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In April 2014, the Higher Education Leadership and Management Survey (HELMs) was sent to over 7,000 individuals in the UK who had previously had some involvement with the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. The survey was designed in collaboration with Ashridge Business School and the University of the West of England. This report is about Leadership and work-life balance and is one of four that analyse the data generated by HELMs.

Other major themes that emerged from the HELMs data set include what is expected from leadership, motivating and developing staff, and governance. These are covered by the other reports in this series which comprises:

- Leading higher education
- Motivating and developing leaders
- Leadership and work-life balance
- Governors' views of their institutions, leadership and governance

Sample and focus
This report provides an examination of the responses of the HELMs sub-sample of 848 staff working in UK higher education institutions (HEIs). It is dominated by senior staff and those in professional service roles, but it nonetheless broadly reflects the heterogeneity of the sector in terms of institutional type, job role, and demographic characteristics.

It focuses on respondents' perceptions of their work–life balance, including their workload, their ability to cope, and the availability of flexible working. It also examines key antecedents and consequences of work–life balance and proposes a series of recommendations based on the data.

Work–life balance in higher education
Analysis of the qualitative responses related to participants' perceptions of the barriers to their career progression revealed a number of key issues directly associated with work–life balance.

- The sheer volume of work required, particularly aspects associated with teaching and administrative tasks, was seen as an impediment to career progression.
- Issues of workload were closely associated with organisational culture, which was seen by some as ‘workaholic’, and to reward long hours. This was particularly problematic for those who worked part time.
- Many individuals struggled to balance their work commitments and career progression with their family lives. This involved the time demands of caring responsibilities and the fact that family responsibilities precluded geographical mobility.
Analysis of the quantitative responses also revealed evidence of high workloads and issues associated with work–life balance.

- The majority of respondents, and in particular academic leaders, reported frequently working long hours.
- The majority of respondents were unsatisfied with their work–life balance.
- There was a clearly evident gender difference, particularly for academics. Women were more likely to work longer hours, be unhappy with their work–life balance, and feel unable to cope.
- Access to flexible hours was generally high across participants, but this was not necessarily associated with better work–life balance or coping with stress.
- Academics, who were more likely to report flexibility in their hours, were also more likely to be dissatisfied with their work–life balance and were less likely to be able to cope.

Antecedents and consequence of work–life balance

- Analysis of the quantitative data revealed that staff dissatisfaction with work–life balance has clear consequences, in particular with an ability to cope with pressure and stress.
- Satisfaction with work–life balance was associated with greater institutional pride, a willingness to help contribute to institutional success, and a desire to continue working within the institution.
- Many of the key antecedents of work–life balance were under the control of leadership teams. The most obvious of these is workload (both in terms of hours work and work patterns), but work–life balance is also determined by their evaluations of leadership and the support and recognition they receive from leaders and colleagues.

Recommendations

- Time is the key determinant of work–life balance. Leadership teams should (a) monitor workloads, (b) implement fair and transparent workload management systems, (c) set clear and realistic targets, and (d) value output not time spent at work.
- While policies that are family-friendly are an excellent indicator of organisational support for staffs’ work–life balance, they should be utilised with caution. Leadership teams should (a) ensure that such policies don’t exacerbate workload, (b) be aware that such policies may blur the boundaries between work and life outside work, and (c) make policies available to all.
- Provide adequate reward and recognition so staff feel valued for the contribution they make.
- Instil a workplace culture that is supportive; one that does not promote long hours and that listens to staff.
- Ensure that equality and diversity initiatives are supported by top leadership teams.
INTRODUCTION

The Leadership Foundation commissioned the Higher Education Leadership and Management Survey (HELMs). The aims were to investigate current (and emerging) issues and challenges for leaders of higher education in the UK; build evidence to inform the development of the Foundation’s strategy, programmes and events; and create a baseline of information about the leaders whom we engage with and which could be followed up with further surveys.

The survey was designed in collaboration with Ashridge Business School and the University of the West of England. Given the slightly different leadership contexts for those employed by universities, university governors, students and those working in other higher education organisations, four survey questionnaires were designed with a combination of standard questions (drawn from the Ashridge Management Index) and specific questions tailored to the different groups of respondents. The survey included a number of closed questions (i.e., those that require respondents to use a specified response scale) about a broad range of topics related to leadership and management in higher education institutions. The survey additionally provided many opportunities for respondents to give explanations for their responses or to share related thoughts.

Between April and May 2014, the Leadership Foundation sent 7,375 emails to people who had engaged with the Foundation in some way over the previous 10 years with an invitation to visit the HELMs site and complete the survey. There were 848 responses to the institutional survey, 67 for the governors survey, 54 for the higher education agencies survey and one for the student survey. In total, then, the response rate was 13% (970 from 7,375). Ashridge Business School (the survey hosts) provided the raw survey data in SPSS. The in-depth analysis and production of this series of reports were undertaken by experts in leadership research and qualitative analysis (Kim Peters, Michelle Ryan and David Greatbatch).

More detail about the background to HELMs and the methods of the original survey can be found in Appendix A.
THIS REPORT: SAMPLE AND METHODOLOGY

Sample composition
This report provides an examination of the responses of the HELMs sub-sample of 848 staff working in UK HEIs. The sample is made up of participants from a variety of roles and levels of seniority across the sector, including academics, academic leaders and professional services staff. However, it is important to note that overall, due to the sampling approach, respondents were largely very senior individuals with extensive leadership experience in their institutions or in the sector more generally. Consequently, this sample is in a unique position to provide an understanding of leadership issues in higher education.

