Chapter 13
Effective Engagement of Field Service Teams

Tanya Alcock and Jonathan Malpass

Abstract Successfully engaging and motivating any work force is vital; how to accomplish such a challenge is the focus of this chapter. It is the shared view of the authors that attaining employee engagement requires a finely tuned mix of actions based upon understanding the workforce from a qualitative and quantitative viewpoint. The qualitative view, based on social science research, reveals insights into peoples' actions, their behaviours, attitudes and values. The quantitative view provides the essential knowledge and information to facilitate the employee's job in hand as well as enable the workforce to reach their full potential. This chapter outlines nine components which emerged from this approach, components that any organisation needs to understand and action to influence employee engagement.

13.1 Introduction

People are the key asset of any organisation, and those deploying field-based workforce teams cannot afford to be indifferent or ill informed about their workforce. If they are, any efforts an organisation makes on forecasting, modelling and delivery of field operations will be to limited avail. One thing is clear: an engaged and motivated workforce is capable of achievements well beyond simply boosting productivity (i.e. working harder and faster). Engaged employees are a rich source of recommendations for improvements to current (inefficient) working practices, they can provide innovative new business ideas, they can pull together to produce fantastic feats during times of crisis, and they can win over new customers as well as retain defecting customers, all of which contribute to the performance of the organisation as well as enhancing its competitive advantage.

Furthermore, engagement is a two-way street between the employee and the organisation, with both parties benefiting when it is achieved and sustained.

T. Alcock (✉) • J. Malpass
Research and Innovation, BT Technology, Services and Operations, Martlesham Heath, UK

Successful employee engagement goes beyond just benefiting the business; employee engagement can also be the key to transforming the working lives of the employees themselves. While an engaged workforce is a happier, well-balanced and focused team, engagement also works for individuals, allowing people to have a greater sense of well-being, understand how they contribute to their employer's successes, gain emotional buy-in to their work and potentially banish those 'bad day at work' blues. Individuals who are intrinsically motivated, as well as enabled, are willing to give their best.

This chapter describes a fresh perspective of employee engagement, identified through the authors' research. By using a powerful combination of qualitative and quantitative research techniques, and distilling those findings, nine key components have emerged that organisations need to understand and action to influence employee engagement. These components are management style; interpersonal relationships and team collaboration; incentives; measures and targets; knowledge and relevant data; continuous improvement; job design; career, mastery and advancement; and work environment. All the different components addressed are essential requirements to be considered by organisations when engaging and motivating a workforce. In short, it is an inclusive list of essential components for any organisation rather than a pick and mix approach.

13.2 Why Bother with Engagement?

The results of successfully engaging and motivating a workforce are evident. Tamkin et al. (2008) report a 10 % increase in employee engagement can potentially increase profits by £1,500 per employee per year. Sears, the US retailer, carried out their own investigation into employee engagement which resulted in the development of the employee-customer-profit chain. They discovered that a 5-unit enhancement into employee attitude (aligned to engagement) drives through an increase in customer impression which is worth 0.5 % increase in revenue growth (Rucci et al. 1998). Harter et al. (2002) found that businesses which typically scored higher for employee engagement experienced higher profitability; they also found that productivity via revenue/sales was on average $80,000–$120,000 higher per month (with one organisation the difference was more than $300,000).

If engaged employees can benefit companies, disengaged employees have an associated cost all of their own. The disengaged are more likely to leave companies resulting in raised recruitment costs, as well take more sick days than their engaged colleagues, on average 6.19 days off a year compared to an average of 2.69 sick days per year (MacLeod and Clarke 2011 and references therein). As sickness absence cost the UK economy in excess of £17bn in 2010 (CBI Report 2011), engaging your employees has a lot of potential benefits.

