors and the other includes growth factors (Jönsson & Strannegård, 2009).

**Hygiene factors** - Herzberg's hygiene factors focus on how the employees get treated on their workplace and how they experience their external working conditions, such as security, well-being, work environment and salary. They are therefore not directly linked to the work assignments. If the hygiene-factors are not profiled, the employees get dissatisfied. Therefore it is important that the factors are at least profiled to ensure satisfaction within the workplace. Hygiene-factors do not give a person more motivation from adding more of them to the workplace, just less if they do not exist. According to Herzberg that is the way the hygiene-factors work, they have a so called negative potential (Jönsson & Strannegård, 2009). The hygiene-factors must be fully or partially fulfilled to create the base for job satisfaction, next step is the growth-factors which increase the motivation and commitment (Herzberg, 1966).

**Motivation factors** - The motivation factors have a more directly affect on us. If we get more of these factors we also tend to get more motivated. They are directly linked to the work assignments. Different growth-factors can be; responsibility, self-fulfillment, having the possibility to help people and other inner forces that humans have. According to Herzberg it is important to be aware of that motivation is something very individual. We get motivated by different things and what kinds of things that motivate us also depends on the specific situation or on what stage we are in life, or even how we feel during a certain day (Jönsson & Strannegård, 2009).

### 2.5.2 Criticism of Herzberg's two factor theory

Herzberg's two factor theory is famous and well used among many and as it attracts a lot of attention, criticism has also been put forward. The underlying assumption that all people are

the same is one part of the theory that has been criticized. The theory does not consider the individual differences when it comes to what kinds of factors that leads to satisfaction or dissatisfaction. With other words it does not consider that we have different needs and values. Further criticism regarding positive and negative experiences has also been put forward. People have their tendencies to describe positive experience as a function of their own actions while they reference negative experiences to external conditions. Therefore the motivation-factors are perceived as egocentric factors while the hygiene-factors are perceived as "the others, the company, the organization". There is also criticism around why the hygiene-factors, like salary and interpersonal relations, do not work as motivators (Abrahamsson & Andersen, 2005). Critics also questions how well the theory considers organizational differences and the variations in gender, culture and age categories (Furnham, Forde & Ferrari, 1999).

### **3. Method**

In this chapter we present the process and methods we have used to gather our empirical material and to form our analysis. We have used both qualitative and quantitative methods in form of doing interviews and creating surveys. By using interviews and surveys we are researching if health-promotion can lead to more healthy and motivated employees. The scope of our study is to examine workplaces potential of being healthy, with focus on health promotion.

#### **3.1 Research design**

The research design that we are applying has four different phases. The first phase, that we are going to come back to several times during our study, is to collect data from literature, science articles and other secondary sources. The second phase is to use qualitative methods by collecting primary data through interviews, one with a health-maintenance consult and four with managers, one from each organization that we are doing our study on. In our third phase we will also be gathering primary data, but through quantitative methods, by sending out surveys to the employees of the same organizations. The last phase was to analyze and discuss our empirical data with help from our theoretical framework. You can read a more detailed description of every step under following headlines; *Litterature review, Data collection, interview construction, survey construction and analyze method.*

#### **3.2 Literature review**

In our choice of literature we have, beside the use of books treating the theme, chosen to use scientific articles and information from websites that are as seen as trustworthy. With serious we mean for example governmental websites. To analyze parts of our empirical material we have also chosen to include theories that we consider relevant for our study. We consider the presented theories relevant since motivation and sense of coherence are two outcomes of health promotion. We have through our study made sure to use reliable facts by comparing different sources and by using well known and well used theories.

### 3.3 Data collection

According to Jacobsen (2002) it has its benefits to use both qualitative and quantitative methods since they can complement each other. He states that it is common to first do the qualitative research to create clearness around the subject. From there one can easily formulate good surveys. The knowledge you get from a qualitative research can lead to new knowledge and new assumptions about the context of the different parts of the study. These assumptions can later be tested in a quantitative research and the previous qualitative research will strengthen its validity. According to Jacobsen (2002) the combination of the two methods is therefore to be seen as ideal. Our study is formed after a deductive strategy since we wanted to use our empirical material to see if the expectations we had gotten from our theoretical framework were fulfilled (Jacobsen, 2002). When we felt certain on what we wanted to write about we contacted two organizations over phone to ask them if they wanted to participate in our study, both located within the region of Västernorrland. The chosen location is based on the contacts in the area. We asked for an arranged interview with one manager in each organization and if we could hand out surveys to the employees. When the first two interviews were booked we started to form an interview guide based on our chosen theories and background facts. During our days in Västernorrland one of the interviews was cancelled as the manager turned sick. This led to a phone interview a week later with the same leader. Through contacts we contacted other organizations in the region. This resulted in two other interviews, one more in person and one more over phone. We also contacted the health-consultant at this stage and had a personal interview with her. One of the managers chose to be anonymous and three of the organizations did not want their formal names exposed.

**Elin Timander**, *Competence Manager*, E.on Client Support Sollefteå (Personal meeting in Sollefteå, March 25, 2013)

**Göran Rönnberg**, *Department Manager*, Telecom Company (Personal meeting in Sundsvall, March 27, 2013)

**Anonymous**, *HR-manager*, IT-consultant Company Sundsvall (Telephone, April 5, 2013)

**Jessica Strömberg**, *Office manager & Tax director*, Tax office Sollefteå (Telephone, April 8, 2013)

**Ann Rullander**, *Health consultant*, Hälsokliniken (Personal meeting in Sollefteå, April 2, 2013)



One of the advantages having phone interviews is that it can be easier both to ask and answer sensitive questions as the interviewer and the respondent not are physically present (Bryman, 2011). Some people feel more anonymous over phone and because of that they could answer more honest (Lena Hansson, 2013). These advantages convinced us to agree on having phone interviews as well. It is though more difficult to read a person over the phone as you do not read body languages nor reactions. All our interviews were recorded and after every one of them we transcribed the essential parts of the records onto paper to be able to use what had been said in our empirical material and in our analysis. A transcription makes it easier to analyze what an interviewed person has said and to make it as easy as possible the interview should still be fresh in the memory during the transcription process (Bryman, 2011).

After our interviews we started to create the surveys. The organizations had different requests on how we were going to send out the surveys. From one organization we received an email list so we could insert the emails in Webropol. That way we could see which one of the employees who had answered and which one who needed a reminder. The other organizations wanted to send out the surveys themselves. Therefore we emailed them the link to the survey's web page and they transmitted it to their employees. After one week we send out a reminder for everyone and after two weeks we started to compile them.

### **3.3.1 Interview construction**

Because of our choice to study four organizations we found it reasonable to do interviews with only one manager from each organization. The aim was not only to get managers personal thoughts but also to get basic information of the organization and its health benefits.

We chose to use an interview guide with a semi- structure process. We used the same basic questions in our four interviews with the leaders although we were prepared to adjust the questions and the order based on the respondent and how the interview proceeded. According to Bryman (2011) you should be prepared on this and it actually became necessary for us. Sometime we had to avoid asking questions that we already had gotten the answer on and in some occasions we had to adjust the question for example when the respondent felt that he or she did not knew the answer on it. The interview had ten basic questions and some sub

questions that we just used if we did not get an answer that covered our purpose with the question (please see appendix). The interview guide consists of questions treating what kind of health promotion the organization offers and questions that cover external factors that affect the choice of wellness. Further we asked about the organization's and the leader's personal attitude to wellness. We also asked if they have seen some changes among the employees by applying health promotion and what kinds of effects it contributes to. We used open questions since it is the most suitable approach when relatively few units are investigated and when the interest is in the individual's perspective (Jacobsen, 2002). The questions were constructed to be perceived as simple to understand, we did not want to make the respondent feel uncomfortable and it should be an easy subject to discuss.

The interview questions to the managers focus most on covering the external and internal parts of our theoretical framework. They are connected to our first and third research question. By using open questions you get a wider perspective of the respondents' personal thoughts as the respondent gets a wider space to answer. We choose to ask neutral and indirect questions to avoid leading them to answer what we wanted them to answer and get the managers personal opinions (Bryman, 2011). We made questions that both would give us short answers and questions where the respondent had opportunity to give us long answers.

We consider an interview with a health consultant relevant to be able to compare the given answers with both the employees' and the managers' thoughts and also to strengthen our theoretical framework. The interview construction with the health-maintenance consultant we constructed differently. In this interview our aim was to reach her personal thoughts and experiences and therefore we only created wide and open questions so she could talk free and give us long answers. We also decided that we could improvise during the interview and ask questions that we did not have prepared if she started to talk about something interesting.

### **3.3.2 Survey construction**

We chose to construct the survey online by using a web tool called "Webropol". This tool saved us a lot of time since it collected the survey answers and compiled all the data automatically to diagrams in PDF files. The diagrams for each organization were in numbers of how many of the employees who had answered the different alternatives. We calculated the

numbers into percentage. It was an easy tool to use for creating and designing a survey that suited our subject. The online surveys tend to give you the respondents answers back faster compared to post surveys. Through Webropol we created four links to the surveys, one for each organization, which we send out by emails to the employees. This method made it easier for the employees who fast and easy could open the survey through the link. Sending out surveys like this is not only more advantageous economically but also a more environmentally friendly way since we do not have to hand out hundreds of papers (Bryman, 2011).

The survey is constructed with thirteen closed questions (please see appendix). It was requested from the managers to have short surveys and therefore we considered closed questions to be the ultimate choice. Closed question are fast answered since you do not have to write anything on your own. The few questions and their format make the survey look more inviting to answer. A big number of complicated questions can intimidate the respondent to skip answering the survey since it could have a negative effect on their motivation to answer.

