



Transcript for S9 E3 Exploring 2024 labour market and employment trends with Neil Carberry

Cat Barnard (00:41)

Hello and welcome to a fresh episode of the Future of Internal Communication podcast. I'm your co-host Cat Barnard and as ever I'm joined by Jen Sproul and Dominic Walters. And we are delighted today to welcome back one of our guests from 2023. Neil Carberry is the Chief Executive of the Recruitment and Employment Confederation and when we chatted with him last, which must be coming up for a year ago, we were talking about labour market complexities. And yet a year is a long time in the labour market. And we were keen to invite Neil back as soon as possible into 2024 to have a conflagration about what has changed in the labour market. And once again, what internal communication can help do about it. So without further ado, Neil, thank you very much for your generosity in tolerating us a second time around.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (01:46)

There's no toleration involved. If there's any toleration it's certainly from you, Jen and Dom having me back but it's a pleasure to be here.

Cat Barnard (01:54)

Thank you. And I, you know, for me, I feel that the intersections between internal communication and recruitment, staffing, talent acquisition, whatever we want to call it, are very poignant and very necessary to review and perhaps reflect on opportunities for upgrade. And we are continuing in a highly complex labour market. So I wanted to kick this conversation off by asking you a first question, which is this, what do you feel are the primary labour market trends employers need to be aware of and mitigating for in 2024?

Neil Carberry (he/him) (02:43)

So I think variation on a theme to what we were discussing when we were together last year, right? For me, the labour market has slowed quite significantly since we last spoke. What we've seen in permanent hiring is a drop generally. I think recruiters would say that 2023 permanent hiring may be dropped by about 20%.

Temporary hiring still pretty strong, but of course that's because of economic uncertainty. Employers tend to lean more on temp in moments like that, like the ones that we've been living through. So your classic response from an employer in that situation would be to say, labour is loose. Therefore, there's less pressure to raise wages and less pressure on me to think about engagement, to think about retention, to think about really good TA. And we are seeing that from some clients in the industry. I would say that is folly and it's built on having managers and leaders in businesses who've



grown up in a unique 20 to 30 year period where the UK labour market was extremely loose, labour supply was not as much of an issue, we had skills issues but less labour supply issues. Given the economy that we've had over the last year, the fact that unemployment is where it is, still close to historic lows is a sign that our domestic labour force is just much smaller than it has been before and there's some there are things we can do to address that obviously we've got to support people back into work from inactivity we should be thinking about skills transitions to help people move across into areas that are growing but the real story of the labour market in the tail end of 23 and going into 24, is businesses who think that they are living in a labour market that looks a bit like a classic 1990s, 1980s recession, so the powers with the business, and perhaps to a certain extent candidates who think they are still living in the post-pandemic era, where we can decide when we go into the office or not, or not at all if we want to, and we can have this much more transactional relationship.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (05:00)

Part of the challenge for recruiters is neither of those things are true. It's tough for everyone. So the phrase that kept coming back to me last year from our members was, this isn't a bad market, it's just harder. And it's harder because people are struggling to understand the dynamics. So for me, that piece around labour supply being very tight, still being very tight in the UK, the economy being a bit tougher, although I'm more of an optimist for 24 than we saw in 23.

That thinking about where are people and how you bring them together effectively in labour market transaction, whether it's new attREction or it's people you've got now, that feels to me like a really big challenge for anyone in business right now.

Cat Barnard (05:43)

And something that I was chatting just before we came on air with you guys, something that seems to be an ongoing slash escalating theme that I'm hearing is from within the job seeker community, just an extreme vexation that it's becoming more and more challenging to get to speak to a real life human being about opportunities that are listed online. And actually, I was at a community event at the weekend and I got chatting to a guy and he was talking about how he'd been looking for work for more than a year. And when I said to him, listen, it's not you, it's the system, I swear without too much exaggeration, he was almost welling up, Neil, so clearly that frustration is really impacting people psychologically. What are your thoughts there?

Neil Carberry (he/him) (06:44)

I'm literally, I've got a Word tab open on this laptop now. We're working on a piece of work at the REC called Aim Hire that's coming out. It's a classic part, it's H-I-R-E of course, which is focused at clients. And it's asking them to think through the sustainability of the models they're building for hiring.