13.3 Background and Approach

It is the authors' opinion that attaining high levels of employee engagement requires a mix of activities based upon understanding the workforce from both a qualitative and quantitative viewpoint. The tactic of using a joint approach has arisen from more than 30 years combined experience, including understanding and working with large field-based engineering communities within a corporate environment. In addition to working with field-based engineers, the authors' experience extends to workforces within more traditional office-based locations, including knowledge workers, contact centres, sales desks and data centres within small- and medium-sized business operations as well as consumer operational support.

The qualitative research techniques and methodologies used include ethnography (O'Reilly 2004), open question interviewing and grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin 1994). These have afforded a detailed understanding of workforces and the drivers behind employees' behaviours. Insights gleaned from hundreds of hours spent shadowing and observing workers as they carry out their day-to-day work, watching what they actually do, who they interact with and the barriers they face while completing their job, are essential to establish a rich qualitative picture (often combined with interviews and questionnaires). It is these techniques based in social sciences that have contributed to the overall understanding of employee behaviour—what people do and why—and what ultimately drives engagement.

A complement to the rich behavioural picture has been the use of techniques more typically associated with Lean Methodologies (Womack and Jones 2003) and Six Sigma (Pande et al. 2000). Research techniques such as root cause analysis (Wilson et al. 1993), statistical process control (Oakland 1996) and randomised controlled trials (Haynes et al. 2012) not only complement the behavioural studies but also yield the 'hard' (quantifiable) data, an essential requirement of any business environment. It is typically the hard data which will sway senior management decisions; by coupling hard numerical data with behavioural evidence, giving additional weight and insight which can be absent from the numbers alone, ensures senior management are enabled to make more informed decisions.

13.4 What Is Engagement?

During this chapter the authors use the term engagement as a generic term referring to both the attitude and behaviours of employees, in particular the blend of positive attitudes and resulting behaviours (and actions) that ensue when an individual is actively engaged in their work and with their organisation. This includes how happy workers feel, how positively they look upon their company, how well they regard their co-workers and how involved they are with the work they are undertaking. It also includes the employee's willingness to put in extra effort (aka 'goes the extra mile') and provide additional input into a job and the organisation. Engagement

also includes how intrinsically motivated the individual is by their work, and therefore motivation is considered as a fundamental part of the engagement story. Job satisfaction and morale, common terms used in the literature and by organisations, are also considered to be vital subsets of engagement.

There is a wealth of literature on employee engagement and motivation theories and how people should be managed and led (e.g. McGregor 1960; Herzberg et al. 1959; Nohria et al. 2008; MacLeod and Clarke 2011). The authors take the stance that humans are self- or intrinsically motivated to work as part of their natural desire to grow, be part of something important and succeed as individuals (e.g. Ryan and Deci 2000; Pink 2009). You cannot enforce motivation or make people be motivated: it comes from within. Along with the assumption that, in general, employees are naturally motivated, the authors consider that motivating employees is about creating the right environment or culture within which people can flourish. Therefore engagement is as much about actively removing barriers or inhibitors which prevent employees from getting on and doing their job as it is about taking action, because when it comes to motivation and engagement, it is all too easy to destroy what is often naturally present.

13.5   The Key Components of Employee Engagement

This section describes the nine components of employee engagement that the authors, through their experience and distinctive approach, have deemed to be vital to employee engagement. A wide range of subjects is covered, which can appear quite daunting, but all the components addressed are essential requirements.

13.5.1   Management Style

Our experience has led us to realise that perhaps the greatest influence on any employee is their immediate manager. How that manager chooses or believes to manage is of fundamental importance. A simple conversation with any manager about the responsibilities and practicalities of their role will often reveal their attitudes and beliefs about their people and uncover their management style and ethos.