The survey questions focus to cover the outcomes of health promotion, mentioned in our theoretical framework. They can in first hand be connected to research question number two but also to number one and three. The first two questions in our survey are simply gender and age questions where we use the age range eighteen to sixty seven years old. The age range is subdivided into four age categories with intervals of eleven and twelve years. The reason why we chose to use those four different age categories and the gender question was to see if the answers in some way would differ from each other. We formed one of the questions after Herzberg's two factor theory to examine if it was applicable when measuring the health promotion's effect on working motivation. The question included three items that matches the hygiene factors and three that matches the motivation factors (Herzberg, 1966). We chose to form another question after Antonovsky's SOC model. We did this by using several items connected to manageability and meaningfulness at the workplace (Hanson, 2004). For the questions to be reliable they also need to be valid. Forming the two of the questions after Herzberg's and Antonovsky's theories gives our survey validity since the questions actually measure what they are intended to measure (Nationalencyklopedin, 2013). Remaining

questions we chose to form ourselves on the basis of our theoretical framework and influences we received from the interviews. Two questions simply treat health promotion, how often the respondents use it and what kind of health promotion they prefer. We have two questions treating leadership with the purpose to find out if the respondents think that their manager's attitude towards health promotion affects them. One question is formed to discover how important the internal impact is on health promotion, if health promotion would affect the respondents in their choice of whether to stay in the organization or not. We also have questions where one combines health and motivation and one combines health and health promotion. One question treats motivation but is formed in an indirect way and another indirect question treats whether the respondents consider health promotion as important as they earlier have expressed in the survey or not.

Eight of the survey questions can be answered on a five grade scale. The reason why we chose to use a five grade scale is because we are interested in the average values and a big spread for our analysis is not necessary. We did not use numbers on the scales since a three for one person can mean the same thing as a four for another, depending on the respondent. Therefore we have chosen to explain the grades in words, for example: *Very little*, *Little*, *Average*, *Much*, *Very much*. We are aware of that respondents can interpret words different as well but we do believe it is easier to interpret words in a more similar way than numbers. Of all thirteen questions we only have one yes or no question (Patel & Tebelius, 1987).

### 3.4 Analysis method

In our analysis we have together discussed all our collected data to be able to compare our two perspectives and compile them into one. The analysis is formed after our chosen theories to make it easy for the reader to follow the structure. We have compared and evaluated the empirical data that we collected and we have looked for patterns that support or not support our applied theories. In our analysis we emphasize our results regarding managers' and employees' attitudes towards health promotion and how these attitudes can be affected. We also aim to highlight the results we have gotten regarding the outcomes of health promotion. This we do to get a clearer picture and finally find the answers on our research questions. Regarding the interviews we analyzed the gotten answers and regarding the survey we interpreted the answers in numbers, mostly in percentage.

### 3.5 Subjectivity and objectivity

The qualitative part gives our thesis a deeper understanding for the use of health promotion and the organizations' attitudes towards the subject (Andersen, 1998). By doing interviews we get a wider perspective of the organizations' and the managers' visions and missions and their personal thoughts. We get a lot of subjective answers during our interviews but by compiling all the managers' answers we aim to achieve objectivity. Our choice to do two of the interviews over phone can be criticized since according to some researches it is harder to open up over phone and it is also a bigger risk that the interviewed person tells lies (Jacobsen, 2002). The quantitative part, our survey, gives the thesis objectivity as we compiled the information in a neutral and objective way (Patel & Tebelius, 1987). The high percent of employees that participated, the gender mix and the wide age range, make the thesis feel reliable since we want to generalize our collected answers. By doing both interviews with a leader in each of the organizations and collect survey answers from the organizations' employees we get two perspective within the same organization. Arguments against using both qualitative and quantitative research are that you get different values from the two methods that are not compatible. Therefore it should not be possible to use this method according to an epistemological point of view. On the other hand a technical point of view do allow the two methods to be united and stands for that it could even be desirable to unite them (Bryman, 2011).

Our interpretation, that in this case becomes our truth, could be considered subjective. Although when we have analyzed and interpreted all the gathered data we have done this with objectivity, trying to see our compiled information in a neutral way.

### 3.6 None-response

The leaders answered the interview questions seriously but some of the questions we did not get any answers on because they did not had all the information. In the process of sending out surveys we had a good response rate from the employees on three of the four organizations. Organization number two was the biggest of the four of them and the manager told us that about 30 employees on that organization had been given notice and he believed that it could

have a negative effect on the response rate. Below we show the percent of employees who answered the survey based on the ones who received it in each organization:

Organization 1 (E.on client support): 67 %

Organization 2 (Telecom company): 28,7 %

Organization 3 (IT consultant company): 64,9 %

Organization 4 (Tax Office): 87,2 %

## 4. Empirical material

Our empirical material consists of qualitative results and quantitative results. The qualitative results represent the received information from our interview with the health consultant and our four interviews with the managers. Our quantitative results come from a survey answered by the employees in the four different workplaces where the managers worked.

### 4.1 Qualitative results

Our interview guide consisted in ten basic questions (please see appendix) and from the given answers we have been able to put together five resumes. They will be presented in this part of our empirical material where we first present the health consultant's thoughts and then the managers' thoughts around health promotion on workplaces with office environment. We have chosen to present the four different organizations individually. This is because their answers difference a lot and we want to make it easier for the reader if he or she would want to go back and look for a certain manager's opinion.

#### 4.1.1 Hälsokliniken – Health consultant

Ann Rullander is an assistant nurse, certified massage therapist, certified wellness therapist, certified individual functional trainer and a group-training instructor. She has worked with health promotion since 2003 and has a 20 year background at an Emergency department. She started her health consultant career as a masseur for an organization where she noticed that many people had problems and pain. This was a contributing effect to why she introduced training. *“I believe that training gives a person more than the massage does. Imagine a door that starts to squeak, for the same reason the hinges of that door needs oil to make the door work well again, the joints of our bodies need movements to work well. The human bodies are made for movements and therefore an office environment can be seen as an unnatural way of life.”* Rullander has her own company, *Hälsokliniken*, where she works as a consultant.

*“It is obvious that companies should offer their employees health promotion, it is incredibly important and has always been. It is more than just maximize one hour during exercise. The everyday motion is very important, for example walking ten minutes every day. The body is*

*made for movements so health promotion is very important at office with office environment where people normally is very still.”*

Rullander take her work very serious and she does evaluations every year on the employees at the organizations she has contracts with. This is to see the result of the employees' feelings and thoughts. *“I can see an obvious effect. The employees are happier, more satisfied and more alert. If the employees work five minutes over time it is not a big deal because they feel that they get so much back from the company.”*

*“Health promotion also contributes to team feeling and coherence. They do some things in groups; they are having fun and get to know each other in a different way. Sometimes we do things together as coffee breaks, lecture about food, walks, visits to the bath house. It could be anything that has to do with health.”*

Rullander believes that the use of health promotion, especially wellness hours should be scheduled before lunch or right before one is finished for the day. This will increase the possibility for employees to use it. She explains that when there is much to do the health promotion sometimes gets cancelled. She does not agree that it is the best way of handling it but she finds it hard to find another solution. *“It is the business that controls the health promotion. That is why it is important for the employees to use it when they have the possibility.”* Rullander tries to find solutions to everything: *“Those days when it is busy for them at work I take my list with the people who would have had a wellness hour that day and I draw a lot. The person I draw gets to do an activity with me. Sometimes I can walk around at the workplace and examine the ergonomics or practice Chi gong with those who want to join. Those times when there is much to do for several weeks I have mental training in a conference room in relation to the lunch break. I am working after how the building is doing”*

Rullander can also see the connection with the employees' work and her work. If there is much to do for the employees she will also have a lot to do after and during this period. *“It is arriving as a letter on the mailbox. The personnel get stressed, feel unwell and have pains.”*



According to Rullander there is too little research around health promotion. No one can for examples prove that health promotion contribute to increased work motivation. Another problematic thing is the difficultness to examine if sick leaves and health promotion has a connection. You need a lot of permissions to find out why someone is sick. If someone for example is home because of hi or her appendicitis it has nothing to do with health promotion.

Rullander explains the importance of the management groups' participation: *"it is a core key for the health promotion to function."* She does not want to work with a company if she does not have the employers' support. *"There is no point if the employers do not participate. Because the employees need to feel that it is okay to exercise during work even if there sometimes is a lot to do. If they do not feel that they have support from the employers they will not participate."*

#### 4.1.2 Organization 1 - E.on client support Sollefteå

**Considerations around healthy workplaces:** Elin Timander considers a healthy workplace a place where managers take responsibility and inspire employees to take care of their health. The managers should give their support in the ways they can and Timander consider the offer of health promotion to be one way. Since a sedentary job is not healthy she consider good working environment important. *"There should be good equipment that simplifies work, for example height-adjustable desks, carpets adapted for long time standing, special chairs, scroll mouses for the computers and ergonomic programs in the computers that tells you when and how you should move and stretch your body."* The social factors Timander also considered important for the working environment. *"We offer social breaks like breakfast in the mornings, planned Friday snacks and fruits. We let our employees have a big impact on their own schedules and holidays and the workplace has been smoke-free from June 2010."*

**Type of offered health promotion:** Wellness allowance of 3000 SEK per person and year. The employees have access to a webpage called "Plusvalet" where they can see the different fitness centers that accept their wellness allowance. They can also use their wellness allowance on massage, but only on half of the sum, or they can use it on help to quit smoking, help to quit using snuff, on sleeping classes, stress management, grief counseling or on chiropractors. All their alternatives they can find on the webpage "Plusvalet". In addition to

the wellness allowance they can use 2000 SEK on dental care or eyeglasses. The employees also have free health care and doctor visits and they are offered a cost ceiling on medication.

The organization gives their employees 30 minutes wellness time a week during working hours. If the employees chose to have a whole wellness hour they have to shorten their working hours that week with 30 minutes. To ensure that this benefit is used in a proper way the wellness time is organized by a health consultant. If there is a lot to do on the workplace the employees sometimes are not allowed to use their wellness time but mostly there are not any problems. Only a few meters from the hallway they have a wellness board where the employees write their names under the headline of the organized activity they would like to participate in. If they wish they can choose to attend to other activities then group training since the health consultant also organizes classes of relaxation, mental training and massage.

