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THE UNINTENDED EFFECTS OF OPEN OFFICE SPACE

Associate Professor Ethan Bernstein's new study uses wearable technology to unearth some important new discoveries about open office architecture.
The impact of the ‘open’ workspace on human collaboration
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Organizations’ pursuit of increased workplace collaboration has led managers to transform traditional office spaces into ‘open’, transparency-enhancing architectures with fewer walls, doors and other spatial boundaries, yet there is scant direct empirical research on how human interaction patterns change as a result of these architectural changes. In two intervention-based field studies of corporate headquarters transitioning to more open office spaces, we empirically examine—using digital data from advanced wearable devices and from electronic communication servers—the effect of open office architectures on employees’ face-to-face, email and instant messaging (IM) interaction patterns. Contrary to common belief, the volume of face-to-face interaction decreased significantly (approx. 70%) in both cases, with an associated increase in electronic interaction. In short, rather than prompting increasingly vibrant face-to-face collaboration, open architecture appears to trigger a natural human response to socially withdraw from colleagues and interact instead over email and IM. This is the first study to empirically measure both face-to-face and electronic interaction before and after the adoption of open office architecture. The results inform our understanding of the impact on human behaviour of workplaces that trend towards fewer spatial boundaries.

1. Introduction

Boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’ have long captivated human interest. Yet even as social scientists continue to study the value of a vast array of boundaries [1], an era in which the nature of work is changing [2–4], managers and organizational scholars have increasingly viewed boundaries as barriers to interaction that ought to be removed [5–8], permeated [9] or blurred [10] to increase collaboration. In the most psychologically salient and concrete example, ‘spatial boundaries’ [11] at work—such as office or cubicle walls—are being removed to create open ‘unbounded’ offices in order to stimulate greater collaboration and collective intelligence. Does it work?

Prior theory is divided—and empirical evidence mixed—on the effect that removing spatial boundaries has on human behaviour in the space previously within those boundaries (e.g. [12,13]). On the one hand, sociological theory presents a strong argument that removing spatial boundaries to bring more people into contact should increase collaboration and collective intelligence. The notion that propinquity, or proximity, predicts social interaction [14]—deriving the formation of social ties and therefore information exchange and collaboration—is one of the most robust findings in sociology ([5,15]). It has been observed in contexts as diverse as the US Congress ([16,17]), nineteenth-century boarding houses ([18]), college dormitories ([19]), laboratories ([20]), co-working spaces ([21]) and corporate buildings ([22]). When spatial boundaries—such as walls—are removed, individuals feel more physically proximate, which, such theory suggests, should lead to more interaction. Such interaction is a necessary
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DENIAL
Dear Harvard Business School,

On behalf of all great workspaces, I believe you need to update your study on the open workplace. News agencies like The Washington Post & Inc. Magazine and social media posts on LinkedIn are telling companies that the open plan workspace does not work and is nearing a slow death. However here at Spacestor we can confidently say it is very much alive and being embraced globally. The main reason for this is the fact that companies realize not one size fits all. You need individual, collaborative and social areas in each workspace to make them functional and productive. Having worked with tech companies like Amazon, Google, Indeed.com we have been able to help more traditional workplace firms like Fidelity Investments, Swiss Re, JPMorgan Chase & Co. embrace the new way of working! If you want to really see what is trending in design check out Spacestor's Top 2019 Trends!

PS: I will be happy to help you update that study as you are causing great conflict! :)}
ANGER
Fulfills a need for research
Research context is questionable:

- Type of organization
- Definition of ‘open plan’
- Why & should
- Ancillary spaces
- The role of choice
8 MYTHS ABOUT AI IN THE WORKPLACE

01 Automation will completely displace employees

02 Companies are primarily interested in cutting costs

03 AI, machine learning, and deep learning are the same thing

04 Automation will eradicate more jobs than it creates

05 Robots and AI are the same thing

06 AI won't affect my industry

07 Companies implementing AI don't care about me

08 Higher productivity equals higher profits and less employment
“Superbly researched, deeply insightful, and a fascinating read.”
—GRETCHEN RUBIN, author of The Happiness Project

The Power of Introverts in a World That Can’t Stop Talking

SUSAN CAIN

NOW IN ITS SEVENTH YEAR ON THE NEW YORK TIMES BESTSELLER LIST
\[ Y_{jt} = \alpha + (\beta_1 \times \text{Post}_{jt}) + \sum \text{dyad fixed effects} + \varepsilon_{jt} \quad (3.1) \]

and

\[ Y_{jt} = \alpha + (\beta_1 \times \text{Post}_{jt}) + (\beta_2 \times \text{Physical Distance}_{jt}) + \\
(\beta_3 \times \text{Gender}_j) + (\beta_4 \times \text{Team}_j) + (\beta_5 \times \text{Role}_j) + \varepsilon_{jt}. \quad (3.2) \]
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Where to Cry in an Open Office

So many places to collaborate. So few places to weep in private.

