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Abstract

This study sought to investigate whether and how worker engagement could facilitate changes in how workers define their work roles to promote behaviours which improve safety. Prior to this research, no single study had investigated the influence of engagement on the full spectrum of safety behaviours nor explained the psychosocial mechanisms involved.

This research adopted grounded theory as the methodological framework, leading to an inductive approach. Six qualitative studies were conducted over five years, each of which contributed to the development of the theory and the design of the next study to challenge and refine that theory. They are presented chronologically to show the academic journey of the author and evolution of the theory. These studies include literature reviews, surveys, focus groups and interviews conducted with health and safety professionals and academics.

The final study, an interview and focus groups with workers and managers, confirmed that data saturation had been achieved by establishing that the model adequately explained the lived experiences and perceptions of participants.

This research makes an original contribution to knowledge by creating a novel and functional psychosocial model of engagement and its association with safety behaviour. The model explains how a process of engagement, which relies on fulfilling the needs of workers, might equip workers with the resources and influence their motivation to integrate protective and/or promotive ‘pro-safety’ norms into one or more role definitions and then invest their resources enacting those norms.
The research supported the development of an intervention termed ‘person-centred safety’. This offers a structure for facilitating focus groups to gain insights into levels of engagement in safety and underlying, contributory factors. The research led to a model representing different types of organisational culture that emerged during the research, and overviews of the management training needed to build and sustain engagement within those cultures.

*The candidate in an expert panel discussion at Safety and Health Expo 2017, debating some of the concepts arising from his research.*
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Author’s Note: This research adopted grounded theory as the methodological framework (described later) and the theory developed in an inductive manner. This introduction reflects the author’s understanding at the start of the research.

In the UK, between 2016-2017, 137 people died from work related injuries, 70,116 workers sustained some sort of specified injury and 1.3 million people suffered from a work-related illness, half a million of which relate to stress or anxiety. The impact on the UK economy is enormous, estimated at £14.9 billion (Health and Safety Executive (HSE) 2017a). These figures suggest that there are moral and financial incentives for improving standards of health and safety.

Occupational accidents are caused by a multitude of factors (Haslam et al. 2005, Manu et al. 2010). One of those factors is human behaviour which contributes to 70% to 90% of accidents (different figures are given by HSE 1999, Hide et al. 2003, Haslam et al. 2005, Phillips 2005) suggesting that a focus on behaviours is warranted.

‘Safety behaviour’ is not a homogenous group of behaviours (Stride et al. 2013). Following rules and regulations (‘safety compliance’) can reduce accidents by, for example, wearing appropriate personal protective equipment (Didla et al. 2009). Organisations also need workers to be “proactive in participating and initiating improvements in safety” (Didla et al. 2009: 475) such as reporting hazards or suggesting improvements (Reader et al. 2017). Marchand et al. (1998), Griffin and Neal (2000), Hofmann et al. (2003) and Neal and Griffin (2006) also distinguish compliance from voluntary, proactive behaviours to improve safety.
In the fifth century BC, the Athenian philosopher, Xenophon, wrote The Education of Cyrus. He proposed that willing obedience, achieved through the pursuit of kindness and virtue, is superior to obedience arising from fear or compulsion. Questions about how to achieve the best human performance stretch back to antiquity. The safety profession might similarly perceive that promoting willing obedience (or compliance) is the most effective way of keeping people healthy and safe. Nahrgang et al. (2011) found a significant, negative relationship between compliance and adverse events.

Some authors suggest that a focus on compliance is counter-productive. Dekker and Pitzer (2014: 60) argue that “subtle human judgement and expertise” maintain safety rather than keeping behaviour within a “prescribed bandwidth” (pg. 61). Resilience is undermined when organisations strive for consistency, rather than encouraging different perspectives which help them to question and challenge the status quo (Dekker and Pitzer 2014). Compliance, these authors suggest, does not equip workers to cope with abnormal situations or the genuine complexities of work. Focussing on “unsafe acts as the final weak link” (Dekker and Pitzer 2014: 63) places responsibility on front line operatives who have the least authority in the organisation.

Safety performance may improve if workers apply their judgement and question rules. Mechanisms might be needed to enable workers to share ideas, as discussed next.

1.1 An obligation to consult and involve workers

Employers must introduce formal mechanisms for worker representation, typically involving consulting with representatives from the workforce in some form of committee. Legislation, or associated guidance, sometimes clarify these duties. In the UK, employers should involve workers in assessing risk (HSE 2014), and workers must notify employers of situations posing imminent and serious danger (Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 (Statutory Instrument No.3242)).

There is an association between worker involvement, especially through consultation in safety committees, and improved safety outcomes (Geldart et al. 2010, Zanko and Dawson 2012). Worker involvement is cited as a contributory factor to the low incident rates achieved during the 2012 London Olympic Games ‘big build’ (Lucy et al. 2011). This project was delivered on time and budget with no fatalities (Bolt et al. 2012).

HSE-sponsored research advocates a range of mechanisms for involving workers in health and safety such as pre-task briefings, joint risk assessments, and near miss and hazard-reporting systems (Shearn 2004, Cameron et al. 2006, Fidderman and McDonnell 2010, Lucy et al. 2011, Bolt et al. 2012, Healey and Sugden 2012). Managers need effective ‘soft skills’ and commitment to worker involvement to involve workers and establish trust and collaboration with the workforce (Shearn 2004, Poxon et al. 2007, Fidderman and McDonnell 2010, Lekka and Healey 2012). It is important to take action and give feedback in response to suggestions and hazard and near miss reports to maintain commitment to reporting schemes (Shearn 2004, Cameron et al. 2006, Lunt et al. 2008, Fidderman and McDonnell 2010, Lucy et al. 2011).

Quantitative studies by Geldart et al. (2010), Vinodkumar and Bhasi (2010), Zanko and Dawson (2012) and Wachter and Yorio (2014) highlight the health and safety benefits
of involving workers. Collectively, the HSE and academic research suggest that when workers are involved with or collaborate in assessing risks and planning systems of work, they gain insights into risks and controls. Rules may be fit-for-purpose and workers may be more motivated to comply, which may account for improvements in health and safety performance. This approach seems to align with the concept of ‘willing obedience’. Consultation can also lead to fundamental changes and improvements in the way that work or the workplace is organised (Strauss 1998).

Involvement is sometimes presented as synonymous with a construct called ‘engagement’ as exemplified by the figure below.

**Figure 1: Worker Engagement (source: Woodrow 2006)**

In what way is involvement the same as or different to engagement? If they might be different constructs, what precisely is engagement?
1.2 From Consultation and Involvement to Engagement

A report into worker representation and consultation by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (2012) identified ‘worker engagement’ as a recent trend in the UK. As an example, the Olympic Delivery Authority, the body responsible for creating the infrastructure for the 2012 Olympic Games, “recognised that effective consultation and engagement was a fundamental mechanism for achieving high standards of health and safety throughout the programme” by allowing issues to be raised and solutions to be identified (Healey and Sugden, 2012: 19). At first glance, it appears that ‘consultation and engagement’ is similar to ‘consultation and involvement’: they are mechanisms to allow issues to be raised and solved.

The report by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (2012) proposes that engagement is different from consultation. The UK’s HSE appears to prefer the term ‘worker involvement’ instead of ‘worker engagement’ (which they favoured in the mid 2000’s, as exemplified by the research of Cameron et al. 2006 and Lunt et al. 2008). However, in the HSE’s online leadership and worker involvement toolkit (HSE, undated) they still define engagement as “the involvement your workers have in H&S decisions”. The Safety and Health Practitioner (SHP 2016) published a book entitled “From Compliance to Engagement” without explaining what those terms mean, who should make the journey to engagement, why or how. It seems unclear what ‘engagement’ is and whether or how it differs from involvement or similar concepts.

Reports and studies suggest that an engaged workforce has lower turnover and absenteeism and improved productivity, performance, innovation and customer service (Harter et al. 2002, MacLeod and Clarke 2009, Alfes et al. 2010, Wollard and

Engagement is associated with discretionary behaviours, sometimes called organisational citizenship behaviour (e.g. Saks 2006, Macey and Schneider 2008, Christian et al. 2011). When applied to safety, these behaviours lead to proactive, voluntary contributions to promote safety in the organisation or environment, such as attending voluntary safety meetings or training (Christian et al. 2009, DeArmond et al. 2011). A meta-analysis by Christian et al. (2009) found that safety compliance and pro-active safety behaviours are equally important in preventing workplace incidents.

Zohar et al. (2015) argues that there may be little potential to display safety citizenship behaviours, i.e. discretionary contributions to improve safety, due to the need for workers to follow prescribed rules. Instead, safety citizenship behaviours might be limited to ‘augmenting’ or complementing compliance (Martínez-Córcoles et al. 2012, Zohar et al. 2015). This could include suggesting improvements and reporting hazards or concerns such as inconsistencies in rules or misunderstandings about procedures (Martínez-Córcoles et al. 2012, Curcuruto et al. 2015). This, however, sounds very much like worker involvement. What, then, is engagement? Are the behaviours promoted by engagement any different to those promoted by involvement? Do the differences extend to increased levels of safety citizenship behaviours?
1.3 An initial search of literature

Researchers have long sought an understanding of what motivates workers and how managers might most effectively influence performance. Examples from 60 years ago include Herzberg's (1959) two factor theory, which built upon studies conducted over the previous four decades, or MacGregor’s (1957) theory X and theory Y. Theory Y management focuses on offering greater autonomy and building positive relationships, leading to greater satisfaction and discretionary effort.

The concept of engagement appears to be a reinvention or reinvigoration of extant ideas (Saks 2008). For example, engagement research concurs that workers are engaged by antecedents such as transformational leadership and greater job control (Christian et al. 2011). Once engaged, workers expand their role perceptions and perceive a wider spectrum of behaviours as falling within their role (Macey and Schneider 2008, Rich et al. 2010, Christian et al. 2011). This leads to ‘proactive work behaviour’ (Schmitt et al. 2016) or discretionary effort (Saks 2008).

This present research is positing whether a specific aspect of employee performance, in this case safety behaviour, might be influenced by adopting organisational or management practices to ‘engage’ workers. Even more specifically, does this process lead workers to redefine their role to prompt extra-role or discretionary behaviours to make work or the workplace safer (Clark et al. 2014)?

There is some evidence to support this proposal. Workers might direct their discretionary efforts at improving safety if they perceive that their organisation cares for them and they feel an obligation to reciprocate in a like manner (Clark et al. 2014,
Zohar et al. 2015, Reader et al. 2017). This explanation partly draws from social exchange theory (Zohar et al. 2015, Reader et al. 2017).

Griffin and Curcuruto (2016: 207) proposed that future research might focus on how individual and organisational motivational mechanisms might interact to influence a range of safety behaviours. Curcuruto et al. (2016) investigated the psychological drivers for proactive safety behaviours, such as felt responsibility and 'role breadth self-efficacy' (the confidence to behave proactively). Their paper (pg. 153) advocates further research to consider “multiple links between organizational features, motivational dimensions of proactivity and consequent effects and outcomes”. Engagement may offer a potential mechanism to explain those links.

An exploratory literature search, undertaken using Summons 2.0 (repeated for the last time on 25/01/17), reveals that the association between engagement and safety citizenship behaviour or participation (the terms used by Hofmann et al. (2003), Griffin and Neal (2000) and Neal and Griffin (2006)) is understudied. Table 1 below shows the articles returned using different search terms (with Boolean operators) and the effect of searching for those terms specifically within the abstract or title (which suggests that the terms would be central themes of the article).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms used across all date ranges</th>
<th>Results returned</th>
<th>Results returned when the terms were used in the abstract or title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>engagement &quot;safety citizenship&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement &quot;safety participation&quot;</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Initial Literature Review using Summons 2.0
The refined search revealed one relevant article (Chmiel et al. 2017). That study found an association between certain management practices, including offering job control and perceived management commitment to safety (PMCS), engagement, safety citizenship role definition (SCRD), safety participation (which is the behavioural manifestation of SCRD) and situational violations. Various mechanisms are proposed to explain the association between these factors. For example, the authors propose that giving workers more resources, such as more job control, leads to them becoming engaged (which they describe as a motivational state), which in turn encourages them to expand or re-define their work roles, to include SCRD. However, why is it motivational to give someone job control, why would someone who is engaged expand their definitions of work roles and why specifically on safety-related role definitions?

Griffin and Curcuruto (2016) and Curcuruto et al. (2016) call for an investigation of the psychological motivational mechanisms underlying discretionary safety behaviours and their interaction with organisational processes. “Understanding the psychosocial factors that explain safety behaviors is not only theoretically useful, but it also has practical relevance for implementing a more effective and successful safety management strategy” (Fugas et al. 2012: 476). Andersen et al. (2018: 22) propose that successful safety interventions depend on “taking into account the interplay between social structures and psychological processes”. Safety behaviours could be explored from a psychosocial perspective to generate robust safety interventions.

1.4 Research gaps and questions

While Chmiel et al. (2017) suggest ways in which engagement can be promoted (e.g. offering job control), the models presented by Christian et al. (2011) and Schmitt et al.
(2016) indicate that there may be a broader range of influential factors. Techniques for engaging workers appear to be very different from how workers are involved. Worker involvement seems to be based around an exchange of safety-related information or ideas while engagement revolves around wider management and organisational practices. It is, as yet, unclear what engagement actually means.

**Research questions:** What is engagement? How does an organisation or manager engage workers? How does this differ (if at all) from involving workers? What psychosocial mechanisms or models explain the links between organisational and managerial practices and worker involvement and/or engagement?

Drawing from Hofmann *et al.* (2003), Chmiel *et al.* (2017) used four measures of safety citizenship behaviour: changing jobs or procedures to make them safer, improving procedures or policies or volunteering for safety committees. However, these are some outcomes or techniques of involving workers. Further, these items are not fully descriptive of safety citizenship behaviour. For example, Schmitt *et al.* (2016) suggest that it would be useful to examine the association between work engagement and proactive behaviours directed at helping colleagues. Curcuruto *et al.* (2016) found that safety citizenship is not a unitary construct as there are differences between behaviours that prevent harm and those promoting improvements in safety. It is conceivable that different psychosocial mechanisms drive different types of safety citizenship behaviour. Therefore, the decision by Chmiel *et al.* (2017) to treat safety citizenship as a unitary construct might have overlooked important, subtle differences.

**Research questions:** Does worker engagement lead to different safety role definitions and behaviours compared to worker involvement? Do the behavioural
outcomes of involvement and engagement include ‘safety citizenship behaviours’ (SCB)? If so, what exactly are SCB and do involvement/engagement elicit particular types of SCB? If there are differences in behavioural outcomes between involvement and engagement, what are they and what explains those different outcomes? Do different psychosocial mechanisms drive different types of citizenship behaviours?

Finally, putting these questions together, one final, potential question emerges:

**Research question:** If there is found to be a link between organisational/managerial practices, engagement and citizenship behaviours, are any practices particularly important in promoting safety citizenship behaviours?

It is important to establish what is ‘out of scope’ of the research. In 2017, the British Psychological Society published guidance on psychology at work, and highlighted engagement at work as a key component of improving wellbeing. This may explain the link between engagement and outcomes such as lower absenteeism. Given the estimates that half a million individuals are suffering from stress-related illness (HSE 2017a), a focus on wellbeing is warranted. Wellbeing, stress and mental health are, however, such significant subjects in their own right that the research cannot hope to do them justice and will not explore them as key themes. It does, however, suggest that practitioners may be interested in engagement for a range of reasons beyond improving safety or operational performance.
Chapter 2: Background of the Study

To explain the author’s personal motivation for undertaking this investigation, it is necessary to undertake a personal reflection. This was prompted by the PhD transfer interview during which the author was asked why this topic was important to him (in addition to other reflexive questions, such as what surprises there had been to date). This needs exploring at this early juncture as it could potentially give insights into how (and not just why) this research will be conducted.

One of the key motivations for this study arose from a hazardous event. The author walked into his office and was shown the photo below. A worker had crawled along the edge of a roof on a building opposite to mend a gutter. The photo had been taken by a qualified professional some half-an-hour earlier, but he had not intervened.

Figure 2: A risk of a potentially fatal fall
The author wondered what encourages or prevents someone from intervening when another person is at risk of harm, prompting an interest in safety citizenship behaviour. However, the line of questioning could have centred on the worker himself. Already it is apparent that unconscious biases are influencing the direction of this research.

Reflecting on the motivation for a study serves a methodological function by exposing pre-existing beliefs, values and presuppositions which can influence the research (Mays and Pope 2000). These can be understood and managed through a process of bracketing (Holloway and Wheeler 2010, Tufford and Newman 2012).

2.1 Bracketing

Fischer (2009: 584) describes bracketing as a “mindfulness” that:

One brings to bear regularly, asking about assumptions that have gone into what one saw and into how one has “languaged” what was apprehended. It is not possible to view without viewing from somewhere. We do our best to become aware of what that somewhere is, questioning it, owning it or changing it, and including it in our reports.

In short, it involves a researcher achieving an awareness of, amongst other things, their background, values and theories (Gearing 2004) and then taking steps to ensure that the research is not compromised through the unconscious impact of researcher bias (Ahern 1999, Tufford and Newman 2012, Sorsa et al. 2015). Researchers should consider their personal values, position, privileges, priorities, potential areas for role conflict or whether they are seeking positive feelings or avoiding encounters that could evoke anxiety (Ahern 1999, Charmaz 2017).
Bracketing originated in phenomenological research, but is used more widely (e.g. in grounded theory) (Sorsa et al. 2015). Different research traditions argue about when and how bracketing should be done and whether the researcher should use or stifle the preconceptions that are revealed (Gearing 2004, Tufford and Newman 2012).

Chan et al. (2013: 4) propose that researchers should “adopt an attitude of conscious ignorance”. Similarly, Glaser (2012) suggests no preconceptions should enter the research process. This has been described as “naïve empiricism” and “fails to recognize the embeddedness of the researcher within an historical, ideological and socio-cultural context” (Thornberg 2012: 246). The researcher can be seen as being ‘embedded’ in the research process and having considerable agency in construction and interpretation of data, to the point that data and theory can be viewed as a co-construction between the participant and the researcher (Charmaz 2006, 2017, Oleson 2007, Sorsa et al. 2015). Research “brings together participant and researcher understandings and organises these into coherent, reflexively processed conceptualisations of the lived world” (Luca 2009: 4).

2.1.1.1 Reflexive (Cultural) Bracketing

A researcher should choose a bracketing method that reflects the researcher’s ontological and epistemological position (Gearing 2004) and be explicit about the method used and how it contributed to the research (Gearing 2004, Holloway and Wheeler 2010, Tufford and Newman 2012). Of the bracketing typologies identified by Gearing (2004) the author’s stance is aligned to Reflexive (Cultural) bracketing in part because it recognises that the researcher’s own suppositions cannot be silenced.
This approach is principally undertaken in the preparation stage to identify suppositions and seeks to make the researcher’s personal values, judgements, background and cultural suppositions transparent and overt to understand how they could impact the research process (Gearing 2004). Therefore, a “thoughtful, conscious self-awareness” (Finlay 2002: 532) is required. Reflexive bracketing is associated with a wide range of epistemological positions from constructivism to post-modernism, is closely related to a relativist ontology and is used in grounded theory. Methods of reflexive bracketing, include writing memos, keeping a journal or interviews with an outside source (for example, as provided by the researcher’s transfer interview) (Hanson 1994, Ahern 1999, Wall et al. 2004, Tufford and Newman 2012).

2.2 Bracketing as an auto-ethnographic exercise

Reflexive bracketing appears similar to an auto-ethnographic approach which revolves around a personal narrative coupled with reflexive analysis where the researcher is the subject (Ellis and Bochner 2000). Auto-ethnography commences with the subject’s personal story (Löwstedt 2015) and is often reported as vignettes (Humphreys 2005, Kanjanabootra and Corbitt 2016). The author will therefore use a series of vignettes to undertake a personal, reflexive account of the reasons for undertaking this research to elicit his values, beliefs, perceptions and motivations.

It is important to question the objectivity of auto-ethnographic research (Denzin and Lincoln 1994, Ellis and Bochner 2000). However, Ellis and Bochner (2000) explain that it does not matter whether auto-ethnographic accounts are an accurate portrayal of events but rather what the consequences are of those stories.
Mills et al. (2006a) suggests that if a researcher recognises themselves as a co-constructor of data and meaning, they may choose to write in the first person. I have used this approach when presenting and reflecting on the vignettes which are contained in Appendix 1. I have reflected on five vignettes which I perceived to have shaped, or demonstrate, my beliefs and values; the potential, fatal fall; a conference talk I attended; my Master’s Degree dissertation; my experience as a Probation Officer, and; a moment of personal crisis. To offer some structure to those narratives I will follow the ‘What? So what? Now what?’ model proposed by Driscoll (2000).

### 2.3 Revelations from the reflections

Reflecting on my use of cognitive-behavioural interventions with offenders, and the influence of positive psychology (vignette 4), I believe that people are rational and behaviour (even criminal behaviour) is functional and driven by and indicative of underlying thoughts and feelings. My reflections on vignette 1, the risk of a fatal fall, revealed that I was upset by my inability to explain the cognitive-affective processes which prevented the professional from intervening. My Masters dissertation (vignette 3) drew on cognitive-behavioural psychology and convinced me that there is value in exploring psychological dimensions of safety.

Collectively, my reflections revealed a belief that people should actively care for and show empathy to others. Vignettes 1 and 5 revealed a belief that the greater the power someone has, the more important it is for people to show these qualities. The reflections suggest that this risks ignoring the accountability and agency of workers.
2.3.1 How my biases may influence the research

The reflections explain my interest in developing a psychosocial model of engagement which recognise that workers behave in a rational way informed by cognitive and affective processes. The concept of safety citizenship behaviour encapsulates the notion of workers taking a proactive interest in safety, including safeguarding the wellbeing of others. The antecedents of engagement appear to revolve around organisations treating workers with decency which also mirrors my belief that people, especially those in positions of power, should care for others.

My reflections on how positive psychology shaped my approach to safety, and how that approach differs from behaviourism, led me to write an article (“saving the soul of safety”, Bell 2017a). I am drawn to research which shares my perception of workers’ capabilities and motivations. Gibbs et al. (2016: 36) wrote that “people are thoughtful, ingenious and attentive…using their cognitive and physical abilities to get the job done”. Workers are also “a source of diversity, insight and wisdom about safety, not purely sources of risk” (Green 2016). However, I recognised that my beliefs and values may not be universally shared in the cultural milieu in which this research is taking place. I need to adopt a methodology which ensures that I am not ‘silencing’ voices or simply not seeking out voices that will strike discordant notes. The next chapter discusses the selection and construction of that methodological framework.

Finally, vignettes 4 and 5 have highlighted how my experiences, beliefs and values are pointing me towards a qualitative methodology that will allow me to hear the voices of my participants and draw on my skills in facilitating interviews and groups.
Chapter 3: Study Design

3.1 Articulating an ontological and epistemological position

From the start of the research process, even when reviewing literature, the researcher applies some sort of methodology. They are demonstrating an underlying belief that there are appropriate sources of data, and techniques for ‘extracting’ and making sense of that knowledge. Underlying that is a more fundamental belief about the nature of the ‘thing’ we are trying to study. Do we, for example, consider the phenomenon to be something that is observable and measurable or is it less tangible?

Researchers, therefore, have pre-existing beliefs about the nature of the world around them, what insights they want to gain about that world and, broadly, how they will gain that knowledge (Creswell 2003, Hay 2011). This is otherwise known as their ontological and epistemological position (Ormston et al. 2014). “All research approaches in the social sciences make ontological assumptions about the nature of reality and social beings” (Hudson and Ozanne 1988: 509).

Dekker and Nyce (2015: 185) explain that ontological considerations underpins human factors research “which turns putative mental constructs into measurable numbers. We should not overestimate the ontological status of our constructs.” In contrast, research based upon testimony by participants can be seen as an “analytic ‘fall from grace’” (Dekker and Nyce 2015: 186). Nonetheless, Gibbs et al. (2016: iv) purposefully adopted an ethnographic approach to undertake observations and interviews to reveal that “[occupational safety and health] knowledge is “co-created and interpreted socially”. These concepts could be difficult to reduce into and measure with numbers.
Research methodology is therefore driven by the researcher’s theoretical perspective and philosophical stance and articulating that position helps a researcher to develop and justify her or his research methods (Hudson and Ozanne 1988, Creswell 2003, Cohen and Crabtree 2008, Sloan and Bowe 2014). Having examined the different ontological positions that can underpin research, I believe that I am a critical realist.

3.1.1 Critical Realism

“From a critical realist standpoint, an understanding of the world will always be constructed from a combination of one’s own experiences, perceptions and standpoint rather than being able to attain an entirely independent ‘God’s eye’ perspective” (Schiller 2016: 92). The earlier reflections (Chapter 2) recognised that this research is informed by pre-existing beliefs and values. From a critical realist perspective, research begins with the researcher’s a priori information or perspectives (Roberts 2014) and these are a valid starting point for research and not a threat to validity.

From the critical realist viewpoint, there is some sort of reality (Schiller 2016) and “maintain that there is an inherent order of things that is graspable by research, and therefore they engage in explanatory reduction in which lower-level mechanisms (such as psychological mechanisms) are used to help explain higher-level phenomena (such as how groups enact practice)” (Peters et al. 2013: 344). However, critical realists consider that knowledge of that reality is socially constructed, so it is conjectural and multi-faceted and means that an absolute truth cannot be found (Phillips and Burbules 2000, Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2011, Houghton et al. 2012, Christ 2014, Ormston et al. 2014, Schiller 2016, Shannon-Baker 2016). Social research can achieve a better but imperfect glimpse of reality (Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2011, Kempster and Parry 2011).
Critical realists focus on revealing ‘generative mechanisms’: the factors, that singularly or in combination, lead to some sort of outcome (Clark et al., 2007, Bunt 2016 and Schiller 2016). From this perspective, a researcher seeks out root causes of a phenomenon, and do not merely describe it, building a conceptual model or theory to explain human experience (Bunt 2016, Roberts 2014, Schiller 2016). Outcomes may or may not be observable and do not always occur because generative mechanisms may interact with each other differently, depending on the context (Schiller 2016).

This ontological position already manifested itself in the introduction. I am seeking to establish whether engagement and safety citizenship behaviours are ‘real’ and if so I wish to explore how they relate to one another. Is engagement likely to be a ‘generative mechanism' for safety citizenship behaviours (a high-level phenomenon)? What are the generative, “lower level" mechanisms that give rise to engagement?

3.1.1.1 Epistemology

This research began with a desire to understand what safety citizenship behaviours are and how they might be promoted. Citizenship behaviours arise from individuals developing a “sense of their role in an organization on the basis of what they think they are supposed to do, what they prefer to do, and what they know how to do. Employees’ role definition is subject to continual reassessment on the basis of perception generated from various social cues” (Turner et al. 2005: 505).

Words such as ‘sense’, ‘think’, ‘perception’, ‘prefer’, ‘supposed to do’, ‘reassessment’ and ‘social cues’, suggest that the research will be dealing with incredibly subjective concepts. The researcher’s epistemological position is to gain insights into the
meaning and significance people attach to their experiences and behaviours. I therefore believe I am most comfortable with a constructivist epistemology. Some indication of this could be seen in the introduction to this thesis in which I was interested in examining the meanings attached to the concepts of engagement or involvement. The reflections also revealed my desire to hear, discuss and understand participants’ experiences and perceptions, not try to measure them.

Critical realism embodies a constructivist epistemology yet still tries to identify and explain the causal mechanisms that really exist and lead to real outcomes (Shannon-Baker 2016). Zachariadis et al. (2013), Kempster and Parry (2011) and Shannon-Baker (2016) suggest that critical realism leads to a middle-ground between the polarization of constructivism and positivism. Peters et al. (2013) notes considerable convergence between critical realism and constructivism, but a key point of divergence is that critical realists see social structures and patterns in social interactions as being real and having causal powers rather than purely a matter of individual perception.

In summary, a constructivist epistemology is compatible with a critical realistic ontology and my own world view. This research is seeking to shed light on real psychosocial mechanisms through the perceptions of those involved (including the researcher himself). It is not simply seeking to describe lived experience.

Having established the ontological and epistemological position of this research, it is now possible to consider the aims and objectives of the study and the structure and research method that can be used to meet them.
3.2 Aim and Objectives

3.2.1 Aim

Chapter 1 gave rise to a number of research questions which are repeated below.

- What is engagement?
- How does an organisation or manager engage workers?
- How does this differ (if at all) from involving them?
- What psychosocial models explain the links between organisational/managerial practices and involvement/engagement?
- Does worker engagement, if such a phenomenon exists, lead to different safety role definitions and/or behaviours compared to worker involvement?
- Do the behavioural outcomes of involvement and engagement include ‘safety citizenship behaviours’ (SCB)? If so, what exactly are these behaviours? Do engagement/involvement elicit particular types of SCB?
- If there are differences in behavioural outcomes between engagement and involvement, what are they and what explains those different outcomes?
- Do different psychosocial mechanisms drive different types of citizenship behaviour?
- If there is found to be a link between organisational/managerial practices, engagement and citizenship behaviours, are any practices particularly important in promoting safety citizenship behaviours?

This research ultimately aims to develop a functional model of the association between worker engagement practices and workers’ safety-related role definitions. The
intention is to help organisations to develop Health and Safety and Human Resource strategies to promote specific, safety-related behavioural outcomes.

It is noteworthy that role definition is being explored rather than behaviour. In part this builds on previous research which has investigated safety citizenship in terms of role definitions (e.g. Hofmann et al. 2003, Turner et al. 2005, Chmiel et al. 2017). Further, direct observations can only take a ‘snap shot’ in time or a longer observation of a fixed point in space (e.g. using a video camera, which was a technique used by Guo et al. 2016). If two workers happened to be seen talking, a video would not reveal whether it was a social or safety-related conversation and why it had been initiated.

3.2.2 Objectives

These objectives have been developed to answer the research questions and, ultimately, meet the aim of the research. It is too early to describe how the objectives are to be met. That will need to wait until a methodology has been developed which is compatible with the ontological and epistemological position of this research.

3.2.2.1 Objective 1: Revealing definitions and antecedents of engagement and its association with safety citizenship behaviour (SCB)

Define worker engagement, understand how it relates to and contrasts with other concepts, especially ‘worker involvement’. Identify what practices promotes engagement (and whether or how these differ from worker involvement). Understand the anticipated outcomes of engagement in terms of behaviour and/or role definitions especially in relation to safety. Define SCB and identify if SCB are thought to be
associated with engagement. Establish if there are existing psychosocial models which explain any association between management or organisational practices, worker engagement and behavioural outcomes or role definitions.

3.2.2.2 Objective 2: Exploring associations between engagement and safety

Examine how and why specific engagement practices might specifically influence safety-related behaviours. Building on the research of Chmiel et al. (2017), explore whether this could be through changes in safety-related role definitions. If so, establish what that might mean and how and why it might occur.

3.2.2.3 Objective 3: Understanding whether/how engagement promotes different types of safety behaviours

Establish what safety-related behaviours engaged workers might be anticipated to demonstrate. Understand whether these behaviours may be associated with changes to safety-related role definitions.

3.2.2.4 Objective 4: Developing a functional model

Develop a functional theoretical model to describe the psychosocial mechanisms that explain the associations between; antecedents of engagement; engagement, and; safety-related role definitions.
3.3 Validity, Reliability and Generalizability in Qualitative Research

Engagement is “an experienced and complex psychological phenomenon, uniquely and individually experienced within the context of an employee’s experience – a woefully understudied positioning of engagement” (Shuck et al. 2015: 13). To address this, and in line with a constructivist epistemology, the research will use qualitative studies. Concerns about the validity of qualitative research must be addressed.

3.3.1 Why validity must be considered

Qualitative research must be “theoretically and methodologically sound” (Braun and Clarke 2006: 78) as “without rigor, research is worthless, becomes fiction and loses its utility” (Morse et al. 2002: 14). The principles of validity, reliability and generalizability are the core criteria for assessing the soundness of quantitative research but need to be reconsidered or operationalised differently when applied to qualitative research (Mays and Pope 2000, Morse et al. 2002, Onwuegbuzie and Johnson 2006, Kempster and Parry 2011). Quantitative research relies upon statistical measurements to prove or falsify a hypothesis (Kempster and Parry 2011) but statistical verification cannot be used to validate qualitative data. There are debates over what may be more applicable criteria to validate qualitative research or even whether criteria can and should be imposed (Braun and Clarke 2006). For example, Guba (1981) argues that the notion of ‘validity’ should be replaced with terms, such as credibility, more suited to qualitative research. It is therefore possible to evidence the validity of qualitative research, albeit using a different approach to validating quantitative studies (Spencer et al. 2003).
3.3.2 Evidencing validity of qualitative research

Strategies for ensuring the validity of qualitative research are set out below and will help to select and justify the choice of methodological framework for this research.

3.3.2.1 Adopt a framework

Fischer (2009) argues that qualitative research is scientific as it uses empirical data, follows specified procedures and allows other to examine the data and findings. However, that will only be achieved if robust protocols are followed, which appear to be a cornerstone for valid, credible qualitative research (Shenton 2004). Braun and Clarke (2006), for example, provide a structure for thematic analysis.

Detailed methodological descriptions and audit trails help to establish how that protocol has been followed, including how unexpected results were managed (Creswell 2007, Morse et al. 2002, Shenton 2004). Mays and Pope (2000: 51) referred to this as “attention to negative cases”. It may be through those unanticipated results that new insights are gained rather than simply reinforcing an existing theory.

No matter what framework is adopted, and what steps are put in place to ensure validity, the study will have limitations. A researcher needs to be honest about those limitations including how researcher bias was managed (Kolb 2012). Consequently, “bracketing is a way of indicating scientific rigour and the validity of the study” (Sorsa et al. 2015: 12). The reflections performed in Chapter 2 will inform reflections throughout the study to identify where and how the researcher’s own experiences and perceptions have influenced the collection (or creation) of data and its interpretation.
3.3.2.2 Sampling strategy

Quantitative studies seek representative samples i.e. ensuring and proving that their samples were of statistically sufficient size that they represent an entire population (Shenton 2004, Kempster and Parry 2011). In qualitative research, however, “‘size’ does not mean ‘significance’” (Bagnasco et al. 2014: e6). Qualitative research focusses on internal generalizability, i.e. forming unique impressions of a specific context, rather than external generalizability, i.e. determining the extent to which findings apply to a wider population or other contexts (Maxwell 1992, Creswell 2007, Kempster and Parry 2011). Sampling in qualitative research can be done in a purposeful way (Kempster and Parry 2011) to gain those insights and impressions, rather than to statistically prove that the findings represent the broader population. Therefore, the sampling strategies will need to be explicitly described and justified.

3.3.2.3 Systematic and transparent data collection and analysis

There is consensus that good quality qualitative research will use a framework to collect and evaluate data and show how and why the conclusions have been reached (rather than randomly collecting and simply describing the data) (Maxwell 1992, Spencer et al. 2003, Shenton 2004).

The validity and credibility of the analysis can be enhanced through triangulation: Using a range of methodologies and data sources to establish the extent to which different sets of data support or challenge each other to achieve a closer approximation to reality and challenge researcher bias (Mays and Pope 2000, Shenton 2004, Creswell and Plano Clark 2011, Kolb 2012). In a similar vein, Lo (2014: 71) argues
that triangulation “amplifies the theoretical value and soundness of a [realist grounded theory] account, because the level of objectivity is manifested by the convergence, or the lack thereof, of a current theoretical account and extant theories/thoughts/ideas”.

A researcher needs multiple sources of data with which to triangulate and this may necessitate a mixed methods design (Zachariadis et al. 2013).

3.3.2.4 Ensure claims and analysis match the data

The emerging theories must be shown to arise from the data rather than the researcher (Maxwell 1992, Shenton 2004). This is however, an objectivist stance, and from the epistemological position of this research (which recognises the researcher to be a co-constructor of data and theory), it would be preferable to take a reflexive approach throughout to show how the author has contributed to the creation of data and theory. Matching claims and analysis can be achieved, in part, by relevant use of extracts and faithfully recording events (e.g. using an audio recorder and transcribing an interview). Braun and Clarke (2006: 96) propose that one component of effective thematic analysis is ensuring that “analysis and data match each other – the extracts illustrate the analytic claims.” This is similar to Maxwell’s (1992) argument that “descriptive validity” relies on factual accuracy of accounts. Therefore, any interviews etc. will be recorded and transcribed and claims will be supported by relevant extracts.

Maxwell (1992) recommends that accounts are interpreted in a way which represents the perspectives and meanings of the members of the group. This could be achieved by, for example, the way in which focus groups are conducted so that emerging themes and concepts are immediately reflected back. A less structured approach to interviews and focus groups may be warranted to give this flexibility.
3.3.2.5 Provide functional theories

From a critical realist perspective, research should generate theory that forms hypotheses about and provide explanations of real events (Zachariadis et al. 2013). If those findings seem plausible to a lay reader the research has greater ‘external validity’ (Kempster and Parry 2011). Maxwell (1992) agrees that a theory which explains an observed phenomenon has greater validity. Plausibility can therefore be viewed as a validity criterion, along with pragmatism and practical adequacy (Kempster and Parry 2011). Collectively, these criteria ask: does the theory allow us to do something with it (is it pragmatic)? Is the theory useful in explaining a phenomenon (is it practically adequate)? Is the theory logical to the audience it is aimed at (is it plausible)? Practical adequacy may be established by testing whether the theory and model that emerges explains the perceptions and experiences of workers and managers and offers practical tools that an organisation would actually be able to use.

All of the preceding criteria are echoed in a UK Cabinet Office report (Spencer et al. 2003). This report argues that qualitative research should; advance wider knowledge; have a research strategy which has a defensible design; collect and analyse data in a manner which is systematic and transparent, and; make credible claims.

3.4 Choice of Methodology

Critical realism is associated with mixed methods research (Christ 2014, Zachariadis et al. 2013, Schiller 2016). This approach is described as “research in which the investigator collects and analyzes data, integrates the findings, and draws inferences
using both qualitative and quantitative approaches or methods in a single study or program of inquiry” (Tashakkori and Creswell 2007: 4).

Critical Realism is compatible with a mixed methods approach (Shannon-Baker 2016) as it offers a much richer understanding of a phenomenon, and a closer approximation of what reality might be, than would have been achieved by using a single approach (Creswell and Plano Clark 2011, Morse and Niehaus 2009). It enables the strengths of one approach to offset the weakness of the other (Creswell and Plano Clark 2011).

Mixed methods research requires some sort of method or framework to help analyse and synthesise multiple types of data. The overarching framework will also need to meet all the validity criteria identified above by:

1. Providing an established, robust protocol which allows different types of data to be integrated. As part of this, the method must;
   - Have an established procedure for collecting and analysing data, as part of which the participant’s own voices must be heard;
   - Have a clear sampling strategy;
   - Provide opportunities for reflexive practice, so that the researcher’s own values and beliefs are not only identified but the research can be adapted as it progresses to enable those beliefs and values to be challenged, refined and accounted for (in how data is being collected and analysed).

2. Being compatible with the ontological and epistemological position of this research (which will reduce the potential for this researcher deviating away from or failing to properly use a methodology which does not fit his world view).

3. Leading the researcher from analysis to the development of a functional theory.
3.4.1 Using Grounded Theory to establish validity

Grounded theory meets all the validity criteria listed above. It offers a structured and recognisable methodology for collecting and analysing data (Kolb 2012). It supports a mixed methods approach as it enables multiple sources of data to be integrated (Charmaz and Henwood 2008). For example, a study by Brunstad and Hjälmhult (2014) employed interviews and focus groups in tandem, coding and utilising the data in accordance with grounded theory to inform subsequent interviews or focus groups. The final focus group confirmed whether saturation had been achieved, and tested the validity and functionality of the theory, by establishing that the theory explains participants’ lived experience. Similarly, Ball (2013) used grounded theory in a mixed methods approach utilising surveys, focus groups and interviews. Grounded theory specifically facilities the development of theory which differentiates it from other qualitative methods (Webb 2003, Braun and Clarke 2006, Kolb 2012, Engward 2013). Grounded theory is compatible with a critical realist ontology (Kempster and Parry 2011). Grounded theory also has a process for determining participants known as ‘theoretical sampling’ (Bagansco et al. 2014).

Grounded theory promotes and supports a reflexive approach, the need for which was identified in Chapter 2, and reflexive bracketing in particular (Fischer 2009: 584). Charmaz (2017: 36) agrees that “constructivist grounded theory relies on developing and maintaining methodological self-consciousness, which calls for reflexivity of a depth researchers may not routinely undertake”. Kolb (2012) takes the same position. The inductive nature of Grounded Theory (as explained later) offers natural pauses, and opportunities for reflection, in the research process.
Only one study (Törner and Pousette 2009), was found which used grounded theory to investigate discretionary safety behaviours suggesting it is a novel framework to use in this context. The seminal study by Kahn (1990) into worker engagement utilised grounded theory, suggesting that it is a viable framework for exploring engagement.

3.4.2 Overview of Grounded Theory (GT)

Grounded theory (or GT) is a systematic, inductive approach to inquiry although the term encompasses a range of strategies (Charmaz and Henwood 2008). From the outset of data collection, data is analysed and tentatively interpreted to generate codes and nascent categories (Charmaz and Henwood 2008). Data could be generated from a sources such as literature, interviews and focus groups (Draucker et al. 2007).

The researcher gathers more data to challenge and refine the codes and categories. Webb (2003: 544) notes “If all the data in a study are collected and then the analysis is done, then this cannot be considered as grounded theory”. It is impossible to determine a priori the precise structure of a GT study (Bagnasco et al. 2014): “an inductive design should have evidence of induction” (McCrae and Purssell 2016: 2291). Returning to and questioning earlier data and codes, a process known as ‘constant comparative analysis’ (Mills et al. 2006a, Draucker et al. 2007), seeks to generate the most plausible theoretical explanation for a phenomenon.

GT is sometimes recognised as an abductive process, as the researcher moves “back and forward between data and pre-existing knowledge or theories and makes comparisons and interpretations in the search for patterns and best possible explanations” (Thornberg 2012: 247). In a process called ‘theoretical sensitivity’
(Noble and Mitchell 2016) researchers identify codes by drawing on their own experience, knowledge of the literature etc. as a source of insight allowing them to see “relevant data and abstract significant categories from his scrutiny of the data” (Glaser and Strauss 1967: 3). Abduction is a creative, rational and scientific form of inference, drawing deep insight and new knowledge from data by speculating about the nature of a phenomenon and possible lines of enquiry to follow about potential causal mechanisms (Loonam 2014, Mcauliffe 2015, Bruscaglioni 2016, Folger and Stein 2017). Abduction therefore appears closely aligned to a critical realist ontology. Bruscaglioni (2016) argues it is only through abduction that new models and theories can be constructed. The development of social cognitive theory and the theory of cognitive dissonance as exemplars of an abductive approach (Folger and Stein 2017).