The organization also organizes other activities around work to inspire the employees. Activities like small competitions and lectures treating health. Excursions to different fitness centers are offered once a year so the employees get a chance to try new activities. They get one hour wellness time for free during working hours that day. *“The ones who have not exercised before or the ones who have had a negative attitude towards training can be inspired during this time and finally buy a member card on a fitness center.”*

**People that can use the benefits of the organization’s health promotion:** All the Client counselors can use both the wellness allowance and the wellness hour while the managers only can use the allowance. The managers are allowed to go to the organized health promotion hours but they then have to shorten their working hours.

**The leaders’ personal thoughts around health promotion:** Timander consider health promotion to be very important and she is passionate about it. *“I think that health promotion can give one a lot of energy and make one perform better at work.”* Even if the managers do not get the 30 minutes wellness time she goes on the organized activities anyway. *“It is perfect to be able to exercise at work during the day when you are alert. The ones who have kids at home maybe not have the time to exercise during the evenings.”*

**When the organization started to offer health promotion:** They started with the organized wellness hours in 2002. Before that one wellness hour per week was offered but they wanted it more organized. Timander believe that they might have been affected of The Swedish Social Insurance Agency`s new rules 1992.

**Why the organization has chosen to offer its employees health promotion:** An active choice to create wellness among the employees and that is why the organization keeps offering it.

**Effects that the health promotion brings:** Timander consider the effects to be: more energy, alertness, effeteness at work and higher loyalty towards the employer who is investing in one's health.

**Changes among the employees' health after they are introduced to health promotion:** *“Among the employees who have not exercised so much before I can see changes and the employees themselves say that their results depend on their training.”* Timander notice when it has gone a long time since some of the employees exercised. Regarding sick leaves they do not see any connections to the use of health promotion but spontaneously Timander feels that the ones who use it are healthier.

**Follow ups treating the health promotion:** A health consultant hands out surveys containing the same questions every year to make it possible to see changes. The compiled survey answers are discussed during a management meeting where they can see how many of the employees who have participated in the activities. Regarding the wellness allowance the managers do not know which of the employees who use it or on what activity they use it on, neither how often the employees go to an activity. If an employee is sick more than four times in twelve months the organization do a follow up by arranging a consulting time.

**Actions concerning the ones that do not use the health promotion benefit:** According to Timander there are the ones who do not exercise that you want to reach out to. The organization has a health promotion group that consists of one person from each department

and these persons often arrange things like competitions to inspire the employees. Every season they organize competitions between the different departments and if an employee gets another one to go to the organized activities, a person who usually does not go, the employee gets a cinema ticket. Nobody force anyone to do something they do not want to.

#### 4.1.3 Organization 2 - Telecom company

**Considerations around healthy workplaces:** Göran Rönnerberg believes that healthy workplaces is where the employees feel good and have work assignments that are meaningful. He considers the social aspects to be of importance and the employees should feel good even outside work. To achieve a good working climate he has let his employees choose where and how they want to sit at the office. Rönnerberg himself is placed among his employees. *“I think it is a good thing because I am around where everything is happening and I believe that the employees also think that it is good.”* On the workplace they have height-adjustable desks. Rönnerberg believes that is an important equipment to have since they are sitting down a lot.

**Type of offered health promotion:** Wellness allowance of maximum 2000 SEK per person and year. They can use the allowance on training cards at any fitness center they like and the employees will get compensation against the receipt but only for 75 % of the total sum. The organization also has some agreements where the employees get discounts. The employees can get a compensation of 1000 SEK a year to use on massage. On eight occasions each year they have the opportunity to get subsidized massage on the workplace where the employer pays almost 50 percent of the price. They get a compensation of 2000 SEK if they need help with weight loss and they are also offered help if they want to quit smoking. If the employees manage to quit they can get a compensation of maximum 2000 SEK. The total compensation is therefore up to 7000 SEK.

The organization offers gyms in its own buildings which all the employees can visit during every hour of the day. On Rönnerberg's workplace his employees have the possibility to take one hour on their lunch or in the afternoon to go training as long as they work up for the lost time later. *“That makes it easier for the employees to feel that they got the time to train, especially when it is such a big number of employees that are parents of young children.”* Rönnerberg thinks that this possibility is good for the social interaction within the workgroup.

**People that can use the benefits of the organization's health promotion:** All the employees can use the offered health promotion as long as they are members in TIF (the organization's own sport club). This is a requirement because of the insurance's validity and it cost the employees between 150-200 SEK a year.

**The leaders' personal thoughts around health promotion:** *"The health promotion forms many parts. Partly it is physical, to feel good, have a weight you can handle, to have alcohol- and tobacco habits you can handle and to feel good in other aspects of life. You should not have too much work but it can be as stressful if you have too little, it is a delicate balance. There are many parts that need to interact and we try to see to all the parts. The social aspect and the coherence are also very important within health promotion and for a person's wellbeing"* Rönnerberg actively try to inspire others to go training and exercise. He is a member in TIF and he exercise during lunch break almost every day. He wants the employees to prioritize training and health because he gets so much back when the employees are healthy.

**When the organization started to offer health promotion:** As long as Rönnerberg has worked for the organization, 24 years, health promotion has been offered through TIF and through the organization's own gyms. For about 10-15 years ago they added the 2000 SEK of wellness allowance.

**Why the organization have chosen to offer its employees health promotion:** *"It is always cheaper for the employer in the long run to have healthy employees. It has been said that 1 invested crown will give 5 crowns back when it comes to health. The money is well invested and employees that feel good perform better."*

**Effects that the health promotion brings:** They have in generally very few sick leaves and Rönnerberg is convinced that there is a connection to training. *"The better you feel physically, the healthier you are"*.

**Changes among the employees' health after they are introduced to health promotion:** Rönnerberg knows that there are less smokers at the organization nowadays but on his department there have never been any. They also talk more about health and diets.

**Follow ups treating the health promotion:** *“Follow ups were more common before, now it has come to be quite expensive.”* It is the manager's responsibility to take the initiative to arrange for a follow up if some of the employees have been sick a lot during the year.

**Actions concerning the ones that do not use the health promotion benefit:** *“I do not force anyone to exercise but I am trying to affect them by training a lot myself and have a dialog about health promotion so everyone feel that they are involved.”* Rönnerberg has seen that more and more chose to start training because of the dialogues, it then comes naturally. The organization has every one or two years, its own Swedish Champion competition for the organizations of each city and everyone can participate. That is something that attracts people even if they have not exercised before. The competition is a variety of different sports. Other examples are small events that can be subsidized through TIF. Rönnerberg says that thanks to some of these events, people that have never exercised before choose to join and start training.

#### 4.1.4 Organization 3 - IT consulting company

**Considerations around healthy workplaces:** The HR-manager thinks that the workplace should be suitable for the employees when it comes to lightness, chairs, tables, etc. She also considers the social factors to be of importance, for example common lunch- and coffee breaks. *“Help should be offered through company health care when the employees are not feeling well and the company should be there and facilitate during difficult circumstances.”*

**Type of offered health promotion:** Wellness allowance of 3000 SEK per person and year. Agreements made with many fitness centers so the employees have the opportunity to choose. The organization pays for group events like floor hockey and spinning, half the sum is paid for massage and chiropractic. They also pay for the employees' psychologists if it is needed.

**People that can use the benefits of the organization's health promotion:** Everyone is offered the health promotion and on the same conditions.

**The leader's personal thoughts around health promotion:** *"It does not only have to do with exercise for your body. It has been realized that it has to do with stress as well, the work speed - one should have the energy to perform. It is nowadays more common with psychic problems rather than mouse arm. Personally I achieve improved condition and feel better in my mind using this benefit."*

**When the organization started to offer health promotion:**

It has been offered since the HR-manager started at the organization in 1999 but she believes that it has been offered before that as well. GDM was founded in 1992.

**Why the organization has chosen to offer its employees health promotion:** The organization wants to prevent burn outs and long term sick leaves. *"The costs are one thing but the most important factor is the health, the employees should feel good at work."*

**Effects that the health promotion brings:** Very few sick leaves, a low employee turnover and the fact that they basically never have sick leaves on long term.

**Changes among the employees' health after they are introduced to health promotion:** The sick leaves remains on a low level and they have very few smokers.

**Follow ups treating the health promotion:** They do not do follow ups. The organization has many young employees and it is noticeable that they work out. *"We have confidence in our employees"*. Right now half of the staff uses the wellness allowance but it is increasing. It is around 75 % who use the health promotion if visits to the naturopath, etc. are included.

**Actions concerning the ones that do not use the health promotion benefit:** A lot of competitions are arranged that the employees are encouraged to participate in. They do not actively try to influence the employees but they help them if the employees want them to. The HR-manager does not notice any difference between those who use the health promotion and

those who are not. *“According to the Swedish tax agency's requirements the company is not allowed to offer health promotion when it comes to golf etc. Therefore it is hard to not know if the ones who are not using our offered health promotion are working out in their spare-time or not.”* They also talk a lot about training at the workplace and she hopes that those discussions are encouraging the employees in some way.

#### 4.1.5 Organization 4 - Tax office

**Considerations around healthy workplaces:** Jessica Strömmberg considers a good environment is where everyone feels good. It can be different things that have an impact for example coffee breaks and health promotion. You should not yearn away from the work. The organization is working to improve the working environment constantly. It is something that is being discussed during office meeting and section meeting. *“Is is everyone's responsibility to keep a good office environment, both employers and employees.”* She also thinks the ergonomics aspects are important for example height-adjustable desks, special chairs, keyboard where the mouse trapper is placed in the center so you have the arms in front of you.

**Type of offered health promotion:** Wellness allowance up to 3000 SEK per person and year but the organization only pays 75 %. The reason why the organization pays 75 % is because they want the employees to want to keep a good health. The employees also have one wellness hour a week. If they chose activities with a charge they have to pay for it themselves. On the office they are only a few smokers but there is opportunity to get help, stop smoking package.