And for us as agencies, that's about if you do everything on the cheap and you try and buy people like you buy paper clips, you are not going to get good returns. The truth is that firms who give jobs to 10 different agencies and bang it on it indeed and pay the agency if there's a placement contingency are not gonna get quality applications. And if they do get quality applications, are going to get quality applications submerged in 15 to 20,000 less quality applications. So the argument that we're having as agencies with our clients at the moment is narrow down. Yeah, you don't have to pay a recruiter retainer, I would argue you should, but at least find a specialist in your field as a hiring business. Give them exclusivity on the job. Have a discussion with them about what the candidate pool looks like. Be prepared to change what you're looking for. And then that recruiter has a much greater chance of finding the person you were talking to. And it also then enables job seekers to have greater confidence that in going to specialist recruiters, they'll find the right job. So it's a flippant answer, not really, it's a short answer but it's not flippant. Jobs boards, yeah, the same jobs listed 10 times in 10 different places, right? Start with recruiters, that's what we're for.

Cat Barnard (08:38)

I couldn't agree more. I mean, I will stop hogging the mic, but my big bug bear is that we seem to be living in an age where we are told time and again that the algorithm is more intelligent than the human being, and I just don't feel that is the case. So I think, you know, where there is an element of doubt slash possibility as to the potential of any job seeker, recruiters need to be getting on the phone and building relationships and having conversations because the algorithms are just a matching process. They are literally just a starting point. They are not the be all and end all despite what any software development house will tell you.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (09:22)

So I've made myself unpopular at the Recruitment Agency Expo last October by saying that I thought the recruitment technology providers were letting the industry down. And they were making us marginally more productive at the things we've always done and not really addressing the problem, which is smoothing the journey of the candidate and the client to meeting each other. And then when you think about that smoothing, there's two things, right? There's match and there's fit. The algorithm can do this. It can't do that.

There's something here about the human skills coming in at the appropriate moment. We took Greg Savage, who's a bit of a guru in our industry, around the country, six states, a thousand people over two weeks last September, around his new book, which he let some idiot from the REC do the foreword to. And that is all about actually the skills that set recruiters apart right now are the skills which we would have set recruiters apart when I started in the industry in the 1990s. They are about interpersonal skills. They are about selling the deal. They're about, you know, I may have said this when we talked last year, but ultimately the game is selling imperfect people to imperfect jobs and imperfect jobs to imperfect people. That's what we're doing. Because we know actually that most of the time imperfect plus imperfect kind of means could be perfect. And so there's a little bit of skill to working out which imperfect goes to which imperfect. And for us as a sector, that's a people skill.



The frustration of working in recruitment, talent acquisition and HR generally is that we're not dealing with a product, you know, as recruiters, we sell the only product that has a right to say no, once you've done all the work. These things, I think get lost if we let the kind of narrative of the valley drive our labour market thinking. There is something here about the humanity of the process and yes, absolutely the tech is non-negotiable.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (11:24)

We published a really great bit of work last July called Tech Enabled Humanity, which kind of gives a link to what we think the story is. You have to do the tech because the tech is a competitive point, but it's the human skills that differentiate. And that's true of HR. And coming to your work at the internal comms piece around retention, come back to what I said earlier, retention is your best recruitment tool. How are you doing that?

Jen (11:52)

So fascinating, and I think that listening to you, the things that strike me are the shared challenges we're talking about from the attREction, the recruitment process, everything, it is the human factor, it is the conversation factor but it is also the alignment factor as well where everything feels sort of between the employer and the employee and what that negotiation stage as well. And where what is written on the page becomes a reality of lived experience which is effectively where you're going to find that level of retention as you talk about. You know, certainly in the world of internal comms over the last year or so, we've certainly found ourselves much more involved in EVP development, much more involved in this kind of employee experience about employee advocacy. So how can we use our employees to help us attRECT great talent? Um, certainly more so in that, but with that as well, we have, I think, more complex challenges in how you create that value proposition where perhaps what the employee wants, whether that's, you know, flexible working days here, days in the office, mandatory not, versus what they want in terms of what the brand represents or how it feels and what it looks like. So how do we make sure what we say at the EVP is then a lived experience, but within a more complex employee domain, if you like, from multi-generational, different aspirations. I think there's a lot of clashes happening in organisations of how work should and should not be done. And we're not spending enough time together or investing in the personal skills to work through those differences. And so I guess really my follow on question is, so with, with that change of multi-generational types of working, forms of working, contRECT, perm and how we're trying to make sure we've been involved in the EVP to then the lived experience, what is actually changing in employment? We say it's two years is a good year to keep some good amount of time to keep people these days. Is there that significant amount of change about how employment and what the lived experience is feeling like and how that drives the sort of retention and attREction of employees?