By JIJI Lee
Ms. Lee is a comedian and writer.
BARGAINING
Thank goodness the hole’s at their end!
The City of Tomorrow: Sensors, Networks, Hackers, and the Future of Urban Life
The concept bite-sized

The issue: Sustainable, data-driven research journals, especially those focused on performance improvement in green buildings, are often criticized for not providing clear and actionable insights. This paper aims to address this issue by presenting a concise and digestible approach to understanding the performance of green buildings.

What we looked at: We analyzed data from a sample of 215,243 employees in 1000 workplaces. Our analysis focused on the correlation between the proportion of employees working in different office settings and overall performance. We also looked at whether the performance of employees working in open-plan settings is influenced by overall effectiveness.

The conclusion: We can say conclusively that employees working in open-plan settings are more likely to work collaboratively and share ideas. However, this does not necessarily mean that open-plan settings are the most effective. There are other ways to achieve high performance, such as flexible working and shared workspaces.

Distribution of employees by work settings:
- Flexible setting: 30%
- Other: 2%
- Shared workspaces: 6%
- Open-plan settings: 55%
- Private office: 13%
### Workplace Features

Q1. Thinking about the work that you do, which of the following physical service features are important and how satisfied are you with them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
<th>Overall % Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Desk</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Chair</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Tea, coffee, and refreshment facilities</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Meeting room (small)</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Temperature control</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 General cleanliness</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 IT helpdesk*</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Toilets/WC</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Natural light</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Notice levels</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Personal storage</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Printing/copying/scanning equipment</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13 Restaurant/centers</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 WiFi network connectivity in off-site*</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15 Air quality</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16 Meeting rooms (large)</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17 General tidiness</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18 Telephones/equipment</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19 Office lighting</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20 Computing equipment, mobile (e.g., laptop, Tablet)*</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21 Quiet rooms for working alone in pairs</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.22 Parking (e.g., car, motorcycle or bicycle)</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23 Security</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24 Desk/room booking systems</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25 Remote access to work files or network</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26 Ability to personalise work station</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.27 General décor</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.28 Access skillful coaches</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.29 Informal work areas/break-out zones</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 Wind-in-office/ventilation</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31 Plants &amp; greenery</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Access (e.g., lifts, stairwell, ramps)</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.33 Space between work SETTINGS</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24 Computing equipment, fixed (desktop)</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25 Leasing/licence (e.g., gym, fitness/wellness centre)</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.36 People walking past your workstation</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.37 Main post room access</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.38 Health/privacy protection</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.39 Dividers between desk/areas</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40 Atriums/communal areas</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.41 Hospitality services (e.g., guest reception services, catering, meeting services)</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.42 Reception area</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.43 Art &amp; photography</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.44 Audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 Vanity of different types of workspace</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.46 Shared storage</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.47 Internal signage</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.48 Shower facilities*</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.49 Guest visitor network access</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 Archivestorage</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Added in March 2016.
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Yes, the Open Office Is Terrible — But It Doesn’t Have to Be (Ep. 358)

November 14, 2018 @ 11:00pm
by Stephan J. Dubner
Produced by Rebecca Lee Douglas
The "Water Cooler" Effect

Chatting around the water cooler may yield more of
off-gossip, it may help scientists produce better research,
according to Harvard Medical School (HMS) investigators.

The benefits of collaboration are well
accepted in the scientific world, but research
with the HMS Center for Biomedical Informatics
wondered whether physical proximity affects the quality of those
collaborations. Do scientists who have more
"face time" with colleagues produce higher
impact research? To test the hypothesis, they examined data from 10,000 biomedical
science papers published between 1999 and
2003, each with at least one Harvard author.

The articles appeared in 1000 journals and
involved across authors.

After analyzing the number of citations
each paper generated a (standard
to gauge article quality) and the
distance between authors, they concluded
that personal contact, especially
tween an article’s first and last authors,
still matters— even in an age of e-mail,
social networking, and video conferencing.

