Productivity Implications of Repurposing and Covid-19 Impacts and Responses

Prof Colin Coulson-Thomas*

Covid-19 lockdowns, local restrictions and consequential slowdowns and/or recessions have resulted in new ways of working and operating practices, related changes of business and organisational models, and reviews of corporate purpose, policies and priorities (Coulson-Thomas, 2019a & b). Within many boards and management team assumptions and practices in areas such as strategic planning have been questioned. Some conversations in corporate boardrooms and executive suites have been tactical concerned with survival and/or responses to Government intervention. Others have been more significant and strategic. The latter include board discussion of vision and purpose, with implications for strategic direction and corporate values, goals, objectives, policies, processes and practices. The involvement of stakeholders in strategic conversations to shape the future might help to achieve a shared purpose (Spender and Strong, 2014).

Speculation about possible futures continues amidst a fog of uncertainty about the longer-term implications of the Covid-19 pandemic for consumer behaviour, market contexts, Government and corporate policies and strategic priorities against a background of multiple business, economic, environmental and social challenges. Questions have long been raised about what the purpose of businesses and capitalism should be and continue (Basu, 1999, Handy, 2002, Coulson-Thomas, 2019a & b, Edmans, 2020, Henderson, 2020). Alongside reimagining, reinvention, re-purposing, re-visioning, transition and transformation conversations, should there also be discussion of their consequences for recovery, growth, productivity, performance and success, and also how businesses should measure and assess them (Boone, 2019; Coulson-Thomas, 2020a)?

The international pandemic has caused some people to question their priorities and lifestyles and review who and what is important to them. New relationships and shifts of perspective have occurred. Might these result in further changes of both immediate requirements and preferences and longer-term aspirations and objectives? Governments and many economists have viewed improving productivity as the key to raising living standards. At the same time there have long been warnings about biodiversity, environmental, global warming and other consequences of unsustainable industrial activities, contemporary lifestyles and economic growth (Meadows, 1972; Meadows et al, 1972; Brundland, 1987; Daly, 1996; Higgs, 2014). Are assessments of productivity, economic output and growth reflecting these concerns?

Productivity and its Measurement

Productivity and its elements have been defined and assessed in different ways (Johnston and Jones, 2004, Baumann et al, 2019). It is often used as a measure of efficiency, and its measurement at corporate and national level usually involves a comparison of assessments of outputs with inputs, for example by dividing one by the other (Productivity Commission, 2015). It grows if outputs increase by more than inputs. Views can vary on the volume and

value of outputs, the assessment of value added and the issue of outputs which are not traded. Outputs can be expressed per unit of labour and/or capital. Their valuation can depend upon a mix of some prices that are established by markets and others that may be set by a regulator or Government. Outputs valued by some people may be regarded as undesirable by others.

Consistent assessment of value added and productivity over time can be challenging (Coulson-Thomas, 2020a). Preferences and demand can change, relative prices may alter, more value could be added to offerings without corresponding price increases and practices might vary in terms of whether or not externalities are included. For example, technological development and innovation has resulted in some products offering more value at a relatively cheaper price than their predecessors (Coulson-Thomas, 2017, 2018 & 2019c). Government, legislative and/or regulatory action sometimes stops or phases out the production of certain outputs, for example petrol and diesel engine vehicles while innovation may result in new ones. Government policies in different countries vary in areas such as the speed with which the use of fossil fuels is reduced. This can complicate international productivity comparisons.

Assessing the Overall Impact of Covid-19

How have some of the changes that have occurred in response to Covid-19 such as the wider adoption of new ways of working, virtual operation and different business models impacted upon productivity (Deloitte, 2020)? What questions do they raise about how productivity should be measured? Much will depend upon whether one is looking just at labour productivity, multifactor productivity, returns on capital or technology investments, or changing combinations of people and technology (Coulson-Thomas, 2018). Isolating the impacts of different factors is not easy. Might the global pandemic and consequential changes in behaviour and physical infrastructure also yield environmental benefits, reduce pressure on natural capital and lead to more balanced lifestyles and a better use of time? How should one take account of these in productivity assessments and corporate and public decision making?