3.4.3 Is GT suitable for a Critical Realist and Constructivist Epistemology?

There are different versions of GT and debates over what methods are valid approaches (Hernandez 2008, Holton 2008, McCrae and Purssell 2016). It is compatible with different ontologies, such as Relativist (Mills et al. 2006b), Realist (Lomborg and Kirevold 2003) or Critical Realist (Kempster and Parry 2011) and constructivist and objectivist epistemologies (Charmaz 2006, Charmaz and Henwood 2008, Staller 2012, Taghipour 2014). Researchers should adopt an approach suiting their own world view (Hall et al. 2011, Lauridsen and Higginbottom 2014) and declare their epistemological position (Charmaz 2000). Given the constructivist approach of this research, it is appropriate to adopt a Straussian/constructivist model (described, for example, in Charmaz 2006, 2017) rather than objectivist/Glaserian iterations.
Objectivist and constructivist GT methodologies are “distinctly different” (Taghipour 2014: 103) particularly in their treatment of literature. Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) original approach argued that research should start without a literature review (Mills et al. 2006b, Holton 2008, Lo 2014) or “pre-existing reality” (Taghipour 2014: 102). This sits uneasily with modern research protocols (Engward 2013) or a critical realist approach to research (Roberts 2014). It would prohibit a researcher carrying out research in their field of expertise (Thornberg 2012). Strauss and Corbin (1998) saw the literature as another voice and source of data in the research process and a source of inspiration, ideas and critical reflection (Thornberg 2012, Loonam 2014). This study follows Lo’s (2014) suggestion and the approach of constructivist GT by treating the initial literature review as a source of data not a methodological threat. Constructivist grounded theorists therefore “advocate recognizing prior knowledge and theoretical preconceptions and subjecting them to rigorous scrutiny” (Charmaz 2008: 402).

A further difference is that constructivist approaches seek to openly discuss the lives and experiences of participants, and the meanings attached to them, to come to a shared understanding, rather than a privileged researcher imposing meaning on them (Charmaz 2000, Williams and Keady 2012). Thus, knowledge is co-created.

Some GT studies would be better described as thematic analysis (McCrae and Purssell 2016). Thematic analysis is intentionally not being used in this research. It is informed by an essentialist paradigm (Braun and Clarke 2006), so does not fit the ontological position of this research, and it is not driven by the need to develop theory (Braun and Clarke 2006) which is a key motivation for this study.
3.4.4 Theoretical Sampling

Theoretical sampling is unique to GT (Bagnasco et al. 2014) and means purposively seeking data, such as specific types of participants, to develop the emerging theory (Charmaz 2006). These decisions are made as it becomes apparent what codes and theories need to be explored but at the outset a researcher must determine a priori which participants or other data sources are likely to be able to shed light on a specific phenomenon (Bagnasco et al. 2014).

3.4.5 Saturation

Saturation means the point at which gathering more data reveals no further properties about a category nor new theoretical insights (Charmaz 2006). This research will not achieve data saturation in each study. Following the inductive approach of grounded theory, data from one study will be analysed, allowing a theory to emerge and informing the design of the next study. Kempster and Parry (2011) recommend that, as a test of validity, the ‘practical adequacy’ of a theory is established. Brunstad and Hjälmhult (2014) demonstrated that both data saturation and practical adequacy can be tested by evaluating whether a theory explains accounts of lived experience.

3.4.6 Coding in Grounded Theory

Coding is a fundamental process in grounded theory. There are various guides and explanations about how, in practice, the coding process, developed by Strauss and Corbin (1998) can be implemented. Table 2, below, summarises the process.
Table 2: Coding in Grounded Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Name of the Step</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open coding</td>
<td>To break data down analytically to identify concepts to use as building blocks to develop categories.</td>
<td>Attach codes (descriptive labels) to concepts directly related to the data. Böhm (2004) and Willig (2013) recommend line-by-line analysis. Labels should be drawn <em>in vivo</em>, i.e. from the text itself (Böhm 2004, Willig 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Axial coding</td>
<td>Piecing concepts together to identify categories that explain the similarities and differences between concepts.</td>
<td>Using inductive and deductive thinking to determine and label the central characteristics. In accordance with Böhm (2004) the axial category will be a central phenomenon and the related concepts are such things as causal conditions and consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Selective coding</td>
<td>Choosing the core category, connecting it to other categories</td>
<td>The relationship of each category will be tested against the other categories to determine which is the core category that explains and links the other categories into a coherent theory (Sørensen et al. 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Structure of the Study

Ahern (1999) suggests that part of bracketing involves understanding gatekeeper’s interests and recognising and managing potential conflicts. To obtain ethics and research approval for Cardiff Metropolitan University it proved impossible to adopt a study design that fully met the inductive approach of GT. The University required considerable detail about the research design, such as lists of interview questions before the theory had developed sufficiently to know what lines of enquiry should be followed. This highlighted a potential mismatch in the ontological and epistemological position between the researcher and the School. The researcher adopted a pragmatic response and outlined as loosely as possible the structure of the study. Bagansco *et al.* (2014) note that this is a common tension for individuals wanting to employ GT.
3.6 The Plan of Work

Having established GT as the methodological framework, it is now possible to set out how the research objectives will be met. This is presented in figure 1, below, as a plan of work. The technique of conveying a plan of work diagrammatically can be seen in papers such as Duarte et al. (2015). Each stage will be undertaken consecutively to support GT’s inductive process. The precise methodology, choice of participants etc. will be explained in each chapter. In this Figure, the “Obj [No.]” relates to the research objective(s) which will *predominantly* be met by that stage of the research.

**Figure 1: The structure of the study to meet the objectives**

- **Literature Review:** Define worker engagement, disentangle it from similar concepts (e.g. worker involvement). An initial appraisal of how workers become engaged and identify the likely outcomes (especially in relation to health and safety).

- **Survey:** Health & Safety professionals are asked for their understanding and examples of how organisations involve or engage workers, to further establish differences between these concepts, and understand what different safety-related behavioural outcomes these practices are expected to promote. This will be compared to the literature and an initial, tentative theoretical model will be developed.

- **Focus Groups:** Health & safety practitioners and managers discuss key antecedents of engagement in more depth. This will provide practical insights into how worker engagement practices are/can be employed by the safety community and keener insights into the safety-related behaviours that these practices can promote. The theory will be developed further.

- **Interviews:** Academics and professionals are interviewed to discuss and challenge the core concepts of the emerging theory/model and allow refinements to be made.

- **Focus Groups and interviews:** Workers and line managers discuss their lived experience and perception of different management practices and the impact on behaviour. This will help test the adequacy of the model to explain the observations.
Objective 1 of the research is to: Define worker engagement, understand how it relates to and contrasts with other concepts, particularly ‘worker involvement’. Identify what practices promote worker engagement (and how these differ from worker involvement). Understand the anticipated outcomes of engagement in terms of behaviour and/or role definitions especially in relation to safety. Define SCB and identify if SCB are thought to be associated with engagement. Establish if there are existing psychosocial models which explain any association between management or organisational practices, worker engagement and behavioural outcomes.

The objective is consistent with the constructivist epistemological position of this research as it is seeking to reveal the meaning people attach to phenomenon. It is also typical of a critical realist perspective which seeks to reveal causal mechanisms (Shannon-Baker 2016).

4.1 The initial literature review

This chapter aims to review the current literature to begin meeting this first objective. A literature review is the starting point for research and involves a student engaging with the relevant body of knowledge, making connections between existing sources, identifying gaps in existing research and clarifying what further research is needed and how it might be carried out (Khan 2008, Boyne 2009, Bryman 2012, Ridley 2012). In some iterations of grounded theory, extant literature is seen as a valid source of data (Strauss and Corbin 1998, Draucker et al. 2007, Charmaz 2008).
The introduction to this thesis was the product of an unstructured, exploratory literature review. Using grounded theory, the introduction was itself reviewed and coded. These initial codes (and the meanings tentatively attached to them) were identified:

- **Engagement**: One of the aims of this literature review is to explain this construct.
- **Involvement**: A tool for communicating about risk and developing controls.
- **Safety citizenship behaviour**: Discretionary behaviour improving safety for all.
- **Safety participation**: It is uncertain if this differs from safety citizenship.
- **Role definitions**: The way people think they are required to behave.
- **Safety compliance**: Obeying safety-related rules.
- **Violations**: This may be the opposite of safety compliance.

This chapter is a more detailed literature review which will use these codes to interrogate the literature and lead to the development of a more comprehensive list of codes and a nascent theory which can be explored, if justified, in future stages of this research. A literature review, like any other research method, needs to have an underpinning methodology (Cronin et al. 2008). This is set out below.

### 4.2 Literature Review Methodology

#### 4.2.1 Initial review of the extent of the literature

To determine an appropriate methodology for the literature review, an initial search was conducted of a number of terms (as shown in the table, below). A vast number of returns would require a different methodological approach to a small number.
The search was performed using the Summon 2.0 electronic search facility. This is a ‘federated search’ or ‘meta search’ facility (Way 2010) which simultaneously searches across a wide range of academic journals and databases, including publishers/providers such as EBSCO, Emerald and the American Psychological Association (Psycinfo). Summon is a web-scale discovery service and can reveal abstracts from sources that are not ‘content partners’ (e.g. JSTOR and Elsevier) (Way 2010).

US variant spellings (e.g. behavior) were used but produced no differences in the number of articles returned. Initially, all source material was accepted (Summons 2.0 allows the search to be refined using various criteria). As this search progressed, particular phrases that included engagement (e.g. work engagement, employee engagement) were noted and used as search terms.

Table 3: The current amount of literature on the subject area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms used (including Boolean operators)</th>
<th>Articles returned Jan 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>1,638,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Employee engagement”</td>
<td>16,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Staff engagement”</td>
<td>3,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Work engagement”</td>
<td>5,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Job engagement”</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Worker engagement”</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Organisational engagement”</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety participation</td>
<td>469,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Safety participation”</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety citizenship behaviour</td>
<td>48,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Safety citizenship behaviour”</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Safety citizenship”</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety compliance</td>
<td>476,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Safety compliance”</td>
<td>12,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>222,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Safety violations”</td>
<td>7,743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trying to review over 1.6 million articles that mentions engagement even once is unrealistic. The use of Boolean operators returned smaller numbers of returns (as well as revealing the popularity of the term “employee engagement” and the larger number of returns when “safety citizenship” is used in contrast to “safety citizenship behaviour”). However, 16,233 articles are still unmanageable and even a review of 459 articles on “safety participation” and “safety citizenship” could be challenging.

It is therefore important to refine the search methodology to uncover fewer and more relevant articles. That is the function of a search strategy (a term used by Boote and Beile 2005, Molen et al. 2008 and Bryman 2012).

### 4.3 Search Strategy

The search strategy, which should be informed by the research questions, should help locate relevant studies, and should be articulated to allow replication (Bryman 2012). Given the aim of exploring the association between engagement and safety behaviours, it seems prudent to investigate what happens when relevant terms are used together. Engagement was combined with "safety citizenship", "safety compliance" and "safety participation". The results are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms used across all date ranges</th>
<th>Results returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>engagement &quot;safety citizenship&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement &quot;safety participation&quot;</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement “safety compliance”</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement “safety violations”</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1000 articles are still an unmanageable number. A more sophisticated approach is required to locate meaningful articles. This is the function of inclusion and exclusion criteria. These criteria are a core part of a search strategy (Cronin et al. 2008).

4.3.1 Inclusion/exclusion criteria: Safety behaviour and engagement

- **Text available online**: For the sake of convenience, only articles that could be accessed online were accepted.

- **Time frame**: To verify whether Griffin and Neal (2000) and Hofmann et al. (2003) were the first to use the terms “safety participation” and “safety citizenship”, a search was undertaken on Summons 2.0 of “safety participation” or “safety citizenship” up to 31/12/99. This returned 5 articles, of which 2 were relevant. Both related to Trade Union representation and presented ‘safety participation’ as union representatives being involved in decision making (Walters 1995, Wright and Spaven 1999). The search was conducted of articles published from 01/01/2000.

- **Source/type of articles**: The search criteria sought scholarly and peer-reviewed journal articles, and excluded ‘grey literature’. Case studies, anecdotes, commercial non-peer reviewed reports (i.e. material likely to be found in grey literature) is at the lower end of the evidence hierarchy (Briner 2014).

- **Nationality/Language**: Research will be accepted from any nationality if it is available in English. Summons 2.0 allows the search to be refined by language. 2 studies were excluded as they were not available in English. Some articles were written in such poor English that it was incredibly difficult to make sense of them. Therefore, ‘legibility’ was added as a criterion. If there was more than two, blatant grammatical errors in the abstract then the article was rejected.
• **Focus:** Articles will be deemed relevant if they relate to the promotion and/or effect of safety participation or safety citizenship in relation to occupational health and safety. Relevancy will be determined by reading the abstracts as explained later.

• **Methodology:** The review will accept articles adopting any methodology so long as it is explicit.

• **Search terms:** Given the popularity of the terms “employee engagement”, “work engagement” and “staff engagement” (as shown in the table above), they were used in conjunction with “safety citizenship”, “safety participation”, “safety compliance” or “safety violations” in the abstract of articles returned. The results are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms used</th>
<th>Results returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;employee engagement&quot; OR &quot;work engagement&quot; OR &quot;staff engagement&quot;) AND (&quot;safety citizenship&quot; OR &quot;safety participation&quot;)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Abstract:(&quot;safety violations&quot; OR &quot;safety compliance&quot;)) AND (&quot;employee engagement&quot; OR &quot;work engagement&quot; OR &quot;staff engagement&quot;) NOT (&quot;safety citizenship&quot; OR &quot;safety participation&quot;)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>i.e. excluding articles that would have been located above</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The small numbers of articles suggest that research rarely investigates associations between specific types of safety behaviour and specific forms of engagement.
4.3.2 Inclusion/exclusion criteria: Engagement

The following criteria were used to refine the search for literature on the subject of “employee engagement”; text available online; scholarly and peer-reviewed journal articles, and; available in English. This returned 5,223 articles. Further refinement revealed that there were 350 articles with “employee engagement” in the title which have been published since 01/01/2010. The last criteria applied was discipline (a further refinement permitted by Summons 2.0): economics and psychology were selected. Economics included human resources which was considered to offer a valuable perspective alongside psychology. In fact, it is crucial to search beyond the boundaries of health and safety literature as Törner (2011: 1262) notes that “organisational processes that are presented as novelty in safety research have often been long accepted in other organisational research.”

This resulted in a total of 114 papers which were reviewed. Articles were deemed relevant if they related to engagement of workers in an occupational setting.

4.3.3 Search strategy for worker involvement

A search was undertaken of scholarly, peer-reviewed journal articles available online and in English, published since 01/01/2000, including the terms “worker involvement” or “safety involvement”. This search sought to exclude articles that have been identified already. This gave rise to the following search term and located 36 articles: (“worker involvement” OR “safety involvement” NOT (“employee engagement” OR “work engagement” OR “staff engagement”)) AND (“safety violations” OR “safety compliance” OR “safety citizenship” OR “safety participation”).
4.4 Process for reviewing the literature

The titles and abstracts of all articles uncovered by this search strategy were reviewed. If the inclusion criteria were met the article was printed and read in full. Forward and backward chaining was then used to locate key reference documents. This resulted in material being included which did not meet the original search criteria (e.g. grey literature or articles on engagement written before 01/01/2010).

4.4.1 Method for coding

Following the grounded theory methodology, text was highlighted on the page and a code written in the margin. The code sought to capture the core theme that summarised that sentence or paragraph. This is shown in the example below in which the article by Christian et al. (2011) was coded. It revealed two references that were sought for through backward chaining, and a range of open codes including transformational leadership and clear expectations. The authors suggest an association exists between trust and psychological safety and these associations were noted as they indicate possible ‘generative mechanisms’ or lower order constructs.

Figure 3: Open coding in practice
A ‘code book’ was maintained to keep track of the codes and their source. As a code was identified it was made the heading on a fresh page of the book and a list of all the sources that subsequently used that code were added. Where possible, the code was taken from the text itself, in line with recommendations by Böhm (2004) and Willig (2013) and helping meet one of the validity criteria for qualitative research by ensuring claims match the data (Braun and Clarke 2006). The codes were later coded as ‘B’ ‘A’ or ‘D’, which stood for behaviour (or other outcome), antecedent and definition.

4.5 Findings of the literature review

4.5.1 What is Engagement?

Since the seminal work on employee engagement by Kahn (1990), employee engagement has been conceptualised in a multitude of different ways. It is considered to be a fairly new concept (Macey and Schneider 2008, Markos and Sridevi 2010, Gruman and Saks 2011, Anitha 2014) and there has been a lack of academic research on the topic (Schaufeli and Bakker 2010, Xu and Thomas 2011). Similar terms are used such as job engagement (Rich et al. 2010), work engagement (Schaufeli and Bakker 2010), personal engagement and organisational engagement (Truss et al. 2014). In their report to the UK Government, MacLeod and Clarke (2009) found more than 50 definitions for employee engagement in use.

These definitions are, partly, indicative of underlying differences in opinion about what the worker is engaging with: their job, organisation or manager (Schaufeli and Bakker...

Employee engagement can refer to cognition (e.g. intentions to stay with a company), behaviours (e.g. being an advocate of the company) and feelings or affective state (e.g. feeling passionate, motivated and empowered at work) (MacLeod and Clarke, 2009, Markos and Sridevi, 2010, Robertson and Cooper 2010, Welch 2011). There are debates over precisely which emotions, thoughts and attitudes represent engagement (Shuck 2011, Schaufeli 2014).

Christian et al. (2011) questioned whether engagement is an enduring trait, predominantly determined by an individual’s own characteristics, or a much more fluid state, constantly shifting in response to events. The authors conclude it is both.

The employee’s thoughts and feelings are sometimes presented as being an antecedent of their subsequent behaviour, and that behaviour could involve workers doing their core duties to a high standard and/or undertaking discretionary tasks (e.g. Saks 2006, Macey and Schneider 2008, Christian et al. 2011). Not all engagement scales measure behavioural intentions or outcomes, however, so do not appear to conceptualise behaviour as a core component of engagement.

Terms such as engagement, involvement and participation at work can refer to the antecedents, strategies, practices, enablers or pre-conditions for engagement (MacLeod and Clarke 2009, Markey and Townsend 2013, Bailey et al. 2015).
In summary, engagement can be what an organisation does and/or relate to different aspects of a worker’s cognitive and affective processes and may or may not include behavioural intentions or outcomes. Consequently, Truss et al. (2013: 2657) describe employee engagement as a “contested construct” and David Guest has argued that there may be grounds to abandon the concept altogether (MacLeod and Clarke 2009). Engagement is in a state of “conceptual nomological chaos” (Shuck et al. 2012: 25). This conceptual chaos is captured in a quote from Bailey et al. (2017: 47):

> despite the number of studies, there is in fact still very little about engagement that can be asserted with any degree of certainty; we do not really know what engagement means, how to measure it, what its outcomes are, or what drives up levels of engagement.

These differences may arise because engagement is being examined from different perspectives. Human resource management (HRM) view engagement as a tool for improving performance, organisational psychologists approach it as a mechanism to redesign jobs to fulfil human needs while political scientists may approach it as a method for meeting the rights of workers (Markey and Townsend 2013).

Employee engagement lacks a single, underpinning theory (Schaufeli 2014). As an academic construct it is “a little bit of this, a little bit of that, some of this, and some of that” or “an umbrella term for whatever one wants it to be” (Saks 2008: 40). Guest (2014: 147) describes it as a “conceptual muddle” and states “there is an absence of any coherent conceptual explanation for the items that form the Gallup 12” (a survey tool for measuring engagement). Consultancies have commercial interest in marketing their own models (Guest 2014). As a result, there are different, or confused,
conceptualisations of engagement which lead to different techniques for measuring engagement (Byrne et al. 2016). Briner (2014) is critical of the confused definitions and lack of methodological rigour surrounding engagement.

Recent research by Byrne et al. (2016) found that the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) appears to be measuring the same construct as the Maslach Burnout Inventory. 8 years earlier, Macey and Schneider (2008) had already argued that some definitions of engagement may be just “old wine in a new bottle”. In other words, engagement might simply be describing constructs or phenomenon that are already established and, arguably, better known, such as job satisfaction.

Bailey et al. (2015) found that “the number of studies conducted to date is too small, and the overall conclusions too mixed, to reach any definitive conclusions about the salience of workplace interventions for raising engagement levels”.

Fidderman and McDonnell (2010: 14) argue that “splitting hairs and complicated models” are of little practical benefit to managers who want to use engagement to improve safety. This theme was evident in a paper entitled “Employee engagement: Do practitioners care what academics have to say – And should they?” (Bailey, in press). Bailey (in press) argues that there is an academic-practitioner divide, citing Pfeffer (2007) who noted that the world’s most influential management innovations, such as lean manufacturing, arose outside academia. Potentially, therefore, some models of engagement have evolved without a clear theoretical foundation.
4.5.1.1 What is worker involvement?

Having seen the confusion surrounding engagement, it may be useful to examine worker involvement. Objective 1 seeks to compare and contrast engagement with concepts such as worker involvement which may help to define engagement.

Mechanisms for involving workers in safety include pre-task briefings/safety planning meetings, joint risk assessments (or job safety analysis), involving workers in safety audits, observations, inspections or accident investigations, and use of near miss and hazard-reporting systems (Fidderman and McDonnell 2010, Frazier et al. 2013, Healey and Sugden 2012, Lucy et al. 2011, Wachter and Yorio 2014, Wu et al. 2016).

When workers collaborate in assessing risks and planning safe systems of work, they gain insights into risks and ownership of the controls, making compliance more likely (Vinodkumar and Bhasi 2010, Wachter and Yorio 2014).

In short, worker involvement are practical mechanisms for promoting communication with or from workers (Morrow et al. 2010), allowing managers to draw on workers’ insights and experiences to identify and address concerns or make improvements. This may extend to joint-decision making about fundamental changes in the organisation of work or the workplace (Strauss 1998). Some worker involvement techniques appear to depend on specific changes in worker behaviour (e.g. filling a card in to report a hazard) or may seek to change workers’ behaviour by influencing safety-related knowledge (e.g. through involvement in risk assessments). These techniques may require or lead to changes in thoughts, feelings and perceptions about workplace risks or controls. However, worker involvement does not appear to be
predicated on the expectation or need of changing worker’s thoughts and feelings about the wider organisation, work, team etc. The techniques are not overtly seeking to change the worker’s psychological state or claim to be a psychosocial process. It is perhaps such qualities that distinguish engagement from involvement.

4.5.2 How can an organisation engage workers?

Put another way, what are the ‘generative mechanisms’ for engagement? Christian et al. (2011) and Bailey et al. (2015) suggest that antecedents of engagement could be grouped into certain categories such as the individual themselves, the design of the job or leadership factors. A structured literature review by Wollard and Shuck (2011) identified a total of 42 antecedents for employee engagement which they divided into individual and organisational factors. Beattie and Crossan (2015) presented a list of factors which promote engagement, but focused on organisational factors and did not present individual qualities as an antecedent. This review is focusing on organisational factors as they are under the most direct control of the organisation.

Rather than listing antecedents of engagement, and covering well-trodden ground, this research aims to develop a psychosocial model, which aims to understand how and why these antecedents might influence a worker’s thoughts and feelings and ultimately their behaviour. It is worth reiterating that these antecedents are based on different perceptions of what engagement actually is (which could lead to different ideas about how to do it). Even a meta-analysis would face the same problems. The purpose is to reveal key themes and seek an overarching theory which can then be examined.
Grounded theory has been adopted to build this theory. The open codes that were identified during the literature review will be highlighted. Using inductive and deductive thinking the connections between these open codes will be examined and give rise to axial codes which draw open codes together into coherent, higher-order categories.

The analysis that follows is structured around the axial codes that emerged. In summary, these axial codes were:

- Basic foundation, which was formed from three axial codes: hygiene factors, psychological safety and transactional management
- Transformational leadership, which appears to support the next two axial codes
- Caring for workers
- Feeling valued, which is supported by a range of other axial codes: voice, quality of work life, learning and development, shared values

4.5.2.1 Axial Code: Foundation

Shuck and Herd (2012) used the term ‘foundation’ to describe the basic building blocks of leadership that support engagement. This term has been used as a high order axial code, which encompasses a number of other, relevant axial codes.

4.5.2.1.1 Axial Code: Hygiene Factors

Workers provide labour in exchange for money (what Rousseau, 1990, calls a ‘transactional contract’). However, if that pay is not deemed to be fair, engagement is unlikely to develop (Wollard and Shuck 2011). Other basic foundations for engagement include work security and reasonable working conditions (Wollard and
Shuck 2011): Workers are unlikely to go above and beyond what is strictly required in the formal contract (in terms of thoughts, feelings and behaviour) if they believe that their employer is not meeting these basic ‘hygiene factors’ (Shuck and Herd 2012, using Herzberg’s (1968) terminology). In such conditions workers may expend the minimum amount of effort needed to fulfil their own side of the transactional contract. Engagement is partly dependent upon workers being given the physical resources to complete their work (Saks 2006, Rana et al. 2014). Shuck and Herd (2012: 165) explain that when someone lacks the resources to do their job:

> resentment sets in and employees who had the potential to be a productive team player becomes frustrated and consequently, less productive.

If workers feel obliged to work despite being ill (a phenomenon known as ‘presenteeism’) they are likely to disengage (Karanika-Murray et al. 2015a).

4.5.2.1.2 Axial Code: Psychological safety

Other factors that promote engagement are trust, justice and psychological safety (Kahn 1990, Saks 2006, Arrowsmith and Parker 2011, Gruman and Saks 2011, Xu and Thomas 2011, Allen and Rogelberg 2013, Ugwu et al. 2014). If workers are treated fairly and trust their managers, they will feel able to take on a broader range of responsibilities as they expect them to be fairly ‘repaid’ through social rather than economic exchanges (Törner 2011). This was supported by a finding that breaches of the psychological contract led to disengagement (Rayton and Yalabik 2014). Bargagliotti (2011: 1423) suggests trust in the leader promotes engagement because it “frees Intellectual capital towards work” rather than to self-protection.
Co-worker norms and relationships contribute to perceptions of psychological safety (May et al. 2004), perhaps because they can ‘be themselves’ in a group and feel confident to speak without fear of disapproval or negative consequences (Kahn 1990). This was borne out by interviews with workers (Shuck et al. 2011) which revealed that when they feel uncared for or work in an aggressive environment, where competition is valued over collaboration, they can become disengaged, ultimately quitting their jobs. Transformational leaders also promote psychological safety (Zhou and Pan, 2015), in part because they are fair (Gillett et al. 2013). Kahn (1990) and Macey and Schneider (2008) previously argued that fairness is an important leadership trait.

Lyu (2016) found that the more participants perceived their organisation to be just, the safer they felt and the more engaged they became. This is an important insight for building a psychosocial model: workers have experiences at work, have cognitive or affective responses to those experiences which influence how engaged they are.

Somewhat similar to the idea of psychological safety, Dollard and Bakker (2010) found that engagement will only flourish if workers’ psychological health is protected. For example, a negative relationship has been found between engagement and bullying/harassment (Law et al. 2011). Workers disengaged due to psychological distress associated with sexual harassment (Jiang et al. 2015).

Chughtai and Buckley (2013) found that when researchers feel psychologically safe they are more likely to take risks, such as trying new methods or novel solutions or sharing unorthodox ideas and may lead to greater satisfaction in work. Quality of work is discussed later as it was found to be an axial code. As well as potentially being motivated by a desire to find more satisfaction in work, the sort of behaviours described
above could be examples of organisational citizenship behaviours: discretionary behaviours that benefit the organisation (rather than simply keeping within the strict requirements of the role and complying with existing procedures).

4.5.2.1.3 Axial Code: Transactional management

Setting clear expectations and providing feedback and rewards, are associated with engagement (Wollard and Shuck 2011). These are representative of a transactional management style (Bass et al. 2003) and may be what Beattie and Crossan (2015) call ‘performance management’. Researchers largely agree with Wollard and Shuck (2011) that feedback and goal setting are antecedents for engagement (e.g. Gruman and Saks 2011, Crawford et al. 2014). However, feedback had a negative effect on engagement in conditions of high worker autonomy, perhaps because it undermines a sense of being trusted (Menguc et al. 2013).

A study to compare employee engagement with the HSE’s stress management standards found that role ambiguity was the only factor which was significantly associated with all subdomains of engagement (Ravalier et al. 2015). Therefore, role clarity appears to be an important factor supporting engagement, and this supports the idea that clear expectations are important to support engagement.

4.5.2.2 Axial Code: Transformational leadership

Shuck et al. (2011) found that managers play a critical role in developing engagement. Transformational leadership, specifically, is widely believed to promote engagement (Christian et al. 2011, Gruman and Saks 2011, Macey and Schneider 2008, Salanova
This may be because transformational leaders offer more autonomy (Breevaart et al. 2014).

Transformational leaders exert idealised influence, so followers trust and identify with the leader, they show individualised consideration for their followers’ specific needs, abilities and development, they intellectually stimulate followers (enabling them to try new things without fear of failure) and provide inspirational motivation by helping followers to find challenge and meaning in their work (Bass 1985, Bass et al. 2003).

One aspect of a transactional style, contingent reward, was found to promote engagement amongst sea cadets (Breevaart et al. 2014). These researchers suggested that the reward itself was not motivating: It was transformational in nature and involved the leaders acknowledging and drawing attention to the cadets’ growing skills which may help the cadet to find more meaning in their work. During this study, feedback was offered daily to leaders and led to development plans and ultimately significantly greater ratings by their followers. This suggests that engaging leadership skills can be taught. Aryee et al. (2012) and Ghadi et al. (2013) concur that transformational leaders promote meaningfulness which leads to engagement. Alfes et al. (2010) found meaningfulness to be the greatest contributor to engagement.

Transformational leadership appears to promote a number of other antecedents. The role of transformational leadership is highlighted through the rest of this analysis.
4.5.2.3 Axial Code: Caring for workers

Caring for workers appears to have commonalities with ‘hygiene factors’ and ‘psychological safety’. However, caring for workers is a broader concept which revolves around promoting wellbeing rather than preventing harm or helping workers to feel that they are not at risk.

Engagement is promoted by actively caring for workers’ wellbeing, supporting health and wellbeing, providing a supportive organisational culture or increasing perceived organisational support (Robertson and Cooper 2010, Wollard and Shuck 2011, Mathumbu and Dodd 2013, Beattie and Crossan 2015). As a specific example of what this might mean in practice, Joshi and Sodhi (2011) and Anitha (2014) argue that engagement can be promoted by providing a good work-life balance. Perhaps as a result, workers on flexible contracts are more engaged (Alfes et al. 2010), although this may also be associated with their increased autonomy. In contrast, teachers who were unable to manage the competing demands of professional and family roles became exhausted (Simbula 2010).

More broadly, perceived organisational support is an antecedent for engagement (e.g. Saks 2006, Rich et al. 2010). In part this may be because it creates an obligation for workers to ‘repay’ their employer: Clark et al. (2014: 107) propose that “employees who feel that their organisation cares about their wellbeing are likely to return the favour”. Clark et al. (2014) therefore postulated that worker engagement was promoted by safety climate, rather than safety climate being a product of an engaged workforce. Transformational leaders help workers to feel cared for due to a quality known as ‘individualised consideration’ (Bass and Riggio 2006).
4.5.2.4 Axial Code: Feeling Valued

Workers are more likely to become engaged if they feel valued and believe they are listened to and being treated respectfully and with dignity and sincerity (Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002, Ghosh et al. 2014, Beattie and Crossan 2015). Feeling valued is, according to Robinson et al. (2004), a core antecedent for engagement. Valuing workers helps them to feel cared for (Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002).

Praise promotes worker engagement (Harter et al. 2013). This is potentially because it conveys respect for the other’s contributions or (as suggested by Breevaart et al. 2014) causes someone to reflect on the meaningfulness of that contribution. Good job design or talent management contribute to engagement (Wollard and Shuck 2011) and could lead someone to feel valued if they believe their job is important (or they are worthy of a good job) or they are an asset to be retained and developed.

4.5.2.4.1 Axial Code: Voice

Dromey (2014) suggests that giving workers a voice helps them to become engaged. “Feeling valued, involved and having a voice” are often seen as inter-related concepts that drive engagement (e.g. Beattie and Crossan 2015: 214, Reissner and Pagan 2013). In some models, they are central to understanding engagement (e.g. Robinson et al. 2004). Collaboration and partnership with the workforce have been identified as routes to engagement (Townsend et al., 2014).

However, people could have little involvement with the organisation of the workplace but could feel engaged due to a satisfying job. This possibly reflects the distinction
between work and organisational engagement (Guest 2014). As Slack et al. (2015) and Reissner and Pagan (2013) point out, simply providing involvement opportunities does not mean people will feel obliged to participate or better about their organisation.

4.5.2.4.2 Axial Code: Shared values

**Shared organisational values** will help an employee to become engaged (Wollard and Shuck 2011, Dromey 2014) as it helps them identify with their organisation and its goals (Robinson et al. 2004, Ye 2012). It is more likely that workers have a sense of shared values if staff have been involved in describing those values (Dromey 2014). The worker may then perceive the organisation’s goals as their own and will expend more effort in working towards those goals (Chughtai and Buckley 2013). Shared values, or lack thereof, influences whether workers engage or disengage from particular organisational objectives (Slack et al. 2015). For example, DeSimone et al. (2016) found workers in a public sector organisation held values that motivated them to serve the public interest and they felt most satisfied and engaged when they perceived that their role allowed them to fulfil that function.

Behaving in ways which is **personally meaningful** (i.e. aligned with one’s values) can be seen as fulfilling a **psychological need** (Kahn 1990). Research by Edwards and Cable (2009) demonstrated that perceived **value congruence** helped predict **job satisfaction** and **intention to stay** (two frequent measures of engagement) as well as organisational identification. In their model, psychological needs fulfilment is a mediating mechanism, explaining these outcomes.
Transformational leadership promotes shared values (Hansen et al. 2014, Andrews 2016), in part by creating conditions in which workers' values can change (Conchie 2013). For example, transformational leaders explain or encourage workers to consider the value and moral function of a goal or duty and helps followers to see connections between organisational and personal goals (Bass and Riggio 2006).

A clear organisational mission or vision, an authentic culture, setting out expectations and providing feedback and rewards support engagement (Alfes et al. 2010, Wollard and Shuck 2011, Dromey 2014). ‘Organisational values’ can be conveyed through the espoused or perceived objectives of the organisation (Suh et al. 2011) and might manifest as organisational goals and role expectations (Delobbe et al. 2016). The culture and mission may need to be perceived as ‘ethical’, as ethical/moral leaders and organisations promote engagement (Hansen et al. 2013, Bargagliotti 2011).

Chughtai and Buckley (2013) and Liang et al. (2017), drew on social identity theory (SIT) to explain the link between positive management practices and engagement through the mediating effect of identification and the adoption of organisational goals. The importance of identification is supported by Hansen et al. (2014) who found that interpersonal leaders (which they describe as transformational and fair leaders) promoted organisational identification which in turn predicted employee engagement. Hansen et al. (2014: 959) explain that identification occurs when employees:

*develop a sense of self-concept and belongingness to the organization. As a result, they are more likely to support the organization, express pride and loyalty, and internalize the values and norms of the organization*
This corresponds with earlier work by Avolio and Gardner (2005) who found that ‘authentic leaders’ (a construct which overlaps with transformational leadership) enhanced engagement by encouraging the worker to identify with the organisation.

There appears to be two different pathways explaining the interaction between engagement, identification and shared values (as shown in the figure below).

**Figure 4: Shared Values, Identification and Engagement: Possible associations**

- Workers already share the values of the organisation
- Workers identify with the organisation (e.g. feel proud to ‘belong’ to the organisation and perceive their goals to be aligned)
- Workers become engaged
- Positive management practices
- Workers identify with the organisation
- Workers internalise organisational goals and values. Their role and relationships feel more meaningful
- Workers become engaged

*i.e. willing to invest emotional, cognitive and physical energy to support organisational goals

**4.5.2.4.3 Axial Code: Quality of Work Life**

Quality of work appears to be an important antecedent of engagement including providing people with work which is a *good fit, uses their strengths* and that they find *personally meaningful* (May *et al.* 2004, Fairlie 2011., Wollard and Shuck 2011, Soane *et al.* 2013, Shantz *et al.* 2014) or provides *job satisfaction* (Beattie and Crossan 2015).

Christian *et al.* (2011) identified *task variety, complexity, challenge* and *significance* (which relates to meaningfulness) as elements that contribute to engagement. *Shared values* may promote a sense that work is personally meaningful (Dromey 2014). Lievens and Vlerick (2013) perceived *job knowledge* to increase engagement. Knowledge could enhance the safety people feel when performing the task and give access to more challenging assignments.
Guest (2014) argues there is far more evidence of work rather than organisational engagement, perhaps suggesting people engage with the jobs/roles they are in.

Bakker and Bal (2010), Dollard and Bakker (2010), Bargagliotti (2011), Joshi and Sodhi (2011) and Bhuvanaiah and Raya (2015) agree with Wollard and Shuck (2011) that **autonomy** (which is also called ‘job control’, ‘decision making authority’ or ‘skills discretion’) builds engagement. Autonomous working arrangements may infer greater **trust in the employee** (Chmiel et al. 2017) and present greater challenge in work.

**Recognition of good performance** and clear expectations might enhance **attachment to the job** (Christian et al. 2011). Breevaart et al. (2014) suggests these practices help workers find more meaning in their work. They might also promote psychological safety as workers know they are meeting their side of the transactional contract (and whether or not their manager notices and cares how they perform). Gillet et al. (2013) found that **transformational leaders** enhanced the quality of followers’ work life.

Quality of work has been coded as supporting the axial code, ‘feeling valued’. The researcher hypothesised that being offered good quality work helps workers to feel that they are valued by managers.

**4.5.2.4.4 Axial Code: Learning and talent management**

Workers can become engaged if there are opportunities for **learning, development** and **“talent management”** (Wollard and Shuck 2011, Guest 2014, Bhuvanaiah and Raya 2015). This might include providing **opportunities for workers to progress** within their career or organisation, and Purcell (2014) suggests that **appraisals** help foster
engagement. Potentially they are mechanisms to give feedback and clarifications about roles, performance etc. (i.e. help provide a basic foundation for engagement). Investing time and money in workers might also signal long term commitment to them.

Looking at learning and talent management from the perspective offered by Christian et al. (2011) and Guest (2014), personal development could offer a worker with new challenges or be perceived as an avenue for greater challenges in the future.

4.5.3 Correlation with studies of worker (un)happiness

The antecedents of engagement correlate with studies such as the Investors in People’s (2017) job exodus trend which found peoples’ reasons for wanting to move jobs include pay (44%), poor management (42%), not feeling valued (34%), no career progression (33%) or the hours of work (28%).

4.5.4 Outcomes of engagement

Engaged workers are considered to have greater attachment to, and make greater efforts to support, the objectives and values of their organisation (Robinson et al. 2004, MacLeod and Clarke 2009, Anitha 2014). The behavioural outcomes of engagement include improved task performance, i.e. workers doing their core jobs better and; Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCB) (Saks 2006, Rich et al. 2010).

OCB are discretionary efforts that improve the performance of the organisation (Organ 1988). There is a wide consensus that OCB is associated with employee engagement (Robinson et al. 2004, Saks 2006, Macey and Schneider 2008, Markos and Sridevi,

Liang et al. (2017) recently found an association between engagement and one specific manifestation of OCB: employee voice (i.e. speaking up about concerns or making suggestions for improvement). Other specific examples of OCB include supporting an organisation’s Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives (Slack et al. 2015), taking personal initiative and helping colleagues (Simbula 2010) or being courteous and helpful (Rich et al. 2010).

Rich et al. (2010: 628) postulated that this could be due to engaged workers broadening their role definition so that they do not consciously consider what is a core or discretionary task when allocating their physical, cognitive, and emotional resources at work “they simply throw their full selves into their roles, which they understand to include any activity that could potentially contribute to their effectiveness.”

The organisational benefits of improved worker engagement include reduced turnover, lower absenteeism, increased productivity, improved performance and better customer service (MacLeod and Clarke 2009, Wollard and Shuck 2011). This can lead to competitive advantages, higher profits, revenue generation and growth (MacLeod and Clarke 2009, Xu and Thomas 2011, Anitha 2014).

4.5.4.1 Engagement and health and safety outcomes

A meta-analysis revealed a significant relationship between engagement (measured by the Gallup Workplace Audit) and a range of beneficial outcomes, such as fewer lost
workdays due to accidents (Harter et al. 2002). Subsequent studies, one of which used the JD-R framework, confirm that engagement has a significant, negative association with adverse events and lost time incidents (Nahrgang et al. 2011, Wachter and Yorio 2014). Improved core task performance is one behavioural outcome of engagement (Saks 2006) and could manifest as higher levels of attention to risks, error traps and procedures and ultimately lead workers to avoid or adapt unsafe working practices and comply with safe working procedures lead to improved safety outcomes (Nahrgang et al. 2011, Wachter and Yorio 2014).

4.5.5 Defining SCB and exploring its association with engagement

Objective 1 requires that SCB are defined and possible associations with engagement and examined. Similar to engagement, there is a lack of clarity or consistency in how researchers measure or describe concepts such as SCB or safety participation (Tharaldsen et al. 2010). Safety participation and safety citizenship behaviours are sometimes considered to be synonymous (e.g. Clarke and Ward 2006, Christian et al 2009) or as related but different constructs (Didla et al. 2009, Ford and Tetrick 2011, Xuesheng and Xintao 2011). Therefore, it is beneficial to examine both concepts.

Hofmann et al. (2003) first used the term ‘safety citizenship behaviour’ (SCB) to describe 27 behaviours aimed at improving the safety performance of other workers and the organisation. Hofmann et al (2003) categorised SCB under six headings: helping (e.g. assisting others to make sure they perform their work safely): voice (e.g. expressing opinions on safety matters even if others disagree): stewardship (e.g. trying to prevent other crew members from being injured on the job): whistleblowing (e.g. reporting crew members who violate safety procedures): Civic Virtue (e.g. keeping
informed of changes in safety policies and procedures), and: Initiating Safety-Related Change (e.g. trying to change policies and procedures to make them safer).

Griffin and Neal (2000) first coined the term ‘safety participation’. Drawing on earlier work by Borman and Motowidlo (1993), Griffin and Neal (2000: 349) contrasted safety compliance (“core activities that need to be carried out by individuals to maintain workplace safety”) with safety participation. They defined the latter as behaviours that “may not directly contribute to workplace safety but they do help to develop environments that support safety” (pg. 349). These behaviours include taking part in voluntary safety activities, helping workers with safety-related issues and attending safety meetings (Griffin and Neal 2000, Neal and Griffin 2006).

Comparing the original definitions and underlying theories of the two concepts reveal considerable similarities, as shown in the table below.

**Table 6: Comparing Safety Citizenship and Safety Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic of the behaviour</th>
<th>Terminology and concepts used in the original definitions of…</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Citizenship</td>
<td>Safety Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-role</td>
<td>Outside the formal role definitions of employees</td>
<td>Not a core safety activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mandatory</td>
<td>‘Discretionary’ and not recognised by formal reward systems</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective of the behaviour</td>
<td>Improving the safety performance of other workers and the organisation</td>
<td>Enhancing the safety of the team, the work environment or the organisation as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original, underlying theories</td>
<td>Social exchange theory, and the associated principle of reciprocity.</td>
<td>Theories relating to individual performance and the influence of organisational climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.5.1 Further refinement of the concept of SCB

SCB has been perceived as both a unitary (e.g. Conchie and Donald 2006) and multidimensional (Turner et al. 2005) construct. Citizenship behaviour may be affiliative (i.e. helping) or challenging, and challenging behaviours could be protective (i.e. trying to prevent harm) or promotive behaviours (i.e. trying to make things better) (Conchie 2013). Curcuruto et al. (2015, 2016) also found SCB could be divided between behaviours that prevent harm (or ‘proactive’) and those promote improvements (or ‘prosocial’). Citizenship behaviours can also manifest as avoiding negative behaviours, such as complaining, abusing company resources and being discourteous (Marköczy et al. 2009). As an example of protective behaviours, Roberts and Geller (1995: 53) used the term ‘actively caring’ to describe a norm that manifests as “looking for environmental hazards and unsafe work practices and implementing appropriate corrective actions”. Conchie (2013) revealed that ‘challenge’ and ‘affiliative’ SCB required different types of motivation. In summary, evidence suggests that SCB is multi-dimensional. Engagement may or may not promote all types of SCB.