The best people managers instinctively understand the potential within their employees: they are capable, driven and self-motivated individuals rather than the 'inert' employees who can only be cajoled into action via extrinsic rewards (first challenged by McGregor in his Theory X vs. Theory Y work (1960). They understand that trust and belief in their employees are essential and that their key role is one of an enabler. Their job is to coach and to remove the barriers that prevent employees from doing their job. They give employees autonomy and successfully empower them by giving them appropriate and necessary levels of information,

responsibility and control. Empowering managers develop their employees' abilities to make decisions. They instinctively know that the imagination, creativity and ingenuity of employees can be used to solve work problems. In an effort to develop and support a culture of empowerment, managers facilitate and direct information and workflow throughout the organisation. They serve as leaders and role models for others through their efforts (Brower 1995). Good managers instinctively give their employees autonomy so they can self-direct (Pink 2009) and they act as both a catalyst and a nourisher to their employees (Amabile and Kramer 2011).

In contrast, poor people managers often place a strong emphasis on the need to observe and control their employees; they manage people with the aim of achieving compliance rather than engagement. Such managers often place high importance on measures and may even be proud of their ability to 'manage' the measures rather than having pride in their employees' abilities and achievements. These behaviours are driven by misguided assumptions about what intrinsically motivates employees (Deci 1975). They wrongly assume that employees dislike working, need to be directed, dislike responsibility and must be controlled and threatened before they will work hard enough (McGregor 1960). They assume that the average person is only motivated by rewards, incentives and avoidance of penalties (see Sect. 13.3). Poor managers are, intentionally or unintentionally, toxins to creativity and inhibitors to their employees' true potential (Amabile and Kramer 2011).

13.5.2 Interpersonal Relationships and Team Collaboration

Interpersonal relationships within the workplace stretch beyond management. Individuals and their levels of engagement and morale are strongly influenced by other relationships, such as those with colleagues or peers within teams and other groups with who they have routine contact. Many individuals enjoy the opportunity to work with others on a regular basis, often referred to as 'teamwork' and 'team spirit'.

However, in our experience the interpersonal relationships which influence individuals can often go beyond organisational boundaries. Within customer-facing teams these relationships often include the customers themselves, even including the customer's customer. Interacting with, and helping, a customer is one of the key drivers of job satisfaction and morale seen in both contact centres and field teams. The level of 'emotional' commitment amongst employees towards the customers with whom they interact can be a powerful asset which should be utilised.

Given that some of the interactions with customers can be transient, this strong sense of commitment to customers should be commended, even encouraged, because of the benefits to the organisation, the employee and the customer. Successful emotional engagement with customers is one of the prerequisites to providing a superb customer interaction and experience (Shaw and Ivens 2002; Reichheld 2006).

Interpersonal relationships are both formal and informal and usually recipro-cated. An engineer may have an appointed coach to whom they can go to for help, but they will also have a widespread network of informal contacts to which they can turn if specific advice or local knowledge is needed. Typically, such knowledge is not formally captured by knowledge management systems but relayed between individuals during early morning meetings in the office or a quick phone call—it is fluid, fast and specific.

The sharing of such advice and knowledge through informal networks goes beyond the simple exchange of information required to do the job. It also is an opportunity to reinforce bonds which have been formed within workplace teams and enhance team spirit. This can be increasingly important to morale and engage-ment if team get-togethers are limited due for logistical or geographical reasons. Such opportunities should be encouraged and facilitated because they benefit both the company (through knowledge sharing) and employees (through enhanced camaraderie). A sense of belonging and cooperation are important boosters for morale within any workplace. Hardy's PhD study on morale (2010) found that interpersonal relationships were one of three main contributors to positive morale (along with future/goal and emotional aspects). Constructive, supportive relation-ships are associated with high morale; divided, isolated relationships or a bad atmosphere is linked to low morale. Hardy (2010) also considered morale to be a contagion, so high morale can be spread from individual to individual, indicting the importance of encouraging opportunities for team interactions.