Covid-19 impacts have differed by country. Rapid and collective action and coordination and compliance with policies, guidance and restrictions may be more of a challenge in individualistic societies and cultures, where discussion about what needs to be done and building a consensus might take more time (Hofstede, 1980 &1991; Triandis, 1995). Political decision makers facing differing interests and contending opinions are required to balance lives and livelihoods. Lost output has increased pressures upon political decision makers to reduce lockdown and other restrictions to control the virus in the interests of economic recovery. However, from a global warming, climate change perspective or sustainability perspective one could argue that economic slowdown and recession has bought the environment and mankind some time and could be seen by responsible business leaders as an opportunity (Coulson-Thomas, 2020b). Currently, at an international level voluntary commitments entered into by Governments are not sufficient to achieve Paris Agreement (2015) targets and United Nations (2015) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Within particular economies there are both winners and losers as some activities have increased while others have been restricted. There are both outputs and inputs/costs to

measure and consider and also contending factors to balance. For example, concerns about the loss of jobs and outputs in city centre business districts, as fewer people visit offices and nearby coffee shops, sandwich bars and other retail outlets, have to be balanced against the possibilities for more services to be provided closer to where people live and where they may now also work. On-line activity has increased. Some retail jobs may have been replaced by those in distribution and the support of people who are spending more time working in their homes. Areas such as pets and home improvements and technologies have thrived..

Assessing Differing Productivity Impacts

In recent years, overall productivity has been thought to be stagnant in some jurisdictions (Harari, 2017; Gordon and Sayed, 2019). Changes of productivity can conceal differing short and longer-term impacts (Coulson-Thomas, 2020a). Much will depend upon differing and relative measured levels of productivity in activities that are allowed or enabled to continue and those that are restricted or closed down by Government intervention. Should the adverse consequences of Covid-19 result in less efficient and productive players failing, average levels of productivity might increase. However, some Government imposed restrictions may apply to all sectors and be more neutral in their impacts. Much will depend upon whether the economic impact of the pandemic increases or reduces innovation.

There is some evidence that the impact of information and communications technology (ICT) innovations upon productivity in the current century is below that in the last (Gordon and Sayed, 2020). It has been suggested that the overall impact of much early ICT investment was neutral, with relatively well managed companies becoming even better, while those which were badly run in comparison saw little benefit, or in some cases a negative impact (Strassmann, 1985, 1990, 1997, 1999 & 2007). Might reaction to adversity during the Covid-19 pandemic and the forced adoption of new ways of working and new business and operating models change this? Alternatively, will a similar pattern of impacts emerge? Will the pandemic accelerate trends such as the replacement of people in more roles by technology (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2013; Way, 2013; Ford, 2015)?

Covid-19 can have an uneven economic impact on different sectors of the economy (Harari and Keep, 2020). Lockdowns and other restrictions could impact disproportionately upon either higher or lower productivity activities. Where highly productive activities and sectors of the economy are closed down, overall productivity might fall. Conversely it might rise if less productive areas are disproportionately prevented from operating. Labour productivity could rise or fall as people are laid off, depending upon whether output falls by a lower or higher proportion. Where decisions on whether or not to operate are taken by boards rather than prescribed by Government one might expect the most productive and value adding of such allowable activities to be the last to be closed.

Assessments of productivity can depend upon assumptions made, for example, whether or not furloughed employees are included in output per person calculations or excluded (Coulson-Thomas, 2020a). In some contexts, output per hour measures could be problematic due to uncertainty as to hours worked in virtual settings such as from home, when the emphasis may

be upon outputs delivered rather than inputs of time at a particular work location. Comparisons of pre and post-Covid-19 outputs and productivity might also be complicated by a change of organisational focus and priority. For example, a hospital might cancel routine and non-urgent operations in order to treat a smaller number of high-risk coronavirus patients. Activities during a pandemic might be more or less complex and/or time consuming than those before and require greater or lesser labour and/or capital.

Embracing Virtual Operation

Virtual teams, technology enabled knowledge networks and responsive network organisations have operated since the dawn of the internet age (Coulson-Thomas, 1992; Quinn, 1992). Why have they not been more widely and quickly adopted for larger groups and communities? Why are more boards not actively exploring opportunities to operate in new and different ways that address negative consequences of bureaucratic structures and unsustainable growth (Coulson-Thomas, 2019a & 2020b)? Have habit, innate conservatism and the start-up and adjustment effort required to effectively change deterred people and organisations from being more flexible in terms of where, when and how people work and with whom (Coulson-Thomas, 2020b)? Given the wide range of tasks that many people are involved with and their differing circumstances, why have so many organisations persisted for so long with standard ways of working at particular fixed locations?

