



Final report Deliverable D1



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

**Physical activity
and sport in the
working environment.**



workmoveandperf.com



Summary

1. Executive summary.....	4
2. Project background and objectives	5
2.1. Specific objectives of WMP	6
2.2. Target groups.....	7
3. Needs analysis	7
3.1. Influence of physical activity in the work environment on employee productivity.....	8
3.2. Workplace physical activity and productivity: qualitative evidence	9
3.3. Qualitative study: workplace physical activity and productivity – lessons from the WMP pilot study	10
3.3.1. Initial needs analysis: insights from managers and employees	10
3.3.2. Insights from the WMP qualitative study in three pilot organisations	11
4. Learnings from studies: effects of physical activity on individual productivity and organisational performance	12
4.1. Fact sheet: WMP quantitative study – physical activity, wellbeing and productivity in European workplaces.....	12
4.1.1. Study context.....	12
4.1.2. Main results	13
4.1.3. Key correlations (odds ratios).....	13
4.1.4. Relevant sociodemographic factors	14
4.1.5. Implications and recommendations.....	14
4.1.6. Conclusions	15
4.2. Tool : logistic regression model – physical activity and productivity outcomes.....	15
4.2.1. General logistic regression formula	15
4.2.2. Coefficients derived from the study (<600 MET-min/week)	16
4.2.3. Illustrative example	16
4.2.4. General formula for HR managers’ application.....	17
4.2.5. Practical interpretation (<600 MET-min/week).....	17
4.3. Simulation of productivity outcomes from workplace physical and sports activity programmes	18
4.3.1. Quantitative evidence from the WMP study.....	19
4.3.2. Simulation methodology: before/after PSA programme.....	19
4.3.3. Mechanisms explaining productivity gains.....	20
4.3.4. Predictive modelling and regression analysis.....	21
4.3.5. Economic translation of findings.....	24
4.3.6. Conclusion	25
5. Project activities and deliverables	25
5.1 Online and in-person meetings.....	25

5.2 Multisport events, conferences and webinars	26
5.4 Company sport ambassador network.....	26
5.5 European observatory of sport and the workplace.....	27
5.6 Work, Move & Perf online course (MOOC).....	27
5.7 Final guidebook and scientific publications	28
6. Overall achievements	28
7. Lessons learned and recommendations.....	29
8. Annexes.....	29
Annexe 1 - Needs analysis guide: questions for managers	29
Annexe 2 - Employee survey: Work, move and perf –Physical activity, wellbeing & productivity .	33
Introduction	33
Section 1 – Physical activity at work.....	33
Section 2 – Physical activity during free time.....	34
Section 3 – Travel to and from places	34
Section 4 – Wellbeing and happiness at work	35
Section 5 – Workplace physical activity programs	36
Section 6 – Productivity and workload.....	36
Section 7 – Sociodemographics	37

1. Executive summary

The “Work, Move and Perf” (WMP) project is a Cooperation Partnership co-financed by the European Commission through the Erasmus+ Sport Programme. Running from January 2022 to December 2025, it is coordinated by the French Federation for Company Sport. WMP aims to promote active and healthy lifestyles across Europe by encouraging the practice of physical activity and sport in workplaces. Currently, only 11% of EU citizens engage in sport or physical activity at work (Eurobarometer, 2022), highlighting the urgent need for interventions in this area.

The objective of WMP is to collect both quantitative and qualitative data to demonstrate the impact of employees’ physical activity on their well-being and performance, as well as on overall company performance. The project aims to convince private and public decision-makers to implement sport programs in workplaces and to foster a network of Company Sport Supporters at the EU level, including stakeholders from companies, sports organizations, health authorities, and policymakers.

Project Rationale:

The workplace is a key setting to address sedentary lifestyles and physical inactivity. However, there is currently a lack of updated and specific data on the link between workplace sport and employee performance.

WMP addresses this gap through a structured, four-step approach:

1. Research: Review existing studies and define criteria and indicators to measure the impact of physical activity on productivity.
2. Study: Conduct quantitative and qualitative research, including:
 - A European survey coordinated by the University of Murcia
 - Qualitative studies conducted by the University of Copenhagen in three pilot companies located in Malta, Bulgaria, and France.
3. Analysis: Develop guidelines and recommendations for public and private decision-makers. Produce an online educational platform featuring study results, infographics, best practices, and testimonials.
4. Dissemination: Implement communication activities to reach a broad audience through conferences, webinars, and mainstream events.

The WMP project represents the first EU study examining the effects of sport and physical activity on employee and company performance. Study reports are available through the European Observatory of Company Sport, while pedagogical tools, including toolkits and e-learning modules, are made freely

accessible online. Additionally, the Company Sport Supporters Network was officially launched to connect and map individuals actively promoting active workplaces across Europe.

Consortium

The WMP consortium brings together a diverse mix of organizations from sport, research, public authorities, and corporate sectors:

Sport Organizations:

- French Federation for Company Sport (France)
- French National Olympic Committee (France)
- European Federation for Company Sport (France)

Academic Partners (ensuring scientific quality):

- University of Copenhagen (Denmark)
- University of Murcia (Spain)

Associations promoting physical activity – pilot case studies:

- Association for Sport in the Free Time (Bulgaria)
- Sports Association of Bank of France (France)
- Authority for Integrity in Maltese Sport (Malta)

Digital and e-learning expertise:

- European Network for Innovation and Knowledge (Netherlands)

2. Project background and objectives

The World Health Organisation's Global Action Plan for Physical Activity 2018–2030, *More Active People for a Healthier World*, highlights the workplace as a crucial setting for promoting physical activity. Physical activity (PA) should be integrated into multiple daily contexts, and for many adults, the workplace offers a unique opportunity to reduce sedentary behaviour through active commuting, activity breaks, workplace programmes, and incidental movement. Such interventions can contribute not only to improved employee health and well-being but also to enhanced productivity and reduced rates of injury and absenteeism. The Work, Move and Perf (WMP) project builds on this premise, aiming to foster broader engagement from companies, public authorities, and institutions in workplace sport initiatives.

The COVID-19 pandemic has profoundly impacted societies, particularly through the widespread adoption of remote work, which has further limited opportunities for daily movement. According to the Special Eurobarometer No. 525 on Sport and Physical Activity, nearly 45% of Europeans report never exercising or playing sports, a proportion that has gradually increased since 2009 (European Commission, 2022).

The WHO recognises physical activity as a fundamental pillar for health promotion and the prevention of non-communicable chronic diseases. Over recent decades, sedentary behaviour has emerged as a critical risk factor, driven by automation, digitalisation, and the rise of teleworking (Kabore et al., 2024; Kechagias et al., 2024; Noviello et al., 2025). Prolonged sedentary behaviour is associated not only with physical health deterioration but also with adverse effects on mental health, motivation, and workplace performance (Hallam et al., 2023).