Neil Carberry (he/him) (3:57)

So a couple of bits. One is that individuals will always have choice. So if you think about my biggest challenge this year is, actually I think we've put a lot of work into the Labour Party who very well may be in government at the end of the year.

I think that Labour Frontbench now understands the value of temporary work economically. I'm not sure they yet understand the value of it socially and why people would choose to work as a temp. And of course not everybody would choose to work as a temp, but a decent slug of people temping is what they want, whether that's as a contREctor or it's to achieve term time working or whatever they personally want to achieve in their lives.

So there's something here about acknowledging, exactly as you say, Jen, these different groups that exist in the workplace. And with the tightness of the labour force, you know, older workers, for instance, are not going to want to be doing the hours potentially that they were doing in their 40s. But that doesn't mean they don't want to work. And it doesn't mean they're not really valuable and you want to retain them. So you have to have almost a twin tRECK approach to this ground war of what do these individual groups need from us and can we offer it? And then there's this air war of, well, what is the culture we're trying to build that ties all this together? And that actually is why I think one of the big themes of 2024, hopefully, will be employers behaving a bit more like employers on discussions like return to the office. I think it's doomed for employers to say, oh, well, everyone's at home now we're saving money on footprint. I think it's equally doomed for employers to say everyone's in. Firms need to find their landing space and it is exactly as you said, it's that negotiation of this is what we need as an organisation and that's what it requires of you and the reason it's the air war is sometimes it is saying to managers in their 40s who are sitting in home offices looking out over the garden such as I am right now. That's very nice, Neil. But actually I need you in here to be helping these guys through early career or to be inputting to these things. There's also something around isolation, loneliness, motivation. Emerging evidence is really clear that the cognitive load of Teams calls, Zoom calls, is much, much higher than the cognitive load of meetings in person. So you end up with all these companies, and the REC is one of them actually, where you have people saying, love my work-life balance, really happy with the policy, EVP is great on work-life balance, I still feel exhausted at the end of the day. Because you're looking for more queues in online meetings. Where does that leave you? Well, it leaves you in a world where internal comms are at the heart of it, okay? Because if I'm, as Chief Executive of the REC, wanting to have a conversation with my staff about the fact that I think it is in their interest to be in the office more, and in our collective interest to be in the office more, even if it's occasionally to the detriment of one or two of us, well that's a collective conversation between people with different interest points in the staff, and the real risk is that I come across as being I don't know, pick your Wall Street behemoth who sounded off about, you know, everyone who's at home isn't really working. They are really working. They're just not working as productively as they might, or as more connectedly as they might. So that piece around how do you have sensible purpose-focused conversations in businesses about how we work, more important than ever.



Jen (17:35)

And it feels like we need to really invest in that time to negotiate rather than because I think sometimes I don't think it feels but leadership and organisations when you have fear or you're worried you're losing it or people like that you make snap decisions and send out that sort of simple communication rather than entering into the dialogue that tries to get everybody into a balanced place that alignment between us so that we don't have to like everything but we understand everything. I think it's going to be really key and it's something that I think this professional community could help with. And it still is a really, really big struggle. So I find that really, really interesting to think about how we can do more of that.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (18:12)

So I think back to my MSc in Industrial Relations ID402, Organisational Behaviour and Change, which is 20 years old, but I still use it and run in the REC every day. Justice frameworks of how organisations run. The evidence is incredibly clear that what matters is not what people get, what matters is that people feel the process was fair. So that's exactly what you should say, Jen, it's about taking time, not rushing to the decision. In situations where you need to rush to a decision actually people are pretty tolerant of that, not rushing the decision and explaining the process and all this stuff critically important.

Jen (18:51)

Absolutely. And context is king depending on your business and the kind of staff that you're hiring and you know, we talk about this very much as if it would, you know, the, the labour market is a hundred percent office workers. We're not. There is a number of jobs that no matter what, we go into different dynamics. So there is sometimes as well, as you say, I like the word justice, there is sometimes a feeling of injustice. And I wonder just as a thought as you're talking. Do you think that will affect what careers people want to go for in their early years right now? You know, I want to work over here or over here because that feels more fair and flexible. Whereas if I go to something where I'm required to be in a factory or out and about or on the road, that's not something... Do you think those are going to play factors into how we view the job market?