Given the steady fall in the cost of digital technologies, their democratisation and their expanding capabilities, in many cases at an exponential rate, one could argue that now is an opportune moment for laggards to embrace them and virtual operation. In response to a global pandemic, Government intervention has forced people and organisations to change. They have often been relatively quick to react. Many homes harbour mobile and other technologies that match or exceed those available at some places of work. However, the availability of technology is not always matched by understanding of how to use it safely. Guidance may be required to prevent the misuse of widely available tools (Moyce, 2020). ICT may also need to find ways of providing homeworkers and members of network organisations with the 'social presence' required for effective learning (Garrison et al, 2000).

Mobile technologies and a range of support tools can enable people to connect, communicate, interact, share and work and learn as and when required 24/7, including when on the move (Coulson-Thomas, 2012a & b, 2013). Time saved from commuting journeys with their traffic jams and/or crowded public transport can be used for working and living. Some homeworkers find they have more time to think and quietly reflect. They may also be able to do this in locations that are more conducive of thought and creativity. They may have greater freedom to select those with whom they interact. Avoiding start and end of day journeys to a workplace can open up new opportunities to contact people in a wider range of time zones. If these benefits outweigh any drawbacks of virtual teams replacing physical ones, ought there to be potential to increase output and productivity?

Accounting for Changes of Working Arrangements

There may be additional expenses to consider when working arrangements change and also possible areas of saving. These may differ for people and organisations and not all of each category will be affected in the same way as situations and circumstances vary. Additional costs could include the provision of performance support tools, although these often deliver large returns on investment that justify their use wherever people work (Coulson-Thomas, 2012a & b, & 2013). Technologies that better support people and complement their capabilities might enable better use to be made of the capacity of human brain and lead to a more productive combination of machine and human intelligence (Dehaene, 2020).

More generally, individuals may face additional costs creating and lighting and heating a home working environment, while for organisations the expense of sanitising hands and work environments that remain open and meeting social distancing requirements might raise the cost of people relative to technology, especially where the capability and performance of the technology in question may be increasing exponentially. Some companies may need to review the criteria they have used to assess technology investments (Strassmann, 2007). These might not be consistent or comparable with those used to assess the returns on investment in talent (Charan, 2018). Unlike people whose hours of work may be limited by family, social, physical, welfare and/or legal requirements, particular digital and other technologies might be available 24/7 until maintenance is required or their replacement.

Social distancing requirements might mean that fewer people can be accommodated at a particular work or leisure location. This can reduce throughput, capacity and the volume and value of output. Various options from extending hours or introducing shifts might allow greater utilisation of fewer items of equipment or less available office space, but much will depend upon health and safety considerations, the reactions of the people involved, the nature of the activity and the availability of alternatives. Management decisions may be complicated by uncertainty concerning how long externally imposed requirements and restrictions and altered behaviours might last and expectations of future changes. There may also be policy responses and support schemes to take into account (Harari and Keep, 2020). These might reduce or defray some employment and people related costs.

Assessing Consequences of Virtual Operation

When assessing impacts one needs to bear in mind that other changes might occur as well as the enforced adoption of a new way of working or a different model of operation during a period of lockdown as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. These might have consequences for future levels of competence, confidence and productivity. For example, advantage might be taken of a slowdown, fewer distractions and the additional time that people have at home to introduce or extend one or more training, development or reskilling courses or programmes. A McKinsey & Co investigation has found that effective reskilling tends to improve productivity by between 6 to 12 percent (Allas et al, 2020). It may be some time before the consequences of recent changes can be assessed in a way that enables the relative contributions of different factors to be assessed.

Virtual operation can have differing consequences for people and organisations. A MORI survey of individuals working from home during lockdown and undertaken on behalf of Deloitte (2020) found that 38% reported a negative impact of lockdown on their wellbeing, but 55% of the workers reported that their colleagues were just as, if not more, productive than before. Reactions to Covid-19 can also give rise to better resource utilisation. For example, the majority of cars are parked for most of the time. Their reduced use for journeys to and from work and/or their greater shared use when safe could allow resources involved in their manufacture and maintenance to be used more productively for more value adding purposes. Virtual operation could yield a reduction in vehicle and related costs for some people and organisations. Over time office and other built estate costs might also reduce.

Direct labour costs can be very different from total employment costs when the expense of premises and facilities are taken into account. Office costs can mount up when local authority rates, utility bills and the cost of meeting legal and regulatory requirements and support services from switchboard operators to cleaners are taken into account. They may be largely unaffected when just a few people occasionally work from home. If people work from home, or another more local location, for only a small part of the time the potential for reducing building and infrastructure costs may be limited. One might also see greater investment in work related technology and infrastructure, as facilities are required in more than one location and greater use of mobile and portable technologies. However, when significant numbers begin to work virtually and hot desk when attending particular meetings it may be possible to rationalise an office estate and secure significant savings (Judkins et al, 1985).