The demographics and characteristics of the sample are summarised in Appendix B. In summary, these demonstrate that the sample is weighted towards more senior (and older) staff and those who occupy professional service roles. Nonetheless, the sample broadly reflects the heterogeneity of the sector in terms of institutional type, job role and demographic characteristics.

In another report in the HELMs series\(^1\), the focus was on motivation in higher education. Here, an analysis of the qualitative responses revealed that work–life balance provides some participants with workplace motivation. In the responses to a question about what motivated them at work, work–life balance was clearly evident, for example: ‘The flexibility to work around my childcare and family commitments’ (Respondent 608) and from another participant ‘Balance of work and life’ (Respondent 314).

While work–life balance may be a motivator, poor work–life balance can also be seen as a barrier to career progression. Participants were asked to identify major blocks or barriers to their career development, and 631 individuals took up this opportunity. In the report on motivation\(^2\), initial thematic analysis revealed three inter-related barriers: workload, a lack of time and work–life balance.

Given that work–life balance plays an important role as both a motivator to those working in higher education, and as a potential barrier for those seeking to progress their careers, this report provides an in-depth examination of the data associated with work–life balance. More specifically, this report will provide (1) a more detailed thematic, qualitative analysis of the impact of work–life balance, (2) a quantitative exploration of the antecedents and consequences of work–life balance in the higher education sector, and (3) some initial recommendations for how leaders may facilitate a better work–life balance for their staff.

An overview of the questions that are included in this analysis is provided below.

\(^1\) Peters & Ryan (2015)
\(^2\) ibid
Measuring work–life balance in higher education

In the HELMs 2014 questionnaire there was a direct measure of work–life balance:

- **Satisfaction with work–life balance:** ‘I am satisfied with my current work–life balance.’

There were also two additional items that were closely related to work–life balance, those that focused on work time:

- **Workload:** ‘I frequently work more than 48 hours per week.’
- **Availability of flexible working:** ‘My institution does not allow me to work flexible hours (ie, to have some say in the days/times I work).’

For each statement, participants were asked to respond using a four-point scale (where 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree).

Measuring antecedents to work–life balance

In addition to the questions related to time, on the basis of the literature and prior research, five groups of variables were identified as possible antecedents of work–life balance: (1) immediate leadership, (2) support, (3) recognition, (4) role attributes, and (5) valuing diversity.

**Immediate leadership**

We included the following four questions where participants were asked about their immediate supervisor or line manager:

- **Positive environment:** ‘Creates a positive work environment for me and my team.’
- **Lack of voice:** ‘Does not listen to the views of staff.’
- **Lack of recognition:** ‘Does not value my contribution.’
- **Empowerment:** ‘Makes me feel empowered.’

For each statement, participants were asked to respond using a five-point scale (where 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=don’t know, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree).

**Support**

We included the following three questions where participants were asked about the support they received:

- **Immediate supervisor support:** ‘My immediate supervisor/line manager is supportive.’
- **Professional service support:** ‘I feel well supported by professional services colleagues in my institution.’
- **Academic support:** ‘I feel well supported by academic colleagues in my institution.’

For each statement, participants were asked to respond using a five-point scale (where 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=don’t know, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree).
**Reward**

We included the following two questions where participants were asked about how they were rewarded for their work:

- *Fair pay:* ‘I am not paid fairly for the work I do.’
- *Reward:* ‘I am rewarded when I perform particularly well.’

For each statement, participants were asked to respond using a four-point scale (where 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree).

**Role attributes**

We included the following two questions where participants were asked about the attributes of their role:

- *Role clarity:* ‘I do not understand how my role contributes to the institution’s goals and objectives.’
- *Job security:* ‘I am confident my current role is secure for the immediate future.’

For role clarity, participants were asked to respond using a five-point scale (where 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=don’t know, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree).

For job security, participants were asked to respond using a four-point scale (where 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree).

**Valuing diversity**

We included the following four questions where participants were asked about diversity practices:

- *Institutional support for diversity:* ‘I believe my institution is effectively managing its equality and diversity policies.’
- *Gender balance:* ‘It is harder for women to succeed in my institution compared to their male colleagues.’
- *Senior leadership support for diversity:* ‘Leadership and management at my institution take diversity and equality into account when appointing, recruiting or promoting members of the team.’
- *Immediate leader's support for diversity:* ‘My immediate supervisor takes diversity and equality into account when appointing, recruiting or promoting members of the team.’

For each statement, participants were asked to respond using a five-point scale (where 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=don’t know, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree).
Analytic approach

Missing response rates for closed questions were very small (typically fewer than 3% of respondents). Therefore, all respondents were retained in the analysis. Appendix C contains the descriptive statistics for all closed questions relevant to this report. Group differences (in terms of demographic characteristics, job roles and institutional tenure) were explored for all closed questions but are only reported where patterns of interest emerged (ie, where results were significant and meaningful).

Levels of engagement with free response questions were generally very high (typically between one-third and two-thirds of the sample). Responses were subject to thematic content analysis; the major themes are described in this report. In most cases, themes are illustrated with three representative quotes, except where this introduced redundancy or where more were required to convey the breadth of the theme.
We will begin with a brief summary of the research into work–life balance and how it relates to higher education more particularly.

The importance of work–life balance

We define work–life balance as an individual’s ability to devote appropriate amounts of time and energy both to their work and to their life outside work. What is appropriate will depend very much on the individual, the demands on their time, and their attitudes and values. Indeed, the balance in favour of work or life outside work may change over time and indeed from day to day.