13.5.3   Incentives (and the Associated Stick)

'Pay is not a motivator' (W. Edwards Deming)

Incentives are the subject of much debate within both social science and manage-ment science. While it has long since been established that humans are motivated by matters beyond simple financial rewards (e.g. Maslow 1943; Herzberg 1968; Pink 2009), the belief that employees are only motivated by rewards or by the fear of external punishment is endemic within many large organisations. Deci's studies (1975; Deci and Ryan 1985) into intrinsic motivation revealed a different view of what made humans 'tick'. Herzberg (1968) drew the distinction between 'motiva-tion' and 'movement'; movement is short term and often via a 'stick' or 'KITA' (kick in the a**), whereas motivation is often long term and driven by the individ-ual's intrinsic motivation to achieve, grow and learn. In short, rewards and incen-tives don't create lasting commitment or motivate or engage employees; they just cause people to temporarily comply with what is required to earn the reward (or avoid the stick) (Kohn 1999). Hence, a different way of thinking about rewards is required.

History has not helped; the twentieth century saw a dramatic shift in the type of work carried out by employees in the western world with a move away from large

numbers of people carrying out repetitive manual labour-intensive tasks in factories, yet assumptions amongst some senior management about motivation and engagement remain resolutely with the mass production ethos. Today's workforce is not dominated by large numbers of production line labour forces but increasingly by autonomous knowledge workers and creative-minded individuals who are looking for innovative solutions to undefined problems. In situations where creative thought is required, rewards not only do not work but the evidence points to the fact that extrinsic rewards (in particular financial rewards) can actually negatively affect performance (Ariely et al. 2009 cited in Pink 2009).

Incentives can introduce a competitive element which can fracture previously strong interpersonal relationships; teams of employees can splinter in the scramble for rewards, destroying cooperation (Kohn 1993). The negative effects of poorly thought-out and implemented incentive schemes on team dynamics are something the authors have observed with disputes and disruptions arising amongst previously harmonious teams.

Issues can also be hidden by employees if they believe revealing problems may have negative consequences, potentially leading to incentives being withheld (Kohn 1993). Incentives can also discourage risk-taking behaviour and potentially encourage people to engage in 'tweaking' of numbers and data to maintain previous incentive levels. A certain amount of 'massaging' of the numbers to achieve required targets is a temptation.

Incentives also have the potential to make managers lazy (Kohn 1993). It is far easier to dangle a reward in front of an employee than to spend time and effort in providing the support and encouragement for employees, ensuring they have a good job to do and are intrinsically motivated and rewarded by achievement and recognition. While in our experience the managers we have observed may not have been 'lazy', incentives certainly can be a distraction and can often (unintentionally) drive unsupportive management behaviour, causing them to focus on the incentive rather than the ethos (e.g. customer service, quality) behind it.

Evidence against poorly thought-out and implemented incentives is clear; however, no claim is made that salary is unimportant. Our own experience, the literature and the mass media show that if wages are perceived to be unfair, it can have a substantial negative effect on people. Pay is of fundamental importance to employees. A fair market rate of pay, and if possible stretching beyond the market rate, will help attract and retain the best recruits. To put it simply, a fair rate will remove potential distractions and *take it off the table* (Pink 2009).

13.5.4 Measures and Targets (and a Quick Word About Goals)

It is vital that targets and measures are addressed as the impact on employees can be substantial. When considering employee engagement, a 'good' measure needs to

take into account numerous aspects of both the employee's and the business' performance. Good measures provide a framework within which to operate so that everyone is clear on the part they need to play.

Call Handling Time (CHT) is a traditional measure widely used in contact centres. It is necessary to understand the average length of call, along with call volumes, for resource management purposes, but from a customer experience and employee engagement perspectives, it fails. A positive customer experience is more likely to be driven by successful resolution of an issue or an effortless transaction (Dixon et al. 2010), and employees are more likely to be motivated by successfully helping customers reach these goals [the 'emotional labour' component of customer service (Hochschild 1983; Millet et al. 2005)]. Furthermore, the random nature of calls means that the contact centre advisor has no control over how long any particular call can take and so being measured against CHT can cause stress and disengagement. Finally, the behaviours that may result from trying to meet CHT targets often impact other aspects of the process: vital information for field operations may be misreported or omitted altogether, and customers may be left uncertain of what will happen next.