“Our data show that the first and last
authors are physically close, they get cited
more, on average,” says research assistant
Kyungjoon Lee. As that distance grew, citations generally declined. Typically,
the first author is a graduate student or
postdoctoral fellow and the last is a more
senior faculty member; they are often more
familiar with the same lab, but do not necessarily
work closely together. This effect
did not hold true for other author combina-
tions, such as last and third; in fact, the
middle authors normally don’t interact
much on a project, Lee notes. The team also
found that, on average, a paper with
four or fewer authors and the same
building was cited 45 percent more than
one with authors in different buildings.

“So if you put people who have the potential
to collaborate close together,” he says,
pointing to one of the building’s floors.

Lee was first author on the study; the
principal investigator was co-director
Lanie Kohane, the Friedman professor
of pediatrics and health sciences and
technology. Kohane had long suspected
that proximity promotes collaboration,
despite lack of hard evidence, so he secured funding
still matters—even in an age of e-mail,
social networking, and video conferencing.
(Their analysis, “Does Collocation Inform the Impact of Collaboration?”
appeared in the online journal PLoS ONE in December.)

“Our data show that the first and last authors are physically close, they get cited
more, on average,” says research assistant
Kyungjoon Lee. As that distance grew, citations generally declined. Typically,
the first author is a graduate student or
postdoctoral fellow and the last is a more
senior faculty member; they are often more
familiar with the same lab, but do not necessarily
work closely together. This effect
did not hold true for other author combina-
tions, such as last and third; in fact, the
middle authors normally don’t interact
much on a project, Lee notes. The team also
found that, on average, a paper with
four or fewer authors and the same
building was cited 45 percent more than
one with authors in different buildings.

“So if you put people who have the potential
to collaborate close together,” he says,
pointing to one of the building’s floors.

Lee was first author on the study; the
principal investigator was co-director
Lanie Kohane, the Friedman professor
of pediatrics and health sciences and
technology. Kohane had long suspected
that proximity promotes collaboration,
despite lack of hard evidence, so he secured funding
still matters—even in an age of e-mail,
social networking, and video conferencing.
(Their analysis, “Does Collocation Inform the Impact of Collaboration?”
appeared in the online journal PLoS ONE in December.)
In this 3D representation of the relationship between collaboration and mean citation impact in the Longwood Medical Area, each building’s height reflects the number of citations of papers originating in the building, while the color gradient (from graylow to blue/high) represents the proportion of publications originating from that building in which both first and last authors work in the building.

“it might lead to better results.”

Lee was first author on the study; the principal investigator was center co-director Isaac Kohane, the Henderson professor of pediatrics and health sciences and technology. Kohane had long suspected that proximity promotes collaboration, despite a lack of hard evidence, so he secured funding study. Then they built a three-dimensional image of authors’ locations, calculated the distances separating them, and evaluated the relationship between citations and distances.

More research is needed to explain why proximity seems to enhance scientific productivity, the group says, but Lee knows firsthand the difference it can make. Early on, he worked on the fourth floor of Countway Library, while Kohane was one flight above. Eventually, Kohane moved to Lee’s floor, and the two wound up chatting a lot in the center’s kitchenette. “I became more active in exchanging ideas because of this experience,” Lee recalls. “Science is all about communicating your ideas so others can build on them.”

~DEBRA BRADLEY RUDER

ISAAC KOHANE E-MAIL: isaac_kohane@harvard.edu
KYUNJOON LEE E-MAIL: joon_lee@hms.harvard.edu
INTERACTIVE MAP: http://healthmap.org/coco
Insights from an evidence based design practice

In theory, knowledge from a growing body of research could be used to inform workplace design, but in practice, this is rarely the case. A survey of 40 architects and designers by the Evidence-Based Design Journal (EBD Journal 2014) found that while 80% of respondents agreed more evidence was needed on the impact of design occupants, 64% admitted they never reviewed literature and 70% indicated they never engaged in any sort of post-occupancy evaluation (POE). Only 3% undertake a formal POE, and even fewer (1%) do so in a rigorous fashion. Nor is there widespread practice of following up with a second round of analysis of a formalized and operational design scheme, despite scholars highlighting the importance of a pre- and post-occupancy study setup in order to be able to understand the impact of a design solution (Sullivan et al. 2008).

In many organizations, workspaces are still based on the experience and intuition of architects and designers who come up with a design solution with little or no input from occupants. While this produces satisfactory results in some cases, the bigger picture suggests otherwise. In the latest issue of the Laurence Brown (Sawaf 2014), only just about half of all respondents (50%) agree that the design of their workplace enables them to work productively, which means that roughly half of the workplace design can be viewed as a barrier. Therefore, additional insights are needed to see which spatial features support productivity, satisfaction and staff wellbeing.