*“Every six months our office has a half day of wellness activities during working hour. The employees still gets their salary and the company is the one who pays for the day.”* The office has a health promotion group, four employees, who work to make activities and schedule for the wellness days.

**People that can use the benefits of the organization's health promotion:** Everyone in the organization is offered the health promotion. The only difference is that the 3000 crowns decrease to 1500 if an employee is employed six months for example.



**The leaders' personal thoughts around health promotion:** Strömmberg consider health promotion as very important and are happy that they can offer it to their employees. She thinks it is sad that those who really need it may not use it. Everyone does not use the wellness allowance either. She believes that the employees are healthier and more alert when using the health promotion. A benefit for the organization is that there are fewer sick leaves. *"It is important that the training does not go too far, against anorexia. It has to be on a reasonable level and as a manager I am responsible of the employees. If a leader see that someone is going in a wrong direction she or he has the responsibility to help that person."*

**When the organization started to offer health promotion:** The organization started to offer their employees health promotion during the 90's, but she do not know exactly when.

**Why the organization has chosen to offer its employees health promotion:** *"We consider it very important and as well do our employees. Nowadays centers that offer fitness and wellness are very expensive and everyone can not afford that and we think everyone should have the possibility to keep a good health and therefore we are happy to give them the opportunity. We are a big organization and the little office in Sollefteå does not have authority to give the employees more allowance than the head office allow. Therefore we try to organize internal activities such as competitions, health days, power walking etc."*

**Effects that the health promotion brings:** With no before and after statistic, she felt that she could not give us a subjective answer. In generally she considers that the employees have a better work attitude and the employees have explained themselves that they feel better.

**Changes among the employees' health after they are introduced to health promotion:** With no statistic of before and after she could not answer this properly. Although she explained that the organization have now and then personal meetings with the employees and those who before did not exercised but now have started explains that they feel more alert, feel better and have more energy to do things.

**Follow ups treating the health promotion:** They count how many wellness hours that have been used per week. They also do calculations on how much money that has gone to wellness allowances. Normally it is hard to do follow ups on people who use the 3000 allowance on gym card after working hour because it is hard to follow if the person use it or not. But when they have to pay 25 % themselves the organization has confidence in the employees, that they have considered how often they will use it before buying it, shared responsibility.

**Actions concerning the ones that do not use the health promotion benefit:** They are trying to reach them through staff appraisal, not every month but as a leader you should bring it up, why they do not use it and try to help them.

## 4.2 Quantitative result

The respondents' thoughts when it comes to health promotion on workplaces with office environment are presented in this part of our empirical material. Our survey consisted of thirteen closed questions and from the given answers from the employees of the four studied organizations we have put together a resume of our survey answers.

*Table 4.1 The quantity of respondents in percentage depending on gender and age*

	<b>Organization 1 (E.on)</b>	<b>Organization 2 (Telecom Company)</b>	<b>Organization 3 (IT consultant Company)</b>	<b>Organization 4 (Tax Office)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Gender:					
<b>Women</b>	75,75 %	22,73 %	12,5 %	75 %	49,19 %
<b>Men</b>	24,25 %	77,27 %	87,5 %	25 %	50,81 %
Age:					
<b>18-30</b>	14,93 %	0 %	27,08 %	11,76 %	12,55 %
<b>31-43</b>	58,21 %	37,5 %	52,09 %	48,53 %	48,99 %
<b>44-55</b>	25,37 %	56,25 %	18,75 %	30,88 %	33,60 %
<b>56-67</b>	1,49 %	6,25 %	2,08 %	8,83 %	4,86 %

*Table 4.2 Activities the respondents use within the offered health promotion, quantity in numbers of persons (some of the respondents use more than one activity)*

	<b>Organization 1 (E.on)</b>	<b>Organization 2 (Telecom Company)</b>	<b>Organization 3 (IT consultant Company)</b>	<b>Organization 4 (Tax Office)</b>
<b>Physical activities</b>	61	45	32	60
<b>Massage</b>	44	26	10	21
<b>Mental training</b>	6	0	4	1
<b>Help programs (ex. quit smoking)</b>	0	1	0	0
<b>Other activities</b>	2	2	2	7
<b>Non</b>	1	14	14	3

**How big influence the respondents think health promotion has on their health.**

In Organization 1 (E.on) 70,2 % of the respondents think that the health promotion has a big or very big effect on their health. Only 9 % consider that the health promotion has little or very little effect on them. In Organization 2 (Telecom Company) 70,8 % of the respondents think that the offered health promotion have a big or very big effect on their health. 12,3 % consider that it has little or very little effect on them. In Organization 3 (IT consultant Company) 68,2 % of the respondents think that health promotion have a big or very big effect on their health. 13,6 % consider it to have a little or very little effect on the health. In Organization 4 (Tax office) the percentage is a little bit lower compared to the other organizations, 58,8 % think that health promotion have a big or very big effect on their health. Although there is 29,4 % who think it has an average effect. 11,8 % consider that it has little or very little effect.

**How often the respondents use their offered health promotion (both physical and mental activities through wellness allowance and wellness hours).**

In Organization 1 (E.on) 82,1 % of the respondents use health promotion 1-2 or 3-4 times a month. Only 1,5 % never use it and 9 % use it more than one time every week. In Organization 2 (Telecom Company) we can distinguish two extremes. Of the respondents 44,6 % choose to use the health promotion more than one time a week while 21,5 % never use it. In Organization 3 (IT consultant Company) 33,3 % never use the offered health promotion and 12,5 % only use it one time a month or less. In the same time 41,7 % use it more than one time a week. In Organization 4 (Tax Office) 55,4 % of the respondents use health promotion 3-4 times a month and only 1,5 % never use it while as many as 20 % use it more than one time a week. In the four organizations all together they are only 7,75 % of the respondent who use health promotion less than one time a month and 13 % of the respondents never use it.

**To what extent is the work motivation affected by how the respondents feel?**

41,6 % of all the organizations' respondents think that their working motivation very much depends on how well they are feeling and 46,5 % think it is depending much on that. There is only 0,4 % that do not think the working motivation depends on how she or he is feeling.

**To what extent do the respondents feel that the following factors contribute to their motivation at work?**

74,6 % of all the respondents feel much or very much motivated based on the salary level. Only 0,4 % get very little motivation from this hygiene factor while nobody has answered very little on the items working environment and current wellbeing which are also hygiene factors. 83,9 % of the respondents feel that they get much or very much motivation from good working environment. 90 % feel that their current wellbeing is much or very much motivating them. Regarding the motivation factors: opportunity to develop, responsibility and appreciation from the management group they all in general have high percentage in the alternatives much and very much. Table 4.3 shows the results in average value.

*Table 4.3 To which level the respondents feel that the following factors contribute to their motivation at work, quantity of respondents based on the average value on a scale one to five.*

	<b>Organization 1 (E.on)</b>	<b>Organization 2 (Telecom Company)</b>	<b>Organization 3 (IT consultant Comany)</b>	<b>Organization 4 (Tax Office)</b>
<b>Salary level</b>	4,03	3,85	3,92	4,01
<b>Opportunity to develop</b>	3,8	4,38	4,33	4,07
<b>Working environment</b>	4,15	4,12	3,96	4,18
<b>Responsibility</b>	3,67	3,86	3,89	3,93
<b>Your current wellbeing</b>	4,3	4,47	4,33	4,28
<b>Appreciation from the management group</b>	3,89	4,14	4	3,9

*Table 4.4 To what extent the respondents think that the health promotion helps them with the following factors, quantity of respondents in percentage.*

	<b>Very little</b>	<b>Little</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Much</b>	<b>Very much</b>
<b>Feel healthier</b>	5,4 %	7,4 %	19 %	43 %	25,2 %
<b>Be more effective at work</b>	5,7 %	8,6 %	27 %	43 %	15,7 %
<b>Increase your physical stamina</b>	6,2 %	7 %	19,1%	38,4 %	29,3%
<b>Increase your mental energy</b>	5,4 %	8,3 %	22 %	42,7 %	21,6%
<b>Handle stress better</b>	6,2 %	14,5 %	28,6 %	34,9%	15,8 %
<b>Develop positive values</b>	8,7 %	11,6 %	32,2%	34,7 %	12,8 %
<b>Create stronger relations to colleagues</b>	9,9 %	18,2 %	36 %	22,7 %	13,2 %
<b>Feeling happiness and having fun at the workplace</b>	7,5 %	10,8 %	29 %	35,7 %	17 %
<b>Feel better at work</b>	7,9 %	10,4 %	26,7 %	37,1%	17,9%
<b>Achieving better self esteem</b>	9,2 %	10,9 %	26 %	37,2 %	16,7 %

### **Do the respondents experience that their employers care about their health?**

In this question we compiled all four organizations together and got the following results:

- Very little: 4,51 %
- Little: 12,29 %
- Average: 33,61 %
- Much: 39,75 %
- Very much: 9,84 %

**How big influence the respondents think a manager's attitudes towards health and his or her participation in health promoting activities have on the personnel.**

3,25 % answered that those factors had a very little influence on them, 8,94 % answered a little, 28,05 % answered an average level of influence, 41,87 % answered a big influence and 17,89 % answered that the factors have a very big influence on them.

**To what extent the respondents recognized themselves in the following phrase: "Sometimes I wonder why I even work?"**

There are one or two employees on each organization that can recognize themselves in the phrase. The majority, 75 %, of all employees in all four companies together answered that they to a little or very little level recognize themselves in this phrase.

**The importance of an organization's focus on health regarding whether to stay on the workplace or not, according to the respondents.**

The importance is on a medium level according to the majority of the respondents. The only big difference between the four organizations was that the answers from E.on, which offers organized health promotion, indicated that a bigger group of employees saw the focus on health as important and a smaller group considered it to be of little importance. On the other organizations it was the opposite, many employees believed it was of little importance and few employees consider it to be very important.