A good measure is, therefore, one that meets several criteria:

- A holistic view of the process needs to be taken so that the business is able to meet its primary goal of serving the customer.
- The operative needs to understand the impact they can have on the measure and their value to the business.
- The operative needs to be able to take action to influence the measure.
- The measure needs to enable and support decision-making.

Measures are important for understanding business performance, but it is essential to understand that processes operate with a certain degree of randomness, causing variation beyond the employee's (and even business') control. By understanding that there is variation, rewarding or penalising employees for random events can be avoided (Deming 1982). Similarly, understanding exceptional levels of performance (both good and poor) can lead to better, more robust processes and improved business understanding.

Targets, as opposed to measures, often drive undesirable behaviour amongst management and employees and should be avoided. They also fail to look at the bigger picture. Goodhart's Law (1975), developed for use within social and economic policy, states that when a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure because targets and statistics can potentially hide the bigger picture and actually fail to measure what is intended, making the target itself invalid. For example, the ambulance service's 'speed to dispatch' target was identified by the National Audit Office (2011) as problematic because it resulted in multiple responses to incidents and unnecessary journeys. The 8-min target, designed for the most seriously ill patients, failed to take into account the broader but vital view of the well-being of all patients.

Becoming fixated on the target (and the underlying reward/punishment) rather than the ethos behind it is a common problem throughout many organisations. For

example, focusing on meeting customer appointment slots can drive the inappropriate behaviour of failing to fulfil the appointment altogether. An organisation may meet their customer appointment target, but some customers may be left waiting for service if an employee acts to avoid the negative consequences of a missed appointment slot rather than be a few minutes late.

Lastly, goals have potential to improve employee performance. While goals can have a limited impact with highly complex and creative tasks, Locke and Latham (2002) found that setting employees' challenging (but not impossible) goals consistently leads to higher performance. Goals positively affect performance because they:

- Direct attention and effort within employees
- Have an energising function
- Encourage persistence (when employees have the necessary level of autonomy)
- Encourage interest and discovery, leading to the use of relevant knowledge

Motivation to achieve the goal amongst employees is raised if the goal has purpose or rationale, rather than a simple 'just do this' (see more in Job Design). Goal commitment is also enhanced by self-efficacy, which can be raised by training and experience. Finally, for goals to be successful, feedback is required so employees can understand progress towards the goals and alter their behaviour accordingly (Locke and Latham 2002).

13.5.5 Knowledge and Relevant Data

Any organisation needs to know how it is performing in a variety of areas, which can be summarised as financial, customer, process and learning and growth (Kaplan and Norton 1992). This information needs to take a holistic view of the business, with an end-to-end perspective of operations. But high-level, business-wide measures do not engage employees as they are often not relevant to an individual's job. Here, it is much more important to have a few key pieces of information that an individual can relate to: how it impacts on the customer and how they can use it and its value to the business.

Given the amount of information that any one person can process at a given time is limited (Sweller 1988), whether it is the number of systems that are being simultaneously operated or the number of tasks that a person needs to plan, it is necessary to restrict the data that an individual has to prioritise and manage so as not to cause stress through cognitive overload.

This is not to say that data such as task volumes, throughput and errors should not be collected; it is vital to understand how service and performance can be improved. It is essential to give employees a view of their performance. It is not always possible to provide instant feedback but timely updates, whilst particular events are still fresh in the memory and are important. Visible feedback is relatively easy to provide for static (or site-based) workers in the form of notice boards,

control charts, etc. The challenge with the mobile workforce is to present timely, relevant information.