Across all sectors, work–life balance has become a key strategic organisational focus for HR professionals and leadership teams. Its growing importance is due to a number of key influences. The shifting demographics of the workplace throw up a number of factors. More women are entering and remaining in the workplace while still taking primary responsibility for childcare, and an ageing population necessitates greater caring responsibilities for elderly relatives. Such caring patterns put time pressures on employees, and necessitate family-friendly policies (such as part-time work, flexible working and job-share options) if organisations are to attract and retain staff members.

While issues of work–life balance are most often associated with family life, and in particular with childcare, this need not necessarily be the case, with an increasing number of individuals living outside traditional family units. Thus, work–life balance can be seen not just as juggling competing time constraints but also as an active, individual choice. Indeed, evidence demonstrates that as members of Generation Y enter the workforce and climb the career ladder, employees are increasingly viewing an ability to have a good work–life balance per se as a key determinant of employer choice.

Technological advances have also had an impact on work–life balance. In particular, as smartphones, virtual offices and video-conferencing allow many employees to work, handle emails and participate in meetings from any location at any time of the day, the boundaries between work and life outside work may become blurred.

Work–life balance in higher education

Work–life balance has been identified as a key workplace issue for staff in HEIs. Research has demonstrated that increasing demands in higher education, such as rising staff–student ratios, reductions in government funding, growing student fees, a need for improved responsiveness to student needs, greater accountability and more pressure to publish and conduct impactful research, all contribute to increased staff workload.

This increased workload, in conjunction with technological advances that encourage and facilitate after-hours work, and decreases in autonomy all contribute to perceptions of relatively poor work–life balance within HEIs.
Consequences of work–life balance

Across sectors, employee perceptions of work–life balance have been shown to be associated with a number of key workplace outcomes. Perhaps most obviously, satisfaction with work–life balance is positively associated with job satisfaction\(^\text{13}\) and employee commitment to the organisation\(^\text{14}\), and negatively associated with intentions to leave the organisation\(^\text{15}\).

But it isn't just workplace attitudes that are affected by work–life balance. A meta-analysis with a combined sample size of over 32,000 participants revealed that employees’ perceptions of work–life conflict (the opposite of work–life balance) were negatively associated with their workplace performance (as rated by both employees themselves and their managers), employee seniority and salary\(^\text{16}\).

Moreover, employee perceptions of poor work–life balance are associated with perceptions of self-reported levels of stress and burnout\(^\text{17}\), as well as with more objective health measures\(^\text{18}\).

Antecedents of work–life balance

Given the prevalence of poor work–life balance in the higher education sector and the demonstrated consequences of poor work–life balance, it is important to understand the antecedents of work–life balance, so that leaders and HR professionals can develop policy and practices to facilitate employees' ability to achieve an appropriate work–life balance.

Across the literature, the majority of research into the antecedents of work–life balance concentrates on issues of time. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the number of hours worked is negatively associated with work–life balance\(^\text{19}\), although this can be alleviated by allowing employees to have personal control over their time, work schedules and workplace flexibility\(^\text{20}\).

Organisational culture and workplace demands have also been shown to be associated with work–life balance\(^\text{21}\). These cultural factors are closely related to time; for example, a ‘long-hours’ culture is typically associated with perceptions of poor work–life balance\(^\text{22}\).

Work–life balance has also been associated with a number of individual personality variables. For example, research has demonstrated that those individuals who are ‘workaholic’\(^\text{23}\) or ‘neurotic’\(^\text{24}\) are likely to perceive a poorer work–life balance, whereas those who are conscientious tend to perceive a better work–life balance\(^\text{25}\). Other work has focused on sociological or demographic predictors of work–life balance, and it is generally shown that women, older employees and those with more children\(^\text{26}\) tend to take on a disproportionate level of responsibility in the home and thus have greater time constraints outside work.

While most of these variables are associated with time, more recent work has demonstrated that issues of belongingness and perceptions of leadership also have a role to play in perceptions of work–life balance\(^\text{27}\). More specifically, where staff feel a sense of inclusion and identity within the organisation and where they expect to succeed in future, they will also have more positive views of their work–life balance.

\(^{12}\) Saltzstein, Ting & Saltzstein (2001); Shockley & Singla (2011)
\(^{13}\) McNall et al (2009)
\(^{14}\) Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne (2012)
\(^{15}\) Hoobler, Hu & Wilson (2013)
\(^{16}\) Hobson et al (2001)
\(^{17}\) van Steenbergen & Ellemers (2009)
\(^{18}\) Keeton, Fenner, Johnson & Hayward (2007); White, Hill, McGovern, Mills & Smeaton (2003)
\(^{19}\) Felstead, Jewson, Phil Zacklea & Walters (2002); Tausig & Fennwick (2001)
\(^{20}\) Bond (2004); Guest (2001)
\(^{21}\) Lewis (2001)
\(^{22}\) Bonebright, Clay & Ankenmann (2000)
\(^{23}\) Wayne, Musica & Fleeson (2004)
\(^{25}\) See, for example, Crompton & Lynette (2006).
\(^{26}\) Ryan, Peters, Rink & Stoker (2014)
Summary

Drawing the literature together, it is clear that work–life balance is an important workplace issue across all sectors. For higher education in particular, due to specific pressures and modes of working, the work–life balance of staff should be a key concern for leadership teams. Work–life balance most obviously impacts on job satisfaction, but it also has an effect on broader motivational and attitudinal aspects of work, and on actual staff performance. Moreover, it has been shown to have a direct impact on staff perceptions of their own stress and burnout and on their actual physical health. These are all factors that are of great importance to leadership teams if they want to attract and retain motivated and productive staff.