Other than Chmiel et al. (2017), no study explicitly investigates the association between engagement and SCB. That study did not examine the impact of engagement on different facets of SCB suggesting that this is a novel area of research.

A variety of other terms were identified to describe discretionary safety effort such as ‘Proactive Safety Behaviours’ (e.g. Parker et al. 2001, Fugas et al. 2011 and 2013), ‘active safety behaviours’ (Cheyne et al. 2013, although they recognise it is analogous to SCB) and ‘safety initiative’ (Marchand et al. 1998, Zacharatos and Barling 2005). The terms are rarely repeated, if at all, and offer little added value for this research.
4.5.5.2 The association between engagement and SCB

Two papers which stated that they would examine the role of employee engagement on safety performance appeared to assess the impact of involving workers in safety (as it is understood in this current study), for example by asking whether workers are involved in audits and inspections (Cheyne et al. 2013, Frazier et al. 2013).

Lievens and Vlerick (2014) propose that engagement is related to safety compliance and participation, but this was not a central theme of their paper. Turner et al. (2005) came to the intuitive conclusion that high levels of demand and low levels of control reduced the likelihood of workers incorporating safety citizenship behaviours into their role definitions. It may be possible to argue that workers in those conditions were not engaged but those researchers did not refer to engagement. Nahrgang et al. (2011) investigated the impact of engagement as an amalgam of proactive behaviours, safety compliance and job satisfaction but in their final model did not specifically explore associations between engagement and safety citizenship (or similar) behaviours. Two papers, discussed below, explicitly investigated the association between engagement (as some sort of cognitive and affective state) and safety outcomes.

Chmiel et al. (2017) found an association between work engagement and safety citizenship role definition, which promoted increased safety participation which is associated with reduced situational violations. The authors suggest (pg. 105) that through participation “an employee can effect a change in organizational procedures and arrangements that lesson organizational constraints likely to provoke situational violations.” They offer an example of a worker joining a safety committee and implementing changes to make protective equipment more readily available. This
illustrates Zohar et al.’s (2015) comment that SCB may augment compliance. Similarly, Martínez-Córcoles et al. (2012: 220) suggests that “safety participation complements the popular rule compliance approach, as it can help to detect possible rules inconsistencies or misunderstood procedures”.

Wachter and Yorio (2014) found that workers’ cognitive and emotional engagement had a significant and negative relationship with recordable and lost time accidents. A wide range of management practices were found to promote engagement, such as providing feedback, giving workers a voice, appearing to value worker’s input and caring for workers. Engaged workers are “willing to invest their mental, emotional and physical efforts toward ensuring that they conduct their work safely and without incident” (Wachter and Yorio 2014: 123). As a consequence, “things go right because people can learn to overcome design flaws and functional glitches, adapt their performance to meet demands, interpret and apply procedures to match conditions, detect and correct when things go inevitably wrong, and understand error prone situations and defend against them” (Wachter and Yorio 2014: 128).

In a somewhat similar vein, Chmiel et al. (2017) suggest that giving workers greater job control both promotes engagement and offers workers more opportunity to manage potentially hazardous situations.

There is, therefore, some evidence of associations between engagement and different types of beneficial safety behaviours, including SCB, and improved safety outcomes.
4.5.5.3 The association between SCB and worker involvement

Involving workers in safety revolve around discussing and developing safer ways of working or the use of the mechanisms to report hazards and near misses and halt unsafe work (Lucy et al. 2011, Bolt et al. 2012). At face value, worker involvement activities could give rise to behaviours that appear to be SCB as they help protect others (by reporting hazards etc.) and are not directly related to their core tasks.

Employees and supervisors might, however, consider that SCB are a core part of a job (Didla et al. 2009) or mandatory and not a personal choice (Tharaldsen et al. 2010). In high-risk workplaces, taking steps to prevent harm to others may be a core element of many tasks (Conchie 2013). For example, a banksman has to direct workers away from a reversing vehicle. Similarly, workers may be required to attend pre-task briefings or report hazards. If activities are not discretionary, they would not count as SCB. Failure to perform the action would probably be viewed as non-compliance.

Workers need some level of motivation to participate in genuinely discretionary involvement opportunities. Workers who are motivated to perform SCB are more likely to participate in involvement opportunities and this partly depends on them being engaged (Chmiel et al. 2017). Engagement may support worker involvement.

4.5.6 The theories that explain engagement

Objective 1 of the research requires that the researcher identifies existing theories or models that explain the link (if any) between how workers are engaged/involved and their eventual behaviour. Schaufeli (2014) identified four frameworks; The needs-
satisfying approach; social exchange theory (SET), The job demands-resources model (JD-R), and; the affective shift model.

A search of the literature was undertaken on 12/01/17 to identify the popularity of these models and the results are shown in the table below. When searching for these terms within the abstract, SET and JD-R models had been the central theme of over 230 articles, compared to just 21 for the other two models. On this basis, SET and JD-R are being adopted as the theoretical frameworks for understanding engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>Results returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement &quot;affective shift&quot;</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement &quot;needs-satisfying&quot;</td>
<td>3,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement &quot;job demands-resources&quot;</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement &quot;social exchange theory&quot;</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract:(engagement &quot;social exchange theory&quot;)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract:(engagement &quot;job demands-resources&quot;)</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract:(engagement &quot;affective shift&quot;)</td>
<td>4 (2 of which were duplicates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract:(engagement &quot;needs-satisfying&quot;)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.6.1 Social Exchange Theory (SET)

Becker (1956) quoted Cicero (Roman Philosopher, 106BC-45BC) to illustrate that a norm of reciprocity is deeply rooted in the human psyche: “there is no duty more indispensable than that of a returning a kindness. All men distrust one forgetful of a benefit.” Gouldner (1960) speculated that the norm of reciprocity is universally held. This norm is at the core of SET (Cropanzano and Mitchell 2005), a theory which was developed through the 1960’s by a number of sociologists including Blau (1964).
The central tenet of SET (as explained by Coulson et al. 2014) is that individuals seek to gain a proportionate reward from their investment of tangible and intangible resources into a social exchange. People feel obliged to reciprocate, to maintain the social balance between the parties and encourage further exchanges. The ‘rules’ of these exchanges are not explicit, and the behaviour of the parties will demonstrate whether their exchanges are acceptable to each other. This can lead to a “self-reinforcing cycle of behaviour” (Coulson et al., 2014: 137). Relationships take time to develop, and for the parties to understand the rules of exchange (Schaufeli 2014).

From this viewpoint, employee engagement represents workers, for example, repaying their ‘debt’ to a supportive employer by acting as positive ambassadors for their company (Saks 2006, Soane 2013). More broadly, individuals might invest more of themselves in their role (Schaufeli 2013) and become more motivated (Cropanzano and Mitchell 2005). Shantz et al. (2013: 2621) stated that their study provides “support for using social exchange theory as a guiding theoretical framework in examining engagement as a mediator of the job design-performance relationship”.

Using SET as a framework, Alfes et al. (2013a, 2013b) suggest that human resources practices can signal that employers trust, value or have a long-term commitment to the worker, building obligations to reciprocate with discretionary effort. Guest (2014: 150) argues that any “approach that seeks to promote employee engagement must offer employees reasons to be engaged”, and presents SET as an explanatory framework.

Aryee et al. (2012) propose that transformational leadership promotes work engagement by increasing meaningfulness of work and social exchange mechanisms transform that engagement into innovative behaviours that enhance task performance.
Slack et al. (2015) used SET to explain why some employees disengaged from an organisation’s CSR initiatives. Involvement in CSR represented discretionary effort and the exchanges between the organisation and employee may be insufficient to generate the social commitment that is needed to drive participation.

The concept of reciprocity has been applied specifically in relation to safety and SCB. In a positive safety climate, workers are likely to feel protected, and become engaged (Huang et al. 2016) and feel obliged to ‘repay’ their manager (Gyekye 2006, Lucy et al. 2011, Törner 2011) and, in such a climate, proactive efforts to improve safety may be seen as a valid way of reciprocating (Reader et al. 2017). Therefore, safety climate has been found to predict SCB (Willis et al. 2012).

Hofmann et al. (2003) explicitly drew on SET to explain SCB, and saw high quality ‘leader member exchange’ (LMX) relationships as crucial in building up social capital. In high quality LMX relationships, leaders provide material and nonmaterial goods, going beyond what is required in formal job descriptions, which requires employees to act beyond the strict boundaries of their prescribed role to maintain social balance (Ilies et al. 2007). It is through this mechanism that roles are expanded. Therefore, SET can be used to explain both SCB and engagement, making it a useful model to adopt.

Although SET appears quite intuitive, Shuck and Wollard (2010) disagreed with the application of SET to explain engagement. SET has been criticised as being “‘parasitic’ on utilitarian economics and psychological behaviourism as partly compromised paradigms in social science rather than an autonomous theoretical endeavour” (Zafirovski 2005: 31-32). Shantz et al. (2016) suggests that the job demands-resources (J D-R) model should replace SET to explain engagement.
4.5.6.2 Job Demand-Resources Model

In the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, developed in 2001 by Demerouti et al., job resources are physical, psychological, social or organisational factors that help workers to complete tasks, manage demands and promotes personal development.

Resources foster motivation and commitment to the organisation (Bakker et al. 2003). Resources are a source of motivation and, when they exceed demands, lead to workers feeling invigorated and dedicated to their role i.e. are engaged (Bakker and Demerouti 2007, Schaufeli 2014). Job demands require expenditure of physiological and/or psychological energy which can lead to burnout (Demerouti et al. 2001). Demands are not all bad: ‘Challenge’ demands (which may lead to personal gain, such as learning a new skill) can motivate workers, while hindrances (e.g. role conflict or red tape) undermine engagement (Crawford et al. 2010). This supports the axial code ‘quality of work’ in which challenge was seen as a factor which promoted engagement.

Hakanen et al. (2008: 238) therefore recommend that corporate programmes to improve wellbeing should focus on increasing resources and reducing demands.

A meta-analysis by Cole et al. (2012) cast doubt on the efficacy of JD-R, finding little functional distinctiveness between the dimensions used to measure burnout and employee engagement. They challenged the notion that engagement “is an independent construct whose accurate assessment requires a stand-alone measure” (pg. 1571). Cole et al. (2012) refer to the problem as ‘construct proliferation’.
4.5.6.3 Combining JD-R and SET and Social Identify Theory (SIT)

JD-R and SET have champions and detractors but may have greater explanatory power when used together. Rayton and Yalabik (2014) used SET and JD-R to investigate the impact of psychological contract breach on engagement. From the JD-R perspective, breach of the contract represents the loss of a resource and employees reciprocate by disengaging. The authors (pg. 2392) go on to say that the JD-R model “implicitly relies upon the ‘norm of reciprocity’”. The figure below draws the theories together to illustrate their theoretical connections to discretionary behaviour.

Figure 5: The link between JD-R, SET and Citizenship Behaviours

Employer provides or enables workers to develop resources as well as manages demands on workers

Worker has more physical, emotional and mental resources at their disposal and less demands eroding those resources

Worker feels a sense of obligation to reciprocate for these resources

Worker reciprocates by expending resources to perform their role to a high standard or expand role definitions to include discretionary tasks which they believe are of value to their employer

However, this model assumes that people behave in a way which is worthwhile to another and does not address changes to beliefs, norms and values. Curcuruto et al. (2016), argues that current perceptions of SCB are limited by their focus on behaviour and failure to recognise the importance of workers’ cognition and affect. For example, Zohar et al. (2015) argue that SCB may be a result of identification.

Organisational identification involves a worker incorporating organisational values and goals within their own self-identity (Suh et al. 2011). SET and SIT can be used together
to explain why perceived organisational support and high quality exchanges with leaders are associated with efforts to reciprocate and enhanced organisational identification (Avolio and Gardner 2005, Sluss et al. 2008, Farrell and Oczkowski 2012, He et al. 2014).

Identification occurs when a worker sees membership of an organization as consistent with their personal values and self-identity, and has been associated with higher levels of engagement (Karanika-Murray et al. 2015b). More commonly, it is theorised that identification occurs when workers associate membership of an organisation or group with enhanced self-worth or -esteem, which may be nurtured by positive management practices (Ashforth and Mael 1989, Sluss et al. 2008, Farrell and Oczkowski 2012, He et al. 2014). Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002: 699) suggest that fulfilling socio-emotional needs leads to an obligation to reciprocate which manifests as workers incorporating "organizational membership and role status into their social identity".

If a person builds membership of a group into their self-identity they begin internalising the values, beliefs, goals and norms of the group (van Dick et al. 2006, Choi et al. 2017). Self-determination theory uses the term ‘internalisation’ to describe the "process in which individuals transform social requests into self-regulation or values that are personally accepted" and suggest that this process is closely linked to needs satisfaction (Haivas et al. 2014: 327). They might support organisational goals through increased and discretionary effort as those goals become personally important (van Dick et al. 2006). If a worker disagrees with the norms, goals etc. of their manager or team, they may only seek ‘transactional’ relationships (Andersen et al. 2015).
4.6 An *initial* theory of associations between engagement and safety behaviour

After putting basic foundations in place, if leaders are perceived to actively care for and value workers (which relies, in part, on adopting transformational leadership qualities), a worker develops a sense of obligation to ‘repay’ their leader. That reciprocation may include identifying with, and internalising the norms, values, goals and beliefs, of the manager or organisation. The worker will also have more emotional, physical and cognitive resources at their disposal to repay and support the goals of their manager (and those goals may now feel personally important to the worker).

The worker will expand their perception/definition of what their role entails, or may be less concerned about the precise boundaries of their role, and will perform tasks that appear to be discretionary and outside the strict requirements of their role. When the manager or organisation demonstrates that health and safety is genuinely important to them, it will help workers feel cared for. Further, discretionary safety behaviours (or ‘safety citizenship behaviours’) may then be seen as valid means of reciprocation. In addition, engaged workers expend more physical, cognitive and emotional energy in job performance, making them more alert to hazards and attentive to safety rules.

In this model, engagement is not a discrete psychological state nor is it a workplace approach. Instead, it is a description of a psychosocial process. This does not describe *what* to do to engage workers, but instead explains the underlying social and psychological processes that explain how a range of leadership or organisational practices lead to changes in cognition and affect and, ultimately, behaviour.
4.7 Discussion

Engagement is a confused concept in the academic literature. The specific association between engagement and safety behaviours has received very little attention. There is some evidence to suggest that engagement may lead to improved safety outcomes, including reduced violations/greater compliance, adoption of safe work practices and greater ‘safety participation’ (or safety citizenship behaviours). In particular, no study has investigated the association between engagement and the full array of SCB, suggesting that this is a novel line of investigation.

The key theories that are used to explain engagement are SET and JD-R. SIT also emerged as being necessary for explaining some of the psychosocial dynamics associated with engagement. By identifying and seeking to synthesise these competing theories into a cohesive theory of engagement, this research is beginning to address an underlying cause for the confusion in the extant literature.

This quest for a core theory of engagement may help organisations cut through the confusion that could be created by the extensive lists of possible antecedents found in the literature. If, for example, engagement relies on workers feeling cared for and valued, organisations and workers could decide for themselves how best to achieve that in a way that suits their own means and circumstances.

In the spirit of being reflexive, the researcher found that the process of coding was not as ‘clean’ as initially supposed. He had not anticipated finding that one open code supported more than one axial code nor using overarching axial codes (basic foundations and feeling valued) to draw together and make sense of other axial codes.
4.7.1 Is engagement worth pursuing?

At face value, it may be worth disposing of the muddled concept of worker engagement and instead focus on the practical steps of involving workers, exchanging safety information with them and drawing on their experiences and insights. This might improve working practices, due to heightened awareness of risks and controls, and better organisation of work and the workplace. Worker involvement may promote behaviours that protect everyone (e.g. hazard reporting). Such mechanisms can be made mandatory so do not rely on ‘discretionary effort’ or psychosocial dynamics.

However, Chmiel et al. (2017) suggest that increasing levels of SCB, in part by increasing worker engagement, may be necessary to encourage workers to actually participate in opportunities to be involved in safety. Further, SCB could potentially prompt a wide range of proactive, discretionary behaviours which go beyond the potentially limited array of involvement opportunities that are offered (or mandated) by the organisation. These assertions will need to be examined in the forthcoming stages of this research.
Chapter 5: An Initial, Qualitative Survey to Compare and Contrast Safety Engagement and Safety Involvement

5.1 Purpose of the survey

The intention of the survey is to help answer objectives 1, 2 and 3 of the survey. Objective 1, as with the literature review, is to understand definitions and concepts and to establish extant theories. The survey will be used to test and challenge the definitions and assumptions arising from the literature review.

Objective 2 is to examine how and why specific engagement practices might specifically influence safety-related behaviours. Chmiel et al. (2017) indicate that this could be due to changes in role definitions. If so, it needs to be established what that actually means and how and why it might occur. Objective 3 is to establish what safety-related behaviours engaged workers might be anticipated to demonstrate and whether these behaviours may be associated with perceived role definitions.

Objectives 2 and 3, according to the plan of work for this research, will not be fully addressed in this survey. The purpose is to further develop the theory and refine existing codes or identify new codes to investigate in later stages of this research.

5.2 Justifying the use of a survey

From a critical realist ontological stance, and to meet the objectives of this research, it is important to understand the perceived causal or ‘generative’ mechanisms and
outcomes of engagement and involvement. From a constructivist epistemological position, it is important to understand what these concepts mean to people and to value and draw from their own perspectives and experiences to understand the differences and associations between these concepts.

In grounded theory, any data collection method can be used to best address the research questions (Engward 2013). This includes interviews, observations, written sources or a combination (Hernandez 2008, Petty et al. 2012).

At this early stage, the researcher was reluctant to invest time and effort organising interviews to discuss concepts such as involvement and engagement if they were meaningless concepts to people or were perceived to have no relationship with safety outcomes. Adopting a reflexive approach (Ahern 1999), the researcher recognised feeling anxious about interviewing peers with half-formed concepts. He worried that he would lose credibility and access to potential, future interviewees.

Therefore, this initial study was devised to collect data using a qualitative, self-administered questionnaire. Informed by the epistemological and ontological position of this paper, the three key area to investigate in this survey are:

- **Definitions**: What is meant by and what are the differences between worker involvement and worker engagement in health and safety?
- **Causal Mechanism**: How can employers involve or engage workers in health and safety?
- **Consequences**: What are the behavioural outcomes of worker involvement and engagement?
5.3 Survey design

5.3.1 Questions

There were three key areas to investigate during this initial survey (definitions, causal mechanisms and consequences). Asking a single question about each of these areas, for engagement and involvement, gave rise to six questions:

1. What do you understand by the phrase ‘worker involvement’ in health and safety?
2. What do you understand by the phrase ‘worker engagement’ in health and safety?
3. How can an organisation best involve workers in health and safety?
4. How can an organisation best engage workers?
5. What behaviours might we see or hear in an involved worker?
6. What behaviours might we see or hear in an engaged worker?

Certain words in the survey tool were presented in bold font to ensure it was clear which concept, either involvement or engagement, delegates were being asked about. Beneath each question, delegates had a box to write in. There were no predetermined answers to select nor a need to answer in any particular way, e.g. single word answers or full sentences. In the introductory paragraph, delegates were invited to answer all or some of the questions. In short, delegates could respond in any way they saw fit.

Due to earlier reflections, the researcher is aware that he is coming into the research with existing assumptions and biases. If a detailed survey tool was created, the questions and available answers would be limited by the researcher’s language, biases, incomplete understanding and perceptions. This could simply confirm his pre-
existing theories. Instead, from the constructivist position of this research, it is more worthwhile asking open questions and giving participants the opportunity to interpret and answer the question in their own words and language.

No questions were asked about role definitions. This was perceived, by the researcher, to be a nebulous, academic concept and may be a ‘hidden’ mediating factor between engagement and behaviour (as suggested by Chmiel et al. 2017).

These questions were followed by two, brief demographic questions: The participant’s current role and the length (in years) that they have worked in health and safety. The survey was otherwise anonymous.

5.3.2 Piloting the questionnaire

The first group of participants were piloting the survey tool. Boynton and Greenhalgh (2004), Jones et al. (2013) and Stratton (2012) recommend use of pilot studies to check for spelling errors, ambiguous items or personal bias. If participants appeared to struggle to answer the questions, or the questions failed to elicit rich, useful data, the tool could be modified before being used again.

5.3.3 Limitations in the questions

Participants are being asked what an organisation can do to involve and engage workers. There could be many other factors that promote or influence engagement, other than what an employer does. For example, the literature review highlighted the potential impact of individual factors (Christian et al. 2011, Bailey et al. 2015).
intention of the survey was to understand what factors may be under an organisation’s (and potentially a health and safety professional’s) direct control.

It is also evident, from the definitions of engagement, that there are cognitive and emotional aspects to engagement, not just behavioural. A survey tool is not the ideal mechanism to meaningfully examine very subjective perceptions of how people think and feel and therefore delegates were only asked about behavioural outcomes.

5.4 Selecting Participants and Data Collection

Grounded theory requires that participants are selected through ‘theoretical sampling’ in which the researcher identifies participants who are most likely to shed light on the phenomenon in question (Bagnasco et al. 2014, Charmaz 2006). This has much in common with purposive sampling (Welman and Kruger 1999, Devers and Frankel 2000, Ritchie et al. 2003). There is no attempt to randomise participants as they are intentionally selected for their ability to enrich the data (Patton 2002, Johnson and Waterfield 2004).

This study will adopt homogenous sampling so participants will have similar characteristics and offer a detailed picture of a specific phenomenon or social process in a particular context (Holloway and Wheeler 1996, Patton 2002, Ritchie et al. 2003). Participants would be selected if they were experienced health and safety professionals and/or have a detailed academic understanding of health and safety policy and practice. They needed to read and answer in English to facilitate the issuing of and analysis of the survey (i.e. no translation was necessary).
The survey was to be issued and completed *in situ* to allow participants to verbally share insights about the subject matter or opinions about the survey. These insights could be valuable. This meant that the survey needed to be kept brief to encourage people to complete it in a relatively short period of time.

As grounded theory research is an inductive technique, there is no requirement to establish sample size to ensure validity. Instead, the researcher “explores data through initial open coding, establishes tentative linkages between categories, and then returns to the field to collect further data” (Willig 2013). This continues until theoretical saturation, when a dominant, emerging pattern emerges (Engward 2013) and no new categories appear. Willig (2013) concedes this is a goal rather than reality as modifications or refinements are always possible.

This survey tool by itself will not aim to achieve theoretical saturation: that is, according to the plan of work, essentially the function of the entire PhD. Instead, enough surveys will be issued to enable the nascent codes and theory, arising from the initial literature review, to be challenged and refined.

Initially, students on the Cardiff Metropolitan University Masters in Health, Safety and Wellbeing course were asked to participate \((n = 10)\). They were a good fit with the selection criteria. As well as providing useful data, this was an opportunity to pilot the survey tool. The data gained through the pilot study was coded in accordance with the grounded theory approach before returning to the field. Following the pilot study, the core selection criteria and survey tool did not need to change.
The survey was then issued to members of the Institution of Occupational Safety and Health (IOSH) attending a meeting for mentors. 25 people attended and 8 returned a survey. Mentors are chartered members of IOSH in good standing and are deemed to have the knowledge and experience to mentor less experienced members. Participants had worked in health and safety for a mean of 16.25 years. Their roles included directors, managers and a head of health and safety. The data was again analysed and coded. As this proved to be generating useful data, the theoretical sampling selection criteria was not changed.

Finally, the survey was issued to health and safety professionals attending training as examiners for the National Examination Board in Occupational Safety and Health (NEBOSH). 12 people attended and 8 returned a survey. These delegates met the selection criteria and worked in health and safety for a mean of 17.75 years.

5.4.1 *Individuals/groups excluded from this survey*

While theoretical sampling purposefully includes subjects who meet certain criteria, it excludes a very large number of people. In this study, there was no attempt to approach (for example) workers, supervisors, professionals from other disciplines (e.g. human resources) and academics.

This was deliberate as the purpose of this study was to examine what involvement and engagement means in practice in the context of health and safety. It was an initial exercise to test and challenge the assumptions arising from the literature review. It was important, early on, to establish whether there was some validity in the line of enquiry being adopted in the PhD. This required an initial confirmation that there is at
least a perceived association between management practices that subjects consider to be engaging and/or involving and health and safety-related behavioural outcomes.

It is, of course, possible that the excluded groups could have shed some light on this subject. The overall research design will account for this by the approach to theoretical sampling employed in later stages of this research. The reflections undertaken during the bracketing exercise revealed that the research may be at risk of seeking out the perspectives of individuals who share the researcher’s beliefs and attitudes. Delegates attending a meeting of mentors may be more inclined to see the benefits of an enabling approach, rather than strictly wanting to control behaviour. On the other hand, prospective examiners may naturally seek and report on non-conformances against established standards. In reality, participants will probably hold and present a wide spectrum of different beliefs and attitudes.

5.5 Opening Coding Process

The surveys were reviewed and words, phrases or sentences were underlined and the margin annotated with a word or phrase to suggest an open code to capture the meaning of that response. This follows the process described by Böhm (2004) and Willig (2013). Some quotes gave support to the open and axial codes from the original literature review. In other cases, new codes were generated. While codes would ideally be taken directly from the data (Böhm 2004, Willig 2013) sometimes it was necessary to summarise or rephrase a quote to capture it’s quintessential meaning. For example, one response said that to involve workers, an organisation would be:

*Asking them to identify the hazards and proposing solutions which are implemented*
This quote gave rise to an open code called ‘eliciting/acting on workers’ ideas and concerns’. Codes were entered in a table. If other quotes then appeared to align with an existing code, that code was written in the margin of the survey and the quote added to the table. If the quote did not support or correspond to an existing code a new code was generated.

Another researcher could have coded the quote above as “encouraging hazard identification” or “promoting protective behaviours”. Constructivist grounded theory recognises that the research process draws from the researcher’s experiences and perceptions and acknowledges that the researcher is a co-creator of knowledge (Charmaz 2006, 2017). As such, some codes were created by an abductive process by which the researcher applied their best judgement to find a suitable label.

The open coding table is presented in Appendix 2. The open codes that this process generated, with selected quotes, are described below.

5.6 Open Codes

**Basic foundation:** One response suggested that:

_If workers don’t have the necessary equipment and tools to work safely resentment will erupt and SWMSs and procedures will go out the door._

This closely aligns with the observations of Shuck and Herd (2012: 165):
When a follower lacks the resources they need to do their job, resentment sets in and employees who had the potential to be a productive team player become frustrated and consequently, less productive.

There was no indication in the responses that other ‘hygiene factors’ (fair pay etc.), as identified by Shuck and Herd (2012) and Wollard and Shuck (2011), were important factors for promoting either involvement or engagement.

**Eliciting/Acting on Workers Ideas and Concerns:** Responses suggested that involvement and engagement rely on managers obtaining and responding to worker’s ideas. To involve workers, the participants suggested, managers would be:

*Asking them to identify the hazards and proposing solutions which are implemented.*

*Discussing issues with workers and gauging their reactions, taking on board their comments and coming up with a solution that works for all parties.*

Both these responses suggest that managers need to believe worker’s observations, perceptions and ideas are valid. ‘Asking’, ‘discussing’ and agreeing “a solution “that works for all parties” infer a more respectful, equitable and more collaborative approach than telling or demanding. In fact, one respondent explicitly stated that workers may be engaged in safety if managers “involve them by asking what they think not telling them”. However, both these quotes suggest that involvement is management-led: managers ask workers to identify hazards or discuss safety issues which the manager has raised. Asking workers to report hazards illustrates how managers can promote protective behaviours. To engage workers, according to the participants, managers would:
Listen and act on workers concerns.

Take the operators and their complaints, worries and concerns seriously and do something about it.

These quotes could infer that engagement is seen as a more reactive process, dealing with complaints or concerns. However, they could hint at engagement being a worker-led process, which is a new insight. Rather than asking workers to find hazards, for example, the leader is responding to the things that actually worry workers. It creates the sense of engagement being worker-centric and also of engaged workers being proactive in raising their worries and concerns.

This finding adds depth to the initial theory. It is illustrative of a more transformational approach and what Bass and Riggio (2006) call ‘individualised consideration’. From a J D-R perspective, it could be interpreted as a manager responding to worker’s emotional demands.

**Taking and tracking actions:** Both involved and engaged workers were perceived to take steps to improve safety. For example, involved workers would, one participant suggested, report near misses and other answers suggested that involved workers:

*Will ask questions and follow up on actions*

*Staff taking ownership of health & safety and driving improvements*

*Raise issues and assist with solutions*

This presents involved workers as more proactive participants, and investing more discretionary effort, than the first literature review had suggested. This is a useful challenge to the initial theory.
A specific difference between perceptions of involved and engaged workers emerged. Engaged workers were described as actually dealing with hazards rather than just reporting them or assisting with a solution:

*Identify hazards as they walk around and take action to deal with them.*

*I fix hazards when I see them.*

**Viability of ideas:** Involved and engaged workers were both perceived to be able to provide ideas which are ‘viable’ or ‘work for all parties’. This had not been predicted by the literature review and is a new insight offered by the survey. This perhaps suggests that involved and engaged workers have sufficient knowledge and/or motivation to help them develop ideas that are practical and effective, rather than (for example) making requests that could be seen as impractical or vexatious.

**Communication/Information:** Both involvement and engagement were described as relying upon the provision of information, and an array of different techniques were proposed (from meetings, to training, to the use of newsletters and notice boards).

**Willing to Learn:** Responses proposed that:

*An involved worker has an interest in learning and a knowledge of health and safety issues.*

*An engaged worker will strive to learn about other processes.*

Both involved and engaged workers were therefore perceived to be willing to learn which is indicative of someone who is cognitively engaged in their work and workplace (Wollard and Shuck 2011).
It was interesting that engaged workers were seen as willing to learn about “other processes” rather than safety. This perhaps aligns with the view that engaged workers support wider organisational goals (Wollard and Shuck 2011) or seek to be effective in their role (Rich et al. 2010). This is another new insight enriching the initial theory.

**Explaining/tailored communication:** To both involve and engage workers, managers could:

*Explain why tools such as hazard reporting will help improve safety.*

*Why the H&S procedures are necessary and will benefit staff.*

*Explaining why the H&S procedures are necessary and will benefit staff*

In contrast, one response suggested that involvement required:

*Ensuring that workers understand the fact that they have to do certain tasks not necessarily why.*

This gives a somewhat ambivalent view of worker involvement: On the one hand, workers can simply be told to do certain tasks, regardless of whether they understand why. Alternatively, the reasons can be explained. This corresponds with the initial literature review which suggested that worker involvement may rely on an exchange of information. Engagement was, however, seen as requiring greater consideration of the specific needs of the workers:

*Make the data personal and relevant to the teams.*

*Talking plainly (without jargon).*

*Asking workers what data they want regarding performance.*
The last quote seems particularly empowering: Asking workers what data they actually want. One quote suggested that to engage workers an organisation might:

*Involve workers in the process from start to finish so they also take ownership of good H&S.*

This suggests that being included from the inception to implementation and review of health and safety initiatives (rather than being a passive participant or only involved in certain elements) may equip workers with “ownership of good H&S”. This serves as a new, practical insight for how to engage workers. From a theoretical perspective, such an approach might signal value and trust in the worker’s contributions. Finally, one answer suggested that:

*Engaging means winning hearts and minds.*

This suggests that engagement relies on both rational and emotional appeals. This theme is touched upon later in relation to codes that relate to motivation, thinking about safety and a sense of caring for others.

**Consultation:** Involvement and engagement are both perceived to build upon a formal consultation process. Consultation had not specifically been used as a search term alongside engagement and is potentially another term that could have a multiplicity of meanings. Therefore, it is important to investigate this concept further.

**Participation:** Both involvement and engagement were perceived to depend on the organisation offering workers opportunities to participate in health and safety which is in line with the findings of the literature review.
Participation was sometimes seen as involving workers in teams. For example, workers could be involved if managers:

*Use them as part of teams of audits, risk assessments etc.*

*I believe involving people in ‘special project’ team to be beneficial to engagement both for the project and process of building engagement.*

One participant said that both involved and engaged workers would be:

*Volunteering for key roles re: risk assessors/fire wardens/first aid.*

This suggests that both involved and engaged workers could display SCB. As also discovered under the code ‘Taking and Tracking Actions’ this presents involved workers as more proactive (and willing to display SCB) than initially assumed.

A discernible difference been involvement and engagement was that engaging workers was seen as depending on a higher degree of participation:

*Ensuring those that are consulted are actively taking part and not just by-standers.*

*Not just active participation but also involved in the process and part of it.*

**Participating without buy in:** A number of responses suggested that involved workers may participate but:

*Inductions might be a good example where the worker is “involved” in an induction when they sit and listen, it is obvious that not all are “engaged” in the process.*
Participating in something but not necessarily having ‘buy in’.

There were no equivalent themes in descriptions of engaged workers. This supports a suggestion from the initial theory that simply offering involvement opportunities does not guarantee worker’s active participation. These quotes may demonstrate how less engaged workers may not fully apply cognitive and emotional resources to the performance of particular roles.

**Praising workers:** According to participants, engagement is promoted by:

> Reinforce positive, praise.

> Catching people doing it right/safely is associated with engagement.

> This would be as easy as walking around and catching people doing it right/safely and then promoting the upside of safety. This has shown to be much more valuable than being a warden that names and shames people for making a mistake.

This is fully consistent with the literature review which found that workers are more likely to be engaged if they feel valued. The final quote explicitly highlights the potentially damaging effects of shaming people (i.e. undermining their sense of being valued or making them feel psychologically unsafe). The importance of feeling valued was explicitly stated in a description of the behaviour of engaged workers:

> Worker is comfortable to raise issues and drive outcomes because he feels valued
There was no equivalent theme for involving workers. This appears to support the initial theory that engagement relies on workers feeling valued and cared for. Involving workers was seen as a more mechanistic approach. The notion of “catching people doing it right” is a new insight and appears to suggest leaders purposefully looking for positive behaviours to reinforce.

**Leadership qualities:** Involving workers, one response proposed;

*Is mostly about ensuring systems are in place that encourage involvement*  
*and that leaders have the skills to capitalize on the involvement.*

This is consistent with the initial literature review and the perception that involvement may rely on formal involvement mechanisms (or “systems”) being introduced. On the other hand, participants considered that engagement consisted of:

*Is a bit of leadership walking the walk.*

*Provide good leadership example.*

*Being open, honest and helpful.*

*Identify key influencers. Strong vision and values, ‘walk the walk’, do what you say,*  
*lead by example.*

A clear theme is the need for leaders to be a good role model and “walk the walk”. This refers to the general qualities or attributes of a leader rather than specific behaviours. This is entirely consistent with the qualities of transformational leaders (Bass and Riggio 2006) and supports the initial theory regarding the importance of transformational leadership for promoting engagement.
Compliance: Involved and engaged workers were both perceived to comply with the rules. Examples include:

- Wears correct PPE.
- Follow agreed H&S procedures.
- Sticking to health and safety procedures/SSOW/method statements.
- Adhering to all controls. Following procedures.

Some responses suggest that involved workers may comply because of external pressure or fear:

-'Doing it' because you have to as opposed to ‘doing it’ because you want to.

Involved workers will be safe because they want to keep their job

Thinking about Safety: Several responses suggest that workers are engaged in safety by encouraging them to think about safety.

- Have ‘hazard hunts’ where we get workers engaged in spotting hazards and thinking about safety rather than just following procedures and pretending that a procedure will make me safe

There was one view that compliance is the anti-thesis of a more autonomous culture:

- There is much more value in building an engaged culture towards a generative environment rather than clamping down and putting more rules in place for people to obediently follow

Perhaps as a result, engaged workers were seen as understanding why certain behaviours are beneficial.
We all wear ear defence because we know we could cause harm if we don’t. Engaged workers will be safe because that’s the best way that they can protect themselves and their co-workers.

These responses are interesting as they also suggest that behaviour is driven by a desire to protect people, suggesting that engaged workers may behave in ways which are consistent with underlying values. The open code “caring for each other” examines this in more depth.

There are parallels with the open code “Explaining”. It is feasible that engaged workers will, because of the way that safety may be discussed with them, have a better grasp of the underlying reasons and benefits.

Engaged workers may be expected to take a thoughtful approach to health and safety because they are perceived to be applying greater cognitive and emotional resources to the work and workplace (Wollard and Shuck 2011). Other than the quote “Self Critical, Self Correction”, there was no equivalent quotes for involved workers.

**Challenging Others/Enforcing Rules:** Both involved and engaged workers were perceived to challenge others or point out unsafe practices. This can be seen as an extension of the concept of compliance: involved/engaged workers are not simply complying themselves but are enforcing compliance on others. The following descriptions were applied to involved workers:

*Enforcing rules to others.*

Say if something is being done incorrectly or unsafely.
You must wear ear defence because this is required/is a procedure we must follow.

Worker challenging a manager for not conforming to HSE standards.

Engaged workers were described as:

Talk/advise his fellow workers that they are acting in an unsafe manner.

We also see fellow workers pulling visitors and new team into line, (but we don’t see it formally) if you get my drift.

Enforcing rules that have been collectively agreed.

Most of these answers do not explain why the workers is enforcing the rule. It may be that they are simply enforcing rules because they are told to do so by managers. However, the answer that engaged workers would be “enforcing rules that have been collectively agreed” suggests there may has been some degree of collective agreement about what rules are valid (which may not correspond with organisational perceptions of which rules are valid). This may also suggest that engaged workers may also be enforcing group norms and adds weight to the idea of engaged workers thinking about safety (in this case discriminating about what rules are valid or not).

Conchie (2013) found that ‘challenging’ behaviours are contingent upon a high level of intrinsic motivation as it could create discord and undermine relationships. It could be indicative of a culture in which there is a requirement for everyone to comply with rules and challenge non-conformance by others (as described by Didla et al. 2009).
Supporting/Advising others: Involved workers were perceived to proactively advise others:

*Offering unprompted h+s advice to colleagues.*

*Advising others without being asked.*

*Discussions amongst workers on doing the ‘right thing’ if they observe someone taking risk.*

Again, this is a new insight which suggests that involved workers are more proactive, and engaging in a wider range of SCB, than predicted by the initial theory.

There were more examples, and more detailed descriptions, of supportive behaviour by engaged workers such as:

*Talking openly about safety in the field/amongst themselves and visitors.*

*You will hear more talking when work is going on because people will comment about the work, the safest way to do a job, and they will stop each other to make the job safer rather than shrugging their shoulders and not intervening.*

*We touch base and check on each other throughout the different stages of a job to make sure we are still on track and no new hazards have developed.*

These responses suggest that engaged workers are in constant discussion about both operational (e.g. production and quality) and health and safety goals. Colley *et al.* (2012) found that there was no tension in organisations which emphasised both
production and safety targets. This perhaps aligns with the view that engaged workers will support organisational goals (Wollard and Shuck 2011) or just be effective in their role (Rich et al. 2010). These comments also suggest that engaged workers may actually be engaged with each other as well as (or instead of) their job or organisation.

A further example was that engaged workers might:

- **Train new or redeployed staff, maybe not in a formal way**
- **Actively assist others when they see an unsafe condition or action,**
  
  *rather than just report it to a supervisor.*

Training and assisting staff is likely to take more effort than just advising them. These quotes highlight how some beneficial behaviours might not be observed or overheard. The sense that some behaviours go ‘beneath the radar’ was also evident in the quote “we also see fellow workers pulling visitors and new team into line, (but we don’t see it formally) if you get my drift”.

A picture is emerging of involved workers being proactive and expending discretionary effort about safety (i.e. display SCB). However, engaged workers appear to be displaying a broader range such as training and assisting others, fixing hazards, and proactively raising concerns.

**Motivation:** Survey answers proposed that engaged workers are:

- **Striving to perform work to the highest possible health and safety standards.**
  
  *Applying discretionary effort to make Health and Safety better.*
The perception of workers performing to the highest standards and applying discretionary effort is consistent with Saks (2006) proposition that engagement is associated with improved task performance and citizenship behaviours. The latter quote almost perfectly describes SCB and captures the sense of ‘promotive’ behaviour: making things better (Conchie 2013).

Involved workers were also described as displaying:

*Enthusiasm, motivation.*

*Enthusiastic approach to all H&S policies and procedures*

*Passion+motivated speeches.*

While involved workers may be seen as motivated, one response illustrates that this motivation could be context specific (which is another new insight from the survey):

*An involved worker will display ownership behaviours for their immediate area – the area they have had involvement in. Make sure that all PPE is being worn, all LEVs are being used, all procedures followed for that particular task but probably would not continue this behaviour through other parts of the building.*

The sense of context-specific motivation was highlighted by another series of quotes. Involved workers may:

*Occasionally take the message home.*

In contrast, engaged workers would, according to the survey responses:
Actively engages in safety in the home.

Practices safe behaviours in the home e.g. mows lawn with correct PPE.

These quotes suggest that engaged workers are seen as more consistently applying safety at home. The open code ‘thinking about safety’ suggest engaged workers understand the benefits of following safe systems of work. If those beliefs have been internalised, they might promote safety behaviours in different contexts. Safety motivation may be underpinned by deeply held beliefs about the value of safety as evidenced in these descriptions of engaged workers (which have religious overtones):

Converted, a true believer.

Proactive/evangelist' for H&S.

Fully committed to health and safety in the workplace, they practice what they preach, is not afraid to speak up.

Other answers suggest that:

Involved workers may be involved but perhaps not putting body and soul into it.

Will report hazards unless get a lot of grief which will drive bad behaviour.

Both these quotes are indicative of a lower level of motivation. The first indicates that limited effort is being applied. The second quote may support the notion of context-specific motivation: additional safety duties are performed but only when there is external reinforcement. The behaviours do not appear to be sustained by a deeply held belief about their intrinsic value.
This highlights the need to examine theories of motivation in more detail to understand why involved and engaged workers might have different levels of motivation. It also seems valuable to explore the potential interplay between values and motivation.

**Empowerment:** Responses identified the need to “empower” workers, to secure both involvement and engagement. Involving workers was described as consisting of:

- Make them responsible for the changes to their environment and give them ownership.
- Given roles and responsibilities.
- Granting staff ownership of programs and processes.

These appear to be features of a transactional leadership style: assigning roles, responsibilities and goals. It is unclear what “granting staff ownership of programs and processes” might look like in practice. Measures to engage workers include:

- Involving workers in special project or development teams, from the start to the finish of the process including financial aspects.
- Give workers resources, roles and responsibilities (and associated targets/goals) relating to health and safety, including responsibility for making changes to their work areas.
- Allowing the team and individuals to be drivers of health and safety saving money in the process but initially needing the resources and tool they require.