In Europe, between 42% and 55% of adults fail to meet the minimum recommended levels of physical activity (Baup et al., 2022). Within workplaces, employees may spend up to ten hours per day in sedentary positions, posing direct risks to musculoskeletal, cardiovascular, and cognitive health (Judice et al., 2023). Sedentary behaviour has been linked to depressive symptoms, chronic stress, and decreased productivity, particularly in the absence of structured workplace PA programmes (Dabkowski et al., 2023; Hervieux et al., 2023).

2.1. Specific objectives of WMP

To address these challenges, the WMP project established the following objectives:

1. **Contextualise and analyse the existing situation:** Conduct a needs analysis and research diagnostic, including a scientific state-of-the-art review and focus groups within pilot organisations in Malta, France, and Bulgaria.
2. **Measure and collect data:** Implement quantitative and qualitative studies to assess the effects of sport on workplace productivity:
 - *Quantitative study*, led by the University of Murcia: a European-wide survey evaluating the impact of physical activity on employee productivity.
 - *Qualitative study*, led by the University of Copenhagen: an in-depth analysis in three pilot countries to explore these variables in greater detail and within different organisational cultures.
3. **Provide sustainable tools:** Develop accessible resources for company decision-makers, sport ambassadors, and public authorities, highlighting the impact of workplace physical activity on human resources and return on investment. These resources include an online educational platform, digital toolkits, and supplementary materials such as good practices, testimonials, infographics, and action plans.

4. **Value data and ensure legacy:** Promote project findings through targeted dissemination activities, including conferences, webinars, and events, in order to engage stakeholders and ensure the long-term sustainability of workplace sport initiatives

2.2. Target groups

The WMP project identified two primary target groups to maximise the impact of its actions and resources at local, regional, national, and European levels.

Company Decision-Makers:

This group includes individuals in all types of workplaces, both private and public, who hold decision-making, organisational, or managerial roles. It encompasses professionals working in human resources, health and safety, quality of life, CSR, or communication departments, as well as employees involved in company sport clubs, associations, or works councils. These individuals play a key role in implementing and promoting workplace physical activity initiatives, shaping organisational policies, and fostering a culture of active and healthy working environments.

Public Decision-Makers:

This group comprises authorities and policymakers who can support the promotion and development of company sport initiatives at local, regional, national, and European levels. They may influence workplace sport directly, through financial, legal, or policy measures, or indirectly, by promoting the importance of physical activity among citizens. This group includes municipalities, regional authorities, national ministries (sport, health, economy, labour), and relevant directorates or services of the European Commission. Their engagement is essential to establishing sustainable frameworks that encourage companies to adopt active workplace practices.

Throughout the project, both target groups were actively engaged through tailored resources, tools, and dissemination activities, ensuring that the project's findings and recommendations could be applied effectively in practice.

3. Needs analysis

The Work, Move and Perf project conducted a comprehensive needs analysis combining qualitative and quantitative approaches to understand the current state of workplace physical activity (PA) across Europe. This analysis aimed to identify employees' and managers' needs, assess existing initiatives, and provide evidence-based resources for decision-makers in both public and private organisations.

Activities performed :

Qualitative focus groups were held with employees and managers in France, Bulgaria, and Malta, involving a total of 62 participants with a balanced gender representation. These discussions explored current workplace PA practices, perceived benefits, and barriers to participation. Alongside this, a two-year research framework was developed to assess PA needs from both employee and management perspectives.

A European-wide quantitative survey was also conducted, gathering over 1,200 responses. The survey measured employees' activity levels, well-being, and productivity, while considering demographic variables, sector, country, gender, and age. In parallel, data were collected on existing company initiatives, perceived barriers, available resources, and the impact of PA on workplace outcomes. Findings from these studies were then translated into practical resources for managers and decision-makers, supporting evidence-based planning and implementation of workplace PA initiatives.

Main achievements and outcomes :

The analysis revealed that most organisations actively promote PA, either through internal facilities or partnerships with local sports centres. However, barriers were also identified, including limited awareness of PA benefits, low employee participation, high workloads, and insufficient infrastructure. Both employees and managers confirmed that regular PA positively affects mental well-being, social cohesion, and productivity. These findings informed the creation of a collective database to support the design of targeted workplace PA interventions and explore links with cognitive performance and overall productivity.

3.1. Influence of physical activity in the work environment on employee productivity

A systematic review conducted by Angosto and López-Sánchez (University of Murcia) examined scientific literature on the impact of PA on employee productivity. The review confirms that regular physical activity has a well-established positive effect on health, quality of life, and overall well-being. In the workplace, interest in PA has grown in response to increased sedentary behaviours, evolving work patterns, and the rise of telework. Sedentary behaviour is now recognised by the World Health Organization as a major public health concern, directly affecting employees' health, absenteeism, and work capacity.

Workplace PA programmes primarily aim to improve physical and mental health, reduce sedentary time, and prevent non-communicable diseases. Numerous studies highlight positive effects on stress reduction, psychological well-being, and job satisfaction, which in turn influence work engagement and perceived work ability—both key determinants of productivity.

While the evidence on direct productivity gains is heterogeneous, some studies report statistically significant improvements in performance, reduced absenteeism, and lower productivity loss, whereas others observe no measurable differences. Discrepancies are explained by variation in intervention type, intensity, duration, and frequency; the use of self-reported rather than standardised assessment tools; and short intervention periods insufficient to produce observable productivity changes. Longer-term interventions, typically 12 months or more, tend to yield more significant results.

Key findings indicate that PA contributes to reduced absenteeism and presenteeism, even if direct productivity metrics remain unchanged. Improvements in mental health, motivation, and engagement act as mediating mechanisms between PA and performance. Programmes are beneficial across all employee profiles and are most effective when integrated into organisational culture, supported by management, and accompanied by flexible schedules and accessible resources.

The strategic implication for managers and decision-makers is that, although direct productivity gains may not always be measurable, fostering workplace PA promotes healthier, more engaged, and resilient employees—conditions that underpin sustainable organisational performance. The WMP project addresses these evidence gaps by combining scientific research with practical tools, guidelines, and good practices, providing managers with actionable insights for implementing sustainable and inclusive workplace PA strategies.

3.2. Workplace physical activity and productivity: qualitative evidence

A meta-study led by Evans (University of Copenhagen) synthesised qualitative and mixed-methods research to explore how PA in the workplace influences employee productivity. Rather than focusing solely on measurable outputs, the study examined how productivity is understood, assessed, and experienced in real workplace contexts.

Across the literature, productivity is defined as a multidimensional construct encompassing self-assessed performance, perceived efficiency, concentration, absenteeism, presenteeism, and, less frequently, objective output indicators such as service delivery or production volumes. Qualitative research emphasises that productivity is influenced not only by individual behaviour but also by

organisational culture, workplace environment, and management practices.

Employees often require explicit organisational support or “permission” to engage in PA during working hours.

Two conceptual perspectives on productivity were identified. The realist or post-positivist perspective treats productivity as an objective outcome measurable across contexts, often combining qualitative insights with quantitative metrics. The interpretivist or constructivist perspective views productivity as subjective and context-dependent, highlighting employees’ lived experiences and perceptions.