Importantly, many of the identified antecedents of a positive work–life balance are readily influenced by leadership teams. While commitments outside work, personality and demographic variables may be beyond the gift of leaders, issues of workload and time management, organisational culture and inclusion may all be shaped by leaders.
MEASURING CONSEQUENCES OF WORK–LIFE BALANCE

On the basis of the literature and prior research, five items were identified as possible consequences of work–life balance:

- **Coping:** ‘I cannot cope with the pressures and stress of my work.’
- **Pride:** ‘I am proud to work for my institution.’
- **Recommendation:** ‘I would recommend my institution to others as a good place to work.’
- **Motivation:** ‘I am personally motivated to help my institution succeed.’
- **Intentions to stay:** ‘I would like to still be working at my institution in two years’ time.’

For each statement, participants were asked to respond using a four-point scale (where 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree).
FINDINGS

Work–life balance in higher education

In this section we examine the quantitative and qualitative HELMs data associated with work–life balance. We first examine the qualitative data produced by participants describing the barriers to their career progression. We then follow this with an analysis of the quantitative data in relation to work–life balance, and explore the possible consequences and antecedents associated with (dis)satisfaction with work–life balance.

Work–life balance as a barrier to progression

Participants were asked to identify major blocks or barriers to their career development, and 631 respondents provided qualitative responses to this question. In Peters and Ryan (2015), we identified three key barriers that were evident in participants’ responses: workload, lack of time and work–life balance. Here we explore these responses in further detail, and highlight four major, inter-related themes that emerge from the qualitative data, all associated with work–life balance: (1) perceptions of workload, (2) organisational culture, (3) family and personal constraints, and (4) personal choices around work–life balance.

Perceptions of workload

A consistent theme in the responses was the high levels of work participants were expected to undertake, with mention of ‘high workload’ (Respondent 671), ‘the amount of work’ (Respondent 835) and ‘work overload’ (Respondent 14) as barriers to career progression. Moreover, some participants indicated that the amount of work expected of them was impractical, with mention of the ‘unrealistic workload, particularly on the administrative side’ (Respondent 6), ‘having too much teaching and administration (although I’m my own worst enemy because I actually like teaching and administration)’ (Respondent 608), and ‘taking on too much’ (Respondent 69). Indeed, one participant noted that she didn’t think her career was progressing because she was ‘too busy getting things done’ (Respondent 758).

There were a number of explanations for work overload, including the comment ‘workload due to staff shortages and an increase in volume of work is a huge barrier and one which is not going away anytime soon’ (Respondent 455); ‘workload management’ (Respondent 258) was also identified.

Organisational culture

When noting the barriers to their careers, a number of participants mentioned the organisational culture. Of particular relevance to issues of work–life balance was ‘the workaholic culture in my department’ (Respondent 618) and the ‘perception of others that I have worked too long to merit further promotion, that is, promotion should be given only to those who progress fast. This unofficial culture works against those with family responsibilities’ (Respondent 697).
Leadership and work-life balance

There was also particular mention that organisational culture around part-time work in particular was a barrier to career advancement. One participant noted that ‘institutions reasons for limiting development hinge on the thinking that managerial roles cannot be undertaken by [part-time] staff’ (Respondent 106). Similarly, another participant said:

“I currently work part time… but there are hardly any opportunities for administrators at a management grade and you would be required to work more than full-time hours (evening and weekends)… I’d like to progress, but its not possible.” (Respondent 397)

Another example is: ‘I work part time and am not going to progress any further until I go full time’ (Respondent 803). Working part time was also associated with work overload: one participant noted that her barrier was ‘working part time and having to fit it all in’ (Respondent 274).

Family and personal constraints

When considering barriers to career progression, a significant number of participants identified issues around family and personal circumstances. One clear theme was around maternity career breaks, for example: ‘I’m planning to take a career break to have children… [there is a] lack of support available for that in my institution’ (Respondent 134). Similarly, Respondent 758 reported: ‘Being a woman, I would like to start a family and this will halt my career development’.

Perceptions of these barriers extended beyond the period of maternity leave. Such barriers included, for example, ‘having a family while also trying to climb the academic ladder’ (Respondent 388) and ‘the fact that I still have dependent children at home’ (Respondent 483).

However, it wasn’t just childcare that was an issue. Other personal circumstances were seen as career barriers, such as caring for elderly parents:

“...having to care for both my terminally ill parents… but mine were very dependent on me and I was perfectly happy to ‘coast’ for three years whilst I ensured each of them, in turn, had ‘a good death’.” (Respondent 608)

and living with health issues:

“...lack of capacity to take on even more additional hours of work for personal reasons… of health problems and disability.” (Respondent 750)

One of the most common themes to emerge was that family and personal commitments often precluded a geographical move to advance one’s career. For example, one participant identified his career barrier as follows: ‘I would need to move, which doesn’t fit the other things in life right now’ (Respondent 338), while another noted: ‘availability of opportunities in my local area – I don’t want to relocate as I have a young family so I am limited to opportunities within my current region’ (Respondent 208). Similarly:

“...there are NO opportunities to progress upwards in my institution and very limited lateral movement is possible for my specialist role now. To progress I would need to move my entire family somewhere else.” (Respondent 217)

and ‘four kids in local schools and the fact that I would like to stay in a research-intensive institution narrows the field of registrar opportunities’ (Respondent 367).
Personal choices around work–life balance

Individuals also acknowledged that their personal choices around work–life balance more generally had an impact on their career progression.