Such measures could signal manager’s trust and value of workers. From a practical perspective, these initiatives may help workers develop insights and skills (planning, cost-benefit analysis etc.) that they can apply to workplace problems. Giving workers
resources or permission to drive safety improvements appears to be handing control to the workers and seems to be an empowering, worker-centric approach.

Being part of a “special project team” could lead workers to become part of an in-group and more highly engaged with managers (Jha and Jha 2013) due to the time and attention they receive from managers and the heightened status they associate with their position. Empowerment had not been used as a search term during the initial literature review and would be worthy of a more focussed literature review.

**Care for others:** Responses indicated that engaged workers will display behaviours, or hold beliefs, values and norms that emphasise mutual care:

*Engaged workers will be safe because that’s the best way that they can protect themselves and their co-workers.*

*Teamworking. Care for each other.*

*Workers taking responsibility for their & their colleagues H&S.*

*Mates looking after mates.*

*Watching each other’s backs.*

*We have each other’s backs.*

*Care for each other.*

This was only apparent in a single quote relating to involved workers which suggested that involved workers had “interest in maintaining a safe environment for all”. This could suggest that engagement may be a mechanism for creating a culture of “actively caring” (Roberts and Geller 1995: 53). Alternatively, it may be that workers become engaged within an organisation which promotes mutual care, perhaps because it
creates a sense of safety (Kahn 1990) or a perception of the organisation being supportive and caring (Saks 2006, Clark et al. 2014).

**Working through key influencers/champions:** Responses identified that workers can be engaged or involved if managers work through key influencers or champions. This might suggest that if workers strongly identify with a particular co-worker, that individual can be used as a vehicle for improving health and safety.

**Individual qualities:** The behaviour of involved workers was described as:

> Supportive, courteous, loyal, respect.

Various words were used to describe the qualities of engaged workers including commitment, self-esteem and “professional, honesty, willingness, positivity”. These suggest that the positive impacts of involving and engaging workers may extend beyond the boundaries of health and safety. Some of these are similar to the qualities of forbearance (Markőczy et al. 2009).

**5.6.1 Themes that did not appear**

Some factors did not appear even though they were predicted by the literature review. These included the need for employers to care for workers, promote psychological safety, attend to hygiene factors or provide good quality work. It is possible that these factors have subtle (or no) influence on worker engagement. Potentially, the notion of caring for workers and making sure people feel safe is taken for granted by the participants (health and safety professionals). It is even possible that these items may need to be removed from the emerging theory of engagement.
5.6.2 Differentiating involvement from engagement

Responses stated that “involvement begets engagement” or described engagement as a “move beyond communication and consultation” or a consequence of involvement: “I believe involving people in ‘special project’ team to be beneficial to engagement both for the project and process of building engagement”. In contrast, some respondents simply wrote “as above” when answering questions about engagement (in which they refer to an earlier answer about involvement) perhaps indicating that they see involvement and engagement as synonymous. This is in line with the observations made during the introduction of this thesis which found that involvement and engagement can be used interchangeably.

5.7 Discussion of the Open Coding

The key purpose of this study was to examine:

- What is meant by and what are the differences between worker involvement and worker engagement in health and safety?
- How can employers involve or engage their workers in health and safety?
- What are the behavioural outcomes of worker involvement and engagement?

The open coding of the survey responses showed that perceptions of worker involvement and worker engagement have much in common. For example, both rely on communication and consultation and were expected to produce some similar results such as rules compliance, challenging people who work unsafely, providing ideas and being willing to learn. However, there were some notable new insights.
• Involving workers in safety emerged from the survey as a manager-led process while engaging workers was presented as being worker-centric.

• Ideas which are proposed by involved and engaged workers are “viable”.

• Involved workers may have less motivation (or context-specific motivation) compared to engaged workers. The higher levels of motivation experienced by engaged workers may be displayed in more consistent safety performance in different contexts such as outside their own work area or at home.

• Involved workers may display SCB such as advising other workers or volunteering for safety roles. They are not just following instructions.

• Engaged workers may display more proactive, autonomous and supportive behaviours, such as dealing with hazards rather than just reporting them or assisting or training colleagues as well as advising them or pointing out that they are working unsafely. Therefore, they were presented as displaying a wider range of SCB and those behaviours may require more cognitive, emotional or physical effort.

• The apparent willingness of engaged workers to display these behaviours may be connected to a sense of obligation to mutually care for colleagues.

• Engaged workers were described as having a passion for safety, being converts, true believers or evangelists. This suggests deeply held beliefs or values regarding safety.

• A team of engaged workers may be identified by their ongoing dialogue and discussions about their task.

• A wide range of thoughts and feelings are attributed to engaged workers. It seems more appropriate to discuss “levels of engagement” (Bailey et al. 2017: 31) rather than perceiving workers as simply engaged or not engaged.

• These discussions are not limited to safety. Engaged workers were described as being aware and supportive of both operational and health and safety goals. This is consistent with the view, arising from the literature review, that engaged workers were concerned with their effectiveness in their role (Rich et al. 2010).
Involved workers might sometimes obey rules simply to follow an instruction or out of fear. In contrast, engaged workers may be motivated to follow safe systems of work due to a better understanding of the benefits of those systems.

Engaged workers may not assume that a procedure will make them safe: They seem prepared to question the value or validity of rules.

Engagement was perceived to rely on managers displaying transformational leadership qualities and a worker-centric approach. Tailoring communication, providing a good role model and walking the walk were some qualities which participants associated with worker engagement. Praise was also seen as engaging. However, this is a transactional approach known as contingent reward. This confirms the finding from the first literature review that a mix of both approaches may be needed.

Many beneficial behaviours may go unobserved by managers. This is, incidentally, of critical importance for research into this subject. If target behaviours are difficult to observe (maybe because they are so quick and short-lived) it confirms that researchers cannot rely on observation to establish the extent of SCB in a workplace.

A much richer and more nuanced picture has emerged and the survey has started to radically challenge the model emerging from the literature review. The next stage of the grounded theory process is called axial coding which draws open codes together into a number of higher-order categories to highlight similarities and differences between the emerging concepts. Before axial coding commences, it would be helpful to explore the significant new concepts that emerged, such as motivation, and how they fit into the model. Consequently, a second literature review will be undertaken.
5.7.1 Limitations of this study

The survey has a number of potential weaknesses. It would have been possible to ask more questions and involve more participants. In that way, participants may be more representative of the wider health and safety community. More responses might have provided even richer data or contradicted the data that has already been generated. Further, coding is a subjective process and a different researcher could have coded the responses entirely differently.

The challenge of ensuring validity of qualitative research was discussed earlier and at length. This study, using grounded theory, has attempted to ensure validity by establishing the methodological framework, justifying the sampling strategy, adopting a process for systematic and transparent data collection and analysis and seeking to ensure the claims and analysis match the data.

The final test of validity, the development of functional theories, is objective 4 of this research and will be pursued through subsequent stages of this research.
Chapter 6: Second literature review and theory development

A researcher employing grounded theory should return to previous sources of data to question and compare the codes that are emerging. This is known as constant comparative analysis (Mills et al. 2006a, Draucker et al. 2007). Therefore, it is pertinent to return to and re-examine the literature, to explore some of the open codes that emerged during the survey. Comparing different sources of data also represents a form of triangulation which is a measure to improve the theoretical validity of qualitative research (Kolb 2012, Lo 2014).

6.1.1 Rule- vs Knowledge/Value-Based Approach to Health and Safety

The survey responses described engaged and involved workers as compliant and acting to secure the compliance of others. However, the motivation of engaged workers to act safely was perceived to arise from an understanding of the underlying benefits of the behaviour or commitment to pro-safety beliefs and values such as caring for others. This may give rise to a “felt responsibility for safety” (Conchie et al. 2013: 113). Two quotes in particular seemed to question the intrinsic value of rules:

*Have ‘hazard hunts’ where we get workers engaged in spotting hazards and thinking about safety rather than just following procedures and pretending that a procedure will make me safe.*

*There is much more value in building an engaged culture towards a generative environment rather than clamping down and putting more rules in place for people to obediently follow.*
The literature was interrogated to identify what themes or debates exist around the place of rules and compliance in securing health and safety.

A body of research emerged in the 2000’s that challenged the notion that safety relied on compliance. Rules may be wrong or unsafe or fail to meet the real demands faced by workers (Reason 2008, Alper and Karsh 2009, Hopkins, 2011). Others argue that the ensuing behaviour may be on the boundary of acceptability or minimum compliance (Mitropolous et al. 2005, Wadick 2010). Further, simply complying with rules does not rely on or encourage development of pro-safety values, knowledge, intuition or awareness (Dingsdag et al. 2006, Hudson 2007, Lunt et al 2008: 62). Rules can give rise to complacency or a false sense of security, reduce feelings of personal accountability and undermines one’s ability to respond to unexpected events (Conchie et al. 2006, Törner and Pousette 2009). Colley et al. (2012) found that organisations which are perceived to strongly emphasise ‘internal processes’ (rules and procedures) reported lower levels of safety climate perception and more unsafe incidents.

Consequently, greater autonomy is positively related to improved safety behaviour (Törner and Pousette 2009). Workplaces will, according to O’Toole (2002) become safer if the culture changes from one of compliance to doing the right thing. This, however, implies there needs to be a shared understanding of what is ‘right’. Hide et al. (2003: x) adds to the discussion: “Education is needed over training, so as to promote intelligent knowledge rather than unthinking rule based attention to safety.”

These debates culminated in the development of a new safety paradigm which was crystallised in Hollnagel’s (2014) “Safety-I and Safety-II: The Past and Future of Safety Management” and Dekker’s (2014) “Safety differently: human factors for a new era”.
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Safety differently was adopted by Laing O’Rourke, a major UK contractor, pushing safety differently into mainstream discourse (e.g. Green 2016, Beach 2017).

According to the new paradigms, workers successfully complete the vast proportion of their work by drawing on experiences, knowledge and intuition to recognise and deal with the unpredictability and variability of real life. They deal with the difference between ‘work-as-imagined’ and ‘work-as-done’ (Hollnagel 2014). The role of management is recognising and supporting the capability and adaptability of humans rather than eliminating variation and removing worker’s ability to cope with the realities they face. Managers become facilitators, asking the workers (for instance) what information or resources they need to complete tasks and what obstacles undermine their performance. As the focus of the new paradigms is on making things go right, the emphasis is on improving performance with safety almost a fortuitous bi-product.

Engagement, as envisaged by Kahn (1990), could facilitate Safety-II. Safety-II envisages workers applying cognitive, emotional and physical energies to work. Engagement, the first literature review revealed, might enhance a worker’s cognitive, emotional and physical resources and harness them to support role performance (Rich et al. 2010). This might support them in assessing their environment (and maybe ‘listening’ to their own emotions and intuitions), considering and weighing up alternatives, remembering and using past experiences etc. Hollnagel (2014: 137) describes some of the cognitive processes involved in Safety II which assumes that:

*Systems work because people are able to adjust what they do to match the conditions of work. People learn to identify and overcome design flaws and functional glitches because they can recognise the actual demands and adjust their performance*
accordingly, and because they interpret and apply procedures to match the conditions. People can also detect and correct when something goes wrong or when it is about to go wrong, so that they can intervene before the situation becomes seriously worsened.

Mitropoulos and Cupido (2009) illustrate how this works in practice when describing the working practices/norms of a high reliability crew. The emphasis is on the avoidance of mistakes but the result is to create a calm and safe approach to work.

This is very similar to the findings of the research by Wachter and Yorio (2014) which found that engaged workers possessed and applied cognitive resources to work tasks, making them more attentive to, and able to adjust work methods to account for, design glitches, hazards and error traps. Turner et al. (2012) explored these concepts in their article “Job Demands–Control–Support model and employee safety performance”. Clarke (2012) found an association between hindrance stressors and injuries, which was fully mediated by reductions in safety compliance and participation, supporting the idea that managers should seek to understand and reduce frustrations. In contrast, the research by Griffin and Neal (2000), and to some extent Chmiel et al. (2017), is fuelling an impression that compliance is synonymous with being safe and non-compliance or violations are always unsafe. There is, in those models, no recognition of workers adapting how they work to cope with the realities they face.

Safety II appears to concentrate on individuals completing their own tasks safely. It says nothing about how and why workers might expend discretionary effort to improve safety for others or help or protect someone who is not associated with their own task. Gibbs et al. (2016) refer to Safety-I and -II, but recognise some tasks, environments and workers (e.g. new starters) warrant a rules-based approach and more dynamic
situations and experienced workers warrant a more person-centred approach. The researchers suggest that organisations might need to blend the approaches, creating a ‘third way’, and workers could be involved in shaping rules so that methods of work are rule-informed and practice-based. Gibbs *et al.* (2016) also fail to explain how an organisation might promote discretionary safety effort, a “felt responsibility for safety” (Conchie 2013) or a culture of ‘active caring’ (Roberts and Geller 1995).

Törner and Pousette (2009: 403) investigated safety culture using interviews and grounded theory, and identified a category they termed ‘collective values, norms and behaviours’. This seems to blend Safety II with a more proactive concern for others as a result of collaborative working practices.

*Developing a good safety culture is encouraged through ideas from below being encouraged and gaining a hearing. Everyone involved in the work gets to know each other and learns to listen, so cohesion develops and the team acquires a shared view of the preconditions for safe work…different teams work side by side and are prepared to adjust to each other. Strict boundaries between work teams are counteracted, so that minding each other’s business (not just one’s own) and taking responsibility beyond one’s own work is encouraged…different work teams inform each other of risks faced. Workers working together have good dialogue. Thinking for oneself is encouraged, and it is acceptable to make mistakes.*

The proposal of blending rule- and practice- (or knowledge-) based approaches could be supported by engagement. The survey presented engaged workers as behaving
in ways that are consistent with their knowledge and values leading to compliance and efforts to help others and proactively raise or deal with concerns. They might have the resources, motivation and confidence to move between prescriptive and autonomous ways of working. This, however, depends in part on workers having pro-safety knowledge and values. Through the rest of this chapter, it is revealed how engagement may also help workers to internalise pro-safety knowledge and values.

6.1.2 Consultation and Empowerment

The focussed literature review used ‘consultation’ and ‘empowerment’ as search terms together with ‘engagement’. Unexpectedly, the articles returned by this search strategy predominantly related to public or patient engagement.

Various frameworks of engagement exist (such as Rowe and Frewer (2005) and Carman et al. (2013)). The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Public Participation Spectrum is shown in Appendix 3 (and the necessary copyright permission to use the model is provided as Appendix 4). Models developed by IAP2 and Carmen et al. (2013) suggest that the highest levels of citizen engagement goes beyond communication and consists of shared decision-making or allowing citizens to develop policies, programs and plans or setting and implementing agendas (Sheedy 2008). These approaches hand considerable power to the engagees.

The concept of ‘participation’, which was identified during the analysis of the surveys, included involving workers in risk assessments but also including them in teams to deal with safety issues. This may represent a form of collaboration (as opposed to, for example, just telling people what the risks are).
The engagement literature highlights the importance of empowerment but this was missed in the initial literature review. Dromey (2014) and Bhuvanaiah and Raya (2015) propose that involving workers and letting workers make decisions leads to engagement. Macey and Schneider (2008: 10) propose that “feelings of self-efficacy and control…comprise another facet of state engagement.”

The theory that emerged from the initial literature review viewed engagement and involvement as relatively discrete sets of practices and outcomes. It appears that they are, in fact, closely intertwined. Marescaux et al. (2013: 9) found that engagement can be promoted by “a system of participation in decision-making that is based on the direct involvement of employees”. This is because, they suggest, participation encourages more autonomy, brings workers into more contact with a diverse range of colleagues and signals that they are more competent (or provides opportunities to develop competence). Engagement practices, as envisioned by IAP2, can be placed on a spectrum of how effective the technique may be at promoting engagement.

The more empowering approaches described in the IAP2 model appear closely aligned to a transformational approach to leadership (Bass and Riggio 2006). Less empowering approaches are transactional in nature, involving exchanges of instructions or information.

6.1.3 Self-Efficacy

Social cognitive theory (SCT) proposes that people form goals based upon their belief in their ability to perform an action (self-efficacy) and achieve outcomes that they value (Bandura 1998, 2001, Luszczynska and Schwarzer 2005, Cameron and Duff 2007).
Rich et al. (2010) suggest that confidence in one’s own abilities determines how ‘available’ a person is to engage in his or her role. Pyszczynski et al. (2004) therefore see efficacy as a source of engagement as well as resilience in the face of set-backs. Self-efficacious individuals, or workers with a positive perception of their own worthiness and capabilities are more likely to be engaged (Guglielmi et al. 2012, Ouweneel et al. 2013, Lee and Ok 2015). In the J D-R model, self-efficacy serves as an emotional resource and motivator (Xanthopoulou et al. 2007). Salanova et al. (2011: 2257) explicitly use SCT to explain the positive relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement, which they describe as “intrinsic motivational processes”. Self-efficacy features in models of ‘psychological capital’ (a concept which originated in positive psychology) (Newman et al. 2014). Research has also found a positive association between psychological capital and engagement (Thompson et al. 2015, Bonner 2016, Datu et al. 2016, Joo et al. 2016).

The expected outcomes of a behaviour could include social consequences or self-evaluation. Some people may be more inclined to uphold personal or social standards depending on which consequences they value most (Bandura 1991). Goals, Bandura (2001: 8) argues, “rooted in a value system and a sense of personal identify, invest activities with meaning and purpose”. He suggests people are naturally motivated to do things that give them self-satisfaction and a sense of self-worth and pride. Bandura (2001: 9) begins to explain why some people might act in a protective way towards others: “Individuals with a strong communal ethic will act to further the welfare of others even at costs to their self-interest.”

The description in a survey response of an involved worker who “will report hazards unless get a lot of grief” is an example of how social consequences and barriers can
help drive behaviour. People’s personal values may influence a person’s sense of self-efficacy. For example, individuals who value openness to change, appreciate challenge and new experiences and tend to develop their abilities (Sousa et al. 2012).

Bandura (2001) suggests that people seek “engrossment” (pg. 8) by pursuing challenging goals, which seems similar to the concepts of dedication and/or absorption in one model of engagement (Bakker et al. 2008). Tabernero and Hernández (2011) concur with Bandura (1982) that there is a link between self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation, finding that the more confident someone is in their abilities, the more challenging goals they set themselves, the more satisfied they feel using behaviours they have mastered, and the greater their intrinsic motivation.

One’s ability to act is clearly affected by external factors, such as lack of resources (Luszczynska and Schwarzer 2005). Transformational leadership qualities help to build self-efficacy (Shea and Howell, 1999) for example by helping people to reflect on successes and set-backs. Transformational leadership can therefore promote engagement and self-efficacy (Conger and Kanungo 1988, Salanova et al. 2011, Macey and Schneider 2008).

The performance of safety citizenship behaviours, along with any other behaviour, will be influenced by self-efficacy. Curcuruto et al. (2016) drew on the work of Bandura (2001) and found that ‘role breath self-efficacy’ (perceived confidence in carrying out a broader and more participative range of activities beyond one’s core role) was one factor associated with a more proactive orientation towards safety.
Self-efficacy should feature in the model of engagement as a defining characteristic of an engaged worker. It would be difficult to describe a worker as engaged if they have little faith they can perform a role or do not value the anticipated outcomes.

6.1.4 Motivation

Motivation emerged during the survey as a defining feature of involved and engaged workers. Engagement has been described as being a “motivational construct” or “motivational state” (Shantz et al. 2013: pages 2610 and 2614) or an “intrinsic motivational process” (Salanova et al. 2011: 2257). Engagement and motivation are sometimes discussed as if they are synonymous (Filsecker and Kerres 2014, Zohar et al. 2015, Daugherty Biddison et al. 2016). This suggests that a person’s level of motivation would be a measure of their level of engagement, or put another way, higher levels of motivation might be a defining characteristic of an engaged worker.

It would be a gross over-simplification to suggest that motivation is solely the product of engagement as motivation is associated with a range of other factors such as core self-evaluations, which are seen as the product of relatively stable personality traits (Judge and Hurst 2007).

Meyer and Gagné (2008) and Meyer et al. (2010) specifically investigated the association between engagement and motivation drawing on the psychological needs and continuum of motivation drawn from social determination theory (SDT) (Ryan and Deci 2000). Filsecker and Kerres (2014) describe engagement as sustained cognitive, emotional and behavioural effort to pursue a goal.
Survey responses described both involved and engaged workers as motivated but there were differences in the *type* of motivation (using the SDT typology). Although involved workers were described as “compliant” and “enforcing rules to others” they were sometimes presented as externally motivated e.g. “‘Doing it’ because you have to as opposed to ‘doing it’ because you want to”, “Involved workers will be safe because they want to keep their job”. Their motivation appeared to be weaker than engaged workers e.g. “participating in something but not necessarily having ‘buy in’”, “Willingness to contribute and take ownership of issues. Perhaps not putting body & soul into it?”, “report hazards unless get a lot of grief which will drive bad behaviour”.

Some responses suggested that engaged workers comply with rules due to identified regulation, i.e. a logical appreciation of the benefit of a behaviour (e.g. “We all wear ear defence because we know we could cause harm if we don’t”). Engaged workers were also described as “converted, a true believer” and an “evangelist for H&S” or held beliefs such as “mates look after mates”. Collectively, these appear indicative of integrated regulation: A deeply held belief about the value of safety, which is likely to be aligned with a person’s core values (and not simply something they do because of utilitarian benefits). Perhaps as a result, engaged workers were described as taking responsibility for health and safety outside their own work area and fixing hazards. This suggests that more engaged workers may experience both identified and integrated regulation (higher levels of motivation according to SDT).

Ironically, a ‘strong’ safety climate could be counter-productive by extrinsically motivating compliance and, in the process, undermine intrinsic motivation towards safety (Zohar *et al.* 2015). An imposed activity reduces the need for self-regulation (Andrews 2016) and will feel less pleasurable (Weinstein and Ryan 2010).
While a highly regulated safety regime could erode a worker’s sense of autonomy (and therefore might undermine motivation) it could also help people feel cared for and obliged to reciprocate (Zohar et al. 2015). Motivation is multi-faceted and the same organisational practice could enhance or undermine engagement and motivation, depending on how it is perceived by the individual (e.g. how significant the loss of autonomy is or how important it is for them to feel nurtured and cared for).

In relation to SCB, the survey indicated that more engaged workers (who may experience identified and integrated regulation and intrinsic motivation) could help and challenge others, while involved workers (who might be externally motivated or experience introjected or identified regulation) might be more likely only to challenge. This conflicts with Conchie (2013) who found that challenge behaviours require higher levels of intrinsic motivation, while helping behaviour did not rely on intrinsic motivation. Conchie’s (2013) study was undertaken in the male-dominated construction industry, in which challenging others could carry more personal risk and could be contrary to the norms of industry (e.g. appearing to criticise another craftsperson) and would require greater motivation. “Helping” behaviours may, in contrast, be a core role requirement or norm for people working in teams and require little motivation. Marköczy et al. (2009) propose that simply avoiding causing harm and displaying ‘forbearance’ typically requires less effort than more proactive behaviour.

Conchie did not comment on culture and gender norms in her research. A study by Törner and Pousette (2009), using grounded theory, highlighted the significance of collective culture and values in influencing safety-performance.
6.1.5 Meeting the basic and higher needs of workers

Throughout this focussed literature review, the concept of needs fulfilment kept emerging. The concept of needs fulfilment was central to Kahn’s (1990: 703-704) original conceptualisation of engagement. He referred to Maslow, amongst others, when formulating his theory that engagement depended on people finding work meaningful and safe and being ‘available’ (having the mental and physical resources to work). From Kahn’s perspective this helped to satisfy personal and existential needs and allowed people to apply themselves cognitively, emotionally and physically to their work role. Schaufeli (2014) therefore describes Kahn’s theory as the needs-satisfying approach for explaining engagement.

It is possible to interpret all the antecedents of engagement as fulfilling needs. The initial literature review suggested that this starts with putting a “basic foundation” in place by meeting basic human/psychological needs which stimulates engagement by providing motivation and energy (Van den Broeck et al. 2008, Wollard and Shuck 2011). Shuck and Herd (2012: 264) highlight the importance of first attending to “lower order hygiene needs before using intrinsic motivation factors to develop satisfaction”. They note that this directly parallels Maslow’s (1970) motivation theory and reference earlier work by Herzberg (1968).

A number of engagement-related studies use Self Determination Theory (SDT) to understand why people become engaged (e.g. Albrecht 2015, Jang et al. 2016). SDT suggests that humans have intrinsic needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness (Ryan and Deci 2000). Deci and Ryan (2008) and Jang et al. (2009) argue that these needs are universal and apply across cultures. Shuck et al. (2015: 12) found that
“looking at a person’s basic psychological needs (theoretically operationalized through SDT…) was an appropriate framework for capturing some of the underlying psychological structures of engagement.”

SDT sees meeting basic needs as important insofar as they influence whether people can fulfil needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness (Rasskazova et al. 2016). Rasskazova et al. (2016) found the three psychological needs identified in SDT had simultaneous main effects on people’s sense of wellbeing, work engagement and intrinsic motivation. These outcomes were enhanced by, but not dependent on, satisfying low-level needs.

Drawing on the work of Kahn (2010), Shuck and Herd (2012: 164) propose that engagement is promoted by meeting ‘higher order needs’ which consist of “perceived importance of contribution, personal growth, meaning, validation, respect, collaborative environments”. Therefore, meeting higher needs may consist, in part, of providing satisfying, meaningful work which gives a sense of fulfilment (Kahn 1990, Saks 2006, Macey and Schneider 2009, Bhuvanaiah and Raya 2015). When participating in organisational roles which meets their own needs, a worker will experience heightened organizational-based self-esteem (OBSE) which promotes engagement (Xanthopoulou et al. 2007).

Sousa et al. (2012) suggest that people may place different levels of emphasis on different needs due to their personal values. Someone who values self-enhancement, for example, may prefer roles or tasks offering more autonomy.
Needs fulfilment and having shared values may be two components of achieving congruence between a worker and their workplace (Hoffman et al. 2011). The duel importance of fulfilling needs and aligning values (as well as beliefs/norms) was highlighted by research on safety behaviours amongst Scandinavian construction workers (Andersen et al. 2015). Using social identity theory as a theoretical foundation, the research revealed that group identity manifested as shared norms and goals. Safety rules, and/or the way they are imposed, were often perceived to make it harder to achieve goals and challenged both the group’s and individual worker’s identity. This is illustrated by one quote in particular (Andersen et al. 2015: pg. 647):

_There was a ladder standing up against a wall, and we were told by [site managers] that we had to lay the ladder on the ground, as somebody could come and climb up and fall down on the other side._

_When they say this, they might as well say, ‘You have a low IQ.’_

_We’re not children!_

This seems a valid criticism and may have frustrated the workers’ needs to feel valued and trusted or, from a SDT perspective, to have a sense of autonomy and mastery. The research found that the group described managers as if they were a different social group/an out-group characterised by being ridiculous, arrogant and out of touch with reality. From the viewpoint of SIT this helps reinforce the value of membership of their own group. Rule-breaking actually became a group norm to protect its goals and sense of identity. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) and Haivas et al. (2014) suggest that satisfying socio-emotional needs leads to organisational identification as an act of reciprocation. In other words, managing safety in a way which undermines workers
needs may prevent them from identifying with site managers and they are unlikely to internalise their beliefs and values, fuelling a downward spiral.

Leaders will, this suggests, need to be aware of possible tensions between safety rules and group goals and may perhaps help to align them (e.g. by helping workers identify the personal benefits of some rules). This is broadly consistent with transformational leadership. Transformational leaders, for example, influence followers to focus on goals by appealing to their own higher order needs such as the need for achievement or a sense of affiliation (Bass 1998, Bass and Riggio 2006). Responding to individual needs, which correlates with the ‘individualised consideration’ quality of a transformational leader (Bass and Riggio 2006), relies on leaders’ ability to understand and be concerned by workers’ needs. In support of this premise, Emotional Intelligence (EI) is positively correlated with transformational leadership (Spano-Szekely et al. 2016). It is perhaps encouraging to know that transformational leadership skills can be taught and developed through coaching (Schmitt et al. 2016).

Hetland et al. (2015) and Kovjanic et al. (2013) found transformational leadership is positively associated with all three dimensions of needs fulfilment in SDT. Shuck and Herd (2012) linked transformational leadership and needs fulfilment with engagement. However, they argued that transactional management techniques provide a foundation for engagement by clarifying role expectations and ensuring adequate resources are available. It appears to be crucial to understand the qualities of effective leadership and this will be the subject of the next chapter of this research.
6.1.6 Individual Factors influencing engagement

Although ‘individual factors’ did not emerge as a theme during the survey, this chapter revealed that “employees are uniquely different” (Shuck et al. 2011: 318) with different values, specific needs and how self-efficacious they feel in different contexts.

Haivas et al. (2014: 326) summarised this as “what motivates you doesn’t motivate me”. Different groupings of volunteer workers experienced different motivations depending on their needs. For example, workers with a higher relatedness need had higher levels of extrinsic motivation: they were more concerned by the response of others. Some individuals are more closely attached to their beliefs, and can react negatively towards people who hold different beliefs (Maxwell-Smith et al. 2015).

Individual traits influence engagement including positive affect (a tendency to experience enthusiasm), extraversion, proactive personality and conscientiousness (Macey and Schneider 2008, Handa and Gulati 2014, Yang et al. 2017).

Contradicting the importance of personality traits, one study found “that emotionally intelligent employees are more likely to be engaged at work regardless of age, gender, and Big Five and [Hogan Personality Inventory] profiles” (Akhtar et al. 2015: 48).

Some individuals feel a heightened need to reciprocate perceived obligations leading to a “reciprocation spiral” with leaders and peers (Delobbe et al. 2016). Cropanzano et al. (2017) likewise found that individuals can have different levels of commitment to the reciprocity norm and could be inclined to reciprocate by actively doing something to benefit the other party or avoiding harming them (mirroring the finding of Markóczy
et al. 2009). This mirrors the findings that SCB is not a unitary constructive and can be protective or promotive in nature (Conchie 2013). Promotive behaviours may need higher levels of effort and motivation (Marköczy et al. 2009).

Emotional intelligence (EI), or being able to regulate one-self, be less impulsive and build positive relationships, is a positive predictor of engagement (Malinowski and Lim 2015, Maguire et al. 2016). Christian et al. (2011) suggests that this self-control leads to a sense of agency and promotes engagement. EI and self-efficacy therefore appear to be related. EI has also been linked to citizenship behaviour (Yadav and Punia 2016) which may be because of associations between EI and empathy (Megreya 2015). It is feasible that higher levels of empathy will be associated with higher levels of motivation to prevent harm or take protective measures.

In summary, there is plentiful evidence regarding the impact of individual traits on engagement and behaviour. “Some employees by nature may be engaged on their own without any leadership direction at all” (Shuck and Herd 2012: 173). Presumably, the converse may be true and some individuals could be difficult to engage.

It appears incredibly difficult to reliably measure engagement when faced with such confounding variables, or to account for sample bias. For example, some organisations may select or retain staff with particular traits that are not representative of the wider population. This is further complicated by the fact that work engagement and proactivity can vary within individuals in short periods of time (Schmitt et al. 2016).
Objective 2 of this research required an investigation of the significance of role definition for engagement. Survey responses referred to individuals taking on new safety roles or altering existing roles to encompass safety responsibilities such as:

Volunteering for key roles re: risk assessors/fire wardens/first aid.
Train new or redeployed staff, maybe not in a formal way.

One survey response suggested that managers might consciously allocate health and safety roles and responsibilities to workers:

Give workers resources, roles and responsibilities (and associated targets/goals) relating to health and safety.

Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement drew on role theory which postulates that behaviour is regulated by how people perceive that someone is expected to behave in a role, such as manager, worker or spouse (Fellows and Kahn 2013). Kahn (1990: 700) envisaged engagement as the result of a worker being able to express their ‘preferred self’ through their role performance. ‘Preferred self’ is described as their “real identity, thoughts and feelings” (Kahn 1990: 700) and may be seen as the core beliefs, values and norms which someone has incorporated into their sense of self.

Saks (2006: 602), following in Kahn’s (1990) footsteps, stated that engagement consisted of “cognitive, emotional and behavioural components that are associated with individual role performance”. Performing a role might help meet someone’s needs, such as for self-esteem (Xanthopoulou et al. 2007, Bakker 2011, Fellows and Kahn 2013).
Role making is a dynamic process with actors formally and informally negotiating expectations of how a role should be performed, leading them to revise their ‘scripts’ (Fellows and Kahn 2013). Over time, trust, respect and obligations develop leading to a high quality relationship which Matta et al. (2015) call a “role-making process”.

Role crafting or making are similar to the notion of engaged workers broadening, expanding or re-defining role definitions (Bakker and Demerouti 2008, Rich et al. 2010, Bakker 2011). In the case of safety, it has been proposed that this process leads to SCB (Hofmann et al. 2003, Chmiel et al. 2017). Chmiel et al. (2017) make an intuitive observation that offering increased job control, or autonomy, gives workers the space to expand or re-define their roles. In contrast, tightly regulating performance will give them little opportunity to broaden their role. Role-broadening can be a mechanism for meeting a felt need to maintain balance in a social exchange (Ilies et al. 2007).

Fellows and Kahn (2013) propose that roles are constructed from normative expectations. People performing roles in different ways in part, norm theory suggests, because of different perceptions of what attitudes and behaviours are normal (Smith and Terry 2013). Norms can be seen as the ‘script’ for performing a role (Smith and Terry 2013). People do not approach similar roles (e.g. parenthood, being a worker or spouse etc.) in the same way as they have different scripts. Role theory and norm theory therefore need to be looked at in tandem. The influence of norms featured strongly in the research of Andersen et al. (2015) who found that a group held norms that encouraged anti-management and anti-safety behaviour (such as rule breaking or describing managers and safety in negative ways).
Social norms influence safety behaviours. Using the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen 1991), Goh and Sa’adon (2015), found that subjective norms, of co-workers and supervisors, were the key factor influencing whether a worker displayed specific safety behaviours. Choi et al. (2017) identified that construction workers’ behaviours were more strongly (and negatively) influenced by group norms than management norms. Drawing on social identity theory (SIT) they infer that membership of a specific group of workers is more emotionally significant to workers than a ‘project identity’ (and associated norms) promoted by site managers. SIT posits that workers who identify with a group internalise and conform to norms associated with a prototypical group member then invest resources in tasks that benefit the group (Farrell and Oczkowski 2012). Andersen et al. (2018) confirmed that workgroup identity was stronger for workers than site identity and, in conjunction with workers’ perception of workgroup safety norms, had a significant association with self-reported accidents.

There are debates about the influence that social norms exert on behaviour, particularly as the strength of normative messages diminishes when descriptive and injunctive norms are in conflict (Hamann et al. 2015). Schultz et al. (2016) and Doran and Larsen (2016) found that people with strong, personal norms are largely unaffected by normative messages. Personal norms are private ethical or moral norms, arising from internalised values (Cialdini et al. 1991), which may be experienced as a sense of personal responsibility to perform a behaviour (Doran and Larsen 2016, Belanche et al. 2017, Landon et al. 2017). Personal norms may be connected to a person’s sense of identity (Belanche et al. 2017) and influence behaviour through a person’s anticipated emotions, such as shame or pride (Rezvani et al. 2017). This correlates with social cognitive theory and Bandura’s (2001) notion of behaviour being shaped by personal standards and anticipated self-evaluations.
Smith and Terry (2013: 3) suggest that some personal norms are chronically salient “shaping and guiding behavior in multiple contexts”. This was perhaps illustrated in the survey which revealed perceptions that engaged workers would reliably display safety behaviours at home or outside their own work area.

6.1.7.1 Activation of norms and roles

The perception, from the survey, that people can respond differently to similar hazards in different contexts (e.g. at home or outside their own work areas) is interesting. According to norm-activation theory (Schwartz 1977), norms can be ‘activated’ by a particular context (Smith and Terry 2013: 3):

Coworker norms will be more important in determining workplace behavior while family norms will be more important in determining dinner-table behavior.

Kines and Pedersen (2011: 2-3) capture some sense of pro-safety norms being becoming more or less salient in different contexts when they state that “while safety values are seen as independent of context…safety motivation involves a situational judgement.” Activation can also occur if there is a threat to something that the person values (Belanche et al. 2017). In this case, activation depends on a person being aware of a threat (i.e. potential consequences) and feeling personal responsibility (Landon et al. 2017). Efforts to change behaviour might target both awareness and felt-responsibility, to strengthen personal norms (Doran and Larsen 2016).
However, why would someone not be motivated to wear protective equipment at home? Surely a vaguely similar hazard should present the same sense of threat and activate the same norm?

Self-categorisation theory, which was developed by Turner et al. (1987) as an extension to social identity theory, offers an answer. Not only are norms activated, but so too are identities (which can be seen as being synonymous with roles (Stets and Burke 2000)). When a salient role or social identity is ‘activated’, a person stops seeing themselves as a unique individual and adopts the stereotypical identity, including beliefs, behaviours, norms and needs, that they associate with a prototypical member of that social category (Brown and Turner 1981, Haslam et al. 2011, Rees et al. 2015,).

People will self-categorise, or identify with groups, depending on which identities are perceived to best serve their current, salient goals and needs (Turner et al. 1994, Stets and Burke 2000, Crawford and Salaman 2012). Some individuals have needs and goals which are relatively stable and ‘chronic’ in nature while others may be transitory (Crawford and Salaman 2012).

The researcher illustrated the concept of role activation in his description (Bell et al. 2016) describing how his wife attended to an elderly woman who had fallen in the street. The theory that has emerged since then would suggest that the event had ‘activated’ his wife’s role as a nurse and pertinent norms associated with that role.

In summary, people have different perceptions of how they should perform a role, and the norms that they attach to a role or identity will be shaped by a mixture of perceived social and personal expectations and standards. A person’s motivation to perform a role and attach particular norms to that role (and conform to those norms) is determined
by the extent to which they believe the role/norms meet their needs. This may include basic or higher needs, such as a need for social or self-approval or to find meaning in their work. Depending on the context, which will relate to their perceptions of the situation, their needs at the time and, as a result, which role is active, some norms will be activated and feel more salient. When norms are derived from someone’s sense of identity, values and beliefs (or personal standards) they may be chronically salient and influence multiple role definitions.

The question this leaves for this research is whether and how a process of engagement can encourage people to attach pro-safety norms to particular roles and encourage people to internalise beliefs and values that would allow them to perceive that pro-safety norms meet their own needs.

6.2 Axial Coding and Discussion

The first literature review revealed the following axial codes in relation to how a worker is engaged (i.e. the organisational antecedents of engagement): foundation, transformational leadership, caring for workers and feeling valued.

Further open codes arose during the survey which illustrated what these antecedents might look like in practice. For example, the survey generated an open code ‘eliciting and acting on worker’s ideas/concerns’ which gives the impression of managers ‘caring for workers’ and may lead to workers ‘feeling valued’. Likewise, the survey and second literature review supported the contention that aspects of transformational leadership, such as walking the walk and tailoring communication to suit the workers, are
associated with engagement. It also highlighted other leadership qualities which might support the development of engagement such as emotional intelligence.

There were, however, significant new insights and new axial codes.

The initial theory suggested that engagement relies on workers feeling valued and cared for. Meeting the needs of workers emerged as an axial code which encompasses feeling valued and care for.

Another new axial code, roles and norms, seems intertwined with the concept of needs fulfilment. Kahn (1990), and subsequent researchers such as Saks (2006) and Bakker (2011), envisage people engaging with role performances. People may “believe they can satisfy their needs by participating in roles within the organization” (Bakker 2011: 267). The emerging theory is that a worker’s level of engagement with a role reflects the extent to which they perceive that the role performance will meet their needs.

The initial theory is too simplistic for three principal reasons. Firstly, due to confusion in the literature, it was unclear about what being engaged actually meant. A revised definition of engagement is emerging (described later).

Secondly, the initial theory seemed to envisage that workers either were or were not engaged. The words used in the survey to describe engaged workers covered a broad range of thoughts, feelings and behaviours and seems to confirm that people experience what Bailey et al. (2017: 47) refer to as “levels of engagement”.
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Thirdly, the survey showed that distinguishing involvement and engagement was not helpful. It is now apparent that different approaches for involving workers can be more or less engaging. Workers who are involved are likely to be, to varying extents, engaged. It is therefore of little surprise that there are overlaps in the perceived behaviours of involved and engaged workers. Contrary to the assumptions arising from the first literature review, the survey suggested that involved workers may display behaviours that would be considered by Hofmann et al. (2003) to be proactive safety citizenship behaviour, including volunteering for safety roles or advising others. They were described as willing to learn and share ‘viable’ ideas about safety.

However, there were differences in perceptions of involved and engaged workers. Engaged workers were described as highly motivated: “striving to perform work to the highest possible health and safety standards” and “evangelist”. Their motivation may possibly arise from an understanding of the benefits of safety behaviours or rules (“thinking about safety”) or out of a sense of caring for others. In contrast, while involved workers were described as motivated they were said to be “participating in something but not necessarily having ‘buy in’” or having context-specific commitment. Their motivation was sometimes presented as arising from fear or threats. This gave rise to a new axial code ‘rule- vs knowledge/value-based behaviour’.

The survey participants attributed different types of behaviours to engaged and involved workers. Engaged workers were described as displaying more expansive, discretionary behaviours such as informally training/assisting others (not just challenging/advising). These safety behaviours appear to be more promotive in nature (as described by Conchie 2013), rather than being ‘protective’ (trying to prevent harm).
The second literature review revealed a breadth of individual factors that could influence a person’s level of engagement. ‘Individual factors’ is a new axial code.

6.3 Selective Coding

Following axial coding, the next stage of grounded theory is selective coding. Each category is taken in turn to examine how it relates to the other categories. In this way, it is possible to identify the central category on which a theory can hinge.

Meeting the needs of workers emerged as both a new axial code and the core category. Almost all the other axial codes can be seen in terms of helping fulfil the needs of workers (feeling cared for and valued, perceiving that values are shared, having a good work life, experiencing transformational leadership).

The new axial codes that emerged from the survey and second literature review were: motivation, self-efficacy, individual factors and rule- vs knowledge/value-based behaviour. Rather than describing organisational antecedents of engagement, the first three describe the internal processes/qualities of a worker and the last describes the outcome. Another new axial code, roles and norms, emerged and describes how an interplay between external role expectations and a person’s own expectations and identity influence their role definitions (in terms of the norms attached to those roles).

6.3.1 The current definition of engagement

The following definition of engagement has emerged from the theories:
Engagement is a psychosocial process. It starts with an organisation or manager seeking to meet the worker’s needs, to increase the worker’s emotional, cognitive and physical resources, with a view to improving their effectiveness in one or more roles. A person’s perception of how those roles should be performed (i.e. which norms are held by a prototypical role performer) comes from an interplay of personal and social standards and expectations.

A worker’s level of engagement in a role can be defined as their level of motivation and self-efficacy to invest their resources in performing the role (by enacting the prototypical norms) and/or expanding the role by attaching new norms to it. The motivation to adopt or expand particular roles or enact particular norms comes from a worker’s perception (or ‘outcome expectations’) that doing so will meet their own needs or the needs of a salient group.