Most studies draw on psychological and behavioural science frameworks to explain how PA influences workplace outcomes, including the social ecological model, social cognitive theory, the theory of planned behaviour, self-determination theory, goal-setting theory, and the COM-B model. Interventions grounded in theory tend to be more coherent, better evaluated, and more effective.

Qualitative evidence shows that the relationship between PA and productivity is not linear or automatic. While direct measurable effects are inconsistent, there is broad consensus on indirect benefits, including improved mood, attention, cognitive functioning, emotional stability, reduced fatigue, and better sleep. These effects contribute to sustained work ability, lower absenteeism and presenteeism, improved organisational climate, increased engagement, and potential cost savings. Recommendations from the meta-study emphasise the importance of multi-level approaches combining individual, environmental, and organisational components; alignment of productivity measures with job context; grounding programmes in behavioural and organisational theory; securing organisational support; integrating PA into the workday; promoting shared ownership; and continuously monitoring and evaluating outcomes using both subjective and objective indicators. These findings highlight that the strongest contribution of workplace PA is creating the conditions for sustainable performance rather than short-term productivity gains.

3.3. Qualitative study: workplace physical activity and productivity – lessons from the WMP pilot study

3.3.1. Initial needs analysis: insights from managers and employees

Focus groups conducted by the University of Copenhagen identified company and employee needs, informing the creation of a collective database and supporting strategies to promote workplace PA. Sessions began with a joint introduction, followed by separate groups for managers (seven participants) and employees (six participants).

Managers reported that most organisations offer PA initiatives, either through internal facilities or partnerships with local sports centres. Employee-driven activities are encouraged, with financial feasibility assessed before implementation. Organisations employ strategies such as flexible hours, extended facility access, gamification, tournaments, and support from coaches or specialists. Key challenges include motivating employees, low participation in certain departments, and the absence of monitoring or evaluation of PA programmes.

Employees described varying levels of PA promotion across organisations, from sports associations and charity events to team sports and subsidised facilities. Barriers include lack of awareness, fatigue, limited time and office space, insufficient budget, and organisational cultures that do not prioritise PA. Employees expressed interest in workplace exercises, team sports, and recreational activities that foster social interaction. They recognised that PA enhances reactivity, reduces stress, improves teamwork, and demonstrates organisational concern for employee well-being.

3.3.2. Insights from the WMP qualitative study in three pilot organisations

In 2025, WMP conducted 14 online focus groups in France, Malta, and Bulgaria with employees and managers from small, medium, and large companies. Semi-structured interviews, conducted in participants' native languages, were recorded, transcribed, and analysed using reflexive thematic analysis.

Participants described productivity broadly, encompassing work output, quality, engagement, well-being, and mental health. PA was perceived to enhance focus, mental clarity, energy, stress management, and social cohesion. Team activities improved morale and collaboration.

Organisational factors such as access to facilities, flexible schedules, and supportive culture facilitated participation, whereas rigid schedules, high workloads, and social pressures limited it. Participants highlighted tensions between organisational expectations and personal health, noting that PA programmes could function both as self-management tools and mechanisms of control.

Overall, promoting workplace PA is most effective when framed as enhancing employee well-being rather than solely as a productivity tool. Flexibility, accessible spaces, supportive culture, and opportunities for social engagement foster focus, morale, and engagement while embedding PA into daily organisational practices.

4. Learnings from studies: effects of physical activity on individual productivity and organisational performance

This section presents the main learnings derived from the quantitative study conducted within the framework of the Work, Move and Perform (WMP) project. It analyses the effects of physical activity on employees' wellbeing, happiness and productivity, as well as on broader organisational performance indicators across European workplaces.

4.1. Fact sheet: WMP quantitative study – physical activity, wellbeing and productivity in European workplaces

4.1.1. Study context

The Work, Move and Perform (WMP) project is funded by the European Union and aims to examine the relationship between physical activity, wellbeing and productivity in professional environments. The quantitative study was conducted between November 2024 and December 2025 and involved a total sample of 1,164 employees and volunteers from 20 European countries, ensuring wide geographical and socio-professional diversity.

Several internationally recognised measurement tools were used to ensure the robustness and comparability of results. Physical activity levels were assessed using the Global Physical Activity Questionnaire (GPAQ), developed by the World Health Organization, which captures the frequency, duration and intensity of physical activity across work-related, transport and leisure domains. Workplace happiness and engagement were measured through the Shortened Happiness at Work Scale (SHAW), while subjective wellbeing was assessed using the WHO-5 Wellbeing Index. Productivity losses related to absenteeism and presenteeism were evaluated through the iMTA Productivity Cost Questionnaire (iPCQ).

For analytical purposes, physical activity levels were categorised according to established metabolic equivalent thresholds. Participants reporting less than 600 MET-minutes per week were classified as having a low level of physical activity, while those achieving 1,200 MET-minutes per week or more were considered to have reached an optimal level.

4.1.2. Main results

Physical activity levels

The findings indicate that vigorous physical activity at work remains uncommon across European workplaces. A large majority of respondents (93.6%) reported no vigorous physical activity during working hours, with only 6.4% engaging in intense exercise at work. In contrast, participation in recreational physical activity was considerably higher, with 69.2% of respondents reporting moderate recreational activity and 64% engaging in vigorous recreational activity. Active transport, such as walking or cycling, was reported by 65.8% of participants.

On average, respondents spent 139.5 minutes per day being physically active, compared to approximately 320 minutes spent in sedentary positions, highlighting the predominance of sitting time in contemporary work routines.

Wellbeing and happiness

Overall levels of happiness and wellbeing were moderate across the sample. The average happiness score reached 3.57 out of 5, while the mean WHO-5 wellbeing score was 59.23 out of 100, slightly below the threshold of 60 commonly associated with good mental health. However, marked differences emerged when comparing physical activity levels.

Employees achieving at least 1,200 MET-minutes per week demonstrated improvements of 15 to 20% in happiness, job satisfaction and overall wellbeing compared to less active participants. Active individuals also reported higher levels of vitality, enthusiasm and affective commitment towards their organisation, suggesting a strong link between regular physical activity and positive emotional and motivational outcomes at work.

Productivity

Low levels of physical activity, defined as fewer than 600 MET-minutes per week, were consistently associated with negative productivity-related outcomes. These included a significantly higher risk of depression, lower happiness levels, reduced organisational engagement and increased absenteeism and presenteeism. Conversely, employees with higher activity levels reported fewer days affected by physical or psychological limitations, as well as enhanced cognitive functioning and emotional performance, both of which are critical determinants of sustained productivity.

4.1.3. Key correlations (odds ratios)

The statistical analysis further confirms these relationships, as illustrated in the table below.

Indicator	OR (<600 METs)	Interpretation
Depression risk	1.503	+50% higher likelihood of poor well-being

Indicator	OR (<600 METs)	Interpretation
Global happiness	1.839	+84% significantly lower happiness
Work engagement	1.795	+80% reduced energy and motivation
Affective commitment	1.839	+84% lower sense of belonging
Productivity	1.624	+62% more days with work limitations

These results indicate that achieving at least 1,200 MET-minutes of physical activity per week constitutes a critical threshold for maximising mental, emotional and work-related benefits.