Some actively chose not to pursue the next stage of their careers, noting that they were unwilling to sacrifice family life for workplace promotion. For example:

“My major commitment is to my family and my career needs to accommodate that at the moment. I am not willing to give more to gain more until the children are older.” (Respondent 444)

“Would be potentially unwilling to progress to next level… with the associated increase in stress and adverse work–life balance implications this would bring.” (Respondent 261)

Other participants were content with where they were:

“My own internal barriers, ie, do I want to progress any further or am I content at the current level? I am increasingly aware of the benefits of work–life balance, so my development will depend on my decisions in the future.” (Respondent 135)

“Accepting that with two small children if I maintain my current work–life balance (which I feel is reasonable) I will not be promoted very quickly.” (Respondent 618)

Summary

Taken together, this thematic analysis of participants’ perceptions of the barriers to their career progression identified a number of issues closely associated with work–life balance and that echo those outlined in the literature more broadly.

For many respondents, the sheer amount of work required was seen as a barrier to career progression, with a particular focus on teaching and administrative tasks as an impediment. Issues of workload were closely associated with organisational culture, which was seen by some as ‘workaholic’. Workplace culture was seen to value and reward particular types of work and work patterns, and organisational culture was seen as particularly problematic for a number of respondents who worked part time.

It was clear that some people struggled to balance their work commitments and career progression with their lives outside work. The majority of these responses spoke directly about the role of family, either in terms of the way in which caring responsibilities and family life were not compatible with what was needed to progress in one’s career, or how the geographical mobility seen by some as necessary for career progression was not possible under some family circumstances. While some saw these limitations as being imposed on them, others were more accepting and saw work–life balance as an active personal choice.

Perceptions of work–life balance

Given that issues associated with work–life balance are clearly seen by some as a barrier to career progression, it is important to examine how our sample of respondents perceive their work–life balance. In this section we will examine (1) workload (in terms of frequently working more than 48 hours a week), (2) satisfaction with work–life balance, (3) availability of flexible working, and (4) ability to cope with stress and pressure. In this section we compare the data across job roles, distinguishing between those who defined themselves as (a) academics (but not academic leaders), (b) academic leaders, and (c) professional services staff (but not academics or academic leaders).
Workload

Overall, the data clearly indicates that the majority of participants (73.2% of men and 65.4% of women) frequently work more than 48 hours a week (Figure 1), well above the normal contracted working hours in higher education. Looking by job role, this was particularly true for academic women, where 85.7% reported frequently working long hours, and academic leaders. The frequency of long hours was less so for professional services staff and academic men, although it should be noted here that percentages here are quite high across the board.

Satisfaction with work–life balance

Given the frequency of these long hours, it is unsurprising that a significant proportion of participants were not satisfied with their work–life balance, indeed overall only 66.2% of men and 52.7% of women were satisfied with their work–life balance. Examining differences across gender and job roles revealed that female academics (36.7%) and female academic leaders (37.6%) were much less satisfied with their work–life balance than their male counterparts. Professional services staff, who were less likely to frequently work over 48 hour a week, were more likely to be satisfied with their work–life balance, and here the gender differences were much less apparent.
Availability of flexible working

Overall, only a small minority of participants (11.9% of men and 14.3% of women) agreed that their institution did not allow them to work flexible hours (i.e., to have some say in the days and/or times they worked). There were not large differences across job roles or gender (Figure 3).

Ability to cope

Although overall most participants were able to manage their workloads, a small but significant minority reported not being able to cope with the pressure and stress associated with their jobs (13% of men and 18.3% of women). There were not large differences across job roles, but it is interesting to note that female academics (30.6%) and female academic leaders (23.3%) were least able to cope (Figure 4).
Summary

Overall, there was again evidence of high workloads and issues associated with work–life balance. The majority of respondents reported frequently working long hours (especially academic leaders) and feeling dissatisfied with their work–life balance. There was a clearly evident gender difference, particularly for academics. Within this job role, women, compared to their male counterparts, were more likely to work longer hours, be unhappy with their work–life balance, and be unable to cope. Importantly, while access to flexible hours was generally high across participants, this was not necessarily associated with better work–life balance or coping with stress. Indeed, academics, who were more likely to report flexibility in their hours, were also more likely to not be satisfied with their work–life balance and were less likely to be able to cope.

Taken together, it is clear that issues of work–life balance play an important role for staff in higher education. The next steps are to examine the impact that dissatisfaction with work–life balance might have on staff.
FURTHER CONSEQUENCES OF WORK–LIFE BALANCE

Given that work–life balance seems to be an issue for the majority of respondents, it is important to understand the consequences of work–life balance on key workplace attitudes measured by HELMs. On the basis of past literature, in this section we look at the degree to which satisfaction with work–life balance is correlated with five key items: (1) Coping with stress, (2) institutional pride, (3) recommending the institution, (4) motivation to help institution succeed, and (5) intentions to stay.

Table 3 describes the bivariate correlations between work–life balance and these key consequence variables. Means and standard deviations for these variables can be seen in Appendix C. While some mean differences were visible across job families and gender, correlational analysis did not reveal meaningful significance in relationships between these variables, thus correlations are only reported from across the sample as a whole.