An illustrative anecdote

After delivering a conference speech I spoke with another presenter, a middle aged man, about his experience of being an academic. He had flown to the UK from Australia to present and had evidently invested tremendous amounts of emotional, cognitive and physical energies into undertaking and sharing his research.

He spoke vociferously about the amount of administration he needed to do. To paraphrase, he said “I’m paid to think, not do paperwork”. He appeared to have a fixed view of the norms attached to the role of a prototypical academic and these did not include administrative tasks. My perception was administrative work did not serve his own needs, and were a barrier to tasks that were more consistent with his self-identity and
helped him fulfil higher order needs. A manager might explain the benefits of academics completing administrative work, but this person might still resist completing it.

I suspected that this academic would be quite selective about how he invests his resources at work and the more that administrative tasks were forcibly inserted into his role as academic, the less engaged he would feel overall in performing that role (or even in his roles as a subordinate of a particular manager or member of a department).

6.3.2 What is the relevance to safety?

An important revelation is that there seems no need to introduce a concept such as ‘safety-specific engagement practices’. The process for engaging workers appears the same regardless of what specific improvements the organisation is pursuing.

Another important realisation is that ‘safety citizenship behaviour’ is no longer a useful concept. The emerging evidence is that people can take a wide range of protective and promotive actions due to a plethora of extrinsic or more intrinsic motivations.

From the perspective of Safety II, meeting people’s needs, and removing barriers and frustrations, equips them with the physical, emotional and cognitive resources to perform their work roles. The new safety paradigms assume that people are motivated to satisfactorily complete their work on time, be seen as having done a good job and get paid. Andersen et al. (2015) describe construction workers who have these motivations despite being resistant to the idea of health and safety. When workers invest their resources in performing work roles, they will have increased attention to detail, alertness to problems and glitches and be more actively involved in problem-
solving. They are, as a natural consequence, more likely to work safely. This is borne out in part by the research of Wachter and Yorio (2014).

Therefore, it seems a valid pursuit of the health and safety profession to work with managers to help them understand and meet the needs of workers. Indeed, Mearns and Reader (2008) and Mearns et al. (2010) found that investing in workforce health improved safety standards, and in particular safety citizenship behaviour. They use social exchange theory to explain this finding (i.e. workers were reciprocating by performing SCB). Enhancing workers’ resources may also be a worthwhile goal under a ‘wellbeing’ agenda. Indeed, engagement and wellbeing are sometimes seen to develop in tandem (Rasskazova et al. 2016) and engagement has been described as an antecedent of wellbeing (BPS 2017).

Engaged workers were described in the survey as displaying more promotive behaviours or investing more resources into enacting pro-safety norms (such as supporting or training colleagues rather than challenging or advising them or dealing with hazards rather than just reporting them). A further insight was that people might only display protective behaviours in certain contexts, or while occupying specific roles, as exemplified in this quote from the survey:

> An involved worker will display ownership behaviours for their immediate area....Make sure that all PPE is being worn, all LEVs are being used, all procedures followed for that particular task but probably would not continue this behaviour through other parts of the building.
The emerging theory offers possible explanations. The person is enacting pro-safety norms which they attach to a particular role while they are occupying that role. Those same pro-safety norms may not be perceived as prototypical norms in other roles or, even if they are, these norms might not meet the person’s needs at that time so are not enacted.

Organisations may respond with a Safety I approach and seek to enforce and monitor desired, pro-safety behaviours. They could take a Safety II approach and seek to increase people’s resources to cope with the real demands of their own work, making it less likely that problems will escalate into significant hazards. While proponents of Safety II states that people are not motivated to harm themselves or others, this does not mean that they will take action to protect others or promote the safety effort. Therefore, an organisation might seek to promote ‘engagement in safety’ which is defined below:

The more that a worker is ‘engaged in safety’, the more motivated and confident they are to invest their emotional, cognitive and physical resources in either;

- Conforming to ‘pro-safety’ norms that they associate with prototypical role performance and/or;
- Pro-actively attaching (and acting on) norms, including pro-safety norms, to roles they occupy, which go beyond prototypical role expectations.

This motivation will depend on;

- Their beliefs and values associated with the pro-safety norm (e.g. their perception of the benefits of enacting the norm, including the extent to which they anticipate it will help them to meet their own needs), and/or;
The value they place on the role to which the norm is attached (e.g. enacting a pro-safety norm simply because they believe it is part of a role that they are motivated to perform).

Therefore, if someone is disengaged in their work role(s), they are likely to invest limited resources in enacting associated norms or expanding role definitions. This means that any pro-safety norms associated with that role may also not be activated/enacted or may be enacted with minimal effort.

A worker who is more engaged will also have greater cognitive and emotional resources with which to notice, evaluate and respond to the perceived demands and risks of their work or working environment.

Pro-safety norms prompt preventive and/or promotive behaviours (which prevent harm or improve standards of health and safety, respectively). Higher levels of engagement are usually required to encourage promotive behaviours.

Engagement in safety relies on individuals having the self-efficacy to enact pro-safety norms, which means having the ability and resources to act on the norm and their ability to predict the personal and social consequences.

If safety motivation is derived from underlying, personal, pro-safety beliefs and values, it is likely that pro-safety norms will be attached to a wider range of roles, and be activated more consistently, even in the face of competing demands.
Pro-safety norms can be expressed in a wide range of behaviours and may not be limited to defined sets of behaviours prescribed by the organisation.

One survey response offered this definition of involved workers’ behaviour:

’Doing it’ because you have to as opposed to ‘doing it’ because you want to.

A very succinct summary of the behaviour of someone engaged in safety could be:

’Doing it’ because they want to as opposed to ‘doing it’ because they have to.

6.3.3 Implications for practice: Comparing safety climate with engagement with safety

Zohar (1980: 101) defined safety climate as “a unified set of cognitions (held by workers) regarding the safety aspects of their organisation”. This perception has largely remained unchanged in intervening years (Johnson 2007). These cognitions relate to multiple features of the organisation such as policies and practices and how they interact with one another, such as a perception of conflict between productivity and safety objectives (Zohar 2010). Zohar (2010: 1518) makes the link between safety climate, employee perception and role performance:

From an employee standpoint, it is the overall pattern and signals sent by this complex web of rules and policies across competing domains that ultimately must be sorted out in order to discern what role behavior is expected, rewarded and supported.
From the perspective of the emerging theory, the safety climate signals what norms should be attached to particular roles.

There are multiple tools for measuring safety climate, as revealed by a HSE Research Report (Human Engineering 2005). Another HSE research report, OTO 1999/063 (Davies et al. 2001) sought to create a common question set extracted from the available climate survey tools at that time (Davies et al. 2001). This led to a 114-item questionnaire set divided into 11 sections. Appendix 5 compares and contrasts measures of safety climate with the emerging theory and definition of engagement.

OTO 1999/063, and by extension a range of extant safety climate tools, differ significantly from the emerging theory about engagement in safety.

Safety climate tools shed light on the behaviours that workers think they do or should perform (based on their perception of the behaviours, priorities and norms of co-workers and managers). The concept of group-level safety climates, and their difference from and interaction with organisational or managerial safety climates, has been investigated by Zohar (2000, 2008), Zohar and Luria (2005) and Kapp (2012).

However, safety climate and social identity research has typically occurred in silos (Andersen et al. 2018). The safety climate of the workgroup has been found to have a stronger effect on the safety behaviours of workers than the climate of supervisors or the organisations (Clarke 2006, Brondino et al. 2012). The reason may be that workers identify more with their workgroup (Andresen et al. 2018) and membership of their workgroup is more emotionally significant to the workers than membership of an organisation (Clarke 2006). However, whether or not a worker is influenced by those
perceived norms depends in part on their perception of the team: a co-operative, friendly workgroup will create a “strong normative climate” (Törner 2011: 1264). When safety climate tools only measure perceived safety norms of co-workers etc., and not the workers’ perception of these other actors, they are only telling half the story.

The questions contained in OTO 1999/063 do not explore safety-related motivation nor beliefs underpinning safety behaviours. Fleming (2012) illustrated that this can be done through questions, using the levels of motivation from self-determination theory, which explore the underlying rationale/motivation for different types of safety-related behaviours. Without motivational questions it is uncertain whether norms will actually be enacted or behaviours will be sustained (e.g. in the absence of external motivation).

Safety climate tools seek to assess an employee’s perception of “the overall pattern and signals sent by this complex web of rules and policies” (Zohar 2010: 1518). Human Engineering (2005: vi) propose that questionnaires, in isolation, are poorly suited to investigate safety climate as they “tell us rather less about why, and in what way, variables impact upon the decision making and behaviour of operational staff.”

Open questions could be much more useful tools for exploring what are likely to be very subjective, contextual and nuanced topics. The Loughborough University (undated) Safety Climate Assessment Toolkit was one of the climate tools reviewed in RR 367 and the question set was included in OTO 1999/063. It employs a mixed methods approach to assessing safety climate using a questionnaire, interviews and focus groups (a similar approach to that adopted to this study).
The key element of the emerging theory revolves around meeting the needs of workers. To some extent, safety climate tools measure what socio-emotional resources workers have by asking questions about job security and satisfaction. However, they do not explicitly investigate any other aspects of needs-fulfilment.

6.3.4 Implications for practice: A new approach for safety conversations

Asking people to change behaviours can be reframed as asking them to alter or expand role definitions and invest additional resources into role performance. The emerging theory suggests that practitioners need to understand people’s perceptions of their work roles, and the motivation and resources they possess to perform those role(s) before investigating what safety-related norms they attach to their roles, and whether they see these norms as core role requirements or something ‘extra’. Revealing the workers’ rationale for those norms, and the resources they possess to enact those norms, will shed light on the worker's pro-safety beliefs and their level of motivation and self-efficacy to adopt and enact pro-safety norms. Tailored interventions could then be devised to address any shortfalls. This approach will be termed ‘person-centred safety’. The concept of ‘person-centric’ safety knowledge was introduced by Gibbs et al. (2016). The term reflects the idea of engagement as being ‘worker-centric’ and revolves around individual perceptions and needs.

This proposed approach is informed by the principles and values underpinning positive psychology. It differs from Safety II as it assumes that psychosocial processes are important and drive how people behave. Safety is more than giving people adequate resources, removing obstacles and trusting them to use their best judgement.
The Institution of Occupational Safety and Health has produced guidance, drawing on Whitmore’s GROW (Goal-Reality-Options-Wrap-up) coaching model, called “coaching to engage” (IOSH 2017). This is based on active listening skills, and a belief in the agency and capability of coachees. Person-centred safety could utilise these skills in a focussed way to explore, and perhaps influence, workers’ engagement in safety.

A simple guide to the theory is provided as an appendix along with a structure for a person-centred safety intervention.

### 6.4 Reflection

A number of initial codes and theories, arising from the first literature review, have been challenged and refined or abandoned as a result of the survey and a re-interrogation of the literature (a process known in grounded theory as constant comparative analysis). Identifying needs fulfilment as the core, selective code has opened up new avenues for interpreting behaviour.

Self-determination theory, role theory, norms theory and social cognitive theory have joined social exchange theory, social identification theory and the job demands-resources model to form a novel, theoretical bedrock for explaining engagement and has led to a new, working definition of engagement.

Worker involvement emerged as an important antecedent of engagement due to the psychosocial processes that are fuelled by the two-way flow of information and ideas. It appears, therefore, that workers who are involved are likely to experience some level
of engagement. However, workers may need some level of engagement and cognitive, emotional and physical resources in order to participate in involvement opportunities. The research is also pointing at the critical importance of leadership practices, particularly transformational leadership, in promoting engagement.

A critical revelation is that in order to understand and improve engagement in safety an organisation first needs to understand how to engage workers. If a worker is disengaged, they are likely to have little motivation or resources to invest in anything other than their own most immediate needs and core role demands. It is likely that a whole swathe of organisational needs, goals and objectives would suffer.

At this stage, this research needs to understand how, practically, an organisation can secure worker engagement by focussing on a small number of important and ‘tangible’ antecedents. The next stage of research will therefore to investigate in more depth how else an organisation might involve workers and what good and bad leadership practices look like from the perspective of members of the health and safety profession.

In the spirit of reflexivity, the researcher recognised that ‘letting go’ of the concept of safety citizenship behaviour was very difficult as a tremendous amount of effort had been expended trying to understand the concept. It had almost become, in the researcher’s mind, an idealised vision of safety behaviour. The emerging evidence could not justify compartmentation of ‘positive’ safety behaviours into rules compliance and more promotive behaviours. Firstly, the new safety paradigms make clear that compliance should not be conflated with working safely. Secondly, the evidence is suggesting that workers with different levels of engagement may invest effort into safe working practices and more promotive behaviours for a range of different reasons.
Describing behaviours as being protective and promotive has provided a much more useful model for describing the safety-related behaviours of workers. However, one of the key findings arising from the survey are the subtle differences in the type of behaviours that workers may display depending on their level of engagement in safety.

6.5 A new, working theoretical model of engagement in safety

In line with the researcher’s critical realist ontology (which focusses on causal factors), an input-process-output model will be adopted to provide a structure for the new theoretical model. The input-process-output model was used by Filsecker and Kerres (2014) to investigate engagement and by Madrid et al. (2016) to explore the impact of leadership qualities (input) on actions by workers (process) and results (output).

The current, theoretical model, which will need to be challenged and refined by the ongoing research, will be called “The 8 Lane Model of Worker Engagement”. Each lane is based on one or more axial codes that have emerged from the research. The lanes should be seen as a sliding scale with more engaging practices or qualities to the right. The more scales that are to right, and the further to the right they are, the more engaged a worker is likely to be.

The starting lane is the axial code called ‘basic foundation’ which emerged from the first literature review and was supported by the findings of the survey. Like the starting lane on a running track, it provides a sound foundation for engagement. It seems possible for individuals to be engaged without those foundations, but engagement is anticipated to be more certain, rapid and stronger with those foundations in place.
Figure 6: The 8 Lane Model of Engaging Workers in Safety

| Foundations: Feeling safe, reasonable work conditions, job security, having goals and feedback, having adequate resources to... | Low | Needs fulfilment: The more that a worker’s basic and higher needs are met (including feeling valued and cared for), the more cognitive, emotional and physical resources they have to invest in their role, being attentive to their working environment and considering or adhering to safety norms. This influences wellbeing (the more a worker’s needs are met the happier and healthier they are likely to be). They may then identify with their managers and seek to ‘repay’ them. |
| Leadership Style: Transformational leaders are better at helping meet workers’ needs. Their leadership style will also influence the involvement strategies that they use (shown in the lane below). This lane includes the emotional intelligence of the leader and the extent to which they genuinely display the value of safety. |
| Low | High |
| Inputs | Low | High |
| Trans-lational | Informing Workers | Worker Consultation | Worker Involvement | Worker Collaboration | Worker Empowerment |
| Low | High |
| Internal Processes | Low | High |
| Extrinsic Motivation: The more a worker believes safety norms help meet their own needs, the more motivated they will be to attach protective and/or promotive safety norms into their role(s) and act upon them. |
| Low | High |
| Intrinsic Self-Efficacy: Workers are more likely to act upon norms if they are confident in their ability to do so and can predict and value the outcome. Self-efficacy can enhance motivation and vice versa. |
| Low | High |
| Individual Factors (e.g. values, specific needs, experience and perceptions) influence the internal processes, e.g. how motivated or confident they feel, their individual needs and how they interpret and respond to different leadership styles. Some factors make individuals more likely to engage. |
| Low | High |
| Protective Worker Role/Behaviours: Workers engaged in safety will attach norms to their role(s) prompting protective and promotive behaviours. The more engaged in safety they are, the more resources they will expend on enacting those norms (and the more they will do this voluntarily) and the more promotive those behaviours are likely to be. |
| Low | High |
| Promotive Outcomes | 161 |
Chapter 7: Focus Groups – Leadership and Involvement

7.1 Aim of this study

The purpose of this current chapter is to challenge and refine the emerging theory of engagement and the assumptions about how an organisation can practically engage workers. It will focus on two key practical antecedents for engagement within the direct control of an organisation: leadership qualities and strategies for involving workers. The emerging theory suggests that it is not necessary to explore phenomena such as ‘safety-specific engagement’: the process for engaging workers is the same.

The ultimate objective of this research (objective 4) is to offer a functional theory to industry, that provides credible and practical examples and avoids inaccessible models and language (as reported by Fidderman and McDonnell (2010) and Bailey (in press)).

The reflections undertaken in Chapter 2 revealed that the author has a particular worldview which might not be universally shared. Safety practitioners may have particular values or beliefs, for example, favouring approaches that secure compliance. Schein (2010) describes his confusion when a group of managers resisted his recommendations and his realisation that he had misunderstood the culture of the company and was projecting his own beliefs and values.

For these reasons it is critical to obtain practical examples of leadership practices and worker involvement techniques from safety professionals while at the same time questioning whether these perspectives are culturally unique. This will be done through focus groups. Some of the specific questions worth exploring are:
• What are the different, practical approaches for involving workers? From the perspective of grounded theory, it is worthwhile establishing whether data saturation has been achieved in respect of how organisations can involve workers.

• The survey was self-limiting as it only asked about the behavioural outcomes of worker involvement and engagement. More open questions about the outcomes could shed light on wider benefits or even the psychosocial processes involved.

• From the perspective of safety practitioners, what does good leadership look like? How does this compare to their view of bad management?

7.2 What are focus groups?

Focus groups are a qualitative methodology for gathering data and typically involves a researcher facilitating/moderating a discussion amongst the participants about themes or a topic determined by the researcher (Plummer-D’Amato 2008, Carlsen and Glenton 2011, Duarte et al. 2015). From a constructivist perspective, humans socially construct knowledge and understanding of a phenomenon (Duarte et al. 2015). Focus groups facilitate that process by allowing people to explore ideas, experiences and perceptions about a subject using their own vocabulary (Carlsen and Glenton 2011, Plummer-D’Amato 2008, Traynor 2015). This generates data that might not have been revealed in interviews (Plummer-D’Amato 2008, Traynor 2015).

Focus groups may be used as part of a mixed methods approach and help ‘triangulate’ findings of other qualitative research (Duarte et al. 2015 Traynor 2015). Like the present study, Mearns et al. (2013) used focus groups alongside interviews to identify and validate the themes arising from a literature review and inform later studies.
7.3 Limitations of focus groups

While surveys can result in exaggerated, positive responses, focus groups can be an opportunity to complain and result in overly negative attitudes (Carlsen and Glenton 2012). A group can polarise, due to the impact of conformity and exaggeration biases, as members identify themselves with more extreme positions (Carlsen and Glenton 2012). To shed light on these biases researchers should highlight interesting discrepancies (Carlsen and Glenton 2012) for example explaining how the findings of a focus groups challenge as well as enrich the existing codes or theory. This is in line with the ‘constant comparative analysis’ of grounded theory (Mills et al. 2006a).

Contributions to focus groups have been seen as a performance, in which actors play out the perceived role of a participant, and the views expressed may not be the lasting perceptions of the subjects (Traynor 2015). Even the act of asking a group what makes a good leader is laden with presuppositions that there is a social group called ‘leaders’ who are distinguishable in some way from other social groups and that it is possible to describe those defining characteristics. This is not a threat to the validity of this research: the constructivist position of this research accepts that meaning is socially constructed, and that the researcher is part of that construction (Charmaz 2006 and 2017). The meaning attached to a phenomenon is, at that time, real.

7.4 Methodological considerations

Focus groups are compatible with grounded theory but the methodology should be transparent about how grounded theory, such as constant comparative analysis and
theoretical sampling, is actually being applied (Carlsen and Glenton 2011). Studies using focus groups should be explicit about how they determine the number and size of focus groups and how they have determined whether data saturation has been achieved (Carlsen and Glenton 2011).

There is some consensus that the numbers of participants could vary between 3 and 12, with 6 to 8 being proposed as an optimal number (Plummer-D'Amato 2008, Carlsen and Glenton 2011, Smithson et al. 2015). Regarding data saturation, it is worth reiterating that it is the purpose of the entire PhD focus groups to achieve data saturation. This stage of the research will be challenging and refining the emerging theory and codes and identify topics and themes to be explored in later studies.

It is important to acknowledge the need to balance data quality and quantity i.e. it is possible for researchers to conduct numerous focus groups to generate plentiful, rich data only to find they lack the capacity to analyse that data (Carlson and Glenton 2011). To address this, a limited number of focus groups will initially be undertaken and analysed. The benefits of conducting further focus groups will then be considered.

7.5 Methodology

7.5.1 The questions

Facilitators should ask open-ended questions, that offer some structure while facilitating a ‘natural’ discussion (Smithson et al. 2015) and the questions or topics for discussion should be informed by preceding stages of research (Duarte et al. 2015). The aims of this study were outlined earlier and were translated into four questions:
Q1. What can we do to involve workers in health and safety?
Q2. What are the benefits of worker involvement?
Q3. What are the qualities that make a bad/ineffective leader so bad?
Q4. What are the qualities that make a good leader so good?

These are fewer questions than envisaged by Plummer-D'Amato (2008). However, they directly relate to the two antecedents under investigation. It is anticipated that the researcher will ask follow up questions in response to contributions by participants.

The focus groups took the form of an interactive presentation as explained below. A copy of the presentation slides is provided in Appendix 7.

7.5.2 Participant selection

Theoretical sampling is a core element of grounded theory and requires a researcher to select participants who can shed light on emerging codes and theory (Charmaz 2006). It seems appropriate to draw the focus group participants from the same population as the survey participants who helped develop those codes and theories: health and safety professionals. This population may have common language or perceptions of leadership and worker involvement. Drawing focus group members from the same population, i.e. achieving homogeneity of focus group participants, helps facilitate an exchange of views (Plummer-D'Amato 2008, Traynor 2015).

To recruit participants, the researcher offered to deliver a presentation relating to worker engagement and safety behaviours to:

- A Masters degree course in Occupational Safety and Health, and;
A Continuous Professional Development (CPD) event for the Bristol and West Branch of the Institution of Occupational Safety and Health (IOSH).

It was explained to the facilitators of these groups that the focus group would be conducted as part of the presentation, turning the event into an interactive workshop. While the membership of these groups met the selection criteria (for the purposes of theoretical sampling), there was also a large measure of convenience guiding the selection process. These two groups were already due to convene and the researcher did not have to actively recruit participants, book or hire a venue etc. As Carlson and Glenton (2011) note, a measure of pragmatism is needed in arranging focus groups.

The first focus group was conducted with four part-time, mature students studying a Masters in Occupational Health, Safety and Well-being. They had a mix of roles. Two were in more senior positions managing health and safety within an organisation or delivering services to clients. The other two were in technical/advisory, and less senior, positions dealing with health, safety or wellbeing. Collectively, they had an average of 10 years’ experience in health and safety roles. This number of participant falls within the range recommended by Plummer-D’Amato (2008).

Masters students may not be typical health and safety professionals as they should have both practical experience (10 years on average in this group) a strong grasp of academic concepts and may question their own thinking and practice. They may offer unique insights to challenge and develop the emerging theory. There is no intention in qualitative research to claim that participants are representative of a whole community. It is their unique perspective that is valuable, not their prototypicality.
Bristol and West IOSH branch members are offered CPD events every 2 months and these are advertised via an annual flyer, mailed to all branch members, and via emails sent by IOSH head office. The attendees, who became participants in the focus group, were 39 members of IOSH and, as such, are health and safety professionals and met the theoretical sampling criteria. 31 sheets were left at the end of CPD event (the significance of this is explained below). 27 participants answered a question asking them how long they had worked in health and safety. The average was 14 years. The majority of respondents (n = 17) described themselves as Health and Safety Advisors or Managers (sometimes using slightly different terms). The remaining participants (n=14) had a mixture of roles such as trainee or consultant. This number far exceeds typical numbers of participants as recommended by Plummer-D’Amato (2008). This led to a novel approach, as explained below.

7.5.3 **Methodology for focus group 1 (Masters Students)**

1. The group was asked to individually write and then discuss as a group their answers to “what can we do to involve workers in health and safety?”
2. This was repeated with the question “what are the benefits of worker involvement?”
3. The researcher then presented a series of slides to explain the perceptions of worker involvement that had emerged and how they related to worker engagement. The group was prompted to share their opinions and ideas.
4. The group was asked to record and discuss perceptions of good and bad leaders in response to the questions: “what are the qualities that make a bad/ineffective leader so bad?” and “what are the qualities that make a good leader so good?”
5. The presentation addressed transactional and transformational leadership after which the group was asked to discuss their opinions about those theories.
This structure serves epistemological and methodological functions. This research has adopted a constructivist position in which sense-making is a shared phenomenon between researcher and participant and the researcher (Charmaz 2000, Williams and Keady 2012). The notion of a privileged researcher interpreting data divorced from the participants is the Glaserian/objectivist approach to grounded theory. Further, discussing elements of the theory with participants is a way of checking its practical adequacy, which is an important test of validity (Kempster and Parry 2011).

For a further hour, this group freely and expansively discussed the presentation and their perceptions and experiences. The researcher facilitated this discussion, using no script or structure. Individual information sheets and consent forms were provided to the participants of the first focus group, enabling an audio-recording to be made.

7.5.4 Methodology for focus group 2 (IOSH CPD attendees)

The structure was the same except that the large group was asked to work in pairs or small groups to discuss and record salient points of their discussion on an answer sheet provided at the start of the session, before verbally feeding back to the main group. Only written comments were analysed as the verbal contributions were not recorded. It was impractical to gain consent for an audio-recording from such a large group. If they consented to their written answers being used, they were asked to leave the sheet with their written responses behind. In total, 31 sheets were left.
7.5.5 Transcription

Only the first focus group was recorded (for reasons explained above). The digital, audio recording was uploaded to a secure server then deleted from the recording device in line with the ethics approval granted by Cardiff Metropolitan University. It was transcribed using voice recognition software, with participants only being referred to as one, two, three and four. Open codes were identified as the text was transcribed. On completion of the transcription, the audio recording was deleted from the server.

7.6 Findings

In line with grounded theory’s ‘constant comparative analysis’ (Mills et al. 2006a, Draucker et al. 2007) the findings will be presented in terms of the support or challenge for existing codes or details of new codes that emerged.

7.6.1 Q1: How do you involve workers in safety?

The answers to this question revealed no new codes suggesting data saturation has been achieved in relation to this specific topic. The focus group agreed with the survey that techniques include; training, induction, tool box talks, acting on workers’ ideas and involving workers in daily briefings, meetings, risk assessments and task groups.

New examples emerged, however, of involvement practices that supported and enriched existing codes. For example, the open code ‘explaining’ (which emerged from the survey) was supported by a response suggesting workers are involved by
sharing “success stories”. From the perspective of Norms Theory, these might draw attention to pro-safety descriptive norms creating a perception about what behaviour is ‘normal’ and acceptable (Smith and Terry 2013). Influencing behaviour by evoking norms in this way might lead to what Self-Determination Theory calls introjected regulation: people behave in ways that maintain or bolster self-esteem and minimise anxieties by gaining approval or avoid disapproval of others (Ryan and Deci 2000).

In contrast, other participants recorded that involving workers might revolve around pointing out what could go wrong: “Share accident history”, “Examples of accidents”, “Gory photos!”. These could be used to support a manager making rational or emotional appeals. These might promote what Ryan and Deci (2000) called ‘identified regulation’ (i.e. they might work safely due to understanding the practical benefits).

The researcher can remain alert to further specific examples that emerge of worker involvement practices, but there is no value in actively seeking further examples.

7.6.2 Q2: What are the benefits of involving workers in safety?

Responses during the focus group suggested that involving workers in safety led to improved health and safety and operational performance (or both). These are shown on the table below.

Table 8: Benefits of worker involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and safety performance</th>
<th>Operational performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowers accident rates</td>
<td>Happier workforce, more productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident reduction</td>
<td>More productive by feeling safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety performance</td>
<td>Operational performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the risks of accidents, near misses, health issues</td>
<td>Less absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction Accidents/ill health</td>
<td>Improved performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced accidents – lower costs, absences, investigations etc.</td>
<td>Less waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce lost working days</td>
<td>Better productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved safety, production, effectiveness, business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These benefits had been predicted by the initial literature review. Some answers refer to emotional and cognitive benefits (including workers feeling valued or cared for):

- Workers feel purpose, involved, worthwhile, valued.
- Happier workforce
- Confidence
- Employees feel valued
- More engaged with their job (this quote helps validate the view that involvement is an antecedent of engagement)
- Make people feel cared for
- Workers feel purpose, involved, worthwhile, valued
- Team feels needed

The responses above offer some confirmation of the supposition, arising from the second literature review, that worker involvement signals that managers value their workers. Further, it indicates that safety practitioners recognise that the consequences of worker involvement extend beyond functional benefits and into how workers think and feel. They describe the fulfilment of both basic needs (e.g. feeling cared for) and higher order needs (e.g. a sense of purpose).
This offers support for the proposal that the way an organisation involves workers in safety can help them to meet their needs. One new code emerged during the analysis of the responses to this question: workforce cohesion which is described later.

7.6.3 **Q3 and Q4: Qualities of good and bad leaders**

Questions 3 and 4 elicited a wealth of information and perceptions about what qualities defined good and bad leaders, supporting existing codes and providing new codes. These were recorded in a tabular format which is shown in appendix 8.

The table below gives an example of one code that emerged from the focus groups: empowering. The text in green came from the first focus group, the text in black from the second. The label “empowering” was drawn *in vivo*, i.e. from one of the responses, as recommended by Böhm (2004) and Willig (2013) as it shows how the theory is arising from the data and therefore offers some evidence of the validity of the research (Shenton 2004). The researcher collected other quotes under this heading that supported the sense of managers empowering/disempowering workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Qualities of bad managers</th>
<th>Qualities of good leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>“Micro-management”</td>
<td>“Empowering”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Micro-manages”</td>
<td>“Empowered you to be able to deal with things yourself”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Control-freak”</td>
<td>“Give them ownership/freedom to work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Unable to delegate”</td>
<td>“Challenged my thinking and was interested in my views”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Gives initiatives and say thank you for taking pride in their work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Be able to walk away and not worry that the jobs not being done”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Allows you to self manage”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.6.3.1 Axial coding of good leaders

In line with Grounded Theory, axial coding followed open coding. The purpose is to use abductive reasoning to cluster open codes together to identify higher order categories, known as axial codes (Bruscaglioni 2016). This gave rise to the table, below. This has been framed in terms of the qualities of good leaders. Bad leaders would display the opposite traits, behaviours and qualities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Code</th>
<th>Axial Code – The Qualities of Good Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>Available and open: The leader is physically and mentally available, listening to and taking on board other ideas. Is prepared to explain their decisions and be challenged about their own opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce cohesion</td>
<td>Workforce cohesion: Promotes and recognises team effort. The team feels needed and valued and is supported to become more competent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable/Consistent</td>
<td>Trustworthy (workers feel safe in the leader’s hands): The leader is organised, competent and consistent. They deal with staff fairly (e.g. avoids favouritism) and will not blame workers or take credit for their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>They lead by example and act in line with what they say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Flexibility: The leader has the ability to recognise and respond to the individual needs of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfish</td>
<td>Inspiring: The leader is enthusiastic, inspiring and prepared to make difficult decisions. Able to challenge workers to find solutions. Accepts personal responsibility. The leader is motivated by goals and objectives bigger than themselves or their own self-interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>Cares for, values, respects and trusts workers: The leader cares for and treats workers with respect, recognising and acknowledging their contributions. They know and treat their staff as individuals. Workers are trusted to do their job and manage themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These qualities align incredibly closely with the qualities attributed to transformational leaders. Bass et al. (2003) conceptualised transformational leaders as displaying the
four qualities of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. These terms can seem quite abstract. One benefit of the focus groups is that health and safety practitioners have described and given examples of these qualities in their own words. The coding of good leaders appears equally applicable to other models of transformational leadership that exist. For example, the concept of ‘approachability’ aligns with the quality of “Being Accessible (Accessible, approachable, in-touch)” which Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalf e (2005: 56) associate with engaging transformational leadership.

As a consequence of this exercise, there appears to be considerable support for proposing that transformational leadership is an important quality for leaders who want to secure the best performance for workers.

### 7.6.3.2 Transformational leadership versus transactional management

The first focus group was asked to discuss the relevance of transformational leadership, after the concept was explained. This revealed a perception that only professional workers can be managed using a transformational approach:

> A construction site definitely wouldn’t work with any type of transformational leadership really, I mean at a managerial, project manager type professional level fine, but probably not with scaffolders and ground workers and so on.

This perspective was challenged by another focus group participant who said:

> If you’ve got a body of people there and you invest your time in, your effort into those people as individuals and get to know them, what they
are and what they’re about then you will get engagement regardless of what level they work at. The guys working at my place at a call centre, some of them, to be quite honest who got half a brain cell from what I can see and some of them are completely inappropriate on the phone in the way they behave and often need feedback, but as long as that feedback is delivered in the right way by the right people then you will get a good days work from them…People are people, aren’t they?

Regardless of whether they’re professional or menial.

The notion of giving feedback “in the right way by the right people” is more closely aligned to the positive aspects of transactional management. However, this participant expressed the importance of getting to know and treat workers like individuals in order for them to become engaged. This is in line with the transformational quality of individualised consideration and consistent with the emerging theory about meeting individual needs. This led to the original participant stating:

I work with very professional people from an engineering background. Sometimes they prefer a more transactional approach.

This manager was recognising that staff may sometimes prefer to be managed in a particular way. The notion of being flexible in managing staff is discussed later. Other positive aspects of transactional management (monitoring performance and contingent reward) were perhaps evident in the following quote. It has been labelled ‘quote 1’ for brevity as it is discussed at several other points.
 Quote 1: if someone’s working for me and we’ve got something to deliver and they do it and they put the time in and they deliver it, if they say to me, or I’ll say to them, “take the Friday afternoon off”.

These exchanges confirmed that both transactional and transformational qualities may be used to manage staff. The solution may be to equip managers with the knowledge and confidence to know which approach will be most appropriate in which situations. For example, when assigning tasks to a new starter, it may be more appropriate to be more prescriptive when setting tasks and more detailed in the feedback. This is consistent with the proposition by Gibbs et al. (2016) that organisations might seek a third way of managing safety that consciously uses a blend of Safety I and Safety II.

7.6.4 Coding: Refining existing codes and identifying new codes

The focus groups provided support for a number of open and axial codes identified in the reviews and survey and revealed a number of new codes. When codes correlate with the findings from the literature review this will be highlighted as it serves to ‘triangulate’ the findings. Further, the focus groups provide further, practical examples from the perspective of health and safety practitioners.

7.6.4.1 Coding a short exchange

A short exchange between two participants emerged as one of the most revealing episodes of this chapter and is recorded below, illustrating how coding was performed. It also illustrates how focus group participants can ‘bounce’ ideas off one another.
Table 11: Coding of a short exchange about participant’s approach to leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Theme/Open Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Richard Branson has recently introduced no set annual leave hasn’t he? I’m so interested to see how that turns out. No set hours, I think that’s a great idea if I ran my own company I’d have no set hours, no set annual leave, I’d just purely be looking at results.</td>
<td>New code: Organisational policies, procedures and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>My brother said about that, there’s big companies in America where there is no annual leave and what actually happens is that basically they say to you “we don’t give you annual leave but we needed to get this job done and provided you get that job done you can have as much time off as you want”. People actively love what they do and they come in and they work over their hours and do a fantastic job and they have the time off because they know that they can relax in that time off.</td>
<td>Autonomy &amp; empowerment: Giving people control and flexibility over their working arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>I actually, you know, if someone’s working for me and we’ve got something to deliver and they do it and they put the time in and they deliver it, if they say to me, or I’ll say to them, “take the Friday afternoon off”. I’ll do that, I’m not allowed to. You know, my line manager will say to me “I don’t want a culture where everyone disappears on Friday afternoon”, and I’ll say “oh no, no, no, that’s definitely not for me” but I don’t care: If they’ve done what they need to do to a high standard, we’ve made an impression on the business, the job’s made money who cares if they have a Friday afternoon off?</td>
<td>Managers recognising performance. Contingent reward/reciprocation by manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>but then you get back from them, if you do that, if you give them that then they will work harder for you next time and that’s what a lot of companies, I know where I work they just don’t get that, they’re so strict.</td>
<td>Reciprocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A manager is lying about their own beliefs/values to enable them to reciprocate and meet needs of workers

New code: Manager focus on business goals/the bigger picture (rather than on processes and bureaucracy)

New code: Manager taking risks
7.6.4.2 Support for theory: discretionary effort/reciprocation

Participants perceived workers to recognise and respond to how they are treated with increased, and discretionary, effort. As an example:

**Quote 2:** Their job probably wasn’t that enjoyable but if you have the right environment and I knew them all as individuals and they all felt valued, they all worked really hard.

In other words, they might not be engaged with their work but still invest effort. Social exchange theory would suggest that this may be as a reciprocation mechanism. During a discussion about giving workers time off if they have achieved their goals, one participant offered two quotes at different times:

*People actively love what they do and they come in and they work over their hours and do a fantastic job and they have the time off because they know that they can relax in that time off. But then you get back from them, if you do that, if you give them that then they will work harder for you next time.*

The first of these quotes seems to capture a sense of work engagement and discretionary effort. The phrase “you get back from them” may suggest the participant recognises that there is a process of reciprocation. A participant shared this personal experience of making discretionary effort, to the extent of working without pay:

**Participant three:** I once worked for a company that got into financial difficulties and administration and all of the employees without any exception carried on working for three months, including me, for no money because we felt, I don’t know, we just wanted
it to work and we felt valued and it wasn’t really the money it was the boss being honest in saying…

**Quote 3. Participant one:** but that’s the thing isn’t it? If you give people an inch they’ll give you back a mile, and they will.

In this case, the need for discretionary effort was prompted by a crisis that required workers to make a decision about leaving or staying. The workers decided to contribute discretionary effort due, in this person’s case, to feeling valued, the honesty of their boss and the hope of a successful outcome (“we just wanted it to work”). There is a sense of collective agreement/effort, perhaps arising out of normative expectations or a felt need to support each other. The sense of collaborative effort in the face of a crisis may have strengthened team bonds and met relatedness needs. This suggests that a new code is needed to capture the sense of teams bonding and having shared norms. The code ‘workforce cohesion’ is discussed later.

In this case, basic foundations for engagement were not in place (hygiene factors such as a sense of safety and security or even money). However, workers still contributed discretionary effort. This challenges an assumption of the 8 lane model and supports the proposition in self-determination theory (Rasskazova *et al.* 2016) that people can still be motivated by higher order needs even if basic needs are not met.

The second quote infers that the participant believes that a process of reciprocation is occurring (“if you give people an inch they’ll give you back a mile”).
7.6.4.3 Support for code: Feeling valued/treating workers like individuals

Quote 2 suggests that discretionary effort can be prompted, in part, by treating workers as individuals and helping them feel valued even if their job is not that enjoyable. These same themes were evident in a number of descriptions of the qualities of good leaders. Examples include:

*Praises positive behaviour and outcomes*

*Respectful*

*Know how to address/speak to individuals on a professional level*

*Get to know everyone as individuals*

7.6.4.4 Challenge to the theory: Work/job engagement

It was theorized that workers engage with their work roles but quote 2 is suggesting that someone may have little intrinsic enthusiasm for that role. Even though work may not be meaningful, i.e. a person might not be displaying their ‘preferred self’ (Kahn 1990), the participant perceived that some level of engagement might still be maintained or enhanced.

Perhaps, at face value, the work role only serves to meet basic needs (e.g. for an income). However, the quote suggests work may be a vehicle that enables the worker to meet other needs, such as feeling valued or meeting relatedness needs (e.g. through having a good quality relationship with their manager). Working hard might
allow a worker meet their felt need to repay a caring, respectful manager even though the work itself is not enjoyable.

The sense of workers engaging with something other than their job was also revealed by the earlier, personal account of a team working without pay.

7.6.4.5 Support for theory: Reciprocation by Managers

Quote 1 seems to recognise that reciprocation is a two-way street and that managers need to recognise extra effort and be prepared to reciprocate (in that case by giving time off when goals have been achieved).

Participant four suggested that with less qualified workers, reciprocation is less important (“much less ‘you scratch my back I’ll scratch yours’”). Instead, they perceived that managers are likely to take a more “dictatorial approach” to “get maximum productivity out of them”:

we’re in this management where we are very much used to dealing with professionals and reasonably well qualified workers whereas if you were rather a basic production line or similar, you’re dealing with shelf stackers, where they’re unqualified and could quite frankly get another dozen jobs the same then there’s a lot of evidence in the literature to support you having a more dictatorial approach, much less flexible, much less “you scratch my back I’ll scratch yours” approach so it seems that more professional industries have higher amounts of professional autonomy in them where the “you scratch my back I’ll scratch yours” approach is more beneficial whereas if you’ve got staff where you’re
trying to get maximum productivity out of them and they could get 10 other jobs with the same cash then it probably pushes you more down the dictatorial approach.

This quote captures the essential differences between Safety I and Safety II (Hollnagel 2014). Participant four was presenting a belief that people (especially in low skilled jobs) are motivated purely or primarily to earn money, they have no vested commitment to their organisation, and the best way to achieve the best performance is to be “dictatorial”. This may align to the less positive aspects of transactional management. As described later, this participant also presents a belief that it is appropriate to terminate the employment of someone who is not conforming.

An alternative view is that people are managed through a less formal or prescriptive process of give and take (or “you scratch my back I’ll scratch yours”) and work best when given autonomy and control over how they do their work (again, this theme will be discussed later).

7.6.4.6 New code: Managers hiding their real selves and taking risks

The manager who explained that they gave workers time off if they have achieved their targets later said:

*Quote 4.* It’s a fine balance because I have to say “do not tell anyone [laughter] if you’re playing golf all day, I know where you are, if I need you in an emergency, fine I’ll get hold of you but do not tell anyone I’ve given you the day off to play golf because, you know, all hell would
break loose” because there are other managers who don’t allow that sort of flexibility with their teams.

This same manager had also stated:

**Quote 5:** I’ll do that; I’m not allowed to. You know, my line manager will say to me “I don’t want a culture where everyone disappears on Friday afternoon”, and I’ll say “oh no, no, no, that’s definitely not for me” but I don’t care: If they’ve done what they need to do to a high standard, we’ve made an impression on the business, the job’s made money who cares if they have a Friday afternoon off?

This presents a picture of a manager forming a perception of, but disagreeing with, their own manager’s expectations of how to treat staff. However, they pretend to agree with their manager and ‘secretly’ manage their employees as they see best.

This participant used the word ‘culture’. This suggests that the culture of the organisation is worthy of further consideration.

Laughter is a complex social phenomenon. In this context, it occurred just after a manager was describing how they asked a worker not to share a ‘secret’ (“do not tell anyone”). The manager may be recognising that they breached a normal convention.

By drawing on the theory of engagement that has developed so far, *possible* interpretations are:
• The manager first has to recognise that an employee has met their targets and performed to a “high standard”

• The manager may feel obliged to reciprocate/reward the employee (and/or may see no benefit in keeping the employee at their desk when their goals have been met)

• They may be taking a personal risk in reciprocating in the way that they do (giving time off in contravention of their own manager’s expectations). These behaviours may even be perceived as transformational. According to Bass et al. (2003), sharing risks and placing worker’s needs above their own are examples of idealised influence and are qualities of a transformational leader.