Neil Carberry (he/him) (19:36)

We are already seeing it. You know, alignment with goals, alignment with purpose really matters. And yes, more at the junior end, but actually at the kind of more experienced end where people have maybe paid off the mortgage, then in a sense they've got choice and they tend to deploy that slightly differently, but deploy it all the same. I think the thing about all of this is understanding that the workforce will judge you on what you do, not what you see. So getting to managers, making sure that approach to your comms to managers really, really matters to make sure you're living your values. And then I think as you develop and approaches in organisation to staffing, understanding that things will change and that's all right and knowing kind of how you're going to flex to that feels important as



well and being really clear about kind of these are the goals that we're trying to achieve and maybe the specific tactics will change over time as the market changes.

Cat Barnard (20:47)

I think that's a really interesting point that you raise there and it segues into another question that I have for you. I think we seem to exist in a pervasive culture of perfectionism and an obsession with getting things right first time. I think if we were to ditch some of the high expectations that we place on ourselves and gave ourselves permission to allow things to some extent to just emerge. Obviously we're all in pursuit of outcomes, but if we were slightly more generous with ourselves, I think work could progress at a greater pace. And I'm curious with that in mind to know your thoughts around workplace reskilling and upskilling because we have got this squeezed labour market. We have got rising unemployment and skills shortages in tandem. And we seem to have an issue of a lack of internal mobility within organisations. And I'm curious to just hear from you as the kind of the expert in this field, why these two things, reskilling and upskilling, are so important right now.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (22:17)

That's a really interesting question, Cat. I'm going to disagree with one thing. I don't think we've got a lack of internal mobility inside companies. What I think we've got is a bunch of smallish companies with narrow career paths so actually people potentially need to move more than they do. So coming back to what Jen said earlier, there's a great truism in the press that nobody has a job for life anymore. Well, actually, average tenure in the British labour market hasn't shifted very much over the last 40 years. It's that thing about some people move jobs and some people don't. The real challenge is how you have a discussion with the workforce about where the work will be in 5 or 10 or 15 years time, both in companies and between companies. And that's why at the REC we push very hard on workforce strategy as a critical part of the industrial strategy. It's not just about skills, it's about engagement and management and all of that as well. But if you look at the best things that are happening in England right now on re-skilling they're happening in Manchester and Birmingham. And they're happening in Manchester and Birmingham because you have a central mayoral authority that can pull an economic plan, the current pattern of employment, the future pattern of employment and the skills providers together with the local businesses and build something where people have really clear signposting. And then we can behave like employers and say to people you need to think about this. Whether it's with us or elsewhere. Now some firms do think about that. So, you know, it's odd to hear Amazon portrayed in a massively positive light, but actually Amazon are pretty good at saying to the areas they set up warehouses that they're gonna employ all these people and they know these people will stay in the warehouse for only so long and they'll need to move out to other jobs. So what is the pathway out? And I think from the point of view of employers, some of that is about being honest with people about future prospects as well. I remember talking to the HR director of ASDA years ago and they were saying, you know, they were talking to store staff and they knew store staff numbers would come down. Electronic checkout, other innovations and they wanted to multi-skill staff so that they could slot into different bits of the store and have higher employability. But even if you were offering people 50p extra an hour, a pound extra an hour to do



that, they wouldn't do the training. And one of the challenges for us is understanding people have different perspectives. Some people have a job, some people have a career. And those are legitimate choices.

So sometimes you need to kind of open the way for people who are, who have that drive. And sometimes you need to put up the warning signs for people who maybe are happy in what they're doing now, that might not go on forever. And again, that's a very subtle communications challenge. And it requires, I think companies to have a greater sense of who their employees are and what the local economic picture is. And again, I keep coming back to collaboration between firms and between local skills providers. It's going to be super important to reskilling.

Dom (25:45)

Neil, I'd like to pick up on what you were saying there about the role for communicators, because one of the things we like to do on this podcast is to draw on experts like you who give us an understanding of the business world that communicators are working in, to see how they can add that strategic value which they're seeking. I think as you were going through, I picked up at least three or four things. One was about the whole thing around retention. And I know we've spoken a bit about that, but how do we, you said, I think retention is the best source of recruitment. And obviously communicators can do that.