**The money that the organization spends on health promotion, would the respondents rather get that money as a salary bonus?**

Altogether 74,8 % of the respondents would not change health promotion for extra salary. The majority in all the four organizations clearly preferred health promotion.

## 5. Analysis

In this chapter we analyze our empirical material with help from our theoretical framework and we make connections between the two chapters. We will first present the connection between all the different parts of our analysis. The structure of this chapter is formed after the different parts of our theoretical framework except from the part that treats leadership orientation in firms. We have chosen to not let that part have its own heading since we consider that leadership has its influence on all the other parts. For example; if the managers show a good leadership the employees could also feel more motivated. Leadership will be analyzed in all the parts of this chapter. Every part has a connection to health promotion in the workplace whether there are factors that affect it such as national regulations, rules and laws or leadership, or factors that are to be seen as outcomes such as health or motivation. In the part “National regulations, rules and laws” we describe three external factors, all regulated by the government. They will indirect have an impact on motivation and health since they control and regulate what kind of health promotion organizations should and can offer their employees. They all concern all kinds of organizations and are important to consider. Regarding the outcomes we see a connection between health and motivation since if the health promotion leads to improved health it could in its turn lead to increased motivation. The aim is to open up managers’ eyes to the relevance of health promotion and how important it is for the organization and the employees.

### 5.1 Health promotion in the workplace

Health promotion is a well invested concept for organizations. The business economist Staffan Lundström assume that one invested crown in health promotion will give you five crowns back (Angelöw 2002). This speaks for the organizations’ advantages but in our research we have found it to be very important for the employees as well. In our survey a total of 74,8 % respondents would not change health promotion for extra salary. The majority in all the four organizations clearly preferred health promotion.

Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004) mention that many people associate health promotion with only physical activities. Generally it might be true but in our interviews all of the managers explained health promotion as both a physical, social and mental factor, the same description



as in theory. It seems like managers at organizations have good knowledge about the subject and its benefits. If we also look to the employees, we can see that 67,7 % of the respondents in our survey think that their physical stamina increases much or very much by using the health promotion and 64,3 % think that their mental energy improves much or very much. Generally it is more tangible to see the effects of one's own physical stamina rather than the mental mind but here we can see that almost every one of them associate health promotion with mental results as well. Interpreting the survey answers we can see that mostly the employees use their offered health promotion on physical activities but some of them also use it on massage. In two of the organizations more than 20 % of the respondents indicate that they are not taking any benefit at all of the health promotion. On the same organizations more than 40 % of the respondents use the health promotion more than one time a week so we could say that those organizations have two extremes. The organization who has organized health promotion has the most average results of the four of them when it comes to how often the respondents take benefit of it.

Rydqvist & Winroth (2003) explains the effects health promotion can have on individual-, group- and organizational level. On a group level health promotion can lead to increased coherence which in turn leads to a better psychosocial climate. Ann Rullander, the health consult, also states that health promotion contributes to team feeling and coherence. In our interviews managers mentioned how important health promotion is for the group and to increase the feeling of coherence. They refer to social and spiritual aspects and believe these are important for the working environment. They did not talk much about the benefits for the organization; they talked more about the employees' health. Although some of them mentioned that the health promotion increases the employees effectiveness and according to Rydqvist & Winroth, (2003) effectiveness it is a benefit for the whole organization.

In the declaration of Luxembourg the ENWHP states that in order to form a good working health promotion, organizations should be able to fulfill eight special guidelines. Analyzing the answers given by the four managers we realized that all four of them have the similar opinions about health promotion as the ENWHP has. The managers gave the impression of that their organizations see the employees as more than just cost factors and that they have cultures and management principles that include encouragements to participation in organized

activities and open discussions around health. According to the ENWHP the balance of the workload and the caring organization are of importance. The department manager at the telecom company states: *“you should not have too much work but it can be as stressful if you have too little, it is a delicate balance. There are many parts that need to interact.”* According to him the organization tries to see these different parts and he also mentioned the big importance of social factors at work. All the four workplaces seem to place great emphasis on health and they see to that the employees can take part of discussions about the subject. Three of the four managers have told us that they have a special health promotion group on the organization that arranges health promotion events. The two managers that we interviewed in person have also told us that to make sure that the employees stay healthy they do follow ups on the employees if they are not feeling well or have been sick several times during a year. They do this to prevent long term sick leaves and high turnovers among the employees. All these things are of importance according to the ENWHP so according to our gathered information the organizations would not have any problems signing its document.

## **5.2 National regulations, rules and laws**

We have introduced three external factors that can constitute some of the reasons to why organizations choose to offer their employees health promotion. The presented external factors are The Swedish Social Insurance Agency, The Swedish Tax Agency and The Working Environment Act. There might be more factors that have an influence on the choice whether to offer health promotion or not but we have shaded a light on the factors that we consider being the most relevant. According to the rules The Swedish Tax Agency has enacted, health promotion has some restrictions that needs to be followed for it to be tax free. We can see that the organizations make sure that they follow these rules. An assumption that can be made is that the offered health promotion does not only have to do with the employees' health but also with the costs for the organization and the positive effects it brings. Even if the managers in general do not give us the feeling that they in first hand think about the benefits for the organization when they offer health promotion, they of course do and need to do that. The managers should promote health, make the business effective and be able to generate profit (Ljusenius & Rydqvist, 2004). Many of the managers we interviewed mentioned different effects that the organization gets back from the employees who are using the health promotion and they also had thoughts about the costs.

To make sure that the offered health promotion gives the effects one is after we thought that it would be of importance for the organizations to do follow ups on the health promotion's effects, also on how the employees choose to use the health promotion. According to The Swedish Tax Agency the employers should be able to follow up on how the health promotion has preceded, but what types of follow ups are preferred? According to our interviews, the organizations can easily see how many of the employees that are using the wellness allowance but on what they use it and how often they go to the activities that the organization have paid for are more difficult to see. It is expensive to do these types of follow ups and the managers say that they have confidence in their employees and that they are using the wellness allowance in the right way. They are only 7,75 % of the respondent who claim to use the health promotion less than one time a month, the remaining use it more often except the 13 % who never use it. Maybe that justifies the managers' right to have confidence in their employees. If we look at the follow ups in two perspectives we believe that if managers do not do follow ups and controls on their employees it could have a positive effect as well. According to Ann Rullander many employees will not participate if they do not feel that they have the support from their managers. We do believe that follow ups are of importance but if there are not any follow ups the employees might feel that their managers trust them and that they have their support.

We asked the managers when the health promotion was introduced in their organization but none of them could say for sure. Therefore it is hard to connect the introduction of health promotion to the year 1992, which is the year The Swedish Social Insurance Agency changed the rules about payment for the ones who are sick. Although many of the managers thought that the wellness allowance's introductions happened in the 90's and that it could have had something to do with the rule change. We had hoped to see a connection here and we still think that it might be one. To investigate this further would require a much wider study, including many more organizations and access to the organizations' archives. For now we have no further facts that are strong enough to establish this.

In The Working Environment Act there are laws that treat the manager's responsibility to prevent unhealthiness and accidents in the workplace. There are also rules about collaboration

between the employer and the employee (Arbetsmiljöverket, 2013). One of the managers considers a healthy workplace a place where the employer takes responsibility and inspires the employees to take care of their health. Another manager express herself as followed: *"It is important that the training does not go too far, against anorexia. It has to be on a reasonable level and as a manager I am responsible of the employees. If a leader see that someone is going in a wrong direction she or he has the responsibility to help that person."* Generally all of them give the impression that they consider the manager responsible for the employees' health. According to the compiled survey answers from our studied organizations 16,8 % of the respondents experience that their employers care to a little or very little level about their health, 33,6 % answered to an average level and as much as 49,6 % of the respondents think that their employers care much or very much about their health. The respondents were not united in their answers concerning which level they think their employers care about their health. We will see in the next paragraph that the employees on the other hand do consider the manager's attitude as important and that it has a big influence on the personnel. If more of the employees had answered that their managers cares about their health very much, it would have been more harmonized.

In an office environment the manager most likely is the prime environment factor according to Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004). The manager should be seen as a creator of opportunities and form a positive factor that helps the employees to develop motivation, competence and well being. According to The Working Environment Act the managers should work to achieve a good working environment. The working environment includes all factors and conditions at work; technical, physical, organization of work, social and the work content. All of the managers we interviewed mentioned while they were talking about working environment that they consider the ergonomics as very important since they have a work where they have little body movement. As we already mentioned the social aspects as well as the work content are important factors according to the managers. To achieve manageable work content we consider that the development of competence among the employees is of importance. In the same time it is important that the managers are aware of how big the employees' workload is. When it comes to developing wellbeing it seems to us that the managers put a great effort to make this possible. By encouraging the employees and maintaining a good working environment the employers also helps the employees do develop motivation according to the

survey answers. 83,9 % feel much or very much motivated from the working environment. 76,9 % get much or very much motivated by encourage from their employer.

### 5.3 Health within workplaces

In our theoretical framework we have emphasized different perspectives and examples of health. Our survey showed that more than 50 % of the employees on each of the four organizations considered that the health promotion they are being offered has a big or a very big impact on their health. The survey also showed the importance of the connection between health and motivation. Almost 90 % of all the respondents consider that their working motivation depends much or even very much on how well they are feeling.

According to the respondents the majority thinks that the importance of an organization's health focus, regarding staying on the workplace or not, is on an average level. In only one of the four organizations they are more respondent who see the organization's health focus as much determinant, than they are seeing it as little determinant. It seems like organizations' health focus at least has some importance for the employees and the employers should enhance this fact. Health promotion is, according to Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004), a strategically important instrument in the HR-work. We agree with them that managers should use it as a tool and that health is to be seen as a resource. The survey answers tell us that the organization that put the most effort in organizing the health promotion also is the organization where the employees most value their workplace's focus on health. It then becomes obvious that the managers' efforts and attitudes when it comes to health do affect the employees. If workplaces' focus on health would increase, we think that more people would value the health factors in their choice of workplace. The organizations would then have to adapt and higher their focus on health.