Might financial cost or expenditure measures replace per-person productivity measures so that a fairer comparison can be made between people and technology? Public sector productivity assessments may need to take account of unusually high recent levels of expenditure and changes, whether increases or decreases, in levels of activity as a consequence of Covid-19. The speed with which Government measures and initiatives have been rolled out and the early competitive struggle to secure personal protective equipment may have reduced the time for traditional value for money, productivity and procurement practices. In certain cases the usual rules were suspended. Some of the hastily introduced measures to address an unprecedented situation may not meet expectations.

Ensuring All Costs are Included

When changes of business model or working practices occur, assessments need to make sure that areas of cost are not overlooked (Coulson-Thomas, 2020a). Examples could include the impact of disruption, the costs of setting up new arrangements and any opportunity costs that might arise. A switch to virtual operation or from physical retailing to on-line shopping with fulfilment from a centralised warehouse could result in a significant productivity gain in relation to the people involved, However, overall before and after financial comparisons could depend upon set up, roll out and/or expansion costs, crawl out costs from unexpired lease commitments and receipts from the sale or redevelopment of unused office space or retail premises at a time of marketplace glut. The differing financial consequences of build, buy, rent or lease options could impact upon financial cost measures of productivity.

Unexpected issues can occur and support mechanisms should be in place to achieve a change such as to working from home (Parker and Jones, 2020). In the short term, there may be a variety of matters to address such as health and safety, data protection, confidentiality and cyber security issues. Employers have a duty to ensure a safe working environment. They may have to undertake risk assessments, provide equipment for home workers and reimburse any additional expenses they incur. Insurance cover may need to be reviewed to ensure those working remotely are covered and arrangements made in areas such as counselling support and the protection of confidential and personal information.

Outputs and costs can change over time (Coulson-Thomas, 2020a). They may need to be monitored during and after transition from one business or operating model to another. As more people work from home, savings from rationalisation, reorganisation and consolidation of corporate premises may take time to realise. There may also be push back from those involved. This can vary over time as situations evolve and people reassess advantages and disadvantages of different patterns of work. How a change is perceived can depend upon whether it is voluntary, temporary and variable or imposed, permanent and fixed. For an organisation there might be both positive and negative impacts on longer-term innovation, resilience, engagement, coherence and unity implications and missed opportunities.

Consequences of New Ways of Working and Operating

When changes and disruptions occur, the resilience of people, organisations, processes and systems can depend upon willingness to review, learn and adapt. Their consequences can also reflect the skills of those involved and whether re-skilling or upskilling accompanies the use of technology to enable new ways of working and operating (Kahn and Lim, 1998). Organisations could review requirements and capabilities. People may or may not take advantage of lockdowns and periods of furlough to acquire new skills or reflect on alternative career paths or lifestyles. The latter reflection might increase or decrease those moving into or away from areas of relatively high or low opportunity to increase productivity and/or traded outputs. Might criteria for national measures of output such as GDP and GNP and assessments of happiness or satisfaction need to change as people review what they value?

Individuals vary in the extent to which they view change as an opportunity, interruption or imposition and are self-motivated, inwardly directed and able to work on their own in a different context. Tests and consultations can identify those for whom teleworking might not be suitable (Judkins et al, 1985). Some people benefit from the presence of supervisors and colleagues. They might be easily distracted in different circumstances. Managers may worry that some teleworkers may opt to use any efficiency gains to free up time for non-work related activities rather than maintain or improve quality or increase output. Perhaps they might be inclined to rush through their work responsibilities as quickly as possible, rather than think or go the extra mile. Such thoughts can unsettle some managers who are used to greater control. A lack of trust may spur a drive to remotely monitor work-related activities.

The effectiveness of virtual teams can depend upon the extent to which they are given clear and concise goals and objectives, enabled to freely communicate, appropriately supported

and issues are quickly dealt with as they arise (Edwards and Wilson, 2004). These and other requirements may not be in place when people are forced to become homeworkers. Isolation at home can also prevent the physical interaction that is often conducive of creativity. On the other hand, some people might use distance from supervision, their greater freedom to think for themselves and an opportunity to access a wider range of digital contacts to reflect, question and challenge. Not all workplaces are hives of creative interaction, productive meetings, active sharing and collective learning. A growing range of tools can support virtual collaboration and joint working on shared documents and collective tasks. The potential of any way of working can depend upon the context and the people and personalities involved.