Most workspaces are still based on the experience and intuition of architects and designers, who come up with a design solution with little or no input from occupants...
Evidence based design

Network of face-to-face contact in a media company

Network of email contact in a media company

face-to-face contact is higher (82%-84%) than for planned face-to-face contact (77%-84%), which is slightly counterintuitive. We would argue that unplanned contact is spatially driven (more so than planned), so the higher overlap between unplanned and email contact highlights how closely email patterns are tied to physical space.

While all of the above organisations occupied open plan layouts, an additional study of an academic department in a more traditional environment showed only 4.4% overlap between unplanned and email contact (Silver et al. 2018b); and a study of communication patterns among caregivers (Silver et al. 2018c) in very cellular, traditionally laid out surgical clinics showed an even lower overlap of 2.6% (while a different hospital with a more open layout showed 9% overlap, as expected).

However, it seems that the openness of the layout impacts how closely email contact follows face-to-face contact. In more openly structured workplaces, staff email those they also meet face-to-face often, while more segregated spaces mean emails reach those recipients that are seen less frequently.

1. Desks are occupied only 44 percent of the time, while staff think this is 48 percent

Having observed over 4,000 desks in more than 20 different organisations with a fixed desk for every employee, it can be confirmed that overall desk occupancy is rather low in the average workplace: only 44% of desks are occupied at any one point in time.

The lowest occupancy we have observed was at 22% in a large media company, whereas 50% was the highest occupancy in the case of a creative agency. What is most interesting is the fact that in most cases people generally overestimate the time they spend at their desks. Perceived occupancy (collected through staff surveys) is on average about 25%-30% higher than actual occupancy figures.

In the case of a creative agency of 500 staff, the gap between actual and perceived occupancy was a stunning 28%, since people believed they would be at their desk for 88% of the time, while in fact they only spent 60% of their day at their desk. Activity Based Working with more shared facilities and a reduced staff-to-desk ratio is an obvious solution for a workplace with very low desk occupancy figures; however, this has to fit the culture and vision of an organisation, and additionally, below we show change from a fixed desk to flexible working can be difficult to achieve.

8. Meeting rooms are always booked. Not really...

A similar picture of overall underutilisation presents itself with the occupancy of meeting rooms across a range of office types. Despite the often heard complaint from people in organisations that meeting rooms are difficult to book, average meeting room occupancy across 24 organisations showed a utilisation rate of only 38%. Reasons for the mismatch between perceptions of staff and factual usage often lie in bookings that don’t take place at all or are shorter than anticipated and the popularity of certain preferred time slots for meetings (10-12 and 2-5pm).

9. Space supports concentrated work. It’s complicated...

With a strong focus on supporting collaboration and communication, the role of concentration is often overlooked in organisations. Only recently has the question of concentration, distractions, noise and privacy received more attention (Gibbs et al. 2014). What we have found in our occupancy studies highlights the importance of spaces in workplaces supporting concentrated work. Drawing on staff surveys in five organisations and based on more than 2,000 responses, we found that 8% of people strongly agree or agree that their workspace supports concentrated and silent work, while on average 4% disagree or strongly disagree. This highlights that many more staff consider concentration difficult to achieve, but the overall picture is relatively balanced.

For this particular question, the case-by-case differences are insightful: while staff in some of the five organisations agreed rather than disagreed that spaces supported concentration,
Evidence based design

Network of face-to-face contact in a media company

Network of email contact in a media company
1. Introduction – Space and Organisation

“Culturally and socially, space is never simply the inert background of our material existence. It is a key aspect of how societies and cultures are constituted in the real world, and, through this constitution, structured for us as ‘objective’ realities. Space is more than a neutral framework for social and cultural forms. It is built into those very forms. Human behaviour does not simply happen in space. It has its own spatial forms. Encountering, congregating, avoiding, interacting, dwelling, teaching, eating, conferring are not just activities that happen in space. In themselves they constitute spatial patterns.” (Hillier 1996: 29)

“In fact, space management may well be the most ignored – and most powerful – tool for inducing culture change, speeding up innovation projects, and enhancing the learning process in far-flung organisations. While we fret ceaselessly about facilities issues such as office square footage allotted to various ranks, we all but ignore the key strategic issue – the parameters of intermingling.” (Peters 1992: 413)
Figure 7.21: Social networks of highest usefulness among group colleagues, reciprocal ties are shown in bold black, nodes are sized depending on status.