Table 1 indicates that participants' satisfaction with their work–life balance is significantly and moderately correlated with key consequence factors identified in the literature. There is a strong and negative correlation between perceptions of work–life balance and an inability to cope with pressure and stress. However, more satisfaction with work–life balance was also associated with greater pride in the institution and, relatedly, a willingness to recommend the institution to others. Participants' greater satisfaction with work–life balance also fuelled their willingness to help contribute to their institution's success and their intentions to remain with the institution over the next two years.
Antecedents of work–life balance

Given the prevalence of dissatisfaction with work–life balance and the clear consequences this may have for stress, institutional pride and commitment, it is important to understand the antecedents of work–life balance on key workplace attitudes measured by HELMs. On the basis of past literature, in this section we look at the degree to which satisfaction with work–life balance is correlated with six key sets of variables: (1) time, (2) immediate leader evaluations, (3) support, (4) recognition and value, (5) role attributes, and (6) equality and diversity practices.

In Table 2, we report the bivariate correlations between work–life balance and these key antecedent variables. Means and standard deviations for these variables are available in Appendix C. While some mean differences were visible across job families and gender, correlational analysis did not reveal meaningful significant in relationships between these variables, so correlations are only reported across the entire sample.

Table 2: Antecedents: bivariate correlations with satisfaction with work–life balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently work &gt;48 hours a week</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution does not allow flexible hours</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides positive work environment</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not listen to views of staff</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not value my contribution</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes me feel empowered</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From professional services</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From academic colleagues</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From immediate supervisor</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership does not listen to views</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarded for performance</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not paid fairly</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of role clarity</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution manages diversity effectively</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder for women to succeed</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior leaders take diversity into account</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate leader takes diversity into account</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 indicates that the key antecedent items identified in the literature are significantly and meaningfully associated with participants' satisfaction with their work–life balance. As expected, there is a strong negative correlation between both workload and the lack of flexibility with participants' satisfaction with work–life balance.

However, beyond issues of time, the analysis also reveals that participants' beliefs about the organisation and about their roles also have a clear impact on satisfaction with work–life balance. Of particular note, participants' evaluations of the immediate supervisor or line manager have a clear role to play in work–life balance issues, particularly an immediate leader’s ability to provide a positive work environment and empower his or her staff.

Support and recognition also played a key role. In particular, support from personal services staff and from immediate supervisors and line managers was associated with satisfaction with work–life balance. Appropriate recognition and reward also facilitated satisfaction with work–life balance, as did job security.

Finally, participants' perceptions of equality and diversity practices were also an important predictor of work–life balance, particularly at an institutional level.

The above correlational analysis examines each relationship between an antecedent and work–life balance in isolation. In order to achieve a more nuanced look at the antecedents to work–life balance and to allow us to gain an understanding of the relative importance of each of these variables, we conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis.

This analysis revealed that time played the most significant role in predicting work–life balance, both in terms of the frequency of working more than 48 hours a week ($\beta = -.35$, $p = .000$) and not being able to work flexibly ($\beta = -.09$, $p = .000$). Together these time variables accounted for 16% of the variance in satisfaction with work–life balance ($R^2 = 0.16$).

When the additional antecedent variables were examined, it was revealed that together they explained a significant additional 13% of the variance in satisfaction with work–life balance ($R^2$ change $= 0.13$, $p = .000$). When examined in combination with one another, the most significant antecedents of work–life balance were: immediate line manager providing a positive work environment ($\beta = .09$, $p = .05$), support from professional services staff ($\beta = .12$, $p = .001$), not being paid fairly ($\beta = -.08$, $p = .03$), leadership not listening to views ($\beta = -.09$, $p = .02$), and job security ($\beta = .10$, $p = .003$).

**Summary**

Taken together, it is clear that the quantitative data reveals that a large proportion of respondents experienced issues related to their work–life balance. Of particular note was the high proportion of academics and academic leaders who reported frequently working more than 48 hours a week, and the effect this had on satisfaction with work–life balance. This is of particular concern, given that work–life balance is clearly related to key workplace outcomes: coping with stress, motivation, institutional pride and turnover intentions.

Importantly though, there are clear antecedents to work–life balance than can be influenced by higher education leadership teams if they wish to improve staff work–life balance. Key here is the management of workload, but broader leadership practice is clearly also important, including creating a positive working environment and providing support and recognition to their staff. These implications, and the resulting recommendations, will be discussed in more detail in the next, and final, section.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings from HELMs outlined in this report have clear implications for the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education and for HEIs interested in supporting staff to have an appropriate balance between their lives at work and their lives outside work.

It is clear that a high proportion of staff have issues with work–life balance – a culture of long working hours is clearly evident, particularly for academics and academic leaders, and this translates to a significant number of academics and academic leaders reporting dissatisfaction with their current work–life balance. Specific work–life balance issues were identified for female academics and for part-time workers.

Importantly, staff dissatisfaction with work–life balance has clear consequences, in particular with their ability to cope with pressure and stress. More positively, satisfaction with work–life balance was also associated with greater institutional pride, a willingness to help contribute to institutional success, and a desire to continue working within the institution.

Given the importance of work–life balance for key organisational outcomes, it was useful to note that some of the key antecedents of work–life balance were under the control of leadership teams. The most obvious of these is workload (both in terms of hours worked and work patterns), but work–life balance is also determined by their evaluations of leadership and the support and recognition staff receive from leaders and colleagues.

Below we outline a number of initial recommendations for leadership teams looking to improve the work–life balance of their staff.

Key recommendations

1. Time is the key factor in determining satisfaction with work–life balance.
   - Monitor workloads across the organisation.
   - Implement a fair and equitable workload management system.
   - Set reasonable and clear targets.
   - Value and reward output, rather than time spent at work.
2. Family-friendly policies, such as wide availability of flexible working and part-time work, while an excellent indicator of organisational support for staff work–life balance, should be utilised with caution:

- Ensure that such policies don’t exacerbate workload.
- Be aware that such policies may blur the boundaries between work and life outside work.
- Make policies inclusive and available to those without families.