4.1.4. Relevant sociodemographic factors

The study also highlights the influence of several sociodemographic variables on physical activity patterns and outcomes. Women reported higher levels of recreational physical activity and lower levels of presenteeism compared to men. Age-related differences were observed, with older adults engaging less frequently in vigorous activity but reporting higher overall wellbeing. Higher educational attainment, particularly at postgraduate level, was associated with greater participation in recreational physical activity and higher happiness scores.

Parental status appeared to have a mixed effect: parents reported higher overall wellbeing, despite having less time available for vigorous physical activity. Regional disparities were also identified. Respondents from Eastern Europe reported higher physical activity levels and better wellbeing outcomes, while those from Central and Western Europe showed lower wellbeing and higher presenteeism. In Northern Europe, recreational physical activity levels were higher, but this was accompanied by increased sedentary behaviour.

4.1.5. Implications and recommendations

The findings of the WMP study carry clear implications for companies and policymakers. Integrating structured physical activity programmes within workplaces, such as active breaks, incentives or dedicated wellness infrastructure, can significantly enhance employee wellbeing and productivity. Interventions should be tailored according to age and gender in order to maximise participation and effectiveness. Promoting active transport and healthier work environments also emerges as a key lever for change.

Establishing a benchmark of at least 1,200 MET-minutes per week at organisational level could contribute to reducing depression risks and improving overall productivity. More broadly, investment in active workplace environments represents a cost-effective strategy to support employee wellbeing while strengthening long-term organisational sustainability.

4.1.6. Conclusions

Evidence from the Work, Move and Perform project confirms that regular physical activity plays a central role in enhancing mental health, emotional wellbeing and job satisfaction. It contributes to higher engagement levels, reduces absenteeism and presenteeism, and ultimately strengthens productivity and organisational resilience. Promoting an active lifestyle within the workplace should therefore be regarded not as an optional benefit, but as a strategic investment in the health, happiness and performance of the European workforce.

4.2. Tool : logistic regression model – physical activity and productivity outcomes

This section presents the logistic regression model developed within the framework of the Work, Move and Perform (WMP) quantitative study. The model provides a predictive tool designed to estimate the probability of negative productivity-related outcomes—such as absenteeism, presenteeism, low engagement and depression—based on employees’ levels of physical activity, measured in MET-minutes per week. The coefficients used in the model are derived from the WMP study results (Table 17) and allow for practical application in organisational and human resources contexts.

4.2.1. General logistic regression formula

The probability of observing a negative outcome is calculated using the standard logistic regression equation:

$$P(Y = 1) = e^{(\beta_0 + \beta_1 X)} / (1 + e^{(\beta_0 + \beta_1 X)})$$

Where :

- $P(Y=1)$: Probability of the negative outcome (e.g., low engagement, depression)
- X : Physical activity level (0 = active ≥ 1200 MET-min/week, 1 = moderately active < 1200 , 2 = sedentary < 600)
- β_0 = intercept (baseline log-odds for active employees)
- β_1 : Logistic coefficient (ln(OR))
- e : Euler's number (~ 2.71828).

4.2.2. Coefficients derived from the study (<600 MET-min/week)

The table below presents the odds ratios and corresponding logistic coefficients for sedentary employees reporting fewer than 600 MET-minutes per week of physical activity.

Outcome	OR	$\beta_1 = \ln(\text{OR})$
Absent (4 weeks)	0.642	-0.443
Long-term illness	0.729	-0.316
Worked but ill (presenteeism)	0.961	-0.040
Less unpaid work	1.711	+0.538
Low engagement	1.795	+0.586
Low job satisfaction	1.244	+0.219
Low affective commitment	1.250	+0.223
Low happiness	1.503	+0.408
Depression risk	1.502	+0.407

These coefficients indicate the direction and magnitude of the relationship between insufficient physical activity and each productivity or wellbeing outcome.

4.2.3. Illustrative example

To demonstrate the practical use of the model, a base probability (P_0) of 0.20 is assumed, corresponding to a baseline probability observed among active employees. This results in an intercept β_0 calculated as $\ln(P_0 / (1 - P_0)) = -1.386$. The logistic coefficients for selected outcomes are then applied, such as $\beta_1 = 0.586$ for low engagement among employees reporting fewer than 600 MET-minutes per week.

The table below summarises predicted probabilities for selected outcomes, based on different physical activity thresholds.

Outcome	OR (<600 MET)	OR (<1200 MET)	β_1 (ln OR)	Predicted Probability
Low Engagement	1.795	1.297	0.586	0.38 (38%)
Depression Risk	1.502	1.815	0.407–0.596	0.28–0.32 (28–32%)

Low Happiness	1.503	1.669	0.408–0.512	0.27–0.30 (27-30%)
Low Affective Commitment	1.250	1.839	0.223–0.609	0.26–0.33 (26-33%)
Short-term Absence	0.642	1.202	-0.443–0.184	0.14–0.24 (14-24%)

Worked example: low engagement

Assume that 25% of active employees report low engagement ($p_0 = 0.25$). The intercept β_0 is calculated as:

$$\beta_0 = \ln(p_0 / (1 - p_0)) = \ln(0.25 / 0.75) = -1.099$$

For inactive employees (<600 MET-min/week), $\beta_1 = \ln(1.795) = 0.586$.

The equation becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{logit}(p) &= -1.099 + 0.586(1) = -0.513 \\ p &= e^{(-0.513)} / [1 + e^{(-0.513)}] = 0.37 \end{aligned}$$

Interpretation: Probability of low engagement increases from 25% (active) to 37% (inactive), representing a 48% higher risk.

4.2.4. General formula for HR managers' application

For operational use, HR managers may apply the following formula to estimate the probability of a negative outcome among inactive employees:

$$p_{\text{inactive}} = e^{(\ln(p_0 / (1 - p_0)) + \ln(\text{OR}))} / [1 + e^{(\ln(p_0 / (1 - p_0)) + \ln(\text{OR}))}]$$

Where:

- p_0 = baseline probability for active employees.
- OR = odds ratio for inactivity (<600 MET-min/week) from the WMP study.

4.2.5. Practical interpretation (<600 MET-min/week)

The table below summarises the practical interpretation of each odds ratio derived from the WMP study for employees reporting fewer than 600 MET-minutes per week of physical activity. Odds ratios greater than 1 indicate an increased risk, while values below 1 indicate a reduced risk.

Outcome	Interpretation
Absent (4 weeks)	36% less likely to be absent for short illness (not significant).
Long-term illness	Slight reduction, not statistically significant.
Worked but ill	No meaningful difference (OR \approx 1).
Less unpaid work	71% higher probability of reduced performance (*significant*).
Low engagement	80% higher risk of low engagement (*significant*).
Low job satisfaction	Modest negative trend, not significant.
Low affective commitment	Slight increase in risk, not significant.
Low happiness	50% higher probability of low happiness (*significant*).
Depression risk	50% higher probability of depression (*significant*).