Similarly, an engaged employee is more likely to want to share information with their colleagues, and this should be encouraged and facilitated. It is easier to share information when employees are co-located, so the problems of knowledge sharing faced by mobile workforces need to be understood. Recent advances in technology allow smartphone apps and social networking sites to be used, enabling individuals to collect, share and receive information. Even so, the traditional 'water-cooler' conversation is often the most productive way of sharing knowledge, and mobile workers need to have opportunities to meet with colleagues.

13.5.6 Continuous Improvement

One way to engage a workforce is to give them a significant investment in improvement programmes. The scale of the programme can be either company wide or just within a department, but by inviting suggestions from the people that know the systems and processes best may not only yield the most enlightening solutions but also gain buy-in to the new solution.

Continuous improvement is an integral part of the Lean Manufacturing (Womack and Jones 2003) and Lean Service (Seddon 2005) philosophies, and the introduction of 'quality groups', equipped with root cause analysis skills, into workforces has been seen by these authors to have benefits ranging from teams adopting radically different roster patterns to meet demand levels to manyfold improvements in cycle times.

By providing the workforce with the autonomy to make decisions where they can see benefit both to the customer and the organisation, this can reap dividends for both the individual and the business. It is essential that there are no limits to the ideas put forward: a holistic and long-term view should be encouraged. The use of red-amber-green processes can assist with this freethinking. Each part of the process is coded accordingly: red if the process must be adhered to (e.g. for legal, regulatory or safety reasons), amber if the process can be changed but only after the benefits of improvement suggestions have been assessed and green if the process can be operated in the way that the employee seems to be most appropriate.

13.5.7 Job Design

'If you want people to do a good job, you give them a good job to do.' (Herzberg)

Giving employees meaningless, repetitive, dull tasks which have little variety can all but destroy engagement and morale, turning employees into robots who just 'do' rather than 'think'. In our experience, problems with engagement can also stem

from employees who are required to just fix the symptom rather than solving the underlying root cause of the issue. Repetitive tasks, performed day in, day out, are unlikely to create a positive working experience or help engage employees. When employees are given a poorly designed job and then made to feel that their work is of little value, this is the ultimate kick the teeth to an individual's sense of worth and engagement.

Wanting to contribute to something which is meaningful is a basic human desire. Therefore, motivating and engaging employees is about enabling progress in work that has a purpose (Amabile and Kramer 2011; Pink 2009). Good job design needs employees to experience meaningful work and to enable this requires (Hackman and Oldham 1976):

- The opportunity and the ability to use a variety of skills
- The ability to observe and understand the outcome of their work efforts
- Participation in work which has an impact on others (including co-workers and customers)

It is about enriching the content of jobs with more opportunities for growth rather than just making the workload larger (Herzberg 1968).

Good job design also requires mechanisms for effective feedback. This includes providing employees with regular opportunities to garner information on what they have achieved and how they are contributing to the organisation, thus providing essential knowledge on their performance (Hackman and Oldham 1976). Feedback gives employees encouragement, direction and information and helps provide meaning and purpose to their work. In our experience when feedback is coupled with information on the value of the employee's contribution to the organisation, it provides a mechanism for positive reinforcement because it makes the employee feel valued by the organisation in return; it is a two-way street.

13.5.8 Career, Mastery and Advancement

Strongly related to job design is the need for employees to be able to advance and develop their career. The aspiration to be involved in something that matters and to get better at it, known as mastery (Pink 2009), is a key driver behind motivation and is aligned with the human need to advance, grow and attain fulfilment (Maslow 1943).

Inability or lack of opportunity to progress within organisations was found to be a demotivator (Herzberg 1968). In our experience a lack of career opportunities within workforces is linked to lower levels of morale and engagement. In some cases where opportunities were available, the opportunities were so infrequent they were effectively absent, colloquially known as *dead men's shoes*. This results in frustrated, disengaged employees who are more likely to tread water until other opportunities arise.

Hence, all organisations need to provide well-structured career paths and opportunities for employees to develop. Whilst it is true that some individuals may not seek promotion or development opportunities, most people need to know that the opportunity is there if required. It is also key for attracting the highest calibre recruits and retaining ambitious and talented employees.