Figure 7-4a and b: Frequency of interaction between individuals of group SP (red) and HO (yellow) on at least weekly (left), and daily basis illustrating office locations of individuals (right).

People located on the second floor are shown as squares, people on the third floor as circles, and those somewhere else as triangles, links depicted in grey reach from one group to the other, black links are group internal.
WORKSTYLES

THE CREATORS
IDEA FOCUSED

Teams are comprised of engineers responsible for research, design and new concept development. Both individual and team work tend to be quieter and more focused. Need access to labs and testing equipment.

THE DEVELOPERS
PRODUCT FOCUSED

Teams are primarily expert engineers responsible for deep knowledge of product or component. Work flow quickly shifts between individual focus and informal collaboration. Need to connect to product at desk, in factory or in testing throughout process.

THE STRATEGISTS
PROCESS FOCUSED

Teams are based in Peoria but do much of their work elsewhere, regionally or across the globe. When they are at their home location they reconnect to their team and other groups, plan projects and tackle administrative tasks.

THE COORDINATORS
PROCESS DELIVERY FOCUSED

Teams support customers across the globe and often play an advisory role to other departments that requires significant time in meetings or on the phone. Require tools and space to allow them to track project process. Prefer when process is viable to support work.

THE EVALUATORS
EVALUATION & REPORTING FOCUSED

Teams are responsible for supporting core business functions (finance, HR). Work processes are highly structured and deadline driven. Project and content development is collaborative and requires persistent connections.

THE PRODUCERS
PRODUCTION FOCUSED

Work is more individually focused, data driven and transactional. When they do connect its typically for report-out and coordination. Typically require adjacent support spaces such as filing or production.

THEIR CORE VALUES

- Technology
- Equipment

- Expertise
- Experience

- Process
- Relationship

- Relationship
- Accuracy

- Speed
- Accuracy
RUOCO PARK
“I can’t wait to bring my date here for a sunset picnic this Friday.”

VILLAGE
“What a great treat to fuel up with delicious healthy food after a tough session.”

MARKETPLACE
“Since I am training for my next triathlon, I can’t go out for drinks at the Gaslamp. I love coming here with my teammates and getting kombucha on tap instead!”

ESPLANADE
“My morning routine is to wake up early, run along the waterfront, and take a quick shower at the club before heading to work. It’s a great way to get centered and start the day.”

VILLAGE
“It’s an easy spot for a business lunch - a quick walk from the office and a scenic escape.”

PENINSULA
“I meet my trainer here twice a week. If I’m going to work hard I might as well be at the beach.”
The human insights missing from big data
Why is having more data not helping us make better decisions?
RESEARCH
WHAT
WHY
SHOULD
Thank you!

- 206 245 6460
- arnold_levin@gensler.com
- Arnold Craig Levin
- Gensler
Your Feedback is Valued!

Please take the time to Evaluate Sessions
Log into the Attendee Service Center

https://events.ifma.org/facilityfusion/2019/registration_update.cfm
CEUs & CFM® Maintenance Activities

You are eligible to receive Continuing Education Units and Certified Facility Manager® maintenance activity credit for attending sessions at IFMA’s Facility Fusion.

To receive CEU points, you must add the US$20 processing fee to your registration. (Full Event PLUS! registration includes the CEU processing fee.)

To Receive 1 CFM Maintenance Activity  (6 required for recertification)
• Record your attendance for the three-day conference on your CFM Recertification Form in CAMP. Documentation is not required for credit since Credentials Staff can verify your attendance.
• At re-certification time, submit your completed CFM Recertification Form.

Managing CEUs:
• Log into the Attendee Service Center: https://events.ifma.org/facilityfusion/2019/registration_update.cfm Your log-in information was sent to you when you registered for the conference.
• Click “Start CEU Process” on the left-hand side.
• Click “Start” next to the session you attended.
• Complete the session evaluation.
• Click “Start Test” next to the session.
After passing the test, your certificate will be available for download.

**If you wish to receive CEUs or LUs for other organizations, you must contact those organizations for instructions on reporting credit hours.
Review Session Learning Objectives

- Learning Objective 1: Understand the HBR study
- Learning Objective 2: Gain knowledge regarding the implications of the HBR study
- Learning Objective 3: Understand why data collection alone is not research
- Learning Objective 4: Implications of the HBR study for workplace professionals