Enforced homeworking due to a lockdown can yield immediate benefits such as time saved from commuting journeys and fewer interruptions from colleagues (Gascoigne, 2020). Some teleworkers become very productive and crack on through their routine work and backlogs. They may have to take care to avoid over-working and might need to consciously try to achieve better work-life balance. Imposed full-time homeworking can have different implications than a voluntary choice by an individual according to task or role and as and when desired and appropriate. It can raise practical issues, particularly when unexpected and hurriedly introduced. . Childcare and home schooling were particular problems for many families during the initial enforced lockdown in the UK.

Allowing Time for New and Changed Arrangements to Settle

An increase in the prevalence of working from home is a structural shift that may occur as a consequence of Covid-19, although the extent of this is uncertain (Harari and Keep, 2020). Over time some when working virtually such as at home, some people begin to miss physical interaction with others. Chance encounters and the sharing of experience, knowledge and understanding can be more varied and stimulating than working alone. It and diversity may also be conducive of innovation (Coulson-Thomas, 2020c). Depending on personal circumstances, working from home for any length of time can limit the access of other family members to space and facilities that were previously more available. This can trigger adverse reactions. Teleworkers may also start to feel distanced from colleagues and cut off from the office grapevine. They might think they are ‘out of sight and out of mind’, lost within a larger team, and at risk of missing career and development opportunities (Gascoigne, 2020).

Virtual operation is easier for some activities, tasks and roles than it is for others (Judkins et al, 1985). Certain personal services such as hair dressing require the physical interaction of individuals. Virtual dentistry beyond the giving of advice in areas such as hygiene may be problematic, but many interactions between doctors and patients are now by telephone and video link as the use of various forms of telemedicine spreads. Piloting an arrangement before wider adoption may be advisable if time allows.. Embracing digital technologies, greater automation or a different business model can increase the range of what could become a virtual activity and so increase flexibility and resilience.

Steps such as providing alternative ways of collaborating, sharing and interacting, being visible and having access to support services and opportunities could be taken to address

particular problems of teleworking. Practical advice could be given on different aspects of working at home and other locations. Thought could be given to how policies and support may need to change when restrictions ease. Should people be given more flexibility in terms of where, when and with whom they can and should work, depending upon task, individual preferences and team requirements? When groups and teams are involved there is some evidence that co-workers operating from home can negatively impact upon team performance (Van der Lippe and Lippenyi, 2020). Views of work colleagues may need to be sought before final decisions on voluntary arrangements for particular individuals (Judkins et al, 1985).

Ensuring Balanced Assessment

Whether or not new patterns of work introduced in response to Covid-19 might result in significant changes in productivity, performance and net operating and overhead costs might reflect how they are planned and supported, and whether or not and how they are underpinned by performance support tools and accompanied by other enabling developments (Coulson-Thomas, 2012a & b, & 2013). It will also depend upon the extent to which they continue and result in sustained improvement and/or innovation, and/or people and organisations revert to previous practices. In time, the initial attraction of working from home may wear off. In the absence of lockdown and other restrictions, this may lead to a return to traditional patterns of work. In certain organisations, activities and locations, might enthusiasm for virtual or teleworking and its adoption wax and wane in a succession of waves? Are the drivers likely to be external developments or internal pressures?

Covid-19 and some reactions to it have complicated the assessment of productivity and especially its financial implications, depending upon the approaches and techniques that are used (Coulson-Thomas, 2020a). There may also be further trade-offs to consider, for example as a result of a desire for greater flexibility, resilience and/or social distancing. Hitherto, many organisations may have had greater discretion to introduce changes of working and operating practices. Social distancing requirements and imposed lockdown and other restrictions as a consequence of Covid-19 have forced changes of working practices. These might have implications for others and beyond the people directly affected. It may therefore be some time before definitive assessments of productivity impacts can be made that reflect changed purposes, priorities and values attached to different outputs.