You talked about this great idea about justice, but having the conversation, the facilitation, the discussions, I think communicators have a role with that about establishing belonging. Then it's always nice to have three, but you've given us more added value, you've given us at least four, I think, which is having that local discussion really about what's going on available locally and how we equip people. Right, yeah, and so in terms of equipping communicators to have that strategic conversation with their senior team, what's your take on the role that internal communication can have in this environment of employment that you've described?

Neil Carberry (he/him) (26:47)

So one robust and slightly flippant comment and then one slightly deeper one. I am fond in my kind of ER world, so when I'm not in the REC and I'm talking to businesses about handling things, I'm fond of reminding senior members of staff that everyone on their staff pays rent or has a mortgage, has a bank account and reads the news.

And the reason for doing that is I am constantly stunned by what business leaders and managers think they can say and not have read through by their staff. It's a bit like PR, right? Don't override your PR. Well, I don't know whether Michelle Moore and Doug Barrowman overrode their PR advice or just got really bad PR advice but you know, don't override it. There's something here about getting business leaders to understand that good communication isn't trying to pull the wool over people's eyes. It has to, it doesn't have to tell the whole truth because some things are commercially important to keep confidential, but it has to be truth adjacent. It has to deal with the real impacts on people's lives and it has to offer ways forward.



And I think I can't remember whether I gave you my standard rant about MBAs on our last podcast, but that piece around most chief execs are ex-FDs, they've all done MBAs, teach you how to run a company in the financial sense, don't teach you how to run a company in the people's sense. There's something here about making sure that...

Neil Carberry (he/him) (28:25)

enough time is put into it and enough process to come back to the fair processes that people think through what we can do. So I do a thing with Mike Clancy, the General Secretary of Prospect, who's on ACAS council with me. We were at ACAS, we were with TUC Congress together when we did it and we're going to do it at an event in April, May this year as well with a business audience. Which is talking about how you negotiate with trade unions. Same thing really, internal comms on employment issues. You know, the first thing I will ask, Mike would ask me if I was the employer side is, is there any more? And not like I want, but seriously, what's the bottom line here? And the first question I'd ask Mike as the employer negotiator would be, what do you really want?

Because the truth is that we live in a world where negotiation has... I mean, Brexit is a great example. Apparently how you negotiate in this country is you shout at people until they give in. And in fact, of course, what happens is you shout at people until you give in, which is what actually happened. But in essence, if I'm approaching a negotiation with a trade union, my first offer is as far as I can go in the minimum I think that they can accept having listened to where they are. And then I try and move once to close the deal. We're not shouting at each other, we're listening all of the time to shape those two offers. And on the other side of the table Mike is doing the other thing because the thing about trade union negotiation and trade union negotiators are just internal communications people with really big clubs, is that I'm always thinking about how does he climb down that ladder over there. They're thinking how does he climb down that ladder over there? So that thing about what's the exit, how does the person you're talking to walk out of the communication feeling like things are have been well handled, feeling like they know what's next, that skill set is terrifyingly missing at the top of some British companies and you see it in these scandals. I mean for God's sake look at Horizon and the Post Office.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (30:38)

Where no one in the post office thought, oh, we've charged 800 postmasters after not charging any for a hundred years, might actually the problem be us. So there's a whole lot of stuff there that I think is all about the skills that internal communications professionals bring.

Dom (30:58)

And also from what you're saying, there's a role for internal communicators, professionals to help their leaders shift their approach to communication. As you'll know, there's a big drive at the



moment to help leaders listen better and see listening as a key part of communication. And I think that's central to what you're talking about is establishing that negotiation. And one of the things I loved about what you've said is this theme about justice, because you said that people feel they may not like the end result, but if they feel that they've been dealt with fairly, and they've been listened to, they're more likely to accept something that maybe isn't in their advantage. I think that's something that communicators, from what you're saying, communicators can help coach and support leaders in achieving. You may have seen that. You may have seen that work.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (31:40)