• By reciprocating, the manager is signalling to the employee that their efforts are recognised and valued

• By asking the employee to keep the arrangement a secret the manager is signalling to their employee that the manager is taking a risk. For the employee, this may magnify the significance of the reward/social exchange

• Explicitly giving a worker time off to indulge in a valued activity (such as playing golf in this instance) may also signal that the manager knows the individual and is offering them something that is personally meaningful. This may again magnify the significance of the reward/social exchange. It could also be seen as a manager looking after the individual’s wellbeing, i.e. caring for the worker, with (perhaps) an eye on sustaining performance over the long term.

• Asking an employee to keep a secret may also signal to the employee that they are trusted and part of an ‘in-group’

• The employee may perceive that their own manager has positive qualities (such as being fair, kind, brave and/or trusting and knowing them as an individual).

• As the arrangement is a secret, the manager may be signalling that other managers (or organisational procedures etc.) are different to them and not fair etc.
• This exchange may increase the likelihood of an employee identifying with their own manager but could undermine wider, organisational identification.

• It could potentially send out signals that some organisational procedures or practices are optional. Inadvertently, this could establish team norms such as “we only have to pretend to follow procedures”. As these are unlikely to be spoken, different team members could come to different conclusions about the team norms.

• It is possible to see how this manager’s team could form an identity or culture of its own (as described by Schein 2010).

In trying to be fair and reasonable, the manager could appear to be manipulative or reinforcing ‘unhelpful’ norms and perceptions. Rather than strictly forcing managers to adhere to unbending rules that frustrate their own and their followers needs, it may be more beneficial for organisational processes and procedures to give managers some discretion in managing their teams. In effect, this is suggesting that the principles of Safety II, i.e. recognising that people use knowledge and discretion to respond to the demands of a situation, need to be applied to management.

7.6.4.7 Support for code: Individual differences

A quote from one participant highlights the concept of workers being individuals:

It does come down to individual behaviours, we have two maintenance guys, one who is more senior and has done a health and safety course and should be fully aware of… He actually doesn’t give a monkeys. If no one’s looking he’ll do things how he wants, the old way, and yet we had a new guy come in who just embraces the whole role and understands health and safety, I’ve got him on a course in Birmingham
at the moment and this other one needs to be very careful because he’ll be out on his ear because he’s non-compliant. It’s the same level, the same role, they are being managed in the same way but they are different people with different behaviours, different viewpoints, different concepts in their minds about how the job should be done.

This quote clearly accentuates individual differences and draws attention to the possibility of two individuals responding differently to the same management approach, as predicted by the second literature review.

This participant is insinuating that a person’s employment is at risk of being terminated (“he’ll be out on his ear”) due to their perceived non-compliance and doing things the “old way” unless being observed. This is potentially drawing attention to the underlying organisational values and culture, and these concepts are worthy of further attention.

Another quote illustrated how a participant consciously reflects on her approach to managing workers in response to her perception of how they define their role and prefer to be managed:

**Quote 6:** Although I personally don’t like that [a transactional] approach and I don’t like it when a line manager uses it on me, I know that some people in my team much prefer that than me to try to empower them and get them to do something over and above what they think they should be thinking about.

This gave rise to another new code, flexibility in management styles, discussed next.
7.6.4.8 New open code: Flexibility in management styles

The focus groups made frequent reference to the need for managers to know one’s staff as individuals then tailor their approach to suit. A good leader was described as:

Someone who can show authority but can encourage workforce,

finding a balance between informative and authoritative.

Quote 6 reveals a perception that some staff prefer to be managed in a more directive/transactional manner. Later this same participant explained that it was annoying to move away from being job-oriented but she recognised that it met individual needs:

It really annoys me when I have to ‘phone someone about a work-related thing and I have to have a five-minute conversation about what they did on the weekend or the family. For me personally, and I’m being blatantly honest, I do it if I know that’s what the individual needs.

The initial literature review illustrated the need for both transactional and transformational approaches to secure worker engagement. These quotes shed light on managers being perceptive and flexible, trying to match their approach to suit the needs of individuals regardless of their own preferences and needs (which illustrates the ‘individualised consideration’ and ‘idealised influence’ elements of transformational leadership). This perhaps supports the finding, from the second literature review, that emotional intelligence is an important quality in effective leadership.
7.6.4.9 Support for theory: Roles and norms

The participant who let a worker play golf (quote 4) usefully illustrates how norms and roles work. The manager presumably holds certain beliefs about the role of managers and how to get the best performance from workers. Her own manager seems to have different perceptions and wants front line managers to adopt norms that ensure workers keep to core hours (quote 5). Quote 5 illustrated that the participant did not want to accept that norm: it may conflict with her beliefs and values and prevent her from meeting her needs. For example, it may undermine her sense of autonomy and discretion, deprive her of a tool for building effective relationships or make her evaluate herself negatively (so they feel ashamed if they think they are being unfair).

Rather than accept the norm, the participant found a workaround (in the same way that the new safety paradigms assume that workers use their knowledge and experience to find workarounds to deal with barriers and glitches).

Andersen et al. (2015) shed light on how challenging a mismatch of norms can be. In their research, people were attached to norms connected to achieving important goals (i.e. meeting their needs) or maintaining their sense of self-identity, which Kahn (1990) called their “preferred self”. In the research of Andersen et al. (2015) the workers identified more with their role as a competent tradesperson or as member of their own team rather than as a site worker. Smith and Terry (2013: 3) propose that some norms are “chronically salient” and the person may then struggle to adopt conflicting norms.

The anecdote of the worker “who doesn’t give a monkeys” is describing an organisation which wants a worker to adopt a norm which could be described as ‘obey all safety
rules at all times’. The worker apparently only conforms with this norm when under observation (“If no one’s looking he’ll do things how he wants, the old way”). From the perspective of SDT this is describing someone who is extrinsically motivated: while under observation, conforming to the norm meets his need to avoid conflict etc. However, like the workers interviewed by Andersen et al. (2015), the ‘non-compliant’ workers might perceive himself to be a competent individual and believe his tasks are within his ability to complete successfully. He might have a norm to get jobs done as efficiently as possible and might rate his own performance on the number of tasks he has completed. Conforming to a norm to obey all safety rules might not meet his needs: it might slow him down, and take away a sense of autonomy and competence. Conforming might take more cognitive resources as he will have to take time evaluating the situation and remembering which rules to apply to which scenarios and have to deal with the confusion that arises when rules do not match reality.

The organisation might deal with it by terminating the worker’s employment (“[he] needs to be very careful because he’ll be out on his ear because he’s non-compliant”). If the worker feels a lack of self-efficacy about conforming with the norm to comply with all safety rules, a training course might help. However, it is unlikely to deal with a person’s sense of identity and deeply entrenched beliefs and norms. A more empowering/engaging approach (in line with the new safety paradigms) would be to have a discussion about how work is really done (compared to ‘work as imagined’), the risks and challenges involved and the resources (including experience) available to manage them. If the evidence suggests that the worker’s beliefs and norms are ultimately putting himself and others at risk, he is much more likely to genuinely reflect on these and be open to new perspectives if there is a positive, engaging relationship with a manager (rather than the manager just being seen as a negative character).
Preceding quotes about employees working “really hard” or “harder” infer that managers also have some notional benchmark about how much effort should be put into performing a role.

Finally, the revelation that a worker may not be engaged with a work role (quote 2), but still appear to be engaged, suggests that a worker may be engaging in other roles (such as a team member).

7.6.4.10 Support for Codes: Empowerment and Autonomy

Empowerment and autonomy emerged as codes during the survey. The focus groups also perceived good leaders as empowering workers and promoting autonomy.

Empowered you to be able to deal with things yourself.

Give them ownership/freedom to work.

Be able to walk away and not worry that the jobs not being done.

Allows you to self manage.

The discussion recorded in table 11 reveals quite an extreme form of trust and autonomy in which some American companies were described as allowing workers to have as much time off as they wanted as long as they met their goals.

Quotes 4 and 5 referred to managers themselves not having discretion in how they manage and not offering “flexibility” to their team.
7.6.4.11 New code: Managers focusing on goals/the bigger picture

Quote 1 illustrated a manager being aware of when workers were meeting organisational goals. Bad managers were described as focusing on their own, personal needs:

*Selfish*

*Self-Centred*

*Self-aggrandisement*

Pushing own agenda regardless of staff thoughts/opinions

*Empire Building*

This is fully consistent with the description of transformational leaders (Bass et al. 2003) as being driven by a vision and goals, which should be ethical, and to focus on needs greater than their own. This open code, while new, supports the existing axial code, transformational leadership.

7.6.4.12 Support for code: Fairness/Justice

The importance of fairness/justice was supported by answers which described bad managers as displaying the following traits:

*Unfair/unjust behaviours*

*Has favourites*

*Passing the blame onto others*

Someone who passes off your work as their own
A sense of (un)fairness emerged when one focus group participant highlighted that organisational constraints could prevent one group of workers from being treated the same way (given the same autonomy) as another:

*I think you have got to be very careful in organisations that have a two-tiered approach, where you’ve got shift workers that have to work shifts to cover the work and then you have people who can work 9-to-5 and if there’s then a discrepancy between what you allow one group to do and what another group can do then you end up with, it’s not a very holistic approach and then there’s conflict.*

This same participant said:

*In our organisation we have a massive issue because we have this what’s called ‘clear rewards’ so if you do extremely well you’re supposed to get a pay rise and if you don’t do well you could go down the competency route and it could be disciplinary and out on your ear, which is all good and well but you can only be rewarded if there’s money in the pot to reward you. As a charity we’re in a financial deficit so there’s no money in the pot, so no matter how well you do you’re going to get a percentage of nothing but if you do badly you could still be out so the balance is now wrong. People know it’s being used, it’s called ‘clear rewards’ but the one thing that is quite clear is there’s no money in the pot.*
The theme of inconsistency and injustice was particularly strong for another focus group member who frequently returned to a belief that performance related-pay drove inauthentic management behaviours and that people who deserved pay rises did not receive one. For example:

*I’m talking about the manipulative people who want their pay rise so will do only what they need to… They come in with all the pieces of paper yet in the day they aren’t very nice people.*

This lends support to the finding in the literature review that procedural and distributive justice are important determinants of engagement, not simply whether leaders are personally fair (Ghosh *et al.* 2014). The decision to offer performance-related pay, and how it is managed and distributed, is driven by organisational procedures. This leads to a new code: organisational policies, procedures and practices.

7.6.4.13  **New Code: Organisational Policies, Procedures and Practices**

The focus group participants referred to or inferred that there were systems of performance-related pay, “clear rewards” and procedures relating to ‘competency’, performance management, disciplinary action and dismissal. Collectively they gave rise to a new code: organisational policies, procedures and practices.

However, these procedures and practices are not created in a vacuum. They are the product of and outward demonstration of organisational values (Malbasic *et al.* 2015). For example, Jourdain and Chênevert (2015: 187) note that:
organizational values will most likely have an influence on the type of human resource management practices implemented, on managers’ behaviors and on how work is organized and divided among workers.

One quote inferred that a worker is at risk of dismissal due to non-conformance. It is possible to surmise that senior managers who initiate, write, sign off and enact such procedures believe that performance is secured by removing under-performing workers (through competency assessments, disciplinary action and termination of employment). Potentially, the threat of dismissal might be seen by senior manager as a valid motivator. A new code is needed to capture the culture of the organisation.

7.6.4.14 Support for Code: Shared Values

The focus group revealed that some organisations publish their values. However, as the following quote reveals, it is unclear whether there is any ‘buy in’ from staff (i.e. whether they are shared values) because they have been imposed.

It’s quite interesting because we have a vision and a set of five beliefs within the organisation I work for but they were just announced. I’m not saying that there’s anything wrong with them but I’m not sure that anyone truly embraces them because it didn’t come from anyone within the organisation.

There can be a mismatch between the values that an organisation expresses and the practices within the organisation. One focus group participant noted:
you can go to roadshow after roadshow hearing about how much people care about you, unless there’s an actual demonstration of that, unless people can see that you are valued, you have to put that into them for them to feel valued, you can’t be told from above that these are all our core values and we believe in all of these things unless you demonstrate them.

This quote again captures the importance of values being shared and demonstrated rather than imposed. It reveals the importance of what Wollard and Shuck (2011) call “authentic culture”. However, both managers and workers need to share the values of the wider organisation: a mismatch of managerial values was revealed in quote 5.

Ideally, these quotes suggest, staff and managers will have some input into wording statements of values to increase the likelihood of value congruence (as promoted by Dromey 2014). Managers whose personal values are at odds with those of the organisation may be seen an ineffective, and may then be stifled, by their own line managers (Hoffman et al. 2011). It is possible to foresee that some people will therefore not be selected or retained as managers and this will potentially create an organisation with a very one-sided view of, for example, how to treat staff. It is also possible that subordinates will get confusing, mixed messages in such a situation and could become disillusioned (Hoffman et al. 2011).

7.6.4.15 New open code: Valuing workers experience

‘Valuing workers experience’ emerged as a new open code. It gives a sense of a manager recognising that they do not have all the answers and values worker’s
experiences and insights in formulating effective solutions. This code arose when answers revealed these perceived benefits of involving workers:

- You gain a full understanding from those doing the work.
- Developing practical solutions (fit for purpose).
- Drawing on operators experience.
- Finding out ‘what really happens’.
- Genuine opportunity for managers to learn.
- Using them and their experience to make work safer.
- Better information (drawing on their experience).

These answers largely confirm the functional benefits of involvement: involvement is a mechanism for gaining insights/knowledge that managers otherwise do not have. However, underlying this is a perception that workers’ sometimes have more knowledge than managers (“genuine opportunity for managers to learn”). In support of this, when describing the qualities of a good leader, one participant said:

if you come from different backgrounds, you have skills and expertise in separate areas...I might respect the fact he knows more about X, Y, and Z and he respects the fact I know more about A, B and C.

This quote appears to describe a participant’s belief in mutual respect which depends on a manager recognising the knowledge of workers but being seen as competent herself. In contrast, one participant proposed that a lack of respect for workers, coupled with a transactional leadership style, would prevent workers having a voice:

They don’t always have a voice, do they? Particularly if we have the mentality that people are considered as menial because of the work that they’re in. For them it may be that that job they do they absolutely love
it and they’ve got lots and lots of things they want to say but because their manager is very transactional, they’re not given a voice…[or] the opportunity to be able to say what they want to.

The impact of the “mentality” (or culture) of the organisation needs to be explored further, including the implicit beliefs about the knowledge and status of workers.

7.6.4.16 Support for Codes and Theory: Controlling workers, Rules vs Knowledge Based Approach to Safety, Safety I vs Safety II

Quote 5 revealed that some managers are perceived to tightly monitor and regulate the behaviour of workers. Quote 6 suggested that some workers might prefer to be managed in that way, while the quote below suggest that this approach may be adopted in response to the perceived lack of intrinsic motivation of workers:

"if you’ve got staff where you’re trying to get maximum productivity out of them and they could get 10 other jobs with the same cash then it probably pushes you more down the dictatorial approach."

The use of the word ‘dictatorial’ appears to conform to perceptions of bad leaders as micro-managing and ‘control freaks’.

It is possible to surmise that an organisational culture may be defined, in part, by the extent to which managers believe they need to control or empower workers, which will be influenced in part by their underlying values and the embedded beliefs and perceptions of workers and how to secure the best performance.
A controlling culture, as illustrated in the preceding quotes, may give rise to a rules-based, Safety I approach (Hollnagel 2014). Where workers are seen as a source of knowledge, and there is greater emphasis on autonomy, an organisation may be more amenable to an approach based on Safety II.

Critiquing an extant, controlling culture could threaten the perceived authority and identity of managers and could give rise to a sense of vulnerability or threat. As Schein (2010) suggests, it is crucial to understand and work with the existing culture rather than imposing an idealised view of workforce management.

7.6.4.17 New code: Organisational Culture

Numerous, preceding quotes (such as quotes 4 and 5) either directly referred to the organisational culture or enabled assumptions to be made about that culture. Culture appears to be an important and relevant factor to consider in research into worker engagement. Mehrzi and Singh (2016), for example, found support for the proposal by Bhuvanaiah and Raya (2015) that organisational culture had an indirect impact on engagement by influencing employee motivation.

Culture, as a concept, needs defining. Schein (2010) proposes that culture manifests as shared norms, values, traditions, behaviour patterns and rituals. Culture is described by Schein (2010) as the shared assumptions about how a group should perceive, think and feel about problems. Culture is stable, surviving when members leave and pervades all aspects of how a group deal with its task and challenges (Schein 2010). Schein (2010) suggests that cultures form in response to human needs for stability and predictability, as it provides a framework for regulating the behaviour
of the group and making sense of the world around it. Culture helps meet deep-seated needs for psychological safety which is a foundation for engagement.

When faced with a worker who is not behaving as expected, the pervading culture will influence managers’ assumptions about the underlying reasons, the potential consequences and significance of that behaviour and how they should respond.

Culture gives members “a basic sense of identity and defines the values that provide self-esteem…Cultures tell their members who they are, how to behave toward each other, and how to feel good about themselves” (Schein 2010: 29). Conforming to cultural expectations could help people to meet a need to feel self-worth. It appears that culture could impact on important components of the theoretical model such as identification, needs-fulfilment and normative expectations.

Schein (2010) also recognises the existence of group level or micro cultures and the potential for clashes between cultures. A micro-culture was evident in the group of Scandinavian construction workers who had negative views of managers and safety (Andersen et al. 2015). Schein (2010) and Andersen et al. (2015) both elucidate the sense of threat that a group feels when it’s goals and identity appear to be threatened.

Grounded theory research by Törner and Pousette (2009) found that worker participation in safety relied on collective values, norms and behaviours, and organisational structures and processes, that promoted involvement. In other words, these researchers made associations between cultural characteristics of an organisation, how it was structured, how managers interacted with workers and the extent to which worker’s participated. By extension, it can be argued that Safety I and
II do not exist in vacuums. They are underpinned by organisational cultures. To explain the facets of the cultures that support these approaches, this research will introduce the idea of Culture I and Culture II. The qualities of these cultures are shown in appendix 9 which will evolve as the research proceeds and new insights arise.

7.6.4.18 New code: Workforce Cohesion

An earlier quote described workers choosing to work without pay for a company which was in financial difficulties. This led to the notion of a team or group pulling together in the face of a threat and, as a result, collectively displaying discretionary effort. They were, potentially, engaged in their role as a colleague or member of a team and negotiating the norms attached to those roles. Other quotes revealed a perception of leaders having a positive effect upon teams:

Team effort. All feel valued/informed.
Supports improvement in team competence.
Team feels needed.

Six responses to the perceived benefits of worker involvement suggested that involving workers changed the dynamics within the workforce or team.

Everybody singing off the same hymn sheet.
Can influence other workers to think positively and proactively.
Motivated attitude inspires others.
Team feels needed, part of a group.
Become part of the team (team working).
Involvement and positive leadership are therefore perceived to help teams to feel needed, valued and more cohesive, perhaps because team members are asked to co-operate and adopt shared goals or norms (“singing from the same hymn sheet”).

The initial survey gave examples of involving workers in safety through team-based activities (involving workers as part of audit or special project teams, for example).

The literature was re-reviewed in light of this new code. Workforce cohesion is sometimes presented as an antecedent of engagement (although this has been missed during the review). Kumar and Sia (2012: 39) found that ‘peer cohesion’ contributed to employee engagement due to co-worker support providing a job resource, and positive interactions meets their relatedness needs. This reinforces the argument that engagement can be defined in terms of needs fulfilment. Indeed, Anitha (2014: 319) suggests that team and co-worker relationships promote engagement because they help workers meet “higher order needs, such as achievement and collaborative decision making”. Rana et al. (2014) drew on Kahn’s (1990) original theories of engagement to explain that supportive co-worker relationships promoted engagement by enhancing psychological safety (i.e. meeting a need for security).

It is interesting to note that focus group participants were aware of potential threats to workforce cohesion. The golf anecdote (quote 4) showed an awareness that there could be social repercussions if other workers found out that someone had been allowed to play golf. Another participant offered a similar insight:

*if there’s then a discrepancy between what you allow one group to do and what another group can do…then there’s conflict.*
Martínez-Córcoles et al. (2012: 217) propose that empowering leaders promote safety participation (described as behaviours that complement rules compliance), in part because the leaders encourage ‘collaborative learning’ within their team, leading to the “transmission and co-construction of knowledge”. Presumably, this could also involve the transmission of norms, beliefs and values, not simply technical knowledge of how to perform a task. Therefore, ‘workforce cohesion’ is a new code and will need to be built into the model as an antecedent of worker engagement.

7.6.4.19 Support for theory: Workers as safety champions or role models

A number of quotes inferred that workers can encourage others to work safely. For example, a benefit of involving a worker in safety was perceived to be that they “can influence other workers to think positively and proactively”. This may align with the perception arising from the initial survey that workers might adopt (what can appear to be) safety citizenship behaviours by challenging, advising or supporting others.

7.7 Discussion and theory development

The focus groups have provided a wealth of new insights and information by encouraging participants to recount and discuss personal experiences which offered a depth of revelation that might not have been achieved in interviews.

Participants defined good leaders in a way which very closely aligned with academic descriptions of transformational leaders and they drew attention to the importance of positive aspects of a transactional approach. These insights have been enriched with a new code which captures managers being flexible in how they manage staff. It was
apparent that managers may be aware of and motivated to meet workers’ needs (e.g. participating in more sociable conversations).

The 8 lane model no longer appears adequate. It has failed to capture key elements such as organisational culture, organisational policies, procedures and practices or relationships with a team. In summary, the model largely fails to convey any dynamics beyond the immediate manager-worker relationship. This is likely to reflect the way that the researcher has, up until this point, been more interested in how managers promote engagement and the worker’s internal processes. It is necessary to look more deeply at the wider organisational context.

The concept of Culture I and II emerged as a useful way of summarising key cultural differences between organisations that seek to control (or are ‘dictatorial’) and those that are more empowering.

The safety profession does not appear to have unique, cultural perspectives of two key antecedents of engagement: leadership practices and worker involvement.

The revelation that workers might not be interested in their work, but can still be engaged due to the way they are treated, is a new insight needing further investigation.

Just two focus groups have been sufficient to challenge and develop the emerging theory. They were also sufficient to establish that the concepts are likely to be familiar and acceptable to elements of the health and safety profession. Further focus groups are not needed as their purpose has been served.
It is now important to explore some concepts in more depth, particularly in relation to the organisational context, the concept of workforce cohesion and to better understand the psychosocial processes. These areas will be the subject of the next chapter.

7.7.1 Limitations of this study

This study has the same, potential weaknesses as the survey. Specifically, more focus groups, with a wider array of participants, could have generated more and richer data and represented a wider range of views and perspectives. The coding is a subjective process, although has been performed in a transparent manner and in a way which hopefully illustrates how claims and analysis matches the data. One test of the validity of qualitative research is to establish whether it has generated functional theories. At this stage, the existing theories have been enriched and challenged and highlighted areas that are worthy of exploring in more depth in the next study.
Chapter 8: Interviews with academics and practitioners

8.1 Aim of this study

This stage of the research is intended to support objectives 2, 3 and 4. In summary, it is important to continue to understand how and why workers become engaged and how and why engagement might be associated with changes in behaviour (and safety behaviour in particular). Given that the 8 Lane Model no longer appears adequate, these interviews must help to meet objective 4 by creating a more functional model.

In particular, the focus groups had revealed a need to better understand the wider organisational context in which engagement is occurring. There is also a need to explore the theoretical principles underpinning the emerging model of engagement and, in particular, the psychosocial processes involved.

8.2 Interviews in grounded theory research

Interviews involve a dialogue between an interviewer (the researcher) and interviewee. In this study, interviews are being used to explore particular concepts and identify if any new codes need to be incorporated into the emerging model of engagement.

Interviews, particularly in-depth and unstructured interviews, are commonly used to generate data in grounded theory research (Noble and Mitchell 2016, Achora and Matua 2016), including in constructivist approaches to grounded theory (Martin and Barnard 2013) which is the particular framework used in this research.
Constructivist grounded theory requires a researcher to elicit more detailed or “richer” data to achieve a much more nuanced and functional theory (Draucker et al. 2007). For this to be achieved, interviewees must freely tell their stories and reflect on their meaning. Charmaz (2014) recommends promoting a conversational dialogue. Martin and Barnard (2013) propose that counselling skills such as reflection, para-phrasing and probing are used to facilitate dialogue and explore emerging themes.

While interviews could have been employed earlier in the research, the researcher did not have a clear sense of the concepts that needed exploring. The researcher may have struggled to ask useful questions or sustain a meaningful conversation.

8.3 Limitations of interviews

Charmaz (2015) draws attention to recurring criticisms of interviews such as the wording of the interviewer’s questions influencing the answers they receive, so that interviews only confirm the researcher’s pre-conceived theories. Less-structured approaches to interviews can also produce spontaneous interview questions that have not been examined in advance (Healey-Etten and Sharp 2010).

A well-planned interview guide can address some limitations of interviews, for example by ensuring questions are open-ended and not leading (Charmaz 2015). However, Charmaz (2015: 1613) states that interview guides “should be treated as initial frameworks for opening the interview conversation rather than as recipes to follow”. The most important questions may not have been planned in advance as they will be responding to something the interviewee has said (Healey-Etten and Sharp 2010). Further, less structured approaches treat interviewees more as “a participant in
meaning making than a conduit from which information is retrieved” (DiCiccio-Brown and Crabtree 2006: 314). This is aligned with the underlying principles of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2000, Williams and Keady 2012).

8.4 The Interview Guide

The researcher developed eight prompts to act as the interview guide. It was not the intention to ask all these questions, using these precise words nor in this precise order. Interviewees were being selected as they have particular areas of knowledge or experience (as explained later). It would be illogical to conduct a structured interview which prevented that knowledge or experience being discussed. Instead, the interview guide was a prop to help the researcher identify which areas of interest were being or could be covered and to refocus the interview if it had ‘drifted off topic’ or ‘dried up’.

1. What do you understand by the term engagement?
2. Can you share an example of an engaged worker of team? What did engagement look and sound like?
3. What are the qualities of good leaders? Can you share a good example of an engaging organisation or manager?
4. What are the barriers to engagement?
5. What might motivate an organisation or manager to seek to engage its workers?
6. What might be going on in the head of a manager who wants to engage workers?
7. What does a worker need from work?
8. Why might treating workers in a particular way affect how they behave? What is happening psychologically when someone is engaged?
Where appropriate, anecdotes or elements of the emerging theory will be shared. As well as creating a more natural discussion, shared sense-making is a crucial feature of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2000, Williams and Keady 2012) and this is a way of checking the practical adequacy of the theory (Kempster and Parry 2011).

8.4.1 Participant selection

In line with grounded theory, and in common with the survey and focus groups, theoretical sampling was again employed. This involves selecting participants specifically because they can shed light on some elements of the emerging theory by challenging or enriching the emerging codes and categories (Charmaz 2006).

As the purpose was to gain deeper theoretical and practical insights, the intention was to interview a mixture of academics and health and safety practitioners in high level positions in organisations. The reasoning was that academics could offer richer theoretical insights while the practitioners could give practical examples of how they have designed and implemented initiatives to enhance engagement.

The academics were located by looking for the name and email of lead authors of influential articles that had informed the research. The researcher selected those based in the UK (to make it as easy as possible to arrange an interview and to avoid encountering possible language barriers).

Practitioners were located in two ways. Past issues of Safety and Health Practitioner, a professional, health and safety magazine was reviewed looking for authors on subjects such as leadership or behaviour. As a regular author for this magazine, the
The researcher anticipated that other authors might be amenable to being interviewed. The researcher asked known health and safety professionals if they could recommend people who might be able to contribute insights. It was hoped that the personal introduction might make the interviewee more agreeable to being interviewed.

The researcher wanted to gain a Union perspective and from a particular organisation that promotes worker engagement. Various unions and this organisation were contacted directly. Finally, the researcher sought the views of prominent figures and organisations associated with behavioural safety, an approach which seems directly contrary to the researcher’s worldview (Bell 2017a). This was intended to overcome a potential bias identified in Chapter 2 but despite repeated requests they either did not respond or would not commit to a meeting.

This process generated an initial list of 23 potential interviewees, split between academics and practitioners. Individuals were contacted by email and, if they were prepared to be interviewed, they were issued an information sheet (explained below) and dates were proposed, stating that a face-to-face meeting was preferred. This would, the researcher hoped, allow for a more natural experience, with both parties being able to see each other’s expressions, body language etc.

If individuals did not respond to a request within 14 days, a second request was issued. If this elicited no reply within 14 days, the person was removed from the list. As it became clear that many of the people on the original list were not responding, the researcher repeated the process for identifying interviewees early in 2016. Interviews had commenced before the list of interviewees had been finalised.
8.5 Information sheets and consent forms

Information sheets and consent forms were prepared for interviewees and approved as part of the Cardiff Metropolitan University ethics research application. These explained the background to the study, the interview process and why people have been asked to participate. The information sheet and consent form explained that the interview would be recorded and described how audio recordings would be managed and privacy protected. The participants’ right to withdraw at any time was explained. No financial inducements were available or offered. When interviews were held in cafés (as explained later), the researcher offered to purchase a hot drink for the participant before the interview began.

8.5.1 The participants

There was a total of 7 participants who were:

- A psychologist who has published research reports on worker involvement in health and safety.
- A PhD student who was investigating, and has published articles on, emotional intelligence and its impact on the behaviour of manager.
- The health and safety lead for one of the UK’s largest Unions.
- Two health and safety managers for different higher education institutions.
- A person employed by an organisation who works with companies to promote engagement as a means of improving productivity and performance.
- A person working as a senior health and safety practitioner for a national building merchant, with previous experience in the rail sector, who had also authored articles on various aspects of safety leadership.
This is not the order in which the interviews were carried out (i.e. references to interviewee one does not refer to the first person on this list etc.).

8.6 Dates and locations of interviews

The interviews were conducted over almost 12 months, the earliest was 13/11/15 and the last was 19/10/16. This reflected the time it took to identify interviewees then set up, conduct and transcribe the interviews. Three interviews took place in offices and three in cafés in venues across the UK. One was conducted by ‘phone. While cafés might not seem a conducive location, due to background noise, it is a ‘natural’ and neutral environment. If people were within earshot, the interviewee was reminded not to name organisations or individuals.

8.7 The interview structure

The interviews were planned to last a maximum of one hour and structured as follows.

**Introductions:** The researcher introduced himself and gave a brief overview of his research and the purpose of the interview. This was summarised as follows and written on a cue-card and used until properly memorised. The wording was deliberately as broad as possible to avoid excessively influencing the interviewee.

*I am looking at the association between worker engagement and health and safety behaviours. In a nutshell, I’ve reached the conclusion that engagement is describing a process. While at work, workers are treated in a variety of ways and this will, I*
believe, influence how they behave. I believe, this process can be consciously used to influence health and safety behaviours. I’d like to discuss your thoughts and experiences about these ideas.

The interviewee was given the consent form to read, reminding them, amongst other things, that the interview was being recorded and that they could withdraw at any point. Once they indicated that they were willing to proceed, they were invited to sign and date the form and the interview commenced.

**The interview questions:** The interview began by asking the interviewee to introduce him- or herself. Follow up questions were asked about their work or research and then a question was picked from the interview guide which seemed to have most relevance to them. Follow up questions were asked to clarify or further investigate an answer. When that line of enquiry had reached a natural conclusion further questions from the interview guide were posed. Where appropriate, and sometimes to explain the reasoning for a particular question, the researcher offered an anecdote from the research or from personal experience. This created a more natural dialogue. The interviewer made notes during this process to record key words or phrases that needed to be returned to and explored further during that interview.

**Close:** The researcher summarised the key learning points from the interview, offered the interviewee the opportunity to share any final thoughts or comments, then thanked them and closed the interview.
8.8 Transcription and triangulation

The digital, audio recording was uploaded to a secure server then deleted from the recording device in line with the ethics approval granted by Cardiff Metropolitan University. It was transcribed using voice recognition software, with the interviewees being referred to as one, two, three and four. Open codes were identified as the text was being transcribed. Upon completion of the transcription, the audio recording was deleted from the server. Where required, additional literature was reviewed during the transcription process to investigate concepts that emerged during that interview.

8.9 Coding

The findings are presented below structured around the codes that emerged. Broadly the codes fall into the following categories:

- Definitions and the subject of engagement
- Organisational culture: Insights into the broader organisational context which the focus group highlighted to be important.
- Core theories: Support for the various elements of the core theory, such as the psychosocial mechanisms that are assumed to drive engagement.

8.9.1 Definitions and the subject of engagement

8.9.1.1 What is engagement? / involvement and needs-fulfilment as antecedents

Interviewee two gave the following explanation of worker engagement.
When I first started with worker engagement, the HSE saw it as a very developed form of worker involvement. However, in doing that work I realised that worker engagement is not the process: it’s the outcome. Worker engagement is the result of worker involvement, if you want to take people with you, however I know that broadly speaking worker engagement is used interchangeably with worker involvement practices such as consultation and I see it as an outcome. Worker involvement is a way of achieving worker engagement.

The notion of worker involvement being an antecedent of engagement is now well-established in this research. A key point of divergence is that this current research views engagement as a psychosocial process. The interviewee was therefore asked what was happening to psychologically to an engaged worker:

Worker engagement from a psychological point of view is about commitment to the organisation, is about loyalty…it’s linking with flourishing, I would say, but as an end result job satisfaction

Equating engagement with concepts such as organisational commitment and job satisfaction is well-established in literature (e.g. Beattie and Crossan 2015). The concept of flourishing is new and was discussed later in the interview.

Interviewee four expressed concerns about the language surrounding engagement:

If we’re not careful we will just add to the complexity of everything by getting scientific about it and creating a scientific language of
engagement when really we need to do the opposite, we need to create
a simple, accessible language of engagement.

This echoes concerned identified in the initial literature review (Fidderman and McDonnell 2010 and Bailey, in press) and is a useful reminder to the researcher that the theoretical model arising from the research must be presented in everyday language. In a similar vein, when asked to define engagement, interviewee three said:

*Lots of people bang the term around and I find it hard to define. I could give you an academic one but for me it’s ‘why do they swing their legs out of bed in the morning?’*

Interviewee four offered a view that engagement and well-being:

*Are quite radical, quite post-modern areas, that are not necessarily materialist views of the world, they don’t always service corporate needs, they service human needs.*

This quote makes a connection between engagement and needs fulfilment (discussed later). It offers a new insight: engagement services human needs in order to help fulfil corporate needs. This theme emerges again later.

8.9.1.2 Engagement leading to behaviour change / establishing a baseline

Interviewee seven said that a body called Engage for Success was formed to benefit government and industrial partners because:
They wanted to source research and practical stuff that would help
people to change behaviour

When asked what behaviours an organisation would want to change she said:

You almost have to go back a step really because you’ve got to
establish what behaviours you are seeing before you can even attempt
to change anything. So you need to look at your culture and
understand what’s going into culture and then what’s coming out, what’s
your culture looking like? Because unless you effectively have a
baseline of where you’re at it is difficult to change anything move
towards a desired state.

This suggests that behavioural change starts with understanding culture (a theme
which emerged during the focus group and is returned to later). This suggests that
any model arising from this research might start with organisational culture.

8.9.1.3 Why engage?

In discussions about the motivation behind and benefits of a health and wellbeing
strategy, interviewee five provided two different quotes:

The aim was to improve performance in the University by having a
healthier, more engaged workforce. What we define health as is not
just being physically healthy but emotionally, psychologically healthy as
well…if staff are healthy and healthier they’re more likely to be here,
they’re more likely to be productive
Core for us is the student and the student experience so we recognise that our staff...are the ambassadors in the University. It’s really important that our staff are engaged…proud of the organisation, seeing the University as a good place to work and being more positive I guess in general so being real ambassadors but also on the basis that if people are engaged and enjoying their work more, feel supported and feel developed, then you’d also like to think that the quality of their work is going to be better as well.

Later he gave an example of the organisation contributing to physiotherapy treatments “looking at the engagement side, psychologically, you would like to think they feel this is a good organisation, but also as well, there are more obvious business benefit” which was related to people not having time off work.

It appears, therefore, that the motivation for promoting better health, which he associated with a “more engaged workforce” is to improve performance, attendance and productivity. This is a ‘text book’ definition of the qualities of an engaged worker: proud of their organisation, prepared to act as a positive ambassador, producing higher quality work etc. From the perspective of the jobs resources-demands model, good physical and mental health provides workers more resources to invest in work.

The antecedents are described as workers feeling supported and developed and enjoying their work. These can be seen in terms of meeting the needs of workers. However, this interviewee highlighted the importance of workers’ perception (“seeing the University as a good place to work”). Workers’ perceptions need further attention.
The quotes give an impression of a clear organisational vision or mission: “core for us is the student and the student experience” and a perception that staff are a critical element of delivering that mission. This gives some insights into the culture of the organisation (a theme which is discussed in more depth later).

These quotes appear to perceive a worker engaging with their organisation (“proud of the organisation, seeing the University as a good place to work”) rather than between workers or workers and managers (themes which are discussed later). Interviewee four suggested that the motivation for investing in staff was staff retention:

> if you attract the best, that’s relatively straightforward you just have to pay a lot of money but to retain the best is another thing, so what people are going to look for is a nice work-life balance, a comfortable environment, you know, the right level of balance of challenge versus ability to work.

This quote touches on meeting the needs of workers. In this case, he is describing higher order needs, such as a sense of challenge, alongside more basic needs such as a comfortable environment. Needs fulfilment is discussed in more depth later.

Interviewee seven referred to a number of benefits of engagement in her response to a question about how companies might become more receptive to the idea of engagement. Her response mirrors observation by Schein (2010) that engagement relies on tailoring the approach to suit the culture and needs of an organisation. Her quote reveals a perception that meeting the socio-emotional needs of workers is not, in itself, the primary interest of organisations:
There can be many, many reasons why they don’t get it, I mean you’ve got to try to tailor the message to get ‘round each of those. So for instance, engagement is paramount for small businesses. Everybody is really busy with their heads down and they don’t look up to see anything else. So for small businesses the message has to be short, massively short, really sharp and it has to be about what’s important to them which is the bottom line so for them you don’t go down the ‘making your staff happy’ route you go down improving business efficiency, you go with the metrics. And actually, interestingly, quite often, even in a big corporate that’s the message as well because if it’s a sceptical CEO you’re after that’s the message again, you go with the data and the data says profit will increase, revenue will increase, your turnover will go down, retention will go up, absenteeism will go down, you know, that’s what the research says, so quite often it’s just tailoring the information out there. Of course, there’s an increasing amount of people who come to it on an emotional and cultural level, which is happy staff, work harder, make happier customers, but people are far more accepting of that approach now than they were five years ago…it’s starting to humanise the workplace in a way.

Interviewee five supported the contention that a business case needs to be made “As we know, the moral argument on its own never works”. Later asked if changes to management practices depended on changes to core values, interviewee seven said:

[An airline owner] is interesting because he was held up as the worst possible example of an evil man to work for but of course he turned around last year and said something along the lines of “blimey, if I had realised that making my staff happy would increase sales this much I would have done it years ago” because he suddenly got actually
treating them like shit wasn’t working, being a bit more like a normal human being actually was. Again, it was because he got the practicality, he didn’t get it because it was the right thing to do, he got it because he could see was making a difference to his business metrics. I kind of don’t care either way, so long as he’s got it.

8.9.1.4 Who or what is someone engaging with?

The focus groups began to question who or what an employee is engaging with. The interviews revealed that workers are sometimes perceived to engage with each other.

Interviewee one initially said “I think perhaps worker to worker engagement is higher”, in comparison to worker-manager engagement, and suggested it arose from displays of “empathy” between workers. Potentially, this would lead to or maintain engagement because workers feel their needs are being protected/promoted by team members or by membership of a team. Interviewee two spoke about the challenge of building engagement in transient workplaces and also proposed that people’s motivation to work safely arises from their relationship with significant others:

The other challenge…is in construction where you have a transient workforce. It’s difficult to get people to engage when they’re only with you for a limited period of time. Their commitment to safety, isn’t framed around their commitment to the organisation, it’s their commitment to the family and to their colleagues, their mates, their workmates.

Interviewee one had similar perceptions:
People are more loyal to the people in their trade, their team rather than the company that they’re working for. They are just mercenary soldiers.

Interviewee six shared her perception that work served social needs for some people.

Most people like going to work. There was a…meat factory and we had someone who got injured and had to retire and one of the biggest issues for her apart from the money and so on was losing her friends. It wasn’t the sort of job that anyone would particularly want to do but there’s those other things about jobs which must not be forgotten.

Interviewee three appeared to concur when describing their own experience:

What made me swing my legs out of bed in the morning to go and stand on platform 4 in Tamworth train station when it was dark and cold and freezing? It’s that drive, it’s not like you’re going to work, it’s like a family. What is it that glues you to that company?

This interviewee later proposed that there may be little organisational identification, but suggested that a person’s motivation to come to work was partly due to their relationship with their boss (as well as with their colleagues).

When you spoke to the technicians they didn’t come to work for [their company], that’s just the name that appeared on their payslip once a month, they come to work for their mates and they came to work for the boss…and they wanted to do the right thing for their boss.
It seems reasonable to suggest that membership of a team may feel much more salient to an individual, as it better meets more immediate needs, than membership of an organisation or the work they do. Enacting and enforcing norms that protect and promote the interests of their team, will therefore seem more important than norms that protect or promote organisational interests. This may explain why (as revealed by the survey) some companies use safety initiative or campaigns that draw on norms such as “mates looking after mates”. These initiatives reframe safety behaviours as supporting the team’s interests.

**Reflection on the implication for the theoretical model**

The emerging theory suggests that people are engaged with their roles. How, can they engage with a team or manager? Stets and Burke (2000) argue that social identities, such as being member of a team, and roles might usefully be seen as synonymous concepts. In other words, when a person is engaging with someone or something, they may be engaged in a social identity or role in which this other person is another actor. A person might behave quite differently to the same person when they meet in or outside work because different roles or identities are being activated in these different contexts.

**8.9.1.5 New Code: Union / worker resistance to engagement**

Interviewee seven shared her perspective of Unions’ response to engagement:

*Unions are appalling. Unions see engagement as a management cop out in general and they absolutely choose to ignore that it’s deeply beneficial to the individual. A couple of unions that we’re talking to, very*
progressive, absolutely about the relationship being three-way, so union employer employee, and they’re very, very interesting. Outside of that it’s just terrible.

While this view was not evident with the Union representative who was interviewed, it does reveal the possibility that Unions will resist the principles of engagement. If the result is that people are willing to invest more resources into their various roles without any formally agreed remuneration or benefit, this could be seen as exploitative. Engagement could be seen as manipulating workers to achieve, as alluded to in earlier quotes, better sales or business performance etc. Workers could be sceptical about the motivation behind engagement. This illustrates the importance of senior managers being honest about their motivations for improving working conditions.

8.9.2 Organisational culture

The focus groups highlighted the importance of organisational culture. This theme also emerged during the interviews but was enriched by a number of new codes that illustrated different facets of organisational culture.

8.9.2.1 Culture as a sub-conscious phenomenon

In a discussion about the values and beliefs that promoted engagement, interviewee seven suggested that:

Quite often they don’t investigate that for themselves, they’re operating almost at a subconscious level so getting management and employees
to have sufficient self-awareness to do that is very difficult and time-consuming, I mean for proper true cultural change takes years and is an ongoing process.