Overall, the global pandemic has highlighted many issues with widely used methods of assessing output and performance. It has led to a period of discontinuity and instability in various indicators that have been used as a consequence of economic slowdown and recession, followed by partial recovery and further waves of disruption and accompanying higher levels of unemployment. Non traded outputs that have increased such as people voluntarily helping their neighbours, or those shielding, are rarely considered. To address other concerns such as the use of scarce natural capital or use of fossil fuels one could also revisit variations of other approaches to assessing productivity that have been suggested such as comparing outcomes with the effort or energy used to achieve them (Sevin, 1965)

Embracing Wider Considerations

Definitive assessments of Covid-19 impacts may need to encompass various factors such as excess deaths and what could have been achieved if attention, resources and innovation had been devoted to other priorities (Coulson-Thomas, 2020c). Externalities, whether of costs or benefits, are taken into account in some major projects and certain public policy decisions. However, they are not included in many corporate assessments. Has this resulted in the overexpansion of some enterprises and sectors (Dauvergne, 2018; Pirani, Simon 2018)? Has the pandemic made people more aware of externalities? Might this result in changes? How long might some of these last? During severe lockdowns, environmental improvements were noted in areas such as traffic fumes, but these could be reversed. For example, advice against the use of public transport might cause a longer-term increase in car journeys for certain purposes. Could beneficial consequences of economic slowdown represent business, environmental and social opportunities (Coulson-Thomas, 2020b, Dorling, 2020)? How might changes in measures of output and performance encourage their realisation?

The nature and make up of some categories of externality are changing. For example, the global pandemic and related changing patterns of consumption, living and working have also affected the content and distribution of rubbish and waste. Packaging associated with on-line shopping and home deliveries, might now be more evident in some residential areas. Specific Covid-19 waste includes used face-masks and personal protective equipment. These need to be disposed of responsibly if they are not to pollute beaches and the world's oceans. If what is measured influences behaviours, should measures that reflect responsible leadership be selected and used (Coulson-Thomas, 2019b)? For example, should one weight the value of outputs and inputs to reflect the nature of waste and/or rubbish produced or the extent to which fossil fuels and/or scarce natural capital is involved? Should a system of weighting give prominence to a challenge such as global warming and Paris Agreement (2015) targets?

Corporate and broader measures of productivity and performance often include outputs that are undesirable, for example because their production involves the use of fossil fuels that contribute to global warming (Coulson-Thomas, 2020a). Whether or not carbon capture is more widely used depends upon the price Governments set for carbon. The prices of some raw materials and natural capital of which there is a diminishing supply fall short of their replacement costs. Raising productivity and economic recovery in terms of how they have been measured in the past might increase the environmental and health damage caused by some outputs. They may be neither desirable nor sustainable. Responsible leaders should ensure that assessments of outputs and productivity reflect externalities and address natural capital, environmental and social considerations and United Nations (2015) SDGs.

References

Allas, Tera, Fairbairn, Will and Foote, Elizabeth (2020), *The economic case for reskilling in the UK: How employers can thrive by boosting workers' skills*, Report, November 16, London, McKinsey & Company

Baumann, Chris, Cherry, Michael and Chu, Wujin (2019), Competitive Productivity (CP) at macro–meso–micro levels, *Cross Cultural & Strategic* Management, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 118-144

Basu, Shankar (1999), *Corporate Purpose, Why It Matters More Than Strategy*, London, Routledge

Boone, Laurence (2019), New measures of economic success, *Think: London Business School Review*, Vol. 30 Issue 2-3, pp 26-27

[Brundland Report] World Commission on Environment and Development (1987), *Our Common Future*, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Brynjolfsson, Erik and McAfee, Andrew (2013), Race Against The Machine: How The Digital Revolution Is Accelerating Innovation, Driving Productivity, and Irreversibly Transforming Employment and The Economy, Research Brief, Cambridge, MA, MIT Sloan School of Management

Charan, Ram, Barton, Dominic and Carey, Dennis (2018), *Talent wins: The new playbook for putting people* first, Cambridge, MA, Harvard Business Review Press

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (1992), *Transforming the Company, Bridging the Gap between Management Myth & Corporate Reality*, London, Kogan Page

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2012a), *Talent Management 2, A quicker and more cost-effective route to the high performance organisation*, Peterborough, Policy Publications

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2012b), *Transforming Public Services, A quicker and affordable route to the performance public organisations*, Peterborough, Policy Publications

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2013), *Transforming Knowledge Management, A quicker and affordable route to the high performance organisation*, Peterborough, Policy Publications

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2017), *Addressing the Productivity Challenge and Ensuring for a Future Management Services,* Speech at the Annual General Meeting of the Institute of Management Services (IMS), Lichfield, IMS, 20th October

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2018), Complicating Factors in Performance and Productivity Assessment, *Management Services*, Vol. 62 No. 4, Winter, pp 41-44

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2019a), Responsible Leadership and Engaging and Retaining Talent, *Effective Executive*, Vol. XXII No. 4, pp 7-21