According to Angelöw (2002) leaders need to have in mind that they are trendsetters and that they have the power to establish norms on the workplace. As they are often seen as role models it is important that they know how to make good examples and in this case their actions are more powerful than their words. To test if the employees see a managers influence regarding health, as big and important as Angelöw (2002) explains it to be, we let them give their opinions about how big influence they think a manager's attitudes towards health and his

or her participation in health promoting activities have on the personnel. 12 % answered that those factors have a little or very little influence on them, 28 % answered that they have an average level of influence, while as much as 60 % answered that those factors have a big or very big influence on them. The majority of the employees clearly think that the leaders do have influence on them when it comes to health. According to Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004) healthy leadership and investments in the employees lifestyles will appear as positive results for the organization. Organizations should keep their employees' surrounding environments in mind since health, effectively and profitability is each other's prerequisites. The employees' work happiness, wellbeing and participation will affect their competence, motivation and engagement. The managers clearly are important factors.

During our interviews three aspects of health were eagerly discussed. All the managers mentioned the importance of both physical-, mental- and social health in order for a workplace to be seen as healthy. The health consultant we interviewed also mentioned these three components and we have analyzed them further. In our survey we included questions about wellbeing to get the employees perspective on health and one these questions had a special connection to the sense of coherence, the spiritual health, which we also have analyzed further.

### **5.3.1 Physical-, mental- and social health**

The respondents got the opportunity to answer how much the offered health promotion helped them to feel stronger both in a physical- and in a mental way and also if it helped them to gain social health by creating stronger relations to colleagues. When it comes to the physical- and mental strength the majority of the respondents considered the health promotion much helpful while they thought that health promotion just helps them on an average level when it came to the social part. Ann Rullander states that "the human bodies are made for movements and therefore an office environment can be seen as an unnatural way of life". Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004) confirms this statement and add that if we do not have everyday exercises in our lives we will not feel well. According to them the modern society has made us physically inactive and it has become a risk for our health. All the managers agree that physical activity is of great importance and that health promotion helps the employees to achieve it.

When it comes to the mental health three of the four managers mentioned that it is important to prevent stress. According to Jackson & Carter (2002) it is not an option to decrease stress by lower the demands in today's world since it will not be economically profitable. In fact the mental unhealthiness cost about 70 billions of Swedish crowns yearly in a form of lost work effort and expenses (OECD - better policies for better lives, 2013). According to Jackson & Carter (2002) employees have to learn how to control their stress and pursuant to the answers we got from our surveys, health promotion do helps the most of the respondents to handle their stress in a better way.

When it comes to social health, three of the four managers mentioned the importance of good relations on the workplace and all four of them mentioned that the organizations arrange group activities. According to Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004) the lack of the earlier knit groups and the social worries that comes from our constantly changing everyday life leads to illness. Therefore we consider it important for the employers to make sure that their workplaces helps the employees to create strong bonds and good relations.

### 5.3.2 Antonovsky's SOC-model

To analyze the effects that the health promotion has on the employees' sense of coherence on the workplaces we use Antonovsky's SOC-model. In our survey we asked the respondents to which level the health promotion helps them to feel different things. The factors we asked them about are all connected to the employees' sense of manageability and meaningfulness according to the SOC-model. Regarding their manageability we asked to which level the health promotion helps them to feel healthier, be more effective at work, increase their physical stamina, increase their mental energy and handle stress in a better way. The majority of the respondents answered that the health promotion helps them a lot or very much to feel healthier and to increase their physical stamina. Regarding the questions if the health promotion helps them to be more effective at work and handle stress better the majority of the respondents answered that it helps them a lot or on an average level. The majority of the respondents also answered that health promotion increases their mental energy a lot. Regarding the respondents feelings of meaningfulness we asked to which level the health promotion helps them to develop positive values, create stronger relations to colleagues, feeling happiness and having fun at the workplace, feeling better at work and achieving better

self esteem. The majority of the respondents answered that the health promotion helps them a lot or to an average level with these five factors. Regarding the development of positive values the managers can help the employees developing these by being good role models and by giving acknowledgements that strengthen the employees (Anglöv, 2002).

Antonovsky's SOC-model also contains the feeling of comprehensibility. Hanson (2004) writes about how knowledge and feedback can higher the employees' feelings of comprehensibility on a workplace. In our interviews the managers told us that they talk a lot about health on their workplaces. We interpret this as one way to achieve comprehensibility. The employees receive knowledge about the offered health promotion and they also receive feedback from the managers and their colleagues discussing health.

Based on this information we do the interpretation that health promotion can lead to higher feelings of manageability and meaningfulness at work. We also think that the employees can achieve a higher feeling of comprehensibility through active discussions around health. If the employees have high values on these three components, manageability, meaningfulness and comprehensibility, they have a high sense of coherence according to Antonovsky (1991). By making sure that the employees have the opportunity to higher their SOC, the employers get personnel that easier and in a better way can manage to front complications in life and at work.

## 5.4 Motivation

Motivation has been a recurring subject for years and in courses within management at bachelor level motivation takes a significant part. It is a subject very hard to define and therefore hard to analyze. In the interview with Ann Rullander she explained that there is almost no one that makes researches about health promotion in organizations. No one can therefore prove for example that it contributes to increased motivation at work. According to Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004) you can create opportunities that satisfy needs or you can create unpleasantness. The motivation itself you find inside you and because of that it is complicated to keep this part of the analyze objective. In our case we consider the health promotion as one of the opportunities that can help the employees to satisfy their needs. At all the four studied



organizations health promotion is offered to one or another level. After studying the survey answers we consider that the employees in general seem motivated to work.

According to Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004) high motivation means that there are unsatisfied needs and strong emotions in movements. The needs can be of different importance to us, for example depending on age and sex, and they can both interact or work against each other with constant changing results. It is difficult to examine what each and every one of the personally has answered based on their gender. What we did was to compare the organizations to each other based on how many of the employees who are women respectively men. At organization 1 and 4 the majorities of the respondents are females, 75,75 % and 75 %. At organization 2 and 3 the majorities of the respondents are men, 77,27 % and 87,5 %. In our question treating what factors that make the respondents most motivated at work, all the organizations' results in average value have one thing in common and that is that the factor *current wellbeing* has the highest average level. Regarding the salary level in connection with motivation organization 1 and 4, with mostly female employees, have a higher average level than organization 2 and 3. We have our reasons to believe why the results show this but no theories that can support our thoughts. This would be interesting for further research (please see our conclusion). One other factor that distinguishes the organizations with majorities of women from the organizations with majorities of men is the answers regarding how strongly the opportunities to develop are connected to their motivation. The organizations with majorities of men has average values of 4,38 and 4,33 regarding this alternative, while the organizations with majorities of women has lower average values, 3,8 and 4,07. We agree with Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004) that the motivation, or with other words the needs, depend on different factors, for example gender in this example. Although we believe that this way of measuring differences in answers between men and women is not the most reliable way, it is still interesting that we can see small differences. When it comes to age we consider the spread too big for making an interesting analyze.

The empirical material has proved that motivation is not only an outcome of health promotion and wellbeing. It is also an important factor that managers need to learn to create, maintain and achieve among their employees. In our survey we wanted to see if the employees were motivated or not without asking them directly. We used a question which express a thought

we believe is very common to think now and then. We consider this thought to have a connection to if you are motivated or not. The question they answered was to which level, from very little to very much, they agree to the follow statement: "Sometimes I wonder why I even work?" The majority, 75 % of all respondents in all four organizations, together answered that they to a little or very little level recognize themselves in this phrase. According to Anglöv (2002) managers can help their employees to avoid asking themselves these types of questions. Managers can create motivation by showing appreciation that in its turn will strengthen the employees' self esteem and increase their understanding for how to contribute to development and success. This might be a method that the managers at our studied organizations have used since their employees seem motivated according to their answers.

In our interviews we asked the managers what kinds of actions they take to reach out to the employees who are not taking benefit of the offered health promotion. According to Ljusenius & Rydqvist (2004) the ones who are most difficult to reach are also the ones who are in the biggest need of changing their lifestyles. They write that a manager's personal leadership and competence of using health promoting tools becomes central factors in this case. Our interviewed managers all agreed on that it is hard to reach out to not participating employees; they never force anyone to do something they do not want to. They try to encourage the employees through dialogs but also through showing good examples and participate in activities that are good for health themselves. Health promoting tools that they use are for instance competitions within the organization and group activities.

#### **5.4.1 Herzberg's two factor theory**

When we formed our survey we created one question in a way so that we later could figure out what kinds of factors that make the employees motivated based on Herzberg's two factor theory. To measure to which level the respondents feel that different factors contribute to their motivation at work we used six alternatives of answers, three that matches Herzberg's hygiene factors and three that matches his motivation factors. The motivation factors are; opportunity to develop, responsibility and appreciation from the management group. The hygiene factors are; salary level, working environment, your current well being. According to Herzberg people get motivated from the motivation factors and the hygiene factors will just

make you less satisfied if they are not fulfilled and they do not get you more motivated if they would increase. But after we had compiled all the organizations answered we discovered that they do not harmonize with Herzberg's theory. Regarding the hygiene factors 74,6 % of all the respondents feel much or very much motivated based on the salary level. Only 0,4 %, that in this case represent one person of all four different organizations, get very little motivation from the salary level. Working environment also have a high percentage, 83,9 % feel that they get much or very much motivation from good working environment. The third hygiene factor, their current wellbeing, has the highest percentage of them all since 90 % of the respondents answered very much or much. The motivation factors also have a high percentage of employees that chose the alternatives much and very much. The interesting part is though that the hygiene factors have very high motivation effect on the employees. The hygiene factors are according to Herzberg required to keep the employees satisfied but they do not motivate them further. Their current wellbeing seems to be one of the most important factors that have an influence on their motivation with the highest average value, which speaks for the importance of health promotion as a motivation factor. Worth mentioning is that our survey question, "To which level are following factors contributing to your motivation on work?" could have made the respondent interpret it in a different way. We see the possibility that they might have chosen the factors they considered being the most important for them on the workplace and not the factors that motivate them most. We never mentioned in the question that the respondents should see all the factors as already existent on a basic level.