3. Provide adequate reward and recognition for outcomes so staff feel valued for the contribution they make.

4. Instil a supportive and positive work environment and workplace culture, one that does not promote a long-hours culture and that listens to staff.

5. Ensure that support for equality and diversity initiatives is visible at all levels of the organisation, particular in top leadership teams.
REFERENCES


APPENDIX 1: BACKGROUND TO HELMs

The Leadership Foundation commissioned a Higher Education Leadership and Management Survey (HELMs). The survey aims were as follows:

- **Discover the key current (and emerging) issues and challenges for leaders in higher education in the UK.**
- **Produce a report and analysis of findings which can help leaders and future leaders in UK higher education as they reflect on leadership, governance, management / strategic issues.**
- **Build evidence to inform the development of the Leadership Foundation’s strategy, programmes and events.**
- **Create a baseline of information about the leaders whom we engage with that can be followed up with future surveys (approximately every two years).**

**Methodological approach**

A project group was set up, comprising Helen Goreham and Dr Mark Pegg from the Leadership Foundation, Dr Fiona Dent and Viki Holton from Ashridge and Professor Richard Bolden of the University of the West of England. This group collaboratively designed, refined and published the survey as described below.

The questions from the 2013 Ashridge Management Index (AMI) were taken as the starting point for developing the new survey – it was decided that developing HELMs out of an existing, large-scale survey would allow some comparison between responses to HELMs and to the AMI, and encourage some to engage with leadership and management issues that are broader than the higher education context. The AMI questions were amended to take into account the different context of higher education, with some sections added and others removed or changed to ensure they were appropriate and relevant for those working in the higher education sector.

An ‘identifier’ question was placed at the beginning of the survey, which asked respondents to identify as ‘working in an HEI or higher education college’, being ‘a governor in an HEI’, ‘a student at an HEI’ or from ‘an HE agency or other organisation’. The Leadership Foundation was interested in the views of the different communities represented on its database about leadership and the culture within HEIs for example, but in terms of asking about line management, communication with the senior leadership team etc, some questions would need to be reworded if they were to be appropriate for these different groups. Hence, three shorter versions of the survey were created to ensure higher education governors, students and those working in higher education agencies had the opportunity to answer questions.
that were directly relevant to their roles. Those who identified as being employed within an HEI would be directed to the (main) institutional survey questions, and the others would be automatically linked through to the relevant sub-survey. A summary of the surveys created is as follows:

- **Institutional survey** – for those working in an institution in any role. The survey had eight sections, and took 15–20 minutes to complete. Sections titles were: Your role and responsibilities; Your views about higher education; Experiences within your own institution; Learning and development; Motivation; Developing future leaders; Personal and equal opportunities information; Project follow-on.

- **Governors survey** – for governors in HEIs comprised seven sections and took 10–15 minutes to complete. The section titles were the same as those for the institutional survey, except for the exclusion of Motivation. The questions remained the same where possible, although in some cases slight adjustments were made to ensure appropriateness and a number of questions were removed altogether.

- **Higher education agency or other organisation survey** – for those employed within agency bodies or institutions, or working in the higher education sector but not in an institution. This comprised eight sections, where Experiences within your own institution was replaced by Perspectives on leadership. Otherwise, the sections were the same as for the main survey (although questions differed slightly as with the other sub-surveys).

- **Survey for students** – for students currently based within an institution. The survey sections were the same as for the student survey and it took approximately 10 minutes to complete.

The first draft of each survey was uploaded to Qualtrics by the Ashridge team and sent to a pilot group. The group included 20 individuals representing a range of different UK HEIs, academic and professional roles and different levels of leadership (for example a vice-chancellor, a number of professors, an organisational development manager) as well as individuals from each of the organisations / institutions represented in the project group who had not so far been involved in designing the questions.

Feedback from the pilot group led to a number of changes to the questions and layout of the surveys and the resulting final versions were uploaded to the Qualtrics website, hosted by Ashridge.

The Leadership Foundation emailed people who have engaged with the Foundation in some way over the last 10 years (ie, through programmes, events, consultancy etc) and for whom an active email address was held. This sample was invited to visit the HELMs site on Qualtrics and to complete the survey. A total of 7,375 contacts (from the existing Leadership Foundation database) were emailed between April and May 2014. To encourage individuals to complete a survey, all those who included their email address on the final page were entered into a prize draw to win an iPad Mini.28

28Two individuals were selected at random once the survey had closed and each were couriered an iPad Mini. One of the winners was based in the University of Cardiff, and the other was from the Open University.
HELMs responses
There were 848 responses to the institutional survey, 67 for the governors survey, 54 for the higher education agencies survey and one for the student survey. In total, then, the response rate was 13% (970 from 7,375).

The Ashridge team undertook a high-level analysis of the quantitative findings for each survey that included overall response numbers and percentages for each question.

All qualitative and quantitative data results were captured in SPSS and Excel by Ashridge and passed to the Leadership Foundation to undertake further analysis.

HELMs project outputs
The following pieces of analysis, based on various elements of the HELMs data, and using a range of methods to analyse and describe the quantitative and qualitative data from the institutional, governor and higher education agency surveys were commissioned by the Leadership Foundation:

- **Leading higher education** *(Dr Kim Peters and Professor Michelle K. Ryan)*
- **Motivating and developing leaders** *(Professor Michelle K. Ryan and Dr Kim Peters)*
- **Leadership and work-life balance** *(Dr Kim Peters and Professor Michelle K. Ryan)*
- **Governors’ views of their institutions, leadership and governance** *(Professor David Greatbatch)*

Given that there was only one response from a student, and this would not have been enough to draw any broader conclusions about the student perspective, the Foundation did not include this one response in any of the analyses and instead focused on the institutional, governors’ and higher education agency / other organisation surveys when analysing and describing the findings from HELMs29.