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2019b), Reviewing Corporate Purpose, Strategic Direction and Board Responsibilities, *Director Today*, Vol. V Issue XII, December, pp 7-9

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2019c), Revisiting Performance Assessment, *Management Services*, Vol. 63 No. 2, Summer, pp 13-17

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2020a), Covid-19, Virtual Operation and the Implications for Productivity, *Management Services*, Vol. 64 No. 4, Winter, pp 13-17

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2020b), Economic Slowdown: A Business and Social Opportunity for Responsible Leaders, *Effective Executive*, Vol. XXXIII No. 1, pp 7-25

Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2020c), Leading Organizational Innovation, *Effective Executive*, Vol. XXIII Issue No. 2, pp 12-30

Daly, Herman E. (1996), *Beyond Growth: The Economics of Sustainable Development*, Boston, Beacon Press

Dauvergne, Peter (2018), *Will Big Business Destroy Our Planet?* Cambridge, Polity Press

Dehaene, Stanislas (2020), *How We Learn, Why Brains Learn Better Than Any Machine … For Now*, New York, NY, Random House

Deloitte (2020), *Working during lockdown: The impact of Covid-19 on productivity and well-being*, London, Deloitte LLP

Dorling, Danny (2020), *Slowdown: The End of the Great Acceleration – Why It's Good for the Planet, the Economy, and Our Lives*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press

Edmans, Alex (2020), *Grow the Pie: How Great Companies Deliver Both Purpose and Profit*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Edwards, Abigail and Wilson, John R. (2004), *Implementing Virtual Teams: A Guide to Organizational and Human* Factors, Aldershot, Gower Publishing

Ford, Martin (2015), *The Rise of the Robots: Technology and the Threat of Mass Unemployment*, London, Oneworld Publications

Garrison, D. Randy, Anderson, Terry and Archer, Walter (2000), Critical Inquiry in a Text-Based Environment: Computer Conferencing in Higher Education, *The Internet and Higher Education*, Vol 2 Issue 2, pp 87-105

Gascoigne, Charlotte (2020), *Working from home: assessing the evidence after lockdown*, Report, London, CIPD

Gordon, Robert J and Sayed, Hassan (2019), The Industry Anatomy of the Transatlantic Productivity Growth Slowdown: Europe Chasing the American Frontier, *International Productivity Monitor*, Centre for the Study of Living Standards, Vol. 37, Fall, pp 3-38

Gordon, Robert J and Sayed, Hassan (2020), Transatlantic Technologies: The Role of ICT on the Evolution of U.S. and European Productivity Growth, Working paper 27425, Cambridge, MA, National Bureau of Economic Research

Handy, Charles (2002), Whats a business for?, *Harvard Business Review*, Big Picture, December [https://hbr.org/2002/12/whats-a-business-for]

Harari, Daniel (2017), *Productivity in the UK,* Briefing Paper Number 06492, London, House of Commons Library, 20th September

Harari, Daniel and Keep, Matthew (2020), *Coronavirus: Economic* impact, Briefing paper No. 8866, London, House of Commons Library, 13th November

Henderson, Rebecca (2020), *Reimagining Capitalism: How Business Can Save the World*, New York, NY, Portfolio Penguin

Higgs, Kerryn (2014), *Collision Course: Endless growth on a finite planet*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press

Hofstede, Geert (1980), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, London, Sage Publications

Hofstede, Geert (1991), *Cultures and Organisations: Software of the Mind,* Maidenhead, McGraw-Hill

Johnston, Robert and Jones, Peter (2004), Service productivity: Towards understanding the relationship between operational and customer productivity, *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management,* Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 201-213

Judkins, Phillip, West David and Drew, John (1985), *Networking in Organisations: The Rank Xerox Experiment*, Brookfield, Gower Publishing Company

Kahn, James A. and Lim, Jong-Soo (1998), Skilled labor-augmenting technical progress in US manufacturing, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 113 No. 4, pp 1281-1308.