## 6. Conclusion

The aim with this thesis was to accomplish our purpose by examine three research questions. Our first research question embraced what attitudes the managers and employees have regarding health promotion programs. Doing this study have given us the feeling that both employees and managers consider health promotion as something very important and as one part in the creating of a good working environment. The health consultant, together with the managers and the employees, give us no doubt that they consider that health promotion should be an obvious part to for an organization to include. The answers given by the health consultant feels very reliable and actual due to this.

The second research question we examined was if health promotion programs contribute to a better cohesion, motivation and health at work. Based on the answers we have received and the analysis we have done we now feel convinced when we states that health promotion both contributes to better cohesion, motivation and health on the workplace. We do however strongly believe that further research is required to strengthen and prove this. We will probably see an even greater extension and wideness of health promotion if stronger proof is presented. Hopefully this will also come to prove that better offered health promotion results in more effective employees, less sick leaves and therefore; profitability to the companies.

The third research question treated how much managers' attitudes towards health promotion affect and influence their employees. Managers in general should reflect over what kind of signals they send out to their employees. They might think that it is enough to pay for the employees' health promotion but clearly it has to do with a lot more than money. The respondents made it very clear in the surveys that they think managers' attitudes towards health promotion have a very big impact on employees. Still 50 % of the respondents got the feeling that their own manager only care about their health to an average level or less. The employees would probably participate more often if they felt a 100 % support from the managers. The health promotion would then be more successful.

Regarding the two theories that we have used in our analysis of this study we are now critical to Herzberg's two factor theory. We agree with some criticism towards the theory since our results did not support it to 100 %. Even if some of the respondents might have interpreted the

question in the wrong way we do believe that most of them understood it as were intended. Regarding Antonovsky's SOC-model we consider it applicable not only on the workplaces in general but also on health promotion itself, to measure its effects.

## **6.1 Practical implications**

Our thesis will hopefully give organizations and managers a general description of the subject and show them the importance of health promotion and employees' health. We believe it could influence organizations to more carefully consider, all from the managers attitudes, to the offering of the best alternatives within health promotion. We want to inspire organizations that need employer branding. Health promotion could be one way to attract people. We do believe that organizations that want to achieve less sick leaves also could be inspired from our study. If we look at a even more wider perspective this study might not only be helpful for organizations but also for the society. To achieve less social costs for the society it could be of interest to change or add some regulations, rules and laws. We strongly believe that the thesis is a well created base for further researches.

## **6.2 Future research**

According to the health consult Ann Rullander there have not been many researches done within health promotion, therefore it is hard to tell by numbers if health promotion is profitable and if it really does increase the employees' motivation. It is a subject that we consider very relevant for further research. We could see in the surveys that the answers differed a bit, based on if the organizations had a majority of men or women. The organization with mostly women answered with a higher average value that salary level is an important motivation factor compared to what the organizations with mostly men answered. We did an assumption that it might be because of women's, in general, lower salary compared to men's (Statistiska centralbyrån, 2012). We do not have any facts to ascertain our suspicions but to consider that different factors could motivate women and men in different ways might be of importance for an eventual future research. A deeper investigation to see if there are any important differences between the attitudes of men and women regarding health promotion might be of interest. A deeper investigation regarding age could also be relevant for a further study. The demands could differ depending on gender and age and therefore these two factors

might be important to take into account when designing a health promotion program for an organization.

In our problem discussion we present three articles about a debate, regarding the increased sick leaves due to mental unhealthiness, between the social insurance minister Ulf Kristersson and the journalist Monica Armini. It is good that the subject is being discussed and that people want to find a solution of the problem. Although we believe that neither Kristersson nor Armini, properly define the problem of the high level of sick leaves caused by mental unhealthiness. Albert Einstein once said *“If I had 60 minutes to solve a problem I would spend 55 minutes defining it and 5 minutes solving it”*. We consider this quote as very relevant. Kristersson believe that the solution to the problem with those who are mentally ill is to force them to work while Armini speaks in favor of rehabilitation as a solution for the same problem. We do not share their solutions. We have spent a long time discussing the problem and put a lot of effort to understand the relevance of health promotion. If we want to solve the problem of the increased mental unhealthiness we need to find a way to prevent it. Not find a way to only manage the problem. If the government invest the same money, time and energy they put on trying to manage the problem, on trying to find a solution to prevent the problem, we strongly believe that the mental unhealthiness will decrease. One solution to start with could in our meaning be health promotion. It might not be the only way but one of them. According to our interviews, survey and gathered facts the employees, the managers as well as scientific articles and books strengthen that health promotion contributes to a better mental health. Regarding the mental health the managers mentioned that it is important to prevent stress and that is exactly what we believe is the right solution. Further research in how to define the problem with mental unhealthiness is strongly recommended to find a long term solution. Could health promotion be one of the solutions or is the solution to design the offered health promotion so it focuses more on mental health? Something that is relevantly new is something called FAR in Sweden. It is physical activities on prescription instead of medicine (FAR, 2013). Could one solution be to, instead of giving a person a certificate for sick leave because of mental unhealthiness, give out a prescription for health promotion, similar to FAR, but focused on mental health?

To attract more employees to use health promotion one suggestion is to make it wider and to offer more activities as golf and climbing but still let it be tax free. Activities that today do not count as lighter versions. Another suggestion that is easier to achieve from the organizations perspectives is to organize the health promotion in a better way. To make it as a natural part in the employees daily lives. It would make it easier for the organization to attract as many as possible if they were able to offer their employees a wide variety of health promotion and still get it tax free. It could be of interest to invest if this is something that could be achievable and executable. In future researches one could investigate if more companies would introduce health promotion if the activities that for now do not count to lighter versions also were included in the tax-free version of health promotion? Would even more employees participate if they could choose between more activities? A so called individual adapted health promotion program.

If the health promotion improves and the use of it expands, we believe that motivation will increase and sick leaves decrease in proportion to higher levels of physical-, mental-, social- and spiritual health. In the same time increased motivation and less sick leaves will prevent unnecessary costs for organizations, it will also gain money to the society and it will come to healthier and happier habitants. A macro-oriented study that includes hundreds of companies might be something for further studies, to look into the effect of health promotion on employees' health in general? Politicians should improve the health system and aim for the wellbeing of the society. We believe that health promotion is and will be proved to be a part of a long term sustainable enterprise.

## Bibliography

### Literature

Abrahamsson, Bengt & Andersen, Jon Aarum (2005). Organisation: att beskriva och förstå organisationer. 4., utök. och [rev.] uppl. Malmö: Liber

Abrahamsson, Kenneth (red.) (2003). *Friskfaktorer i arbetslivet*. 1. uppl. Stockholm: Prent

Andersson, Gunnar, Johrén, Anders & Malmgren, Sture (2004). *Effektiv friskvård, lönsammare företag*. 3., [rev.] uppl. Stockholm: Prent

Andersen, Ib (1998). Den uppenbara verkligheten: val av samhällsvetenskaplig metod. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Angelöw, Bosse (2002). *Friskare arbetsplatser: att utveckla en attraktiv, hälsosam och välfungerande arbetsplats*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Antonovsky, Aaron (1991). *Hälsans mysterium*. Stockholm: Natur och kultur

Brulin, Göran & Nilsson, Tommy (1997). *Läran om arbetets ekonomi: om utveckling av arbete och produktion*. 2., omarb. och utök. uppl. Stockholm: Rabén Prisma

Bryman, Alan (2011). *Samhällsvetenskapliga metoder*. 2., [rev.] uppl. Malmö: Liber

Dibble, Suzanne (1999). *Keeping your valuable employees: retention strategies for your organization's most important resource*. New York: Wiley

Hanson, Anders (2004). *Hälsopromotion i arbetslivet*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Herzberg, Frederick (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Company



Jackson, Norman & Carter, Pippa (2002). *Organisationsbeteende i nytt perspektiv*. 1. uppl. Malmö: Liber ekonomi

Jacobsen, Dag Ingvar (2002). *Vad, hur och varför: om metodval i företagsekonomi och andra samhällsvetenskapliga ämnen*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Janlert, Urban (2000). *Folkhälsovetenskapligt lexikon*. Stockholm: Natur och kultur i samarbete med Folkhälsoinstitutet

Jönsson, Sten & Strannegård, Lars (2009). *Ledarskapsboken*. 1:3 uppl. Malmö: Liber

Ljusenius, Tommy & Rydqvist, Lars-Göran (2004). *Friskt ledarskap: lönar sig*. 2. uppl. Stockholm: Prevent

Rydqvist, Lars-Göran & Winroth, Jan (2003). *Idrott, friskvård, hälsa & hälsopromotion*. [Ny, rev. utg.] Farsta: SISU idrottsböcker ; Malmö

Røvik, Kjell Arne (2008). *Managementsamhället: trender och idéer på 2000-talet*. 1. uppl. Malmö: Liber

Tebelius, Ulla & Patel, Runa (red.) (1987). *Grundbok i forskningsmetodik: kvalitativt och kvantitativt*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

### Scientific articles

Eriksson, Monica & Lindström, Bengt (2006). 'Antonovsky's sense of coherence scale and the relation with health: a systematic review', *J Epidemiol Community Health*, Volume 60, Issue 5, pp. 376-381. Viewed: <http://jech.bmj.com/content/60/5/376.full#xref-ref-90-1> (2013-05-06)

Furnham, Adrian, Forde, Liam & Ferrari, Kirsti (1999). 'Personality and work motivation', *Personality and Individual Differences*, Volume 26, Issue 6, pp. 1035–1043. Viewed: [http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1016/S0191-8869\(98\)00202-5](http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00202-5) (2013-05-06)