Later she said “we don’t often stop and think about what our values actually are”. She went onto say that it can be easier to take a much more tangible but superficial view of engagement:

Put fresh fruit in the canteen because they’ll like that and then they’ll be engaged. No!

The researcher recounted to interviewee seven some recent research suggesting that people wanted to work in a family firm, leading to this disclosure:

If they genuinely are a family firm the likelihood again is they’re…not thinking consciously about this. My partner worked for 11 years for a family firm, a very small firm, there was only six or seven of them in total. Dreadful. Worst employer ever. The irony was just paramount with me doing my job and him as possibly one of the most disengaged people I’ve ever met in my entire life simply because, you know, the boss has got no idea about people, how he remained married I have no idea, his people skills were so lacking, no trust, absolute micromanagement, everything you could do badly he did…I suspect that what people are trying to identify there is a sense of community.
This reinforced the importance of leadership, emotional intelligence and social skills for engagement. The themes of micromanagement and ‘community’ are discussed later as to is another code which explains how cultures self-reinforce.

8.9.2.2 Clarity of purpose / shared values

Interviewee seven drew on the MacLeod report (MacLeod and Clarke 2009) and described the four enablers for engagement:

*So you need to look at how your organisation behaves in terms of its strategy, its story, its history, how do people fully fit into that? That’s around their purpose, their meaning and how they feel connected.*

This supports the notion that it is necessary for an organisation to clearly articulate its’ purpose and mission (e.g. “core for us is the student and the student experience”) and offer opportunities for workers to reflect on what it means to them. It has been established that the theoretical model will need to address worker’s perceptions of the organisational mission and what this means in terms of whether values are shared.

8.9.2.3 Cultural integrity

Interviewee seven said that one enabler for engagement

*is the integrity of the organisation so how consistent are the values that the organisation espouses and what is actually seen on the ground?*

Later she was asked what integrity means to her and said
Saying what you do, doing what you say. There’s no difference between them.

From the position of norms theory, this is asking whether injunctive and descriptive norms are aligned (Smith and Terry 2013). The organisation might state or imply, perhaps in the form of value or mission statements, what sort of behaviours are important to it but those behaviours would need to be modelled by leaders and be the sort of behaviours that are recognised and rewarded.

The focus groups also identified integrity to be a quality of good leaders. From the perspective of social exchange and social identity theories, a lack of integrity could send mixed messages about the ‘worthiness’ of the organisation (would the worker want to identify with an organisation that is confused about what it wants?), what values should be incorporated into the person’s identity as a member of the organisation or what behaviours are valid means of reciprocation. As social exchange relies on trust, perceptions that an organisation or manager do not believe what they say could prevent the development of high quality, relational exchanges.

8.9.2.4 New code: Embedding engagement

Asked if she could give an example of an engaging organisation or leader, interviewee seven said that:

There is a difference between an organisation which is engaged because they have a charismatic leader or an organisation which is engaged because it’s endemic throughout its culture. One is likely to be
sustainable one obviously isn’t because it’s tied to a person if they get
run over by a bus, or whatever else it is, this charismatic role isn’t
systemic, it’s gone.

The inference is that the beliefs and values that sustain engagement need to be held
across an organisation. This interviewee named a chief executive officer of a large,
global organisation as a model of an engaging leader leading to this contribution:

All of the work they do is about engagement isn’t a thing we do to
people but it’s simply about this is the way we work ’round here, so they
embed it in everything and that’s how it should be. The moment you
start to think of it as an engagement programme or an engagement
strategy or an engagement approach, what you’re doing is you’re doing
it to people.

This may be revealing a perception that engagement is describing how an organisation
fundamentally manages staff rather that being a distinct campaign or policy.

**Illustrative anecdote**

The researcher is aware of an organisation that has set up an engagement task force, which
promotes engagement activities and prepares an engagement newsletter. This was in
response to a staff survey which was itself a response to high rates of turnover which the
company was struggling to understand or lower. Some of the key findings of the survey
was a perception of poor communication through the management chain and that senior
managers were seen as being unapproachable (in part due to a fear that line managers
would think that people have gone over their heads). Establishing and funding an engagement task force is potentially a less challenging proposition than looking at how managers perceive and communicate with staff.

### 8.9.2.5 New codes: Organisational structures / emotional investment

Interviewee one discussed the way that organisational structures might influence the opportunities and motivation of employees to become “emotionally invested” in the lives of other workers. Emotional investment is a new code and seems to refer to someone identifying with and caring about someone else. Potentially, it is linked with the concept of empathy.

*Construction projects are a strange, unique kind of organisation in that different contractors come together and each, sometimes they don’t even interact, they just work in their silos or their tunnels, they lay their bricks, or do the plumbing or lay the floor and then they leave and so you might be working alongside people that you will never see again so why would you get emotionally invested in their lives?*

While this interviewee is describing a construction project it is conceivable that organisations using a lot of temporary labour could experience similar phenomenon. The idea of ‘emotional investment’ fits comfortably into the emerging theory: it could represent the worker investing their emotional resources into their role as co-worker. This process depends on the individuals actually having the emotional resources to invest in work relationships, which highlights the importance of an organisation helping to meet the socio-emotional needs of workers.
This interviewee went on to discuss how the piece-rate structure of construction affects the opportunities that workers have to look after their own well-being.

*I’ve heard about some of the more forward thinking companies, like Sweden’s just brought in a six hour working day which is great for well-being. Virgin has a no holiday policy and another company, I was speaking to a guy who introduced four days a year well-being leave, one a quarter, so in addition to your annual leave you get one day to spend on your well-being …could you give that to construction workers? No! Because they’re not employed on that basis where you can take annual leave. You’re employed on a per task basis so you can’t say have some annual leave, because on the days they’re not working they’re not paid.*

Workers employed on this basis might not expect or want time off if this affected their earnings. They may only want, as Andersen *et al.* (2015) found, a transactional relationship with site managers (exchange of money for a specified amount of work). The expectations of workers were apparent in a contribution from interviewee three:

*If colleagues didn’t get a 4% cost of living increase, well, there’s all hell to pay. If you made people have stretching targets linked to their bonus, there’s hell to pay because the bonus is what people got for coming to work, wasn’t it?*

A cost of living increases is likely to be discretionary and the expectation of a 4% annual increase would be an example of a psychological contract, which is explained later. It seems that workers would be upset (“there’s all hell to pay”) if this was
withdrawn, rather than seeing the bonus as a discretionary benefit that prompted reciprocation or identification with the organisation. The interviewee was describing a public sector organisation that had become nationalised and the researcher formed the opinion that this quote illustrates an enduring public sector culture.

This quote highlights and reinforces a number of issues:

1. Workers and the workforce can have their own values, beliefs, goals and norms (e.g. “we are entitled to a 4% pay increase”, “if managers threaten our ‘rights’, we’ll give them hell to pay”).

2. Practitioners and academics need to be sensitive to the culture, values and beliefs at all levels in an organisation.

3. Engagement relies mostly on social, discretionary and implicit exchanges rather than tangible, material, prescribed and explicit exchanges. As revealed during the second literature review, if people do something because of a tangible, material reward, their motivation is primarily extrinsic and the exchange is more transactional. There may then be less scope for them to find the intrinsic logic or value in doing something (Andrews 2016, Weinstein and Ryan 2010). For example, “I report hazards to get a breakfast voucher” rather than “I report hazards because it’s right to make this a safe place for me and my mates”.

8.9.2.6 New Code: Leaders letting go of authority

Interviewee three described an approach adopted by a previous employer where managers presented safety initiatives to workers in a manner similar to ‘dragons den’:

Before, safety was made at the board table and we decided that we were going to turn that on its head but at the same time we didn’t want
people to run off and do their own things because there has to be some framework and some element of control. We sent our regional director out to find best practice in relation to reducing manual handling activities and I then got involved putting a playful twist on it…they thought they were going to present to their peers. Instead, they presented to a load of frontline colleagues and it was a bit like the Dragons Den. They got a score and if they thought it was good we rolled it out and if they thought it was bad we didn’t touch it. It’s still within a framework but it became a much easier sell for ourselves, one of the most powerful bits that we haven’t really shouted about… It opened up the idea that leaders can get it wrong, it’s alright when they got it wrong, it was in a laughing-joking way, but it made them more humble and it made them more approachable.

As well as describing an innovative way of involving workers, eliciting their thoughts and opinions, this quote showed a conscious awareness of finding a compromise between empowering people and maintaining control (“we didn't want people to run off and do their own things because there has to be some framework and some element of control”). It changed and challenged perceptions and behaviours of managers (“it opened up the idea that leaders can get it wrong…it made them more humble and it made them more approachable”). Deeper still is the notion of an organisation and senior management team that is secure and creative enough to accept a challenge to the perceived authority of managers and offer control to workers.

Interviewee four was posed a question about how receptive organisations would be to theories that appeared to hand control to workers or question the authority of leaders:
Could any leadership type research be expected to be received by the leadership if it erodes their importance? In other words, the whole leadership discourse is about enforcing the importance of leader figures or leadership groups so to go there and say leaders are only partly effective you’re not going to get very far with that, although it may be a very important feature.

Later, and supporting the notion of leaders letting go of authority, he referred to ‘chaos leadership’ and explained that leaders may need to accept that there are other people who are better informed than them or more important for the success of the company. This code is similar to the notion of manager taking risks, which emerged during the focus groups.

8.9.2.7 Command & control / micromanagement / self-reinforcing cultures

The preceding sub-section is reminiscent of the finding from the focus groups that some organisational cultures support a perception that their function is to control workers. Interviewees three, four and seven used the phrase ‘command and control’. Interviewee three was discussing how to introduce innovative management practices:

if someone comes along and you’re trying to encourage that in your team at whatever level in the business you then need the skills to not be command and control and to be coaching.

Interviewee four said that “If necessary you have to revert to command and control” and explained this might be appropriate when something goes wrong and decisions
need to be taken rapidly. Interviewee seven put it in the context of gender-related norms/behaviour (as discussed later) and shed light on how cultures self-reinforce:

Because we’re working longer, so we have, particularly in top-level, we have people who are going to be in that position for much longer than we might’ve expected so they’re perpetuating an out of date leadership/management paradigm. And we’re chucking people in underneath who haven’t got the tools to combat it so of course we’re perpetuating this command and controlling, somewhat aggressive, very masculine, management culture and we haven’t got people falling out the end of it yet, so many of whom are elderly/middle-aged white men and it’s a huge issue… And our general leadership culture is set up to reinforce that so if that’s the way you behave then you are rewarded, and it’s the behaviour you see around you. There was one manager in [a previous company] who absolutely fit that and it’s the worst management experience of my entire life because it’s irrational behaviour and it made me ill and it’s very, very hard to deal with as a rational person. That person is not going to respond in the same way that you expect the world to respond to you. It was a horrendous.

Drawing and elaborating on a quote from the focus groups, the researcher shared an anecdote with interviewee seven about a manager who carefully watched who left before four o’clock on Friday and passed comments on Monday morning. This elicited the following response:

That’s micromanagement which is one of the worst management practices ever, if you’ve ever worked for a manager who micromanages you it’s absolutely soul destroying, it’s horrible, you end up in a position
where you don’t want to be there…you do the minimum, the absolute minimum, because you feel no connection or loyalty or anything, in fact you are very likely to feel negatively about the organisation.

This touches on the importance of autonomy (discussed later) and illustrates how management practices elicit different thoughts and feelings that impact on behaviour (“you do the minimum”). This drew attention to the importance of workers’ perceptions. Interviewee seven later said these management practices arise from organisational culture and the example set by senior managers which other managers copy.

Interviewee seven stated, in contrast with her views about giving workers a voice, a more directive approach can be seen as positive:

Interestingly, you find in leadership, actually people will have respect for a leader who is simply being strong and clear about what they’re doing and everybody might actually say “you know this isn’t a good direction we’re going in” but flipping hell, you know, they’ve got absolute clarity about the direction, about why we’re doing it. People can find that really attractive, so I do find it interesting.

This gives a fascinating insight that cultures can be sustained by the workers and not just senior managers: If they respond negatively to more relational approach, the manager may adopt a more directive management style. The concept of ‘Followership’ is discussed later. This quote supports the findings from the focus group that some workers may respond well to a more transactional approach, and Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi’s (2000) proposal that autonomy is not universally desired.
The researcher drew attention to this apparent contradiction between resisting or liking ‘strong’ management and interviewee seven said:

*I think it depends a little bit on what level it’s at… So, at your local leader/line management level, that’s a very difficult attitude to deal with but if it’s whoever it is at the top saying “this is where we go as an organisation”, he or she isn’t micromanaging you.*

Potentially, these quotes suggest, workers may be less concerned about being involved with strategic direction (they may not see this as part of their role) but a more directive management style becomes more salient to them when it directly impacts on how they perform their roles. As discussed later, the solution may lie in having the awareness and flexibility to adopt a management approach that matches the culture of the organisation, the specific challenge or situation that is being managed or the needs and expectations of the workers.

The representation of different cultural models (Appendix 9) needs to be updated to account for these new insights.

8.9.2.8 New code: Gender roles / norms in organisational cultures

In a similar vein to the concept of command and control, interviewee one spoke about a perception of a “macho leader”:

*In construction…to get a job done they’re under so much pressure that you need to be angry, you need to be the boss, you need to be that macho leader that’s telling people what to do.*
This quote is revisited later in a discussion about emotional intelligence. It highlights that some organisations may maintain stereotypical images of effective leadership and for a male-dominated culture, this may encapsulate notions of decisiveness and focussed anger. People performing a site manager role might be expected to incorporate norms promoting aggressive behaviour into the role, maybe underpinned by beliefs that managers must maintain their authority (“be the boss”). It is foreseeable that such managers may find that concepts of engagement challenge their deep-rooted sense of identity as a male (i.e. the role and norms they attach to manhood, not just to their position as site manager).

8.9.2.9 Dangers of Behavioural Safety / threats to team cohesion

When asked about behavioural safety, interviewee six said:

*You need to watch that kind of thing. We’re actually concerned about behavioural safety, very concerned because...If you’re not careful you can create a situation where people are watching each other.*

The second literature review revealed critiques of health and safety management systems that were perceived to rely on tightly controlling behaviour (Safety I), and the negative connotations of ‘command and control’ and micromanagement are discussed above. In this particular quote, the idea of workers “watching each other” evokes concern rather than being seen as a positive. Potentially, some safety initiatives are designed or implemented in a way which can break down mutual trust as colleagues might potentially be seen to be supporting the agenda/needs of managers and the wider organisation over the needs of the colleague/team.
The focus groups introduced a new code revolving around valuing workers’ experiences. As a counter-point to this, interviewee one spoke at different points about workers sometimes being treated like children or as if they cannot be trusted:

*You can get into that vicious circle “if you treat me like a child I’ll act like a child so I’ll be less responsible so you’ll treat me like a child more” so it spirals down.*

*I think there is perhaps a misconception that you give them an inch and they’ll take a yard, you give them a day off they’ll take a week off, and I don’t think it’s true I don’t think they’re fundamentally evil or saboteurs.*

*I think they are mistrusted. I think maybe it goes back to that needs fulfilment thing if someone treats you like you can’t be trusted then you’re going to respond by acting in an untrustworthy way.*

The notion of a “spiral” of behaviour is similar to the “reciprocation spiral” mentioned by Delobbe *et al.* (2016). This might also be understood from the perspective of organisational culture. Some organisations may perceive workers as untrustworthy children. This may be more likely in cultures that favour “command and control” and a belief in maintaining managerial authority. Interviewee seven reinforced these insights when responding to a question about what values or beliefs might be held by an organisation that wanted to engage their staff and an anecdote, shared by the researcher, of a company who refused to train staff on the basis that they might leave:

*They would understand that developing your staff to do a better job, retention will go up, no doubt, and they’ll do a better job because you’ve*
Nicholas Bell: PhD Thesis 2018

trained them. But that’s about trust. The organisation that you stated there simply does not trust their employees. I would imagine that they have great difficulty with flexible working, another very engaging and attractive proposition. They will have the attitude that if we haven’t got our eyes on them they won’t work so they are treating their people in a very parent-child way. Conversations at work should be adult to adult.

8.9.2.11 Social divisions in the workplace / Caring for workers

The emerging theory has established the importance of meeting workers’ needs, in part by helping them feel valued and cared for. The following quotes (from interviewee one) goes beyond this, however, and seems to be commenting on social divisions within a construction site:

I’ve seen sites where you got the workers canteen at the bottom of the Portakabin and above are the offices and they were all pristine and the canteen below is all filthy. World War II, slop in a tin dish. Leave your dirty boots at the door, something like that. So there is that segregation and I don’t think that’s particularly positive place to be.

If the canteen is nice enough for workers it should be nice enough for the managers. If they kind of eat with the workers that’s almost breaking down the segregation and why should there be that substandard canteen where the workers go and all the managers go off in their suits to Starbucks?

This may create a sense of division (or ‘them and us’) and could reinforce negative perceptions and norms about managers, as recorded by Andersen et al. (2015). This seems to be the antithesis of approachability and availability.
The concept of social divisions in the workplace is new. It hints at an organisational culture that promotes a belief that managers are different from and deserving of better facilities than workers. This may be linked to the perception that managers need to maintain their authority and use “props” (such as welfare standards) to signal their status or value. These insights can be added to the cultural models in Appendix 9.

8.9.2.12 Organisational structure / Sense of community

Interviewee seven shared her experience of working for a previous employer:

You have people spread all over, in telephone exchanges, you’ve got big office buildings. The exchanges were gradually emptied over the years with people going home working, people being moved out into the bigger hubs around…actually the exchanges have got to stay, and the engineers have got to stay. So, what they did was reverse the trend and said “we’ve got to put people back into the exchanges”. They made exchanges nicer places to work, and they started trying to rejuvenate the local communities that had gone. So, I worked out of [a particular] telephone exchange, we had a big concentration of IT people there who had known each other over years and years and so we maintained things like Christmas curry, that sort of stuff, so it gave them a hub from which to try to reconstruct these local communities the people had had. When I first joined [the company] I remember you would go for a couple of pints on a Friday lunchtime, just nice social cultures like that. They’ve been ripped away unnecessarily because it didn’t make us any less productive or any less professional, it just meant we worked better as a team.
This supports a number of codes. The organisation is described as consciously investing in creating an organisational structure which supports the development of ‘local communities’ (as well as meeting basic needs by making “exchanges nicer places to work”). In other words, workforce or team cohesion was directly influenced by organisational structures. The sense of cohesion was built and sustained by “nice social traditions”, or norms, such as Christmas curries and drinks on a Friday lunchtime. Organisations may prohibit certain norms which they consider counter-productive or unprofessional but inadvertently threaten what another interviewee called the ‘social glue’ i.e. they can undermine workforce cohesion. The notion of having something “ripped away” perhaps reveals a lingering sense of hurt.

8.9.2.13 Pre-existing engagement / crisis as an antecedent of engagement

Interviewee three was asked how high levels of engagement were built within a team which he described as highly engaged:

*It was already there, that’s the thing that amazed me. There was a fierce sense of protection about the company or that team so when somebody said “we are up against it boys, if we don’t start making some money we are in trouble” and people did some amazing things on the back of it. So all we tried to do with our leadership behaviour piece, we just tried to write down what it was: it was about respecting people, taking risks, about being entrepreneurial and that kind of thing. It wasn’t anything rocket science…It was really quite phenomenal.*

Engagement may already exist due (for example) to the shared history, identity, values, beliefs, goals or norms of a team. In this case, organisations might consider
what they can do to preserve that engagement or help direct, in this case, “a fierce sense of protection about the company or that team”. This phrase is potentially describing the tangible evidence of a protective norm. Potentially, such norms would be ‘pro-safety’ if, coupled with pro-safety beliefs, it led to behaviours that mitigated health and safety risks or promoted improvements. The reference to the team being allowed or encouraged to take risks is describing a transformational approach to leadership (Bass 1985).

This quote confirmed that one antecedent of engagement is perceived to be “respecting people”. It also supported a finding from the focus group that engagement can be promoted by perceived threats or crisis (“we are up against it boys, if we don’t start making some money we are in trouble”). Interviewee three was asked how these people actually behaved and he initially described his perception of their thoughts:

*What really amazed me, Nick, if I’m honest with you, everyone knew, it wasn’t just like “we might not have a job” it was “how am I going to keep our centre open? What are we going to do?”*

This led to what he called “probably the best level of engagement that I’ve ever seen”:

*These guys with their work they were supposed to shut at five they kept going and they pushed “let me open on a Saturday, I want to do this on a Saturday” “can we get this T-shirt printed boss?” and they’d wear it around the local town when they’re out and about shopping with the family so that people see it.*
This appears to be describing significant discretionary effort. A crisis may create new needs or a sense of threat to existing needs. From the perspective of flourishing and self-determination theory, dealing with that threat could create a sense of purpose and meaning, and require people to be more creative (“taking risks” and “being entrepreneurial”), use a wider range of strengths and work collaboratively. Ironically, this may help them meet higher order psychological needs even while a basic sense of security might be threatened. From the view of norm-activation theory, a crisis creates situations or threat which activates certain norms such as those that promote collaboration and mutual effort.

Interviewee five shared that measures of wellbeing and engagement improved during a time when his organisation, and the employees, were going through a period of uncertainty leading to redundancies. He attributed this to the development and implementation of a wellbeing strategy during this period.

If the theory is correct, and engagement is driven by needs fulfilment, a team or organisation which is generally satisfied with, or accepting of, their existing conditions will feel little motivation to try new approaches.

**Reflection**

Writing and reflecting on this text brought to mind Prochaska and DiClemente’s (1983) transtheoretical model of change: some organisations or teams will be in a ‘pre-contemplation’ stage (with no intention or felt need to change). In his former work as a probation officer, the researcher actively used this model alongside techniques such as motivational interviewing (as described by Rosengren 2017). This approach uses open-
ended questions, reflective listening, summaries etc. in a way which encourages people to reflect on their goals and barriers, their ambivalence about change, their strengths and anxieties, in order to increase their motivation to change while maintaining that change is in the person’s control (it is not something that can be done for or to them). It is based on humanistic, Rogerian principles and emphasises personal agency and autonomy and “egalitarian collaboration” (Miller and Moyers 2017). Rosengren (2017) notes that motivational interviewing is aligned with the tenets of positive psychology. There may be scope to employ this technique with managers, workers or teams to help introduce new ways of thinking about their roles and relationships in work before a crisis occurs.

Reflecting further, it became apparent that the core structure of the person-centred safety approach could align with the structure proposed by motivational interviewing. Navidian et al. (2015) used a motivational group interviewing approach to promote safety knowledge.

8.9.2.14 New code: Followership (the agency of workers in the engagement process)

During a discussion about how to engage workers, interviewee four described something he called ‘followership’:

Personally, that’s why I think we need this kind of paradigm shift and this is why I was attracted to things like followership, the concept that leaders only achieve what followers allow, but of course that’s kind of revolutionary talk in some places… it also assumes a couple of things, it assumes that followers can be bothered to actually engage in this which very often they can’t.
This is a new insight. Workers have agency in the engagement process. For whatever reasons they can choose whether or not to engage, and may choose whether or not to adopt or (as interviewee one inferred) ‘emotionally invest themselves’ in roles and associated norms. “Employees have an active role to participate in the engagement activities offered by managers” (Reissner and Pagan 2013: 2741). As Andersen et al. (2015) and Matta et al. (2015) revealed, some workers may want to maintain a purely transactional relationship with their manager. This adds depth to the existing axial code ‘individual factors’. In support of this, interviewee seven suggested that some workers, or their representatives, may resist engagement strategies or certain management styles.

8.9.2.15  New code: Measuring engagement and wellbeing

Interviewee five referred to a number of metrics that can be used to measure levels of engagement and wellbeing. He referred to the use of a staff survey, which incorporated a number of items to measure engagement, as well as measures such as sickness absence, grievance/disciplinary, turnover and participation in health and wellbeing activities. These metrics, he suggested, need to be looked at collectively. They served to justify investment, such as the reduced cost of stress related absence.

Interviewee seven raised questions about the relevance of surveys:

*Surveys can be massively imprecise tool, their use is widely misinterpreted, people don’t use them as simply the measurement tool that they are. They are a snapshot…it’s all backward-looking...Organisations often mistake the act of doing a survey for doing engagement itself. “We know we do engaging stuff, we’ve done a*
survey”. It’s amazing how often we hear that…There’s a whole spectrum of difficulty under the questions themselves, if you’re ever asking people how they feel that’s immediately subjective, so the whole thing is fraught with difficulty. There are very few organisations that use surveys in a useful way.

8.9.3 Core theories

The following section explains how the interviews supported, enriched and challenged the assumptions about the psychosocial mechanisms that drive engagement, the needs of workers and the qualities of manager that facilitate or hinder engagement.

8.9.3.1 Roles and Norms / Reciprocation / Needs fulfilment

At different points in the interview, interviewee one said:

I think if people treat you well then you’re going to treat other people well. So, if you feel valued, then you’ll value the people around you.

If people are respected they’ll respect the people they’re working for and the people they’re working around.

This can be interpreted as workers perceiving that their need to feel valued has been met, then adopting a norm which promotes respectful behaviour. They might adopt this norm as a reciprocation mechanism or due to shifts in underlying beliefs and values. This can also be understood in terms of a person having their own socio-emotional needs met, and having the resources to attend to the needs of others.
8.9.3.2 Safety motivation arising from needs fulfilment

Interviewee two recognised that transient workforces pose a challenge for promoting a culture of mutual care between teams. When asked whether one team on a construction site would take action to protect another she said:

They probably wouldn’t. They need to identify what’s in it for me to look after those people in the team over there.

This offers some support for a core theory of this research: workers are likely to only accept or act on pro-safety norms if they perceive it would serve their own needs.

8.9.3.3 The association between engagement, needs fulfilment and safety behaviours

The concept of needs fulfilment is central to the emerging model of engagement. Interviewee two stated:

I think the evidence is saying, from safety climate research, and if you think about psychological contracts...if an individual feels they are being looked after by the workplace, if they feel that the workplace is doing the right thing by them, they’re more likely to do the right thing by the workplace, which includes following the rules...If your organisation is abusing their safety for a reason they’ll disengage, less likely to try generally.

This offers some validation of parts of the theory that has developed to date. A worker is seen to form a perception of how they are being treated (whether they are being
“looked after” or the workplace is “doing the right thing by them”). There is a sense of reciprocation (“they’re more likely to do the right thing by the workplace”). Finally, there is a suggestion that reciprocation could take the form of rules compliance.

Earlier, it was proposed that engagement could enhance safety performance by giving workers the cognitive and emotional resources they need to be more attentive to the hazards and demands of their work and work environment (rather than just complying with rules). It is feasible that, as a reciprocation mechanism, engaged workers might look beyond the norms that meet their own immediate needs, which might encourage them to complete work quickly and with inadequate preparation, and take a more holistic view of the competing demands, risks, norms and needs (including those of colleagues, managers etc.).

The concept of psychological contracts relates to the unwritten, subtle expectations that two parties have of how each other’s party will behave, and their actual behaviour is carefully observed and interpreted (Chih et al. 2017). These are not explicit, written, economic transactions so psychological contracts refer to relational, rather than transactional, exchanges. Rousseau (2016) describes the psychological contract in terms of the perceived reciprocal arrangements between two parties. Therefore, in organisations, these contracts “encompass an employee’s perception of the contributions he or she feels obligated to make to the organization and the inducements he or she believes the organization is obligated to provide in return. For example, an employee may be willing to take on extra work but only in return for future promotion opportunities” (Sherman and Morley 2015: 164). Social Exchange Theory, at the core of which are the concepts of reciprocation and felt obligations, can explain how and why psychological contracts are formed and maintained (Kasekende 2017).
Psychological contracts can also be understood in terms of norms theory: both parties assume that the other party will integrate certain norms into their role.

The quote from interviewee two suggests that workers might disengage if workers do not feel safe. This can be seen in terms of the ‘basic foundations’ not being in place and the employer not meeting their side of the contract. According to the emerging theory, workers in these conditions may not identify with their employer and will have less motivation and resources to invest in adopting and enacting norms that support their manager or organisation.

8.9.3.4 Meeting needs of workers

8.9.3.4.1 Basic Foundations/Welfare

During a discussion about what workers need, interviewee seven referred to hygiene factors and the role of pay in engagement. It began with her perception of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs.

*I think Maslow’s fascinating because there is no evidence for it whatsoever. It’s just really intriguing that we all kind of get it because it actually resonates with our experience… There are things before you get engagement that are essentially hygiene factors. Pay is one of the them. You see, I do not include pay as something we do with engagement. At a certain point people are generally not motivated by money. They will be demotivated if they’re not being paid enough in their minds to be comparative with the job that they do or the profession that they’re in or whatever else, so once you reach a certain level giving
them more money is not engaging. It’s disengaging to assume you are so shallow that you would be motivated by money... And it’s why things like zero hours don’t work because there is no security and all the financial risk is transferred to the employee and so therefore you have a bunch of people who are desperate working for you which is not a healthy work environment.

Again, this highlights the importance of personal perception (“they will be demotivated if they’re not being paid enough in their minds”). The perception that zero hour contracts precludes engagement could be challenged. A person could be engaged with the work they do or with their team or manager. Someone at the start of their working life could feel differently about financial security compared to someone with greater financial commitments (Taylor 2017: 13). Differences in individual perception was highlighted in the Taylor review to government (Taylor 2017: pages 11):

Hearing one person describe a job as the best they have had followed by another person describing the same job as highly stressful or exploitative highlights the challenge for policy makers in seeking to promote better work for all.

This highlights the need for interviews and focus groups to understand workers’ perceptions rather than (or in addition to) issuing quantitative surveys. Interviewee six was asked how an employer might meet the needs of their workers.

Using toilets is a major issue. Because we’ve had situations where, we had to take issue with employers because, they’re docking pay for toilet breaks. [The senior managers] are in offices aren’t they?
Later this same person spoke about the barriers that work created for people to look after their own health:

It’s quite shocking some of the findings…there’s about 50,000 women I think they calculated on the basis of the research they did who had difficulty gaining access to antenatal appointments so putting their health and their baby’s health at risk.

This was a sharp reminder of the importance of basic foundations. In such conditions workers might disengage from their managers/organisation. Further, it suggests that the representation of organisational cultures in Appendix 9 needs to start with a cultural level in which workers’ most basic needs are not met.

Interviewee one commented on the importance of providing good welfare facilities, such as heated lockers for people working outdoors in inclement conditions. She shared her perception that it was giving signals to employees:

That’s important because it shows that you care. Is that different to engagement? Yeah, it’s engagement at an organisational level, rather than engagement at an individual conversational level, and I think that’s what people immediately leap to, but it’s about understanding that these are people and you don’t even have to speak to people to provide them with a hot meal and a bedroom.

Later she was asked why an organisation might want to invest in the worker’s welfare:

Because I think being appreciated like that, someone has thought out the design of your equipment of your accommodation with your quality
of life and it makes you feel appreciated and encourages you to be more loyal to the company that you’re working for. And loyalty is something I don’t think there’s a lot of in construction. People are more loyal to the people in their trade, their team rather than the company that they’re working for. They are just mercenary soldiers

Again, the quote reveals a perception that workers are interpreting and making judgements about their working conditions which influence their thoughts and feelings (“you feel appreciated and encourages you to be more loyal to the company”).

These quotes from interviewee one also pose questions about who or what someone is engaging with. The first of the two quotes, above, implies people may engage “at an organisational level”. The second quote suggests that people may engage more with their trade or team rather than their company, as discussed earlier.

8.9.3.4.2 Respect, integrity and honesty

Interviewee seven was asked what workers need. She had recently run a workshop for 250 people and asked them to write down what they value in free text, confirming workers’ needs to feel valued (or respected) and not to be treated like children.

* A huge proportion were respect, integrity and honesty. There were a lot…about openness and fairness. You know, that’s not fluffy, that’s really hard, that’s people saying ‘talk to me like an adult’.
8.9.3.4.3 Job satisfaction/meaningfulness

Interviewee six offered two quotes which illustrated that some people gain satisfaction, meaning or a sense of purpose from their work, as well as meeting relatedness needs, reinforcing the role of job satisfaction in meeting workers’ needs.

*I think people get a lot of satisfaction out of being in work, they like working with their friends and having the satisfaction about doing the job, people don’t have to be bus drivers but some people choose to be drivers.*

*I was talking to one of our members and I said “what else have you been building then?” He pointed to something on the horizon, he said “I built that” and you could see the pride in his face.*

8.9.3.4.4 Involving workers

Interviewee seven referred to the MacLeod Report (MacLeod and Clarke 2009) stating that employee voice is one of the four enablers for engagement.

*Do people feel able to speak up? Whether it’s a good thing about being a challenge, a fix, whatever it is, do they trust the organisation enough that their voice is listened to or some manifestation of that such as suggestion boxes, working groups, anything, the Unions. All of that are manifestations of how employee voice works in an organisation.*
8.9.3.4.5 Autonomy

Self-determination theory proposes that autonomy is a core psychological need (Ryan and Deci 2000). Interviewee six drew attention to the importance of autonomy:

People don’t like having things done to them, no one does. I think that’s the way to put it really. Do you like having things done to you? Of course you don’t.

At separate points, interviewee four highlighted the importance of autonomy:

There is some interesting psychological stuff because people like not to be bossed around in the 21st-century, generally.

People want and often take responsibility for their own existence, don’t they?

This contradicts the assumptions of Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) and some findings from the focus group. In reality, these ‘contradictions’ are highlighting the realities of dealing with individuals with their own needs, personalities etc.

8.9.3.4.6 Treating people like individuals

Interviewee six suggested that it is necessary to treat people as individuals:

We have to because people are individuals, you know, you can’t just treat one person as another person. If you do that you’re doomed.
8.9.3.4.7 Engagement as ‘flourishing’

Interviewee two was asked to explain what ‘flourishing’ meant after she used the word.

*It’s the extreme end of worker engagement. There’s lots of interrelated terms like job satisfaction, commitment I see it as an outcome and as a result of consultation and involvement. It’s linked with Seligman’s work.*

Painter (2015) describes Martin Seligman as “the father of modern positive psychology” and guided by a belief that psychology should revolve around nurturing strength rather than treating illness. Seligman *et al.* (2006) propose that ‘happiness’ relies on having a pleasant, engaged and meaningful life. The latter two qualities consist of revealing, nurturing and allowing people to use their strengths and directing these to “serve something that one believes is bigger than the self” (Seligman *et al.* 2006: pg. 775). This is similar to the proposal that people seek meaningfulness in their work (Dromey 2014). In common with Bandura (2001), Seligman *et al.* (2006) proposed that people want to be engrossed. This list of three qualities was expanded to five, positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning and accomplishment (PERMA) in Seligman’s book titled Flourish (Seligman 2011). Bell (2017a, b) argues that organisations, and the health and safety profession, might seek to promote flourishing rather than focussing on preventing harm.

Conway (2012) draws attention to Seligman’s lack of focus on the dynamic and bidirectional interrelations between an individual and their context. The emerging theory of engagement needs to be explicit about the way that an individual impacts on their social environment.
Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000: 9) questions the value that self-determination theory places on autonomy: “The burden of responsibility for autonomous choices often becomes too heavy, leading to insecurity and regrets. For most people in the world...individual choice is neither expected nor desired. Cultural constraints are necessary for leading a meaningful and satisfying life”. This supports the observation that people may sometimes desire a more directive approach and suggests that behaviour may reflect individual and cultural differences. People with high levels of engagement but a low desire for autonomy may invest additional resources into their core tasks rather than, for example, generating and acting on novel ideas.

Interviewee four said that he had adopted the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) definition of well-being. Following the interview this definition was located and was found to refer to flourishing (CIPD 2007 pg. 4): “Creating an environment to promote a state of contentment which allows an employee to flourish and achieve their full potential for the benefit of themselves and their organisation.” As discovered earlier, under the heading ‘why engage?’, this quote reinforces the perception that organisations might invest in their workers to benefit the organisation.

8.9.3.5 Management abilities

8.9.3.5.1 Valuing workers’ experiences / Agreeing pro-safety beliefs and norms

Interviewee four described an adult-to-adult approach to safety conversations:

I had an example here where we had an unsafe behaviour...and the classic response was there’s going to be disciplinary intervention...We did an exercise where we got the group together, and their line
manager, their supervisors and their management were present. We did this thing “what do we mean by risk?”, “what do we mean by hazard”, “what’s tolerable?”, kick the idea around and that group...were primed to work safely, and we didn’t do that from the top of the estate’s organisation down, we done it at the bottom…and what we’ve got to do then is bounce it back up…but you can’t assume it’s exactly the same script for a grounds and gardens person, for maintenance.

The reference to a ‘script’ is interesting as norms have been described as ‘scripts’ (Smith and Terry 2013). This word may be easier for people to relate to than ‘norms’ (a word that has not yet been used by any participant). The interviewee also said that he organised “inspirational leadership and coaching” for leaders as a result of which:

now it’s less prescribing how to work safely but more getting groups together to say “let’s agree it would be great work safely”, “let’s think about how we can do it”, so you might create not one safe system of working across an institution like this, you might create hundred which is a bit of a management nightmare.

He is describing a conscious effort to build a consensus within a group of their pro-safety beliefs, values and norms, and moving away from being prescriptive. He is also recognising the ‘nightmare’ that could come from giving greater ownership of safety to teams. Interviewee three also proposed that while being innovative “there has to be some framework and some element of control".
The second literature review and focus groups had generated a new theme coded ‘emotional intelligence’. Interviewee one was asked to explain this concept:

To be an influential leader you need to be understanding people and engaging with them, understanding your own emotions and other people’s emotions and in construction it’s almost the opposite, to get a job done they’re under so much pressure that you actually need to be angry, you need to be the boss, you need to be that macho leader that’s telling people what to do. I think part of that comes from the environment they’re in, extremely dynamic, new contractors coming in all the time, different people and you don’t necessarily have the time to get to know people and understand their emotional needs so the best way to get things done is then to just be a dick.

Interviewee three appeared to describe emotionally intelligent qualities when describing the defining qualities of a good leader:

Somebody with good self-awareness but more crucially awareness of others around them, and the impact they have on those people.

Both interviewees suggested that this awareness can be taught. Earlier in the research it was proposed that one of the potential functions of emotional intelligence is to help a manager decide what management style or approach to take in response to a particular person or situation. Flexibility in management styles is discussed later.
In response to a question asking what good engagement looks, sounds or tastes like, interviewee one responded:

*I think tea is incredibly important. As in the British cup of tea. It is a social glue of such importance I mean I don’t know whether you find the same thing in other projects around the world, international projects, but it probably doesn’t work like this, but we have this wonderful social tool so you can say to someone ”do you want to go and get a brew?” And you can take a step back from what you’re doing and you know, it’s comforting, it’s warm, it’s a little taste of home. So I think, maybe not taking regular breaks but having chances to speak to people really. So, I think it will taste like tea to answer your question.*

This is an interesting insight, prompted by what may have been an unconventional question, and led to the interviewee referring to other senses: the taste of tea.

Her answer revealed a perception of managers taking time away from work, and participating in a shared tradition. Tea is described as a “social glue”. The interviewee was asked what they might be talking about and said that as well as the TV and the family, they may discuss things affecting their “emotional well-being”. Potentially, these small opportunities to interact are chances to get to know people as individuals.

Equipping and encouraging managers to discuss mental and emotional health was a recommendation of the Stevenson / Famer review of mental health and employers...
(Farmer and Stevenson 2017). Interviewee one described it as being a natural part of conversations that can occur if managers and workers just talk over a cup of tea.

Based on the preceding codes, it is possible to speculate about the signals or messages that may give to workers. The manager wants to spend time with or get to know the workers, is giving up some of the props they use to display their authority or distinctiveness from workers, are attending to the basic needs of workers and are participating in an everyday activity which may act as an ‘equaliser’ as it serves their own basic human needs. Potentially, the manager could become someone whom a worker can identify with. These concepts will be summarised in the representation of organisational cultures in Appendix 9.

8.9.3.5.4 Transformational and transactional management / flexibility in approach

When describing the qualities of a good leader, interviewee three said “somebody who can move quickly along the scale of leadership and management”. He was asked to elaborate on what that meant:

At one end of the scale you’ve got management, following processes, bottom line detail, essentially working in the business. Then at the other end of the scale you’ve got leadership it’s more developing people, supporting innovation beyond the business. For me…I’m not sure that leadership and management are helpful terms… It doesn’t matter what you do whether you are a team leader, supervisor or the Chief Exec there are times when you move along that scale so if you are a shop manager you’re more in the management scheme, the management side, I get that but there are times when you have to deliver a team brief
when you do need to be that inspirational leader but at the same time if you are chief Exec or a managing director you might spend a lot of your time in the leadership side, but every now and again you do have to do management. So for example if you’re going through the capital expenditure process there’s governance stuff that you have to follow through… There are times when you have to be a manager and you have to be a leader and it is a scale and you have to move along it depending on the circumstance you’re in.

Asked whether management is more about process and leadership more about people, the interviewee said:

And the vision. I would agree. Take something like personal development. A manager’s approach to development is it’s a process, we sit down we look at the matrix we fill in a form for a course, whereas a leader, a leader’s approach is more of a coaching, mentoring type role. But you’re right one is people driven and one is process driven.

This may be describing the difference between a transactional (process-led) manager and a transformational (person-led) leader. This interviewee attached the attributes of being inspirational, supporting innovation and coaching to the leader. These quotes supported the code ‘flexibility in management style’ and reinforced the importance of managers having the awareness to assess and respond to situations.

Interviewee four proposed that transformational leadership is relevant for safety:
Transformational leadership is to some extent the greatest most studied thing that gets anywhere near safety management. If you try to find the literature there wasn’t an awful lot of stuff about safety leadership really…that’s why I think we need this kind of paradigm shift

Interviewee two proposed that the researcher should review the work of an academic called Sharon Clarke. The researcher, already familiar with her work (e.g. Clarke 2013), said “she’s done a lot of research around transformational leadership”. The interviewee responded by stating:

Transformational leadership is more likely to be associated with engagement, and transactional leadership is more likely to be associated with compliance.

This reflects the researcher’s understanding at the start of the research, although now appears an over-simplification. The emerging evidence is that engagement can be supported by positive aspects of transactional management. This was to some extent confirmed by interviewee two who offered this view about building engagement:

It’s about looking after the psychological contract, the informal side of things, so that people are clear about the expectations of their jobs, more widely it’s about the well-being side of things, is about looking after the effort – reward balance, making sure people are being recognised and rewarded for the effort they are putting in.

Clarifying goals and objectives, providing resources, giving feedback and contingent reward are examples of a transactional approach.
8.9.3.6 Behavioural outcomes

Interviewee one started by giving examples of behaviours of people who are not engaged, such as smoking where they should not. She said that she had heard of examples of people selling personal protective equipment on internet auction sites (which amounts to theft of company property).

*If people understood the organisation they were working for, showed some kind of loyalty and respect, they definitely wouldn’t be doing that.*

This interviewee seems to relate engagement with loyalty and respect. Interviewee two said (at different points) that when people are engaged there would be “flexibility” “consistency” and said “there is less likely to be discord”. She stated that:

*We would see and hear communication, workers to managers, workers to workers, energy and it’s ideas and innovation.*

8.10 Discussion

This stage of the research was intended to support objectives 2, 3 and 4 by continuing to explore how and why workers become engaged and understanding whether and why engagement might promote different types of behaviour. This should lead to the development of a more functional model.