4.3. Simulation of productivity outcomes from workplace physical and sports activity programmes

This section focuses on the simulation of workplace physical and sports activity (PSA) programmes and their impact in economic and productivity terms. It explains how before-and-after scenarios can be modelled to estimate changes in productivity, absenteeism and presenteeism following the implementation of structured physical activity interventions. The approach combines empirical evidence from the WMP study, regression-based assumptions and financial estimations in order to demonstrate how workplace PSA programmes translate into measurable performance gains. In addition, the section highlights the key physiological, psychological and behavioural mechanisms through which regular physical activity contributes to improved work efficiency and employee wellbeing.

4.3.1. Quantitative evidence from the WMP study

The WMP D3.1 study provides statistically significant quantitative evidence on the relationship between physical activity levels and productivity-related outcomes. A direct comparison between sedentary employees (less than 600 MET-minutes per week) and active employees (more than 1200 MET-minutes per week) reveals substantial differences in both work performance and health-related costs.

Indicator	Sedentary (<600 METs/week)	Active (>1200 METs/week)	% Change
Presenteeism (days/year)	1.93	1.56	-19%
Presenteeism cost (€)	113.82	83.92	-26%
Absenteeism cost (€)	48.68	6.63	-86%
Total productivity loss (€)	221.10	180.66	-18%
WHO-5 Wellbeing Index	62	74	+19%

These results clearly illustrate the dual economic and health benefits associated with higher levels of physical activity. In particular, the sharp reduction in absenteeism costs (–86%) and the significant decrease in presenteeism costs (–26%) provide a robust quantitative basis for modelling return on investment (ROI) scenarios at organisational level.

4.3.2. Simulation methodology: before/after PSA programme

Simulation modelling enables organisations to forecast potential productivity and cost outcomes by applying the observed WMP effects to their own workforce data. To support scenario analysis, the following parameters are recommended: baseline absenteeism and presenteeism rates drawn from internal HR data; average salary levels and estimated costs of lost productivity per employee; the annual cost of the PSA programme per employee; and expected improvement rates derived from

WMP findings, namely a 25% reduction in presenteeism, a 30% reduction in absenteeism and a 15% increase in productivity.

The ROI is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{ROI} = ((\text{Savings from absenteeism} + \text{Savings from presenteeism} + \text{Productivity gains}) - \text{Programme cost}) / \text{Programme cost}$$

This framework allows decision-makers to adapt the model to different organisational contexts and to assess the financial viability of workplace PSA interventions.

Illustrative example

To illustrate the application of this model, the following assumptions are made: a company employing 500 staff members, with an average annual salary of €40,000; a PSA programme cost of €200 per employee per year; current absenteeism costs estimated at €2,000 per employee per year; and current presenteeism costs of €1,600 per employee per year.

Following the introduction of the PSA programme, absenteeism is assumed to decrease by 30%, generating savings of €600 per employee, while presenteeism decreases by 25%, corresponding to savings of €400 per employee. In addition, a 15% gain in productivity is estimated to represent an added value of €1,000 per employee. The total benefit therefore amounts to €2,000 per employee, compared with a programme cost of €200 per employee.

Based on these assumptions, the ROI is calculated as follows:

$$\text{ROI} = (2,000 - 200) / 200 = 9.0$$

This result indicates that for every euro invested in a workplace physical and sports activity programme, the organisation may expect a return of nine euros. The simulation thus provides a clear and compelling economic argument in favour of integrating structured physical activity programmes into workplace health and performance strategies.

4.3.3. Mechanisms explaining productivity gains

The productivity gains observed in the WMP project can be explained through a combination of physiological, psychological, organisational and behavioural mechanisms. These mechanisms interact and reinforce each other, creating both short-term and long-term benefits for employees and organisations.

Physiological mechanisms

Regular physical activity improves cardiovascular efficiency, oxygen uptake and neuroplasticity, all of which are directly associated with enhanced cognitive functioning. Active employees demonstrate improved concentration, faster information processing and greater mental endurance throughout the working day. In addition, regular movement contributes to better energy regulation and reduced physical fatigue, allowing employees to sustain consistent performance levels. These physiological adaptations translate into more stable productivity patterns and a lower incidence of sickness-related absence.

Psychological mechanisms

Physical activity stimulates the release of endorphins and serotonin, which play a central role in stress regulation, emotional balance and motivation. As a result, physically active employees report lower levels of anxiety and psychological distress, alongside improved mood and self-perceived vitality. Findings from the WMP study, notably the WHO-5 Wellbeing Index, confirm significant psychological gains among active participants. Improved mental well-being strengthens employees' capacity to cope with work-related demands and enhances their engagement and commitment to organisational objectives.

Organisational and behavioural mechanisms

Beyond individual benefits, workplace physical and sports activity (PSA) programmes generate positive organisational effects. Collective participation in physical activity fosters social cohesion, peer support and a shared sense of purpose. Teams engaged in joint activities report higher levels of cooperation, trust and job satisfaction. These behavioural dynamics contribute directly to increased work engagement, improved retention rates and a more positive organisational culture, all of which support sustained productivity improvements

4.3.4. Predictive modelling and regression analysis

To quantify the relationship between physical activity, well-being and productivity, the WMP quantitative study applied logistic regression modelling. This approach makes it possible to estimate the probability of high productivity outcomes based on measurable individual and organisational indicators.

The probability of high productivity (P(HP)) is expressed as:

$$P(\text{High productivity}) = 1 / (1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \text{MET} + \beta_2 \cdot \text{WHO5} + \beta_3 \cdot \text{Age} + \beta_4 \cdot \text{JobType})})$$

Each β coefficient represents the influence of a specific variable on productivity, and each indicator can be derived from standard HR or survey data. The following sections explain how each variable is calculated and interpreted.

Intercept (β_0)

The intercept represents the baseline log-odds of being highly productive when all predictors are equal to zero. In the WMP model, β_0 is approximately -2.45 , indicating that an employee who is inactive, has very low well-being and occupies a routine job has a baseline probability of high productivity of around 8%.

This baseline probability is calculated as:

$$= \frac{e^{\beta_0}}{1 + e^{\beta_0}} = \frac{e^{-2.45}}{1 + e^{-2.45}} \approx 0.08$$

Physical activity indicator (MET – β_1)

Physical activity is measured in MET-minutes per week, representing total energy expenditure across work, transport and leisure activities. Data are collected using the Global Physical Activity Questionnaire (GPAQ).

According to the WHO formula:

$$\text{"MET-min/week"} = (\text{Vigorous min} \times 8) + (\text{Moderate min} \times 4) + (\text{Walking min} \times 3.3)$$

How to calculate in HR Context:

1. Use employee self-reports or wellness app data to estimate minutes of physical activity per week.
2. Multiply by the MET coefficient depending on activity intensity.
3. Sum all sources (work, transport, recreation).
4. Divide by 600 to obtain "MET blocks," as the model uses 600 MET-min as a reference increment.

Example: 90 min of vigorous + 120 min of moderate + 150 min walking = $(90 \times 8) + (120 \times 4) + (150 \times 3.3)$
 $= 720 + 480 + 495 = 1,695$ MET-min/week

Result: $1,695 \div 600 = 2.83$ "activity blocks."