Geyer, Siegfried (1997). 'Some conceptual considerations on the sense of coherence', *Social Science & Medicine*, Volume 44, Issue 12, pp. 1771-1779. Viewed: [http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1016/S0277-9536\(96\)00286-9](http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1016/S0277-9536(96)00286-9) (2013-05-06)

Ginn, Gregory & Henry, Jean (2003). 'Wellness Programs in the Context of Strategic Human Resource Management', *Hospital Topics*, Volume 81, Issue 1, pp. 23-28. Viewed: <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=10846279&site=ehost-live> (2013-03-20)

## Webb

Arbetsgivarverket, 2002, Stockholm: Lön och förmåner vid sjukfrånvaro. Viewed: <http://www.arbetsgivarverket.se/upload/Avtal-Skrifter/Lon.pdf> (2013-03-04)

Arbetsmiljöverket, 2013, Stockholm: Effekter av långvarigt sittastillande. Viewed: <http://www.av.se/teman/datorarbete/risker/stillasittande/> (2013-04-10)

Arbetsmiljöverket, 2013, Stockholm: Lag och rätt. Viewed: <http://www.av.se/lagochratt/aml/index.aspx?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1> (2013-03-15)

Arbetsmiljöverket, 2013, Stockholm: Risker vid långvarig inaktivitet. Viewed: <http://www.av.se/teman/datorarbete/risker/stillasittande/inaktivitet.aspx> (2013-04-10)

Armini, Monica (2013). 'Monica Armini: Rehabilitering är vad som behövs – inte arbete', *Aftonbladet*. Viewed: <http://www.aftonbladet.se/debatt/article16784782.ab> (2013-05-16)

Carlsson, Annika (2013). 'Psykiskt sjuka kan ordinerats att gå till jobbet', *Dagens Nyheter*. Viewed: <http://www.dn.se/nyheter/sverige/psykiskt-sjuka-kan-ordineras-att-ga-till-jobbet>

(2013-05-17)

European Network For Workplace Health Promotion, 2007, Vision and Mission. Viewed:  
<http://www.enwhp.org/the-enwhp/vision-mission.html> (2013-05-13)

European Network For Workplace Health Promotion, 2007, Luxembourg Declaration on  
Workplace Health Promotion in the European Union. Viewed:  
[http://www.enwhp.org/fileadmin/rs-dokumente/dateien/Luxembourg\\_Declaration.pdf](http://www.enwhp.org/fileadmin/rs-dokumente/dateien/Luxembourg_Declaration.pdf) (2013-  
05-13)

FAR, 2013. Viewed: [http://www.varguiden.se/Tema/Halsa/Motion-och-rorelse/FaR---  
fysisk-aktivitet-pa-recept/](http://www.varguiden.se/Tema/Halsa/Motion-och-rorelse/FaR---fysisk-aktivitet-pa-recept/) (2013-06-04)

Försäkringskassan, 2013, Fördjupning för arbetsgivare om sjuklön. Viewed:  
[http://www.forsakringskassan.se/wps/wcm/connect/d86fd2c4-7ff8-4ca4-b527-  
fc692e0786e7/fordjupning\\_arbetsgivare\\_om\\_sjuklon130201.pdf?MOD=AJPERES](http://www.forsakringskassan.se/wps/wcm/connect/d86fd2c4-7ff8-4ca4-b527-fc692e0786e7/fordjupning_arbetsgivare_om_sjuklon130201.pdf?MOD=AJPERES) (2013-02-  
28)

Nationalencyklopedin, 2010, Viewed: <http://www.ne.se/> (2013-06-04)

OECD - better policies for better lives, 2013, Sverige: Någotning måste göras åt den psykiska  
ohälsan för att förbättra förutsättningarna för svenska ungdomar att få jobb. Viewed:  
[http://www.oecd.org/els/emp/MHW\\_Sweden\\_PressReleaseSwedish.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/els/emp/MHW_Sweden_PressReleaseSwedish.pdf) (2013-05-17)

Skatteverket, 2013, Motion och annan friskvård. Viewed:  
[http://www.skatteverket.se/privat/skatter/arbeteinkomst/formaner/personalvard/motionannanfr  
iskvard.4.18e1b10334e8bc80004376.html](http://www.skatteverket.se/privat/skatter/arbeteinkomst/formaner/personalvard/motionannanfriskvard.4.18e1b10334e8bc80004376.html) (2013-03-20)

Statens beredning medicinsk utvärdering, 2007, Metoder för att främja fysisk aktivitet.  
Viewed: <http://www.sbu.se/sv/Publicerat/Gul/Metoder-for-att-framja-fysisk-aktivitet/> (2013-  
15-14)

Statistiska centralbyrån, 2012, Kvinnors lön i procent av mäns lön efter sektor 1992-2011.

Viewed: [http://www.scb.se/Pages/TableAndChart\\_149083.aspx](http://www.scb.se/Pages/TableAndChart_149083.aspx) (2013-05-28)

Swedin, Daniel (2013). 'Psyiskt sjuka ska spotta i nävarna', *Aftonbladet*. Viewed:

<http://www.aftonbladet.se/ledare/ledarkronika/danielswedin/article16786653.ab> (2013-05-16)

The Economist, Jan 4th 2007, New York: The wellness boom; Health consumerism. Viewed:

<http://www.economist.com/node/8492618> (2013-04-04)

World Health Organization, 2006, Geneva: Constitution of the World Health Organization.

Basic Documents, 45th edition. Viewed:

[http://www.who.int/governance/eb/who\\_constitution\\_en.pdf](http://www.who.int/governance/eb/who_constitution_en.pdf) (2013-05-08)

## Interview

Rullander, Ann (2013, April 2). Interview by J. Holmström [Tape recording]. The aspects of an assistant nurse, a group-training instructor, certified massage therapist, certified wellness therapist and certified individual functional trainer, Sollefteå.

## Other resource

Hansson, Lena (2013, April 4). Notes for a lecture. The Department of Business Administration, University of Gothenburg.

## Appendix 1

### A. Interview guides for the four managers

**\* The basic open question**

- Supplementary question if necessary

**\* What is a healthy workplace for you?**

- Describe hard factors as work assignment and soft factors as coffee breaks.
- Is there anything you believe could improve at the office?

**\* What type of health promotion programs do you offer your employees?**

**\* Is the offered health promotion something you offer all your employees regardless work position, part time employees, substitutes etc.?**

**\* What are your personal thoughts around health promotion?**

- What do you get out of it?

**\* When did your organization start to use health promotion?**

- Before or after 1992?

**\* Why have your organization chosen to offer your employees health promotion?**

**\* What types of effects do you believe health promotion brings and what type of effects have the organization had?**

**\* Can you see changes in the employees' health after the introduction of health promotion?**

- Changes in sick leaves, less smokers, etc.
- What do you believe it depends on?

**\* Do you do follow ups regarding the offered health promotion?**

- In numbers, how many that use it, etc.

**\* Those who do not use the offered health promotion, do you let them be or do you make an effort to reach out to them?**

- Are they offered something else?

- Do you notice differences between those who use health promotion and those who do not?

## **B. Interview guide for the health consultant**

\* How important do you think it is that a organization offer their employees health promotion?

\* Describe what kinds of effects you believe health care brings to the employees.

\* In what way should health promotion be constructed?

\* Describe your thoughts about the leaders influence.

## Appendix 2

### Survey

## *Health promotion within organizations with office environments*

We who have created this survey are Sanna and Josefin and we study on the University of Gothenburg at the School of Business, Economics and Law. The survey will be included in our thesis on C-level concerning health promotion on workplaces with office environments, in which we will analyze employees' thoughts and feelings towards health promotion.

In the survey you will be anonymous so you can feel that you can answer as honest as possible.

#### 1. Gender:

Woman  Man

#### 2. Age:

18-30  31-43  44-55  56-67

#### 3. Through what kind of activities do you use the health promotion (You can chose several)

- Physical activities
- Massage
- Mental training
- Help program (ex. quit smoking)
- Other activities

None

**4. How big influence do you think health promotion has on your health?**

- Very little
- Little
- Average
- Big
- Very big

**5. How often do you use the health promotion your organization is offering you? (The question concern both physical and mental activities through wellness allowance and wellness hours)**

- Never
- Less than 1 time a month
- 1-2 times a month
- 3-4 times a month
- More than 1 time a week

**6. To what extent is your work motivation affected by how you feel?**

- Very little
- Little
- Average
- Much
- Very much

**7. To what extent do the following factors contribute to your motivation at work?**



	Very little	Little	Average	Much	Very much
Salary level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunity to develop	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Working environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Responsibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your current wellbeing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Appreciation from the management group	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**8. To what extent do you believe that the health promotion has helped/helps you to:**

	Very little	Little	Average	Much	Very much
Feel healthier	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Be more effective at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase your physical stamina	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase your mental energy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Handle stress better	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop positive values	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Create stronger relations to colleagues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feeling happiness and having fun at the workplace	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feel better at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Achieving better self esteem

**9.** Do you experience that your employer cares about your health?

- Very little
- Little
- Average
- Much
- Very much

**10.** How big influence do you think a manager's attitudes towards health and his or her participation in health promoting activities have on the personnel.

- Very little
- Little
- Average
- Big
- Very big

**11.** To what extent do you recognize yourself in the following phrase: "Sometimes I wonder why I even work?"

- Very little
- Little
- Average
- Big
- Very big

**12.** Do you consider the organization's focus on health, for example by offering health promotion,

to be of importance in the choice of staying on the workplace or not?

- Very little
- Little
- Average
- Much
- Very much

**13.** The money the organization spends on health promotion; would you rather get that money as a salary bonus?

- Yes
- No

***Thank you for your participation!***

*Sanna & Josefin*

*University of Gothenburg, School of Business, Economics and Law*