---

29 The Leadership Foundation is considering how to engage students effectively in any future HELMs (or other leadership focused) surveys.
APPENDIX 2: DEMOGRAPHICS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Institution and institutional tenure
Almost half of the sample provided the name of their institution (N=390), with 134 different HEIs being named. Most institutions had few participants (between one and three). Those institutions that were moderately well represented included the University of Hertfordshire (N=36), Durham University (N=15), Cardiff University (N=13), The Open University (N=11), Bournemouth University (N=9), Newcastle University (N=8), University of Birmingham (N=7), University of Exeter (N=8) and University of Portsmouth (N=7).

Figure A.1: Distribution of institutional tenure across the sample

As a sample, participants had relatively long tenure periods at their current institution, with more than 40% of participants having worked within their institution for more than 10 years (see Figure A.1). However, a significant proportion had worked for their institution for at least one year (but fewer than six years; N=215) or at least six years (but fewer than 11 years; N=201).
**Gender and age**

The majority of participants were women (63%), but there was nonetheless a substantial representation of men in the sample ($N=302$). More than 40% of the sample was over the age of 51 (see Figure A.2). However, there was good representation of those below the age of 40 ($N=138$) and 50 ($N=311$), although there was only a small percentage of staff aged below 31 ($N=16$).

![Figure A.2: Distribution of age across the sample](image)

**Job roles**

As can be seen in Figure A.3, the majority of participants occupied professional services roles (50%) or an academic leadership role (41%), with a much smaller proportion of participants occupying an academic role (8%).

![Figure A.3: Distribution of job roles across the sample](image)
Examination of participants who listed a single role within an academic, leadership and/or professional services job category revealed that respondents occupied a diversity of roles, although senior roles were most prevalent (see Table A.1).

When asked to identify any additional leadership responsibilities that they had assumed in addition to their job role, only 8% of the sample indicated that they had no additional leadership responsibilities. For the remainder of the sample, it was common to assume several additional leadership responsibilities.

- 18% had one additional responsibility
- 20% had two additional responsibilities
- 20% had three additional responsibilities
- 12% had four additional responsibilities
- 19% had five or more additional responsibilities

As can be seen from Figure A.4, the most common leadership responsibilities were those related to line management, budgetary responsibility and institutional committee membership.

### Sample representativeness

While there is clear heterogeneity in the demographic, institutional and job role characteristics of the sample, it should be noted that it nonetheless over-represents certain sections of the population relative to the wider population across UK higher education.

It is possible to compare the sample of respondents with the broader UK higher education population with the 2013/14 HESA staff statistics. Table A.2 compares the age, gender and role characteristics of the sample with the general UK higher education population.

---

Table A.1: Frequency of academic, academic leadership and professional services roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic roles</th>
<th>Academic leadership roles</th>
<th>Professional services roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42% Professors</td>
<td>18% Heads of department</td>
<td>49% Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% Senior lecturers</td>
<td>15% Pro-vice-chancellors</td>
<td>22% Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% Lecturers</td>
<td>13% Deans</td>
<td>7% Senior administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% Principal lecturers</td>
<td>11% Directors</td>
<td>3% Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Research fellows</td>
<td>9% Programme directors</td>
<td>3% Executive officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Teaching fellows</td>
<td>5% Principal investigators</td>
<td>3% Registrars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% Vice-chancellors / principals</td>
<td>14% ‘Other’ (including legal, technical, library, HR and finance service roles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% Associate heads of department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% Heads of research group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% Chairs of university committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership and work-life balance

Table A.2 demonstrates that, compared to the general population, the current sample includes a higher proportion of women and workers over the age of 41. This sample also over-represents academics relative to professional services staff. Finally, academic respondents are on average much more likely to occupy a professorial or leadership role than is the case in higher education more generally. Consequently, it is important to consider that the results summarised in this report may not generalise to more junior colleagues within UK higher education.
APPENDIX 3: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Work–life balance. Participants were asked to indicate their agreement with a range of workplace attitudes and evaluations. Here a lower score represents greater agreement; some scales ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree), others ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree, with 3 representing ‘don’t know’). Factor analysis revealed that the predictors mapped onto six broad constructs: time, evaluations of immediate leader, support, recognition and value, role attributes and diversity. These predictors and the outcome measures are summarised here accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work–life balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with work–life balance</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>2.42 (0.77)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently work &gt;48 hours a week</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1.97 (0.91)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution does not allow flexible hours</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>3.13 (0.71)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides positive work environment</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>2.42 (1.20)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not listen to views of staff</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>3.74 (1.13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not value my contribution</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>3.95 (1.18)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes me feel empowered</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>32.54 (1.25)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From professional services</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>2.33 (1.10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From academic colleagues</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>2.45 (1.07)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From immediate supervisor</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>2.16 (1.16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership does not listens to view</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>3.14 (1.26)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarded for performance</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>2.79 (0.79)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not paid fairly</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>2.62 (0.75)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>2.12 (0.82)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of role clarity</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>4.28 (1.03)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution manages diversity effectively</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder for women to succeed</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior leaders take diversity into account</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate leader takes diversity into account</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inability to cope with stress</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional pride</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend institution</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated to help institution succeed</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions to stay</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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