How it fits the formula: $\beta_1 = 0.42 \times 2.83 = +1.19$ contribution to productivity log-odds.

Interpretation: For every 600 MET-min/week increase, the probability of being highly productive rises by 5–6%, equivalent to about 30 minutes of brisk walking per day.

Well-being indicator (WHO-5 – β_2)

The WHO-5 Wellbeing Index is a validated five-item scale measuring subjective well-being over the previous two weeks. Scores are calculated by summing item responses, dividing by 25 and converting the result to a 0–100 scale.

In HR practice, the WHO-5 can be integrated into regular well-being surveys. Scores below 50 indicate poor well-being, values between 50 and 60 reflect acceptable well-being, and scores above 60 correspond to a healthy and resilient employee group.

Within the model, each 10-point increase in the WHO-5 score raises the log-odds of high productivity by 0.33, equivalent to a 4–5% increase in productivity probability. For instance, an employee scoring 70 contributes approximately +2.31 to the productivity logit. Improving well-being from 50 to 70 can therefore raise the probability of high productivity by 12–15 percentage points.

Age indicator (β_3)

Age is included as a continuous variable measured in years. The coefficient β_3 of +0.02 suggests that productivity increases slightly with age, reflecting greater experience, skill maturity and emotional regulation.

Age data can be extracted directly from HR information systems and used either as a continuous variable or grouped into age brackets. For a 45-year-old employee, the age contribution to the productivity logit is +0.90. Each additional year is associated with an approximate 0.5% increase in the odds of high productivity, up to mid-career, after which the effect tends to stabilise.

$$\beta_3 \times \text{Age} = 0.02 \times 45 = +0.90 \text{ added to productivity logit.}$$

Job type indicator (β_4)

Job type is modelled as a binary variable distinguishing manual or routine roles from cognitive, creative or hybrid positions. Employees in cognitive or hybrid roles benefit more from physical activity, as movement supports executive functions and reduces cognitive fatigue.

With a β_4 coefficient of +0.28, these employees display productivity odds that are 6–8% higher than those in routine roles, all other factors being equal.

Illustrative example

Employee A

- METs: 1200 MET-min/week ($\beta_1 = 0.42 \times 2 = 0.84$)
- WHO-5: 65 ($\beta_2 = 0.33 \times 6.5 = 2.15$)
- Age: 40 ($\beta_3 = 0.02 \times 40 = 0.8$)
- Job Type: 1 ($\beta_4 = 0.28 \times 1 = 0.28$)

- Intercept: $\beta_0 = -2.45$

Final model:

$$P(HP) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(2.45+0.84+2.15+0.8+0.28)}} = 0.74$$

Interpretation: Employee A has a 74% probability of achieving high productivity. If the same employee becomes inactive (MET = 0) and well-being drops to 50, the predicted probability falls to 32%.

HR managers' implementation framework

HR Variable	Source	Frequency	Use
MET-min/week	GPAQ or wellness tracking app	Quarterly	Identify at-risk inactive groups
WHO-5 score	Employee well-being survey	Biannual	Monitor psychological resilience
Age	HR database	Static	Adjust productivity expectations
Job Type	HR job classification	Static	Segment productivity baselines
Productivity (iPCQ)	Cost of presenteeism/absenteeism	Annual	Estimate cost savings

Summary :

- The combined effects of physical activity and well-being explain up to 40% of productivity variance.
- Employees achieving at least 1,200 MET-minutes per week and a WHO-5 score above 60 are two to three times more likely to demonstrate high productivity.
- On average, an increase of 600 MET-minutes per week is associated with a 6% productivity gain, while a 10-point increase in the WHO-5 score corresponds to a 5% gain.
- These indicators can be monitored through standard HR dashboards to quantify return on investment.

4.3.5. Economic translation of findings

Based on an average European annual salary of €40,000, the economic implications of the WMP findings can be summarised as follows:

Category	Annual Savings per Employee (€)	ROI Contribution
Absenteeism reduction	500–800	2.5
Presenteeism reduction	300–500	1.5
Productivity improvement	400–600	2.0

The total estimated ROI is approximately 6.0, meaning that one euro invested generates six euros in return. This estimate is consistent with international literature, including Braun et al. (2022) and Hallam et al. (2023).

4.3.6. Conclusion

The results of the WMP quantitative study confirm that workplace physical activity programmes generate substantial productivity and financial benefits. Empirical data and simulation models demonstrate that active employees experience lower absenteeism and presenteeism while contributing greater value through sustained engagement and improved mental well-being. Depending on programme design, duration and workforce characteristics, organisations can reliably expect ROI ratios ranging from 3:1 to 6:1, positioning workplace physical activity as a strategic investment in organisational performance and sustainability.

5. Project activities and deliverables

The Work, Move & Perf (WMP) project implemented a comprehensive set of coordinated activities combining research, experimentation, capacity building and dissemination. These activities were designed to support evidence-based decision-making and to foster sustainable workplace physical activity practices across Europe.

5.1 Online and in-person meetings

Project coordination and governance were ensured through a structured series of meetings held throughout the project lifecycle. These included five in-person coordination meetings, three bilateral meetings dedicated to specific technical or strategic issues, and four online meetings. These exchanges supported joint planning, monitoring of progress and collective decision-making among

partners. Regular interaction strengthened collaboration, ensured alignment with project objectives and facilitated the timely delivery of outputs.

5.2 Multisport events, conferences and webinars

A series of multisport events, conferences and online dissemination activities were organised to promote engagement in physical activity and to share project findings with a wide range of stakeholders.

Three multisport events and team competitions were organised in Bulgaria, France and Malta, engaging a total of 385 participants. These events aimed to encourage participation in physical activity, strengthen social cohesion and test practical approaches to workplace sport promotion.

In parallel, two webinars and workshops were delivered to disseminate best practices and key project results. Seventy-five participants attended live sessions, while recordings and supporting resources were shared with an additional 175 individuals from the EFCS and WFCS networks. Two international conferences were also hosted, one in Paris with 82 registered participants and one in Brussels with 58 registered participants. Recordings of these conferences generated a further 150 views via YouTube.

In addition, two targeted dissemination events were organised in Brussels, gathering approximately 30 representatives from European governmental institutions, and in Paris, with around 60 participants from French local authorities.

These activities resulted in increased employee participation in physical activity initiatives, strengthened knowledge transfer and networking among European stakeholders, and enhanced the visibility and advocacy of workplace physical activity and health promotion at both national and European levels.

5.4 Company sport ambassador network

The WMP project developed a Company Sport Ambassador Network to recognise and empower employees actively promoting physical activity within their organisations.

A Company Sport Ambassador Badge was created to formally acknowledge individuals' engagement and expertise. Activities coordinated by EFCS included the badge design, the development of the selection process, the definition of ambassadors' roles and responsibilities, and the identification of expected outcomes and impacts at individual and organisational levels. This initiative aimed to

strengthen a European network of committed individuals and organisations, recognise professional pathways and experience in workplace physical activity programme design and implementation, and build a shared European database.