Meadows, Donella (1972), *Limits to Growth*, London, Signet

Meadows, Donella H; Meadows, Dennis L; Randers, Jørgen; Behrens III, William W (1972), *The Limits to Growth; A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*, New York, NY, Universe Books

Moyce, Cliff (2020), Zoom Security, *Management Services*, Vol. 64 No. 3, Autumn, pp 35-38

Paris Agreement (2015) [Agreement adopted on 12 December 2015 at the twenty-first session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change], United Nations Treaty Collection, Chapter XXVII Environment, New York, NY, United Nations

Parker, David and Jones, Morris (2020), Collarless: The New Norm, *Management Services*, Vol. 64 No. 3, Autumn, pp 25-27

Productivity Commission (2015), What is productivity and how is it measured? *P C News*, May [Staff Research Note, Melbourne, Australian Government Productivity Commission

Pirani, Simon (2018), *Burning Up: A Global History of Fossil Fuel Consumption*, London, Pluto Press

Quinn, James Brian (1992), *Intelligent Enterprise, a knowledge and service based paradigm for industry*, New York, The Free Press

Sevin, Charles H. (1965), *Marketing Productivity Analysis*, New York, NY, McGraw-Hill

Spender, J.-C and Strong, Bruce A. (2014), *Strategic Conversations: Creating and Directing the Entrepreneurial Workforce*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Strassman, Paul A. (1985), *Information Payoff: The Transformation of Work in the Electronic Age*, New York, NY, The Free Press

Strassman, Paul A. (1990), *The Business Value of Computers: An Executives' Guide*, New Canaan, CT; Information Economics Press

Strassman, Paul A. (1997), *The Squandered Computer: Evaluating the Business Alignment of Information Technologies*, London, Atlantic Books

Strassman, Paul (1999), *Information Productivity: Assessing Information Management Costs of US Corporations*, New Canaan, CT; Information Economics Press

Strassman, Paul A. (2007), *The Economics of Corporate Information Systems: Measuring Information Payoffs*, New Canaan, CT; Information Economics Press

Triandis, Harry C. (1995), *Individualism & Collectivism:* London, Routledge

United Nations (2015), *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* [Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015], 70/1, New York, NY, UN General Assembly

Van der Lippe, Tanja and Lippenyi, Zoltan (2020), Co-workers working from home and individual and team performance, *New Technology, Work and Employment*. Vol 35, No 1, pp 60–79

Way, Ben (2013), *Jobocalypse: The End of Human Jobs and How Robots will Replace Them*, Scotts Valley, California, CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform

*Author

Prof (Dr) Colin Coulson-Thomas, President of the Institute of Management Services, has helped directors in over 40 countries to improve director, board and corporate performance. An experienced chairman of award winning companies and vision holder of successful transformation programmes, he leads the International Governance Initiative of the Order of St Lazarus, is Director-General, IOD India, UK and Europe, Chancellor and a Professorial Fellow at the School for the Creative Arts, an Honorary Professor at the Aston India Foundation for Applied Research, a Distinguished Professor and President of the Council of International Advisors at the Sri Sharada Institute of Indian Management-Research, a Governing Director of the SRISIIM Research Foundation, a Visiting Professor of Direction

and Leadership at Lincoln International Business School, and a member of the advisory board of the Aravind Foundation and ACCA's Governance, Risk and Performance Global Forum.

Colin is the author of over 60 books and reports. He has held public appointments at local, regional and national level and professorial appointments in Europe, North and South America, Africa, the Middle East, India and China. He was educated at the London School of Economics, London Business School, UNISA and the Universities of Aston, Chicago, Southern California and Westminster. He is a fellow of seven chartered bodies, an honorary fellow of professional bodies in the UK and India, an honoured fellow of the Institute for Responsible Leadership and a fellow of the World Academy of Productivity Science. He obtained first place prizes in the final exams of three professions and the CSR Lifetime Achievement Award at the 2018 CSR Leadership Summit. Details of his most recent books and reports can be found on: http://www.policypublications.

Abstract

Covid-19 lockdowns, local restrictions and resulting slowdowns and/or recessions have had many consequences. New ways of working, virtual operation and alternative business and organisational models have been more widely adopted and reviews of corporate purpose, policies and priorities have been undertaken. As a result of the pandemic and reimagining, reinvention, re-purposing, re-visioning, transition and transformation conversations, there may also be a need to discuss their consequences for the measurement of productivity and performance. There are differing national and sectoral impacts and various externalities, uncertainties and consequences of new and different ways of working and operating to consider. These can change over time. Assessments can reflect assumptions made. They should be comprehensive, balanced and allow time for new arrangements to settle. Responsible leaders should ensure that assessments of outputs, productivity and performance reflect externalities and address wider natural capital, environmental and social concerns and United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Publication

Published in *Effective Executive*, a quarterly peer reviewed journal of IUP (ISSN 0972-5172).

The citation is:

> Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2021), Productivity Implications of Repurposing and Covid-19 Impacts and Responses, *Effective Executive*, Vol. XXIV No. 1, pp 55-69