13.5.9 Work Environment

What is considered by employees to be their 'place of work' can vary and certainly should not be restricted to the clean, bright and slightly sterile office that many associate with working environments. Some employees enjoy the isolation afforded by individual mobile working; others relish having a number of colleagues in close proximity. Open plan spaces can be distracting to some, but others may find the buzz stimulating and conducive to productive work. Domestic dwellings are also the working environment of a large number of mobile workers, as well as (more importantly) being the customer's home.

Amongst Herzberg's hygiene factors (1968) is the expectation that the working environment is of a satisfactory level. Being a hygiene factor, working conditions are more likely to upset and demotivate employees if they are poor or considered to be unacceptable, rather than have a strong positive effect on motivation if they are of a high standard. A poor work environment caused by, for example, heating and air conditioning problems not only causes complaints and potentially distracts employees but can also have the undesired effect of undermining the individual's sense of value to the organisation. Equally, mobile workers who have no fixed workplace and lack access to basics such as hot drinks or well-maintained toilets can feel unappreciated, even demoted, especially if such facilities have been available in the past.

Whereas a poor work environment can disengage employees, a good working environment can facilitate how 'valued' employees feel. The authors have spent time with mobile engineers who enjoy the autonomy of their role and not being under constant supervision; others enjoy the ability to have a 'picnic' style break (often with a view of fields) whilst they eat lunch. They often consider this to be part of their 'rights' or their 'psychological contract' with the company (Lester and Kickul 2001) and can afford a higher level of job satisfaction. Removing previously enjoyed 'rights' will potentially cause low morale and disenchantment.

Work environment is one area often overlooked in terms of employee engagement by organisations. Getting it right will help engender an employee's sense of worth to an organisation and consequently improve employee motivation and engagement.

13.6   Conclusions

'Be the change you wish to see.' (Gandhi)

Within this chapter the authors have described nine elements or components of employee engagement that they believe are fundamental to realising the full potential of a workforce. These components have been identified through the authors' fresh perspective on employee engagement using a blend of tried and tested research methods: the combination of qualitative methodologies, to reveal key insights into employees' attitudes and behaviours, with quantitative techniques, to provide essential data and information on the employee's job in hand. As a result a distinctive and revealing insight into employee engagement has emerged.

To close, a final word about culture and employee engagement and in particular about those driving the change. The prevailing culture within any organisation wishing to engage employees must be one of openness and respect for its people. Respect goes hand in hand with valuing employees, but also required is the ability to engender trust, often via honest and open discussions. Creation of trust is paramount; otherwise, concerns will not be aired, and progress towards change will be limited. The impetus to change also includes the values, attitudes and behaviours of the senior managers and leaders who typically dominate the culture of any company. Without their drive and commitment, any move towards a culture of employee engagement will only ever scrape the surface and, at the most, be superficial. Senior management must be fully committed to engage and motivate employees, including 'walking the walk'. Only then will the full benefits of employee engagement to both the business and individuals be fully realised.

References

Amabile TM, Kramer SJ (2011) The power of small wins. Harv Bus Rev 89(5):70–80

Ariely D, Gneezy U, Loewenstein G, Mazar N (2009) Large stakes and big mistakes. Rev Econ Stud 76(2):451–469

Brower MF (1995) Empowering teams: what, why, and how. Empower Organ 3(1):13–25

CBI report. Healthy returns? Absence and workplace health survey (2011) http://www.cbi.org.uk/media/955604/2011.05-healthy_returns_absence_and_workplace_health_survey_2011.pdf

Deci EL (1975) Intrinsic motivation. Plenum, New York, NY

Deci EL, Ryan RM (1985) Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Springer, Berlin

Deming WE (1982) Out of the crisis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Center for Advanced Engineering Study, Cambridge

Dixon M, Freeman K, Toman N (2010) Stop trying to delight your customers. Harv Bus Rev 88 (7/8):116–122