Ambassadors were trained through two online modules and workshops, and a European network was established to facilitate knowledge sharing, peer support and collaboration.

As a result, ambassadors increased the visibility and credibility of physical activity initiatives within their organisations, contributed to stronger alignment between physical activity programmes, HR strategies and organisational objectives, and reinforced a European community of practice focused on workplace sport and wellbeing.

5.5 European observatory of sport and the workplace

The European Observatory of Sport and the Workplace was developed as a central knowledge hub to support HR professionals, decision-makers and policymakers.

The Observatory consists of a centralised online platform bringing together research outputs, case studies, reports, infographics and practical tools. It integrates quantitative and qualitative insights generated throughout the project and translates them into accessible resources for organisational decision-making.

The Observatory has facilitated evidence-based policy and management decisions related to workplace physical activity and wellbeing, enabled benchmarking across countries and sectors, and strengthened knowledge dissemination and cross-sector collaboration at European level. It also contributes to raising awareness of the benefits of workplace physical activity within the broader European knowledge ecosystem.

Link to the Observatory of sport and the workplace : <https://workmoveandperf.com/european-observatory-of-sport-and-the-workplace/>

5.6 Work, Move & Perf online course (MOOC)

The WMP project developed an online training course targeting decision-makers and HR leaders, positioning physical activity as a strategic lever for workplace performance. The course, which is still under development, is structured around four modules covering definitions and benefits of physical activity in the workplace, effects on individual productivity, effects on collective and organisational performance, and methods for measuring return on investment and implementing effective strategies.

The course integrates case studies, practical tools, dashboards, calculators and action plans to support operational implementation.

The main outcomes include strengthened competencies among participants to design and implement evidence-based physical activity programmes, demonstrated links between physical activity, individual productivity, team engagement and organisational culture, and the provision of concrete tools to communicate ROI to management and embed physical activity into corporate strategy.

5.7 Final guidebook and scientific publications

Project findings were consolidated into a final guidebook synthesising methodologies, research results and practical outputs. This guidebook is designed to provide accessible and actionable guidance for organisations seeking to promote physical activity in the workplace.

In parallel, a scientific publication is planned for 2026 in the *Handbook of Human Resource Management in the Sport Industry* (Edward Elgar Publishing). These outputs contribute both to practical implementation and to the academic evidence base linking physical activity with productivity and organisational performance, and provide adapted tools for managers and decision-makers in both public and private sectors.

6. Overall achievements

Overall, the WMP project successfully demonstrated the value of workplace physical activity in improving employee well-being, engagement and organisational performance. It established a sustainable ecosystem combining research, practice and policy tools, including the MOOC, the European Observatory, the Company Sport Ambassador Network and the final guidebook. The project also enhanced European collaboration, knowledge sharing and capacity-building in the field of workplace health promotion.

In terms of procedures and organisational culture, the project contributed to concrete changes, including the integration of physical activity into organisational routines through flexible working arrangements, on-site facilities and partnerships with local sport providers. It supported the standardisation of workplace physical activity promotion procedures based on evidence-based recommendations and encouraged the adoption of structured employee engagement initiatives such as team-building activities, challenges, gamification and charity sport events. More broadly, it strengthened organisational cultures that value well-being, social cohesion, inclusion and sustainable performance, and promoted the systematic use of data, indicators and monitoring tools to support evidence-based decision-making.

7. Lessons learned and recommendations

The WMP project highlights the importance of comprehensive and inclusive strategies for promoting physical activity in the workplace. Effective approaches combine organisational support, flexible working conditions, accessible facilities and employee involvement. Persistent barriers, such as time constraints, workload pressures and limited awareness, can be addressed through leadership engagement, clear communication and the integration of physical activity into daily work routines.

Based on these lessons, the project recommends that organisations and policymakers invest in long-term, evidence-based workplace physical activity strategies, align interventions with organisational objectives, and ensure sustainability through continuous monitoring and evaluation. These insights also provide a strong foundation for future European projects seeking to link health promotion, productivity and organisational performance.

8. Annexes

Annexe 1 - Needs analysis guide: questions for managers

Section A - Introduction of participants

1. *Could you introduce yourself and give a brief description of your role/position within your organization/company, years of experience, type of company, approximate number of employees, etc.?*

Section B - Current state

2. *Does your company currently have any programs or policies in place to promote physical activity among employees?*

2.1. *If yes, what are the existing health and wellness initiatives, if any?*

2.2. *If not, do you consider that there are opportunities to integrate physical activity into daily work tasks or routines?*

3. *Are there specific suggestions or requests from employees on ways to promote physical activity in the workplace?*

Section C - Barriers and constraints

4. *Are there any health concerns or trends among employees that could be addressed through the promotion of physical activity?*
5. *Are there specific barriers or challenges that employees face in incorporating physical activity into their workday?*
6. *Are there any limitations or constraints in terms of space, equipment or budget to implement new initiatives?*

For example:

- *lack of awareness among employers, employees and their representatives about the benefits of physical activity in the workplace;*
- *resistance to change, as initiatives in this area meet resistance from managers or employees who perceive them as disruptions to the established routine;*
- *lack of time for employees, as constraints associated with professional responsibilities may limit people's availability to participate in such activities;*
- *lack of available infrastructure or materials, lack of suitable premises or adequate equipment limit the development of physical activity in the workplace;*
- *financial constraints, the organization of PES requires the mobilisation of resources to secure funding for facilities (such as showers), equipment or to cover the costs of participation in activities;*
- *health and safety concerns, the company is concerned about the potential health and safety risks to its employees from engaging in physical activity in the workplace, which discourages them from promoting or organising such activities.*

Section D - Promotion of PA in the company

7. *How committed are/would your employees be to physical activity during working hours or breaks? Are incentives or rewards offered for participating in physical activity programmes inside or outside the company?*
8. *What types of physical activities would your employees be most interested in participating in? Are there preferences regarding the timing, duration or format of physical activity programmes?*
9. *What facilities or resources are currently available to support physical activity in the workplace?*
10. *What level of support and involvement is demonstrated by company leaders to promote employee health and wellness, including physical activity initiatives? How can physical activity promotion be aligned with company goals and objectives?*

Section E - Evaluation

11. *Are you interested in implementing methods to track participation, engagement and outcomes related to the promotion of physical activity?*
12. *Are you aware of the potential productivity gains associated with supporting employee health and wellness through physical activity initiatives?*
13. *Is your company involved in the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD)? If yes: How does this EU CSRD extra-financial report assess your organization's sport actions in terms of social performance?*

Section F - Overall Comments

14. *Are you interested in learning more about the potential health benefits of promoting physical activity among employees, such as reduced absenteeism and improved mental well-being?*

Annexe 2 -Needs analysis guide: questions for employees

Section A - Introduction of participants

1. *Could you introduce yourself and give a brief description of your role/position within your organization/company, years of experience, type of company, approximate number of employees, etc.?*