One of the reasons we're doing this thing with business leaders on industrial relations or employment relations as we're supposed to call it now, in a couple of months time is I've lost count of the number of times where companies have tried to persuade their solicitors to do their negotiation for them. It's never a great look. I think there's a genuine deficit of collective communication skills at the top of British business. And that along with the ability to be consistent and drive it through management behaviour. If you are looking for why we have a productivity problem, there it is. And the challenge now is I think we're being forced to step up on productivity. So the minimum wage is a classic example. It's going up went up 10% last year. It's going up 10% this year. There's been no growth. 20% rise, I know there are lots of companies who employ low paid workers who are now saying, well, how do we invest to reduce labour and increase capital in our production model? I mean, actually logically in a tight labour market that's probably the right thing to be doing. But you then have to say, well, the labour that we need to run the new capital, where do we get them from? And how do we talk to our current workforce to get them onto the path? You know, coming back to Cat's point about training. All of that is a level of strategic comms internally linked to commercial decisions that I think we've lost a bit. If you go right back to the Leitch report in 2006, Sandy Leitch basically said the problem with government skills policy is it doesn't understand that skills is derived demand and that demand is derived from the commercial decisions that companies make. So it's how you get to the top, how you don't deal with the HR director, the training director, the talent advisory team, you deal with the commercial decisions that are being made at the top and you put people into the heart of them. That's a kind of mission for us, but I think if you think about the role and purpose of the profession, it's really important to be in that debate as well.

Dom (33:47)

Maybe an unfair question, I don't want to put you on the spot Neil, but can you think of an example of an organisation that has done this, or at least started along the road of doing this well? This negotiation, this building a story, a picture.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (34:00)

That is a really good question. The best public policy example I've seen of it was for automatic enrolment and pensions, where you had independent review, set out the case for action, which drew



from a wide tent of people, so everyone felt they were involved. Government then took it forward, kept opposition parties engaged, kept businesses engaged. Basically got to a point where people like the business organisations were willing to go out and sell it to British business, introduced it, ruled it out gradually and it's been in force for what? 12 years now and when I talk about the apprenticeship levy which I do at great and tedious length and all of its many failures what I tend to focus on is the government has thought that problem business had with the apprenticeship levy was it cost too much? Well, automatic enrolment into pensions costs six times what the apprenticeship levy does and yet where is the campaign against it? Because the process was done well. So that's just a public policy example of kind of how one might do that. I sure have to think about a business example.

Dom (35:12)

No, that's a great example because all the elements are there. Keeping people in the loop, explaining things simply, explaining the benefits to each individual party, and I think keeping people up to date on progress as well. So bearing in mind what you've said about the crucial role of internal communicators, again, probably a very difficult question, but for people listening, for practitioners listening, what do you think is the one thing that internal communicators should be looking at or focusing on to help their organisations in the market you've described for 2024 and beyond.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (35:43)

So I think it's about understanding that we live in a fundamentally different world. So the labour market of 2015 has gone forever. So when we're dealing with people issues, people supply is short in the UK. There's no immediate prospect of it getting any less short. So retention of older workers, inclusion of less active groups, our disabled employment is a shocker in the United Kingdom, really high quality staff engagement, all of these things are mission critical to businesses in competing. So I think my advice is find some allies who are willing to have the discussion with the top of the shop that this stuff which was nice to do when if someone fell out the back of the lorry you could hire really easily is now commercially absolutely critical. And then give it some resource. I think the age of employment relations is here. And what we know about conflict in organisations is that it cannot be squashed. It can only be channelled. So companies who get this wrong drive that conflict somewhere. They drive it to higher turnover rates. They drive it to lower productivity. They drive it to mental health issues and high sickness absence. Getting this right has always mattered but it matters more than ever now and I think there the critical thing it's a bit like I say to recruiters you know we're a 40 billion pound industry we're actually bigger than law and bigger than accountancy in the UK you wouldn't believe it from the way it's talked about. It's shoulders back head up, pride in what we do, it is mission critical, it is commercial. I think pushing back on this idea that if you're not a manager with a P&L you're a cost centre, it feels like thinking that needs to change.



Jen (37:38)

Neil, thank you so much for your time today. Honestly, there's so much taken and I think that rounding off what you've been talking about, this argument is critical. There is a growing body of evidence to justify what everything that we've said, all the data is out there. You know, the things and also I think what's quite interesting is we do our own employee research every year. We're planning next year to see how it shifts and the things that come up again are listening, dialogue, manager behaviours, all these things affect how we feel about our employer and the work that we do. And I think you've given us some great insights and some real sense of shoulders back, head up, this is important, we get our allies go forward. It is not a fluffy nice to do. This is mission critical to the fundamental future of organisations. So Neil, thank you so much for coming on and giving us your time today.

Neil Carberry (he/him) (38:26)

Absolute pleasure, thank you all very much.