Goodhart CA (1975) Monetary relationships: a view from Threadneedle Street. In: Papers in monetary economics 1

Hackman JR, Oldham GR (1976) Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory. Organ Behav Hum Perform 16(2):250–279

Hardy B (2010) Morale: definitions, dimensions and measurement. PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, Judge Business School

Harter JK, Schmidt FL, Hayes TL (2002) Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. J Appl Psychol 87(2):268–279

Haynes L, Service O, Goldacre B, Torgerson D (2012) Test, learn, adapt: developing public policy with randomised controlled trials. Cabinet Office Behavioural Insights Team, https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/test-learn-adapt-developing-public-policy-with-randomised-controlled-trials

Herzberg F, Mausner B, Snyderman BB (1959) The motivation to work. Wiley, New York

Herzberg F (1968) One more time: how do you motivate employees? Harv Bus Rev; 46–57

Hochschild AR (1983) The managed heart: commercialization of human feeling. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA

Kaplan RS, Norton DP (1992) The balanced scorecard–measures that drive performance. Harv Bus Rev 70(1):71–79

Kohn A (1993) Why incentive plans cannot work. Harv Bus Rev 71(5):54–63

Kohn A (1999) Punished by rewards: the trouble with gold stars, incentive plans. A's, praise, and other bribes. Mariner Books, New York

Lester SW, Kickul J (2001) Psychological contracts in the 21st century: what employees value most and how well organizations are responding to these expectations. Hum Resource Plann 24 (1):10–21

Locke EA, Latham GP (2002) Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. Am Psychol 57(9):705

MacLeod D, Clarke N (2011) Engaging for success: enhancing performance through employee engagement, a report to Government

Maslow AH (1943) A theory of human motivation. Psychol Rev 50(4):370

McGregor D (1960) The human side of the enterprise. McGraw-Hill Professional, New York

Millet CT, Johnson SJ, Cooper CL, Donald IJ, Cartwright S, Taylor PJ (2005) Britain's most stressful occupations and the role of emotional labour. In: BPS occupational psychology conference, Warwick

National Audit Office (2011) Transforming NHS ambulance services. http://www.nao.org.uk/ambulance-service-2011.

Nohria N, Groysberg B, Lee LE (2008) Employee motivation. Harv Bus Rev July–Aug; 78–84

O'Reilly K (2004) Ethnographic methods. Routledge, New York

Oakland JS (1996) Statistical process control. Butterworth-Heinemann, UK

Pande PS, Neuman RP, Cavanagh RR (2000) The six sigma way. McGraw-Hill, New York

Pink D (2009) Drive—the surprising truth about what motivates us. Canongate Books, Edinburgh

Reichheld F (2006) The ultimate question: driving good profits and true growth. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA

Rucci AJ, Kirn SP, Quinn RT (1998) The employee-customer-profit chain at sears. Harv Bus Rev Jan–Feb; 82–97

Ryan RM, Deci EL (2000) Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: classic definitions and new directions. Contemp Educ Psychol 25(1):54–67

Seddon J (2005) Freedom from command and control: a better way to make the work work; the Toyota System for Service Organizations. Vanguard Education Limited, New York

Shaw C, Ivens J (2002) Building great customer experiences. Palgrave Macmillan, New York

Strauss A, Corbin J (1994) Grounded theory methodology. Handbook of qualitative research. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp 273–285

Sweller J (1988) Cognitive load during problem solving: effects on learning. Cogn Sci 12 (2):257–285

Tamkin P, Cowling M, Hunt W (2008) People and the bottom line. Institute for Employment Studies (cited in D. MacLeod and N. Clark 2011)

Wilson PF, Dell LD, Anderson GF (1993) Root cause analysis. Quality, Milwaukee, WI

Womack JP, Jones DT (2003) Lean thinking: banish waste and create wealth in your corporation. Free Press, New York