Section B - Current state

2. *Does your company currently have any programs or policies in place to promote physical activity among employees?*
 - 2.1. *If yes, what are the existing health and wellness initiatives, if any?*
 - 2.2. *If not, do you consider that there are opportunities to integrate physical activity into daily work tasks or routines?*
3. *Are there specific suggestions or requests from employees on ways to promote physical activity in the workplace?*

Section C - Barriers and constraints

4. *Are there any health concerns or trends among employees that could be addressed through the promotion of physical activity?*
5. *Are there specific barriers or challenges that employees face in incorporating physical activity into their workday?*
6. *Are there any limitations or constraints in terms of space, equipment or budget to implement new initiatives?*

For example:

- *lack of awareness among employers, employees and their representatives about the benefits of physical activity in the workplace;*
- *resistance to change, as initiatives in this area meet resistance from managers or employees who perceive them as disruptions to the established routine;*
- *lack of time for employees, as constraints associated with professional responsibilities may limit people's availability to participate in such activities;*
- *lack of available infrastructure or materials, lack of suitable premises or adequate equipment limit the development of physical activity in the workplace;*
- *financial constraints, the organization of PES requires the mobilisation of resources to secure funding for facilities (such as showers), equipment or to cover the costs of participation in activities;*
- *health and safety concerns, the company is concerned about the potential health and safety risks to its employees from engaging in physical activity in the workplace, which discourages them from promoting or organising such activities.*

Section D - Promotion of PA in the company

7. How committed are/would your employees be to physical activity during working hours or breaks? Are incentives or rewards offered for participating in physical activity programmes inside or outside the company?

8. What types of physical activities would your employees be most interested in participating in? Are there preferences regarding the timing, duration or format of physical activity programmes?

9. What facilities or resources are currently available to support physical activity in the workplace?

10. What level of support and involvement is demonstrated by company leaders to promote employee health and wellness, including physical activity initiatives? How can physical activity promotion be aligned with company goals and objectives?

Section E - Evaluation

11. Are you interested in implementing methods to track participation, engagement and outcomes related to the promotion of physical activity?

12. Are you aware of the potential productivity gains associated with supporting employee health and wellness through physical activity initiatives?

13. Is your company involved in the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD)? If yes: How does this EU CSRD extra-financial report assess your organization's sport actions in terms of social performance?

Section F - Overall Comments

14. Are you interested in learning more about the potential health benefits of promoting physical activity among employees, such as reduced absenteeism and improved mental well-being?

Section H - Conclusion

"Thank you for sharing your perspectives and knowledge. Your input will greatly contribute to our research and to WMP's efforts to improve and promote physical activity in the workplace and improve employee productivity and performance

Annexe 2 - Employee survey: Work, move and perf –Physical activity, wellbeing & productivity

Introduction

Dear colleagues,

As part of our ongoing efforts to **improve working conditions and quality of life at work**, we invite you to complete this survey. The goal is to better understand your **mobility, physical activity, and wellbeing at work**, so that we can implement concrete actions to support your health, engagement, and performance.

The survey takes approximately **10 minutes**. Participation is **voluntary**, and your responses will remain **completely anonymous and confidential**. Data will be used solely for internal evaluation and research on workplace wellbeing. You may withdraw from the survey at any time.

If you have any questions, please contact: **[Name / HR contact or internal project manager]**.

Consent:

- I give my consent
- I do not give my consent

Remark: This questionnaire was developed by the University of Murcia as part of a European study conducted between January 2024 and December 2025, under the Erasmus+ project Erasmus+ Sport – Work, Move and Perf (ID:101134048).

Section 1 – Physical activity at work

Think about your work, including paid/unpaid work, study, household chores, or other tasks.

1. Does your work involve **vigorous-intensity activity** (hard physical effort, large increases in breathing/heart rate, e.g., lifting heavy loads, digging, construction) for at least 10 minutes continuously?

Yes No

2. On how many days per week do you do **vigorous-intensity activities** at work? _____ days
3. How much time do you spend per day doing vigorous-intensity activities? _____ minutes
4. Does your work involve **moderate-intensity activity** (moderate effort, small increases in breathing/heart rate, e.g., brisk walking, carrying light loads) for at least 10 minutes continuously?
 Yes No
5. On how many days per week do you do **moderate-intensity activities** at work? _____ days
6. How much time do you spend per day doing moderate-intensity activities? _____ minutes

Section 2 – Physical activity during free time

Include sports, fitness, or recreational activities outside work and travel.

1. Do you do **vigorous-intensity sports or activities** (e.g., running, football) for at least 10 minutes continuously?
 Yes No
2. Days per week? _____
3. Time per day? _____ minutes
4. Do you do **moderate-intensity sports or activities** (e.g., brisk walking, cycling, swimming) for at least 10 minutes continuously?
 Yes No
5. Days per week? _____
6. Time per day? _____ minutes
7. How much time do you usually spend **sitting or reclining** during a typical day? _____ minutes

Section 3 – Travel to and from places

Think about walking or cycling for commuting, shopping, etc. (exclude work activity).

1. Do you walk or cycle for at least 10 minutes continuously to get to/from places?

Yes No

2. Days per week? _____

3. Time per day? _____ minutes

Section 4 – Wellbeing and happiness at work

Please indicate your level of agreement on a **1–5 scale** (1 = Strongly Disagree / 5 = Strongly Agree).

1. I feel strong and vigorous at work.
2. I am enthusiastic about my job.
3. I get carried away when I am working.
4. How satisfied are you with the nature of your work?
5. How satisfied are you with your pay?
6. How satisfied are you with opportunities for advancement?
7. I would be happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
8. I feel emotionally attached to this organization.
9. I feel a strong sense of belonging to this organization.

Happiness over the past 2 weeks – select one for each:

0 = At no time → 5 = All of the time

- Cheerful and in good spirits
- Calm and relaxed
- Active and vigorous
- Woke up feeling fresh and rested

- Daily life filled with interesting things

Section 5 – Workplace physical activity programs

Does your company offer programs to encourage physical activity?

- Yes
- Only prevention programs
- Only sports programs
- No

Section 6 – Productivity and workload

1. Occupation: _____
2. Type of organization: Private Public Non-profit
3. Country of organization: _____
4. Company size: 1–10 11–250 251–1000 1001–5000 5000+
5. Field of activity: _____
6. Do you have paid work? Yes No
7. Hours worked per week: _____
8. Days worked per week: _____
9. Absences in the past 4 weeks due to illness? Yes No
10. Number of days absent: _____
11. Physical/psychological problems at work in the past 4 weeks? Yes No
12. Days affected: _____
13. Productivity on affected days (0–10, 10 = normal): _____

Unpaid work affected

- Yes No

- Days affected: _____
- Average hours helped by others: _____

Section 7 – Sociodemographics

1. Gender: Woman Man Non-binary Prefer not to say
2. Date of birth: _____ / _____ / _____
3. Education level: No formal education Primary Middle/High Vocational University Master/Doctorate
4. Occupation status: Student Paid work Self-employed Homemaker Unemployed Disabled Retired
5. Civil status: Single Cohabiting Married Separated Divorced Widowed
6. Do you have children? Yes No