The interviewees confirmed and enriched many elements of the existing theory. As hoped and intended, the interviewees were able to shed light on the organisational context in which engagement occurs, including the potential ‘drivers’ for organisations
to engage with engagement. Many different aspects of organisational culture were explored giving insights about the degree to which organisations seek to control workers and gender influences. This has highlighted elements of the organisational culture that might facilitate or act as barriers for engagement and need to feature in the models and tools arising from the research. These insights have been incorporated into the representations of organisational cultures in Appendix 9.

The interviews offered new codes and insights. These include the popularity of the phrase ‘command and control’, the idea of ‘flourishing’, the manifestation of social divisions in the workplace, the impact of different organisational structures on employees’ emotional investment in their organisation or with colleagues and the notion of followership. The notion of followership reinforced the agency of the worker, potentially to the point of shaping an organisational culture. Interviewees highlighted the benefits of meeting workers’ needs and suggested how this can be done.

The interviews unexpectedly supported a perception, initially found in the focus groups, that engagement can be maintained during, if not enhanced by, a sense of crisis. Two interviewees stated that workers are sometimes seen and treated like children. Interviewees confirmed the importance of emotional intelligence and flexibility to effective leadership. A new code emerged about a leaders’ ability to give up their own authority to empower workers.

Some of the researcher’s core beliefs and ideas were challenged during the process. Some workers struggle just to meet basic bodily needs. The interviewees highlighted the benefits of the positive aspects of transactional management and challenged the notion that autonomy is always desired. Workers or their representatives might not
embrace some of the concepts underlying engagement. Organisations may only be interested in engagement if they believe it serves corporate needs. This strengthens the need for a credible psychosocial model, rather than case studies and anecdotal evidence, as it can explain why managerial and organisational practices lead to particular outcomes (and why, sometimes, anticipated outcomes do not manifest).

One interviewee discussed how pro-safety norms, beliefs and values can be discussed with workers to seek a consensus: the safety agenda is not ‘owned’ by the organisation. Another spoke about leaders adopting a coaching or mentoring approach. These are interesting insights as they illustrate how person-centred safety might work in practice.

8.11 Limitations of the study

It is again possible to speculate whether more interviewees with different academic and professional backgrounds might generate new codes or challenge existing codes. It may have been interesting to interview and explore the perspective of academics or professionals (or business leaders) who believe that an authoritarian or ‘dictatorial’ approach is appropriate. The theoretical sampling strategy intentionally sought people who could still challenge but could also enrich the emerging theory rather than being completely antagonistic to the core principles. More challenging views may, however, emerge during the next stage of the research.

It is also possible that a different researcher would have asked different questions, coded the responses differently or found interconnections or contradictions between
data that this researcher missed. The ontological position of this research accepts that there can never be a perfect representation of reality: at best, research can shed a murky light on it and attempt to explain the mechanisms that give rise to particular, perceived outcomes. The epistemological position and methodological framework also accept that coding (and the creation of knowledge) is an abductive process that draws on the researcher’s experience and insights. People with different professional and personal experiences might reach different conclusions from the same data.

The proof is in the eating: does the theory adequately explain people’s lived experience? That theory needs to be re-articulated in light of the focus groups and interviews before being ‘tested’ through conversations with workers and managers.

8.12 The revised model of engagement

This research is informed by a critical realist ontology. Critical realists seek to reveal generative mechanisms which lead to some sort of outcome (Clark et al. 2007, Bunt 2016 and Schiller 2016). The critical realist aims to build a conceptual model or theory to explain human experience (Roberts 2014, Schiller 2016). The first iteration of this model, which was based on an input-process-output structure, was called the 8 lane model. This was found to have a number of gaps. A new iteration of the model should incorporate the new insights gained through the focus groups and interviews.

Specifically, a new iteration of the model needs to:

- Explain the organisational context in which engagement occurs.
- Highlight the relationship between a worker and their colleagues or team.
• Draw attention to the importance of the worker’s perceptions of their experiences in the workplace.

• Better explain the generative mechanisms, i.e. the psychosocial processes, involved. In other words, why do certain management and/or organisational practices lead to enhanced motivation and self-efficacy? The function of roles and norms are a key element of the emerging theory but are poorly articulated in the 8 lane model.

• Highlight the agency of the worker in the engagement process: engagement is not something that is simply done to them.

8.12.1 Visualising the model

There is some validity in maintaining an input-process-output model, in which the inputs are largely within an organisation’s direct control (the culture, procedures and management practices). The processes are the psychosocial mechanisms, beginning with an individual’s perceptions of those inputs. These will largely be ‘hidden’ to the organisation and often to the individual. The outputs are the behavioural consequences, which can themselves impact on the organisation, team or manager.

Interviewee one mentioned a “virtuous circle” which was similar to the “reciprocation spiral” mentioned by Delobbe et al. (2016). This led the researcher to use a circle to visualise and present the model, and highlight the agency of the worker in interpreting, responding to and creating social systems (Bandura 2006). This led to the Cycles of Employee Engagement (CyCEE) model shown below.
8.12.2 The Inputs

8.12.2.1 Culture

This refers to the culture of the senior managers and decision makers. It manifests as their beliefs, values and norms. This shapes the overarching mission and values of the organisation, and managers' perceptions of workers and how they should be managed and motivated. These perceptions will be reflected in organisational structures, policies and procedures. Individuals who conform to cultural expectations may be selected as managers, thereby perpetuating the culture.

The different features or qualities of organisational cultures emerging from the research are represented in Appendix 9. These have been presented as Culture 0, I, II and III. For example, in Culture 0, an organisation might see anger as an appropriate
management tool and would not consider it important to consistently meet workers’ basic needs. Culture I describes an organisation which seeks to maintain control (and would give rise to Safety I). Culture II, which is assumed to underlie Safety II, recognises and seeks to support the capabilities of workers by collaborating with them and providing work-related resources and removing work-related barriers. Culture III is envisaged to be the most engaging culture and revolves around recognising workers as individuals and meeting individuals’ needs in order to achieve organisational goals.

8.12.2.2 Organisational structure, policies and procedures

The overarching mission and culture will influence organisational structures, policies and procedures. These could take the form of targets, job descriptions, key performance indicators, various human resources policies (addressing issues such as training and talent management, rewards and remuneration etc.).

Policies will influence whether and how managers are trained. The procedures may strictly prescribe how to manage workers or may offer more discretion (which may give more tacit support for managers trying to respond to individual needs).

Organisational structures will likewise reflect the organisational mission and culture. These structures may directly influence whether teams and communities can form. For example, whether the workforce is structured into distinct teams, whether agency staff and zero hour contracts are used, whether workers are incentivised based on team and/or individual performance and whether those incentives put individuals or teams in competition with each other.
8.12.2.3  Leadership

Managers will perform their role depending on their own perceptions of how they think managers should behave. This could be driven by their own pre-existing beliefs and values (including their perceptions of (and interest in) workers’ needs and motivations) but could be shaped by the examples set by other managers, how managers are incentivised (e.g. targets, reward/performance structures etc.), the procedural framework governing the management role etc.

Managers may find ways of circumventing procedures or senior management expectations in order to manage in their preferred way or to respond to a situation.

Managers can employ a range of different techniques, including transactional and transformational approaches, and some may have the awareness (including emotional intelligence) and skills to adapt their style to suit the needs of the situation, group or individual they are dealing with. Different managers can use different techniques to involve workers, ranging from exchanging information to more collaborative and empowering approaches.

The representation of organisational cultures in Appendix 9 proposes the beliefs that managers may hold about workers or their own roles in the different cultures.

8.12.2.4  Team / Community

The word “community”, which was used by an interviewee, seemed a better fit than the phrase “workforce cohesion”. The culture of the organisation and organisational
procedures may facilitate or hinder the formation of team/community identity. For example, promoting shared customs such as meals out, ‘morning prayer’ meetings, collectively rewarding or penalising a whole team for the performance of individuals within it, promoting rivalry between individuals or teams (e.g. by publicly displaying performance figures) are likely to have different effects on team and identity formation.

Joining a team can be seen as stepping into a role as a member of a particular community or group, which may have distinct values, beliefs, goals, needs and norms. These will become important later.

8.12.3 The Process

The process refers to the worker’s psychological processes. Workers are individuals with their own unique personalities, values, beliefs, norms, needs, sense of identities (both personal and social identities) etc. These act as a prism through which the worker observes and attaches meaning and significance to the various inputs. These individual factors influence all the following, separate steps of the process.

8.12.3.1 Perceptions: Needs Met? Roles and goals

Through a process of ‘sensemaking’ (Griffin and Curcuruto 2016), individuals make judgements about their work environment, and whether particular needs should be and are being met. This includes basic needs (e.g. for reasonable working conditions, fair pay) and higher order psychological needs (to feel autonomous, competent etc.). Workers will also be making judgements about the roles, and associated goals, that they are being asked or want to occupy, and whether those roles (which can also be
seen as identities) help workers to meet their needs and goals. These roles are more than formal work roles and include membership of social groups or categories within the workplace (e.g. a member of a particular trade or team). The worker is also likely to hold non-work roles/identities (e.g. parent or spouse) and will have needs, goals, norms etc. associated with those roles.

Source: Self-determination theory, self-categorisation theory, role theory, principles of positive psychology.

8.12.3.2 Resources, obligations and identification

The more that a worker’s needs are met then:

- The more emotional, cognitive and physical resources the workers will have. Source: Job Demands-Resources Model.

- They may feel obliged to repay others who have helped the worker to meet their needs if they consider that the other party has done more than is strictly required (e.g. going beyond contractual requirements). Source: Social Exchange Theory.

- They may identify with the group(s) who are perceived to help the workers to meet their needs. As a result, they may begin to internalise alternative beliefs and values or adopt the identity of what they assume is a prototypical group member. Source: Social Identity Theory, Self-Categorisation Theory.

As a result of these processes a person may have the capacity and motivation to internalise different beliefs, values and perceptions. This will influence what significance they attach to different roles or norms (and the level of motivation they have to adopt and perform them) as described in the next step.
8.12.3.3  Motivation, well-being and self-efficacy

Workers have a large number of roles (and identities) available to them. A worker’s level of engagement in a role reflects a relatively stable or ‘chronic’ level of motivation and ability to occupy and invest their resources into performing the role. This motivation derives from perceptions that performing the role will meet the worker’s needs, or the needs of a group or social category with which they have identified.

A workers’ sense of self-efficacy will depend on having adequate emotional, cognitive and physical resources to invest in role performances and being able to predict the outcomes if they invest those resources. Workers can invest resources into roles that they do not find intrinsically satisfying as that role might be a vehicle for meeting other needs, such as ‘relatedness’ needs.

Engaged workers are likely to experience enhanced well-being, as a result of having their needs met, and feeling motivated, confident and belonging (MacLeod and Clarke 2009). This gives an important, ethical dimension to the model rather than (for example) superficially meeting worker’s needs in order to extract free labour from them which could lead to burnout and resentment. Bakker et al. (2011) refer to a potential ‘dark side’ of engagement. Bell (2017a, 2017b) proposed that organisations might seek to promote human flourishing and presented this as a more holistic and caring approach for the health and safety profession than pursuing ‘zero harm’.

Source: Self-determination theory, social cognitive theory
8.12.3.4  Role definition and crafting

Workers will decide what norms to attach to their available roles and to which norms they should direct their resources. The more engaged a worker is in a role the more resources this will invest in;

- Conforming to what they believe are the norms and goals of a prototypical role performer and/or;
- Expand their definition/performance of the role, going beyond these stereotypical expectations, by attaching new norms to the role (a process of ‘role crafting’).

Sometimes they may have no distinct beliefs about the benefit of specific norms (and the associated behaviours) other than perceiving them to be prototypical: it is the role or identity itself than serves the person’s needs, not specific norms and behaviours.

Some personal norms could so important to an individual (and consistent with their core beliefs, values and identity) that they may be ‘chronically salient’ and become attached to a range of roles that the worker occupies. Another possibility is that the individual’s personal identity is readily and frequently activated. They are likely to experience ambivalence in situations or roles where they are expected to adopt or conform to norms which are contrary to their ‘preferred self’.

8.12.3.5  Role & norm activation

A worker cannot simultaneously perform all the different roles (or identities) that are available to them; parent, spouse, child, worker, co-worker, sports fan etc. This would
require them to invest emotional, mental and physical energies attending to all the
different (and possibly competing) goals, beliefs, norms etc. of these different roles.

Instead, particular roles or identities are activated depending on the worker’s
perception of the situation and which role best serves their most salient needs and
goals (or the needs and goals of their social group(s)) at that time.

Roles are performed according to particular scripts (or norms). A situation will not
require all the norms associated with a particular role to be enacted. Therefore, certain
norms will also be activated depending on the person’s perception of the situation (and
their needs and goals at that moment), thereby directing how they perform their role.

Source: Norm activation theory, self-categorization theory.

8.12.4 The Output

The final step describes the behaviours that are actually performed.

8.12.5 Completing the cycle

The worker’s behaviour will be observed and interpreted by co-workers, managers etc.
They will form their own perceptions and decide whether and how to respond (based
on whether they perceive that their own needs and goals have been met or
compromised). Their behaviours will then be seen and impact on the worker, setting
off a new cycle.
Chapter 9: Interview and Focus Group with Workers and Managers

Objective 4 of the research was to develop a functional model. The purpose of this final study was to identify whether the theory and model that has emerged can adequately explain the lived experience and perception of workers and managers. The intention was to establish whether data saturation had been achieved. If, on the one hand, workers and managers expressed opinions, motivations etc. that do not ‘fit’ into the model, this would suggest that the theory needs further refinement. In contrast, if the theory can accommodate the codes that emerge during discussions with workers and managers then the theory can be seen as functionally adequate. This serves as a critical validity check as one of the validity criteria for qualitative research is whether it is practically adequate (Kempster and Parry 2011) or explains real events (Maxwell 1992, Zachariadis et al. 2013).

The general purpose of focus groups and interviews have been described in previous chapters and it is not intended to repeat that background here.

9.1 Selection and recruitment strategies

The selection criteria for participants in these studies was simply that the participants needed to be a worker or front-line supervisor/manager. Suspecting that different industries or sectors could have unique cultures, languages etc. it was deemed by the researcher to be useful to hold focus groups in different industries.
Each individual focus groups would be held with established groups (i.e. would not be a collection of strangers). This is known as homogenous sampling (Holloway and Wheeler 1996, Patton 2002, Robson 2002) and facilitates an exchange of views (Plummer-D’Amato 2008). This is because established groups may be comfortable ‘opening up’ and talking in a shared language about shared experiences and histories.

To recruit workers and supervisors for focus groups, the researcher contacted people who had already been interviewed or involved in focus groups asking them if there was a possibility of running a focus group with managers and/or workers from their own workplace. They were supplied with a copy of the focus group information sheet (approved by the Cardiff Metropolitan University Ethics Committee) to enable them to make an informed decision.

There was obviously an element of convenience sampling in this approach. These individuals had gained insights into the approach and emerging theory of the research. The researcher anticipated that this would encourage them to support this stage of the research rather than speculatively contacting individuals or companies with whom the researcher had no prior history.

This approach led to one person inviting me to hold one focus group with managers and one with workers in a call centre.

Needing viewpoints from a different industry, the author extended the search through work and academic contacts. This led to two more opportunities: A focus group with supervisors in the construction sector and an interview with a worker whom a manager described as being highly engaged.
9.1.1 Limitations of this approach

The sampling strategy is not intended to obtain a cross section of the working population or from one industry or company. The sample is likely to be fundamentally biased as the people being contacted to help facilitate the focus groups all work for reputable and generally large organisations. The employees of these larger organisations, due to selection and training processes, may have different traits or qualities compared to, for example, employees of micro-companies. The individuals being selected to participate in the focus groups was beyond the researcher’s control. They might be particularly vocal, articulate, motivated or trusting individuals as less vocal, motivated or trusting individuals may not have been selected or take part. It is therefore possible that more focus groups, and focus groups in different companies or sectors, would raise different insights and challenges to the CyCEE model.

The research is not attempting to create statistically significant results. The intention is to test the adequacy of the theory to explain the lived experience and perceptions of those particular workers and managers.

9.2 Topics to be explored by the focus groups/interviews

The key purpose of the focus groups is to verify whether it is possible to ‘map’ the experiences and perceptions of the participants against the CyCEE model. Clearly, questions need to be asked to help delegates to express and make sense of their experiences and perceptions.
Using a similar approach to the interviews (Chapter 8), the researcher developed a focus group guide. These were prompts to help the researcher retain some focus but, like the interviews, the focus groups would otherwise be unstructured. Therefore, the researcher anticipated asking some or all of these questions (and the follow up questions), but not necessarily using these exact words nor in this order, and would be able to devise follow up questions which would explore answers. This is applying the approach that Charmaz (2015) recommends for interviews to focus groups.

- Describe a typical day in work. *This was intended as a ‘warm up’ question, but could lead to follow up questions such as “which of these activities do you enjoy the most?”*
- What do workers want from work?
- How do/might workers describe their work or workplace?
- What is the role of managers? How can managers best fulfil that role?
- What do workers want from their managers?
- Is there a link between how people are treated in work and how they behave? If so, what is the connection? Can you give examples?
- What is the role of workers? What might encourage them to put more effort into that role?
- In work, do workers do more than they ‘have to’? Can you give examples? What is the reason for this?

### 9.2.1 Organisational permission

The researcher wrote, via email, to the organisation where the focus group and interview was to take place in order to get permission. The focus group information sheet was sent with the email.
9.2.2 Information sheet and consent Form

At the start of the focus groups and the interview, the participants were given and asked to read the participant information sheet and to read and sign the consent form which, amongst other things, enabled the meeting to be audio-recorded.

9.2.3 The focus groups

In total there were three focus groups and one interview:

1) Focus group with 4 workers in a call centre. This was operated by a national organisation supplying energy, phone, broadband and home maintenance services. Hundreds of workers operate in a large building in a business park.

2) Focus group with 3 managers in the same call centre.

3) Focus group with 9 supervisors and site managers from one construction project. This consisted of supervisors and managers from two different sub-contractors as well as a site manager and supervisor for the principal contractor. The principal contractor is a large, national contractor. The sub-contractors are smaller firms undertaking mechanical installations.

4) Interview with one worker working in facilities management in a higher education establishment.

9.2.4 Transcription

The digital, audio recordings were uploaded to a secure server then deleted from the recording device in line with the ethics approval granted by Cardiff Metropolitan University. It was transcribed using voice recognition software, with the participants
being referred to only as supervisor, worker etc. In part, this was to protect anonymity and in part it was sometimes difficult to distinguish between different voices. Open codes were identified as the text was being transcribed. Upon completion of the transcription, the audio recording was deleted from the secure server.

9.3 Findings

The results of the focus groups and interviews are presented in line with the structure of the CyCEE model to explicitly show how participants’ perceptions and lived experience correspond to the model. Some quotes touch upon a number of elements of the model and are discussed where they appear to have the most significance.

Throughout the process new insights will be added to the representation of organisational cultures in Appendix 9.

9.3.1 Culture

The interviews revealed that some aspects of the culture of the organisations, and potentially a wider industry could be inferred by the answers given by managers and workers as explained in the following extracts.

9.3.1.1 Insights into the culture in construction

An opening question to the construction supervisors asked what their workers might say about their work. A number of the construction supervisors initially laughed before
one said: “they’ll probably whinge and moan about anything, nothing will be right but it’s a matter of just pick yourself up, shake yourself down and crack on and get on with it.” The supervisors seem to view complaining as a norm of construction workers. It also appears that the supervisors consider the complaints to either be without merit or believe that workers should just accept whatever is wrong. The concept of understanding and meeting worker’s higher psychological needs seems quite far removed from this perspective.

When asked what motivates people to come to work, one supervisor said “money”. Asked what workers enjoy about their job, one supervisor suggested “4 o’clock when they get in their vans”. This appears to be describing a transactional perception of work: the exchange of a set amount of labour for a set amount of money.

It is feasible that these views do not accurately portray the behaviours of construction workers. Potentially, people who are acting in a supervisory role might adopt particular beliefs about workers (e.g. they are only motivated by money and complain about anything) and might adopt norms into their definition of the supervisory role (e.g. being dismissive of complaints). From the perspective of self-categorisation and social identity theories, this may be a ‘classic’ example of one social group evaluating another group negatively to enhance their own perceived status.

There were no dissenting voices in the focus group. Very tentatively, one could suggest that this might mean that these beliefs and perceptions are embedded in the culture of the organisations (or even industry).
Any engagement intervention might begin by exploring the beliefs of managers and supervisors (which might shed light on the organisational culture). Engagement strategies could then need to be tailored to suit the existing culture of an organisation.

In the case of the construction supervisors/managers it may be important to start at a simple level and ensure that workers have reasonable working conditions and that ‘genuine’ complaints are being dealt with.

9.3.1.2 Culture from the perspective of call centre workers

During a discussion about their working arrangements, a rapid exchange took place amongst the call centre workers, starting with a revelation that the company had received a financial penalty. Later it was explained that this was due to breaches of financial regulations regarding mis-selling.

“This is the first outbound centre they’ve done in seven years. They had a massive fine, they had. They’re still trying to find their feet of what they can and can’t do.

They’re so scared.

They’re doing trial and error, and once they’ve found their feet with one thing, maybe they’ll get like a bit softer on that.

One of the biggest problems I personally find is if you do something wrong, instead of turning around and saying “why do you think you done it wrong?”, I just get “you signed this piece of paper six months ago saying that you knew this happened”. Well, I’ve definitely slept since then for a start [laughter]. We’ve gone through three different jobs
and...gone back to this then they’re like “well you signed this piece of paper so that’s your fault.”

They’ll get a piece of paper to say that they taught us but it might be literally thrown under your nose while you’re on a call and told to sign it.

Researcher: Are they codes of conduct?

They’re briefs...say you had to ask everyone who lives in Preston if they had a dog...and then you forget and you signed that piece of paper, they’ll bring that piece of paper back up and say “you said you understood it”. I’m not saying I don’t understand it, simply put I forgot, we haven’t done it in so long, we’ve forgotten. No excuse.

Be a bit organised. If you’ve got a brief about [one product line] you can have them in different files and then every time you go into a job, “here you go, everyone pass them around, you brush up on all them”.

But no one does that do they?

The problem is, what happens is, I could fail on something then he could fail on exactly the same thing, and she could fail on exactly the same thing, and only at that point then will they say “right, we should brief this out”

These quotes give a perception of the organisation as fearful and, as a result, controlling and blaming. Frequent exchanges (discussed later) also revealed a perception of the organisation as being unfair (e.g. measuring or rewarding/penalising workers for matters beyond their own control).
Regardless of what values or culture the company purport to have, it is possible that narratives such as this help to describe, shape and sustain workers’ perceptions of their organisation. Indeed, constructivist grounded theory sees the research process as a mutual, inclusive exchange between participant and researcher which both reveal and generate ‘storied meaning’ about their experiences (Williams and Keady 2012).

As he was leaving, the researcher noticed that the organisation displayed its values on the wall. These did not describe strict compliance as an organisational value. In fact, the values contained concepts such as being innovative which appears to be in stark contrast to the workers’ lived experiences and perceptions. This brought to mind a quote from the focus group with professionals:

we have a vision and a set of five beliefs within the organisation I work for but they were just announced. I’m not saying that there’s anything wrong with them but I’m not sure that anyone truly embraces them because it didn’t come from anyone within the organisation.

MacLeod and Clarke (2009: 75) propose that a compelling, authentic ‘strategic narrative’ is an enabler for engagement. They describe it as:

a clearly expressed story about what the purpose of an organisation is, why it has the broad vision it has, and how an individual contributes to that purpose. Employees have a clear line of sight between their job and the narrative, and understand where their work fits in. These aims and values are reflected in a strong, transparent and explicit organisational culture and way of working.
Although not specifically discussing engagement, Williams et al. (2016) highlighted the importance for healthcare providers to develop a ‘moral architecture’ that permeates through organisational governance and procedures to ensure that staff are treated with the same compassion as, it is hoped, they will treat patients. They describe how one Trust actively engaged staff in describing how they can ‘live’ their values.

Collectively these exchanges revealed that although the concept of culture is quite nebulous, workers form and verbalise perceptions of organisational culture. They appear to use these perceptions to interpret and make sense of managers’ motivations. It is possible that workers would evaluate ‘controlling’, managerial behaviour differently if the motivation and ultimate purpose for compliance was perceived as serving pro-social purposes, such as treating customers fairly, rather than fear. The motivational effect (for some people) of having a perceived positive social impact, and of organisations pursuing espoused, positive mission statements, are highlighted by Suh et al. (2011), Castanheira et al. (2016) and DeSimone et al. (2016).

This reinforces the importance of understanding different perceptions of the organisational culture. An organisation might then need to work with staff to retell the story of the organisation (rather than this being a top-down, marketing exercise primarily pitched at customers or shareholders).

9.3.1.3 Values

One construction manager offered this insight:

_I’ve worked with [my company] for 40 years or so. I was taken on as an apprentice and I’ve come through. I’ve respected the elders in my trade_
and the elder fitters, you know it just comes down, it steps down. Now we got youngsters out who probably just started, we got one in particular… so long as he progresses well, and obviously knows his job and whatever, again there’s no saying he won’t be here for 40 or 50 years. So, we’re a family company and we keep it that way. You look after your workforce because at the end of the day it’s your workforce that’s going to make you your money.

It seems that this manager attaches particular beliefs and values to the culture of a “family company”. A “family company” is being associated with looking after and having a long-term commitment to the workers. This quote also infers what this manager perceives as important to workers; job security and opportunities to progress.

Asked what else made a ‘family company’, a manager and a supervisor shared examples such as socialising outside work or the firm hiring a minibus to take the workers to a horse race event and “put a bit of money in as a bit of respect and to thank them for the job”. These displays of respect and gratitude are distant in time and space from the actual behaviour and are not governed by formal or informal agreements. They do not seem to be the contingent rewards of transactional managers. Instead, they appear to be reciprocal and symbolic exchanges which are being used to acknowledge contributions. This exemplifies how social exchanges occur in practice.

The quote reveals a perception, in common with the interviews with professionals, that looking after the workforce is driven, in part, by a desire to meet organisational objectives (in this case, “to make you your money”). Some managers may accept the idea that engaging workers, perhaps by looking after their welfare, is good for the
organisation. The idea of ‘looking after’ workers, and the concept of having “elders”, may suggest that managers are seen in a patriarchal or parental role.

The quote reveals a perception that the role of apprentice should incorporate norms such as respecting elders, which may expose enduring, traditional views of the master-apprentice relationship in some professions or industries. This quote also appears to present “elders” as role models (“it just comes down, it steps down”), perhaps suggesting how norms as well as work-related skills and knowledge are passed on.

This exchange illustrates that managers have pre-existing beliefs of what workers want and need (and how they should behave) and have ideas about whether and how organisations can meet those needs. The may be informed by the beliefs and values embedded (or perceived to be embedded) within the culture of the organisation. In this case, they are associated with what it means to be a family company. The focus groups demonstrated that is relatively easy to shed light on these beliefs. Engagement initiatives would ideally do so, to understand why different managerial practices are being adopted in different teams and organisations.

It also reveals that the managers have a more nuanced and balanced view of workers than first suggested. Although workers might be perceived to complain, they are also presented here as deserving of thanks, respect, job security and being ‘looked after’.
9.3.1.4 Perceptions of workers as weak / organisational culture being self-sustaining

The call centre managers were asked how a “regimented” manager (a term that they had used themselves) might describe their team or the people on their team.

They feel their team are weak. The people on their team are weak, they’re pushovers and what they say, they’ll do, and they never cross them. Then what you find is eventually they cross them and that’s the end of them, to be honest…I think the one’s who’s in charge think that they know what’s best, I think they want to employ and drive people who are exactly the same as themselves. I think very similar mistakes are going to be made very soon in this business where they are expanding and the people who are doing the recruitment, or the main person doing recruitment, is going to employ very similar people to them.

This manager had a keen insight into how a culture sustains itself if managers only recruit managers who have a similar approach to themselves. In this case, there is a perception of workers as weak and needing to be controlled. The call centre workers (i.e. not the managers) appeared to have similar perceptions when asked how promotion works.

I think sometimes the problem is, the people who are in the higher end management have got their favourites and they don’t really hide the fact that they are their favourites.

The workers discussed a perceived lack of fairness in the promotion process (and a lack of fairness was a recurring theme throughout their responses). The interviewee
also expressed beliefs that people were rarely promoted on the basis of ability within their organisation (which is within a higher education sector), whereas he saw it as commonplace in the private sector. Shuck (2011) supports this contention. An organisation’s recruitment processes would need to be reviewed if seeking to ‘diagnose’ why some organisations are chronically engaging or disengaging.

### 9.3.2 Organisational Procedures

Recruitment processes are just one example of organisational policies and procedures. The extracts above illustrate how organisational processes can be shaped by and help sustain the culture. The following quotes reveal how other aspects of organisational processes can impact on workers and their perceptions.

#### 9.3.2.1 Impact of the working environment

In the following quotes the call centre workers revealed the positive impact of the layout of the workplace. They were asked what they enjoyed about their company:

> Having the team manager out on the floor helps, not stuck away in offices. They’re always there to approach.

This arrangement seems to give workers easy access to the ‘resource’ of help by a manager and availability of managers had been established in earlier focus groups as a quality of good leaders). Another added to this saying:

> The open plan layout works. I’ve worked in some call centres where you’re caged off from everyone and that’s not helpful at all.
Asked what else they liked about the open plan layout there was a quick exchange

You’re allowed to have a laugh and joke on the floor.

You get to know your team members…You can ask your team mates if you’ve got any questions or queries…You can socialise between different teams as well because, like I said, if they box you off then you tend to probably only socialise with the people you are actually on your team with. You’ll probably never speak to the people in the next team over.

We’re pretty loud…you would never get away with that in the other ones I’ve worked in. Your team’s always bloody singing and that!

From a job demands-resources perspective, the working environment gives the workers access to informal resources (“you can ask your team mates if you’ve got any questions or queries”). This might help them to feel safe and competent. From a role perspective, it may be that these workers enjoy being able to step between work and social roles, or have expanded their perception of the role of worker to include norms around socialising with colleagues. This is likely to help them meet relatedness needs. These quotes illustrate how the physical and social organisation of the workplace can impact on the extent to which workers’ needs are fulfilled.
9.3.2.2 Impact of organisational procedures on worker’s perception of work quality, autonomy and fairness

The way that work was structured and rewarded impacted on the experience of call centre workers. This exchange followed an invitation for them to describe their work:

*R*epetitive. *S*elling the same thing every day.

*It’s an easy job.*

*Customers will ask you for your opinion and you’re not allowed to say anything.*

*It’s the stress of meeting the requirements or expectations of managers but the actual job is the easiest, it’s the expectations of the business that adds the stress.*

*That’s what drains a lot of people.*

*It’s all well and good. I can sit in front of the computer and sell to someone every day and you go to a certain page “you do this, you do that” but you’re getting marked on stuff that’s completely out of your reach...Conversion rates, things like that...it’s not our fault that the customer don’t want it.*

*It’s the luck of the draw.*

*Especially on an in-bound line, if someone comes in and they want it, they’re going to want it. If they’re going to ask questions and not want it, it’s not our fault, we’re answering the questions. Especially when we’re in a business and industry where we’re in the spotlight so we’re...*
not allowed to push for a sale, we’re not allowed to do this, we’re not
allowed to do that.

We’re not allowed to say we’re cheaper than someone else, even if we
are we can’t say it.

Later, this theme was returned to:

They want results, but they don’t allow you to use your own initiative to
get those results. I’m not saying I want to mis-sell or lie, or anything like
that, I just want to be able to have some sort of freedom...like [another
company] will turn around and offer people incentives like cash
vouchers, things like that, they turn around and chuck you a service in
two weeks, little things to get people on board and here it’s you have
this to offer and that is it.

Later still, this worker said:

If you’re using your personality but you got to follow a script your
personality doesn’t come across and you end up sounding like a polite
sounding robot.

After a short exchange, this prompted a response:

The script that we follow is so long winded, you’re too scared you’re
going to say something that they’re not happy with, you tend to not to
build too much of a rapport with the customer because they’re going to
ask you questions that you’re not allowed to answer. You tend to try to
keep the talking to a minimum. The less you say on a call the less
chance you got of breaching.
You can get told off for saying too much..."why didn't you explore on this?"...then you go into depth and they go “No, it's wrong.”

The dialogue highlighted a number of key themes:

- To one person the job was repetitive, to someone else the same job was easy. This probably reflects individual values, needs, perceptions and expectations. It highlights the challenge revealed by the Taylor review (2017): good work means different things to different people and some people might enjoy ‘easy’ work.

- Workers felt, and kept returning, to a sense of injustice about how some aspects of how their performance are measured. In particular, they wanted to be measured on matters that were within their control. A subsequent section of dialogue explored the workers’ perception that some parts of the business were inherently more likely to generate sales and that it was unfair to have the same sales targets and expectations across the business.

- Unclear or shifting perceptions about what is or is not acceptable behaviour appear to lead to a sense of unfairness and may undermine the sense of psychological safety.

- The interview later clarified that for some workers the emotional demands (or “stress”) of the work appears to come from the need to prescriptively follow written ‘scripts’, to meet regulatory requirements. The extract above suggests that workers consequently feel unable to perform at that best (“we’re not allowed to push for a sale”), yet are being measured on their ‘conversion rates’ (the number of calls that result in a sale). From the perspective of self-determination theory and social cognitive theory, the workers are unable to feel a sense of mastery or autonomy (“they don’t allow you to use your own initiative”).
• Some workers experience fear when performing their duties. Earlier, they identified that the organisational culture was defined in part by fear, and this fear is reflected in organisational processes and management practices which penalise workers for “breaching”.

9.3.2.3 Work procedures as unfair

The call centre workers expressed dissatisfaction with what one called a lack of structure stating “I could be put in a team where I don’t know what I’m doing. I don’t think that’s very good management skills at all”. One did not know where she would work the following day and the workers described being redeployed at short notice to different teams. Another explained that each role has its own “pitfalls” and quality standards and there was no time to prepare. This prompted a response: “particularly as it’s all based on sales and if we don’t hit our targets, we don’t get our bonus”.

Later, one worker explained that different parts of the business used different software systems. She used the word “horrendous” to describe the experience of being moved around and using up to seven different systems which she did not feel competent to use and which the managers (she said) knew that workers are not competent to use.

Another worker explained that a single call could generate sales of four different products requiring the use of four different systems, but they were marked as non-compliant if they took four times as long undertaking post-call administration “and if you mess up then it’s your fault because you didn’t check your work”.
The source of the dissatisfaction was framed in terms of organisational decisions about how to deploy workers, the decision to operate multiple software systems leading to workers feeling incompetent, and offering workers little control over or information about their working arrangements. There was a perception of procedures relating to rewards and bonuses being unfair and the culture being one of blame.

The worker was describing what has been called hindrance stressors (Crawford et al. 2010, Clarke 2012); lack of training; complex systems; lack of control; insufficient time. From a job demands-resources model, or the HSE stress management standards (HSE 2017b), there appears to be an excess of demands and insufficient resources. Yet again, this highlights the need for engagement initiatives to begin by ensuring that basic foundations are in place. In the UK, this should include assessing and managing sources of stress, potentially using the HSE’s stress management standards.

9.3.2.4 Training for managers

None of the call centre managers had received formal management training (as found by Shuck 2011). One sought mentoring and advice from other managers. He also learned by observing managers and consciously deciding not to duplicate their methods “as I don’t always agree with the way they do things.”

One of the call centre managers, who expressed the most engaging beliefs and practices out of all the managers and supervisors in the focus groups, referred to past training he had received as a sports coach. This loosely begins to suggest a possible, beneficial connection between coaching training and engaging leadership practices. It
is possible that male-dominated industries, such as construction, could respond better to leadership training delivered under the guise of sports coaching.

The CyCEE model, and underlying theories, highlights the importance of leadership skills and qualities in promoting engagement. It was surprising that a large, national organisation does not have a formal leadership development programme. An initiative to improve employee engagement might, as suggested elsewhere, need to include training in leadership skills. This might be structured into ‘foundation, intermediate and advanced’ training, with positive transactional management skills and basic communication and assertiveness skills forming the foundation training. Poxon (2007), Kines et al. (2010) and Breevaart et al. (2014) demonstrate that leadership skills can be taught and reinforced through coaching and feedback.

9.3.3 Leadership

9.3.3.1 The role of managers

One of the call centres managers described himself as a coach which involved listening to ‘phonecalls, identifying non-compliances and coaching staff. He described his role as protecting the business and helping ensure it complies with Regulations. Another initially described their role as “dealing with problems” and then “staying on top of their compliance and their conversion and availability” (relating to the number of calls that were converted into sales and the time spent on calls). In this case, the manager defined his role in terms of supporting organisational targets and objectives.
Asked to discuss their day as supervisors, one construction supervisor said that it began with “organising material and labour” and attending a meeting of supervisors.

It’s just supervising in general then…to try and correct anything you see going wrong, obviously making sure the boys have got their materials and everybody is in the place that they should be.

This also suggests a task-oriented view of supervision: allocating resources, monitoring performance and seeking to address non-conformance.

It is perhaps logical that managers and supervisors view their role in terms of supporting organisational objectives. It is possible, at least in the short-term, to meet organisational objectives by over-working staff and ignoring their needs. The researcher was curious whether the supervisors also defined their role in terms of how they should support and interact with workers.

The construction supervisors were therefore asked how they would address poor performance. This led to a short exchange which revealed a desire to maintain the self-esteem of workers:

You pull them to one side, you don’t have to dress anybody down in public… Then point them in the right direction because that’s all you can do.

Keep it light the first once or twice, don’t you, make a little bit of a, not a joke of it…a bit of banter
It is notable that “poor performance” was immediately associated with ‘dressing down’ rather than understanding underlying causes. This correlates with call centre workers’ perceptions of how they are treated and blamed if they breach operating procedures.

The construction supervisors were later asked how else they build up “respect” (a word they had used). This gave insights into the norms attached to their role as supervisors:

*You got to be fair with them, treat them tidy like you want to be treated.*

*And jump in with them when they’re busy, that’s the main thing…*  
*Help the boys out, it takes the pressure off everyone then doesn’t it?*  
*Off yourself and off the boys.*

Asked what being fair means, one supervisor said:

*If you shout and scream at everyone, the atmosphere goes crap…it if you treat everyone tidy they work better.*

Although the overarching role of the supervisor is framed in terms of helping the team to achieve organisational objectives, these exchanges appear to have exposed the norms that are attached to the role of supervisor to help them achieve that goal; help out when needed (which is ‘activated’ when the team is busy); treat people like you expect to be treated; help workers maintain their self-esteem etc. Underlying these norms are beliefs such as that people work better when they are spoken to in a ‘tidy’ manner (not “shout and scream”).
As well as indicating how pre-existing managerial beliefs, norms and behaviours might impact on worker’s experiences, this exchange again illustrates that it is relatively easy to shine light on those beliefs, norms and behaviours. It also demonstrates how roles are constructed from an amalgamation of norms, some of which will only be relevant and activated in certain situations.

9.3.3.2 Anger and apologies: The role of gender norms

The reference to shouting and screaming correlates with a finding from one of the interviews which revealed a perception that some construction site managers see anger as a tool. Despite a supervisor saying that “if you shout and scream at everyone, the atmosphere goes crap” a manager said:

   I might have a rant and rave with someone every now and again, I don’t hold a grudge but we move on, I’ll be a bastard one minute but your best mate the next... I’ll tell it as it is.

The manager was challenged by the site manager “do you apologise for it?...that is a big thing”.

   If I think I’m in the wrong I’ll openly apologise straight away. I don’t care who’s stood around… I’m not afraid to apologise, no man should ever be afraid to apologise.

After a short exchange (during which someone said “you all blow it as some time”), a supervisor (who worked under the ‘rant and rave’ manager) said:

   I’d rather see you before I go home, because I hate the thought of coming in in the morning and facing you again, I’d rather see you on
the way home and say “see you tomorrow - it’s all good isn’t it?”. It
might not be words [he then mimed waving and making eye contact].

Job done isn’t it?

The researcher was left with a mental image of an older, grumpy silver-back gorilla and the younger males going through a ritual to either appease the chief gorilla or enact a series of behaviours to test whether they are safe from further attack.

This is suggesting that various beliefs and norms, some of which may be gender-based, are being attached to the role of supervisor, manager and/or site worker; it’s acceptable for (or even expected that) people will lose their temper from time to time; tell it as it is; apologise if you are in the wrong; apologise in public (and men should not be afraid of doing so); do not hold grudges; ‘clear the air’, or make sure the air is cleared, before going home. Using grounded theory, Choudhry and Fang (2008) found that unsafe behaviours in construction can be driven by a desire to be seen as ‘tough guys’ who were not afraid of being hurt. This helps confirm the potential need to discuss and understand gender norms as part of safety interventions.

This code suggests that, for some organisations, engagement initiatives need to start at a basic level. For a manager who has a “rant and rave” and is “a bastard”, training in positive transactional management and assertiveness or communication skills may be an improvement. Training managers to meet higher order, individual needs could be delayed until the foundations are in place. Shuck et al. (2011) note that managers are often promoted without management preparation programs.
9.3.3.3 Managers as information brokers

The initial survey revealed that engagement and involvement relied on the provision of information. Call centre workers had different perceptions of how well different managers conveyed information:

So there’s one team manager I know out of the four, he’s pretty top on keeping all his advisors informed, one-to-ones, the lot. Then there’s another manager on the floor where [sighs] well [laughter]. It’s very difficult to get information out from the manager.

My team manager is good on getting information out to everyone. Praising a lot. He boasts about the team so he’s like…

“My team’s the best”

Lavelle et al. (2007) propose that employees will have different quality relationships with different people or groups. It is feasible that different norms are activated when workers are dealing with different managers or they might perceive their role as a subordinate of manager A as quite different to their role as a sub-ordinate of manager B. This question was not put to the group, however.

The quality of managers was judged, in part, on their ability to disseminate information. Organisational information might be perceived as a resource (from the perspective of the JD-R model) or commodity, with some managers being perceived to withhold it, whether intentionally or through lack of understanding.
This exchange also revealed worker’s perception that some managers took pride in their team. They also seem to recognise it as authentic (“praising a lot” was followed by “he boasts about the team”).

These quotes illustrate leadership qualities that might help workers to meet their needs and potentially help build high quality, relational exchanges with managers.

9.3.3.4 Empathy of managers

A call centre worker said that some managers do not have a sales background and suggested that managers would be better if they spent time “on the ‘phones”. In particular, the workers said that on an ‘outbound’ line they face a lot of rejection and some customers are “personally nasty”. One participant said that it would be beneficial for managers throughout ‘the hierarchy’ to spend time on the ‘phones.

If you’re going to turn around and tell me how my job is and how I’m supposed to do it, unless you’ve walked a mile in my shoes, don’t pretend you know the person I am.

The call centre managers (in a separate focus group) echoed this perception:

You get better buy in from a team of people if they think you know what you’re doing or you’ve done it.

Agreed.

That’s why some of the best football managers succeed, because they’ve gone through the training. You know, they’ve had the knocks, they’ve had the rejections.
It was fascinating that both the call centre workers and managers touched on the importance of a manager understanding the “rejections”. This hints at workers looking for managers to have empathy and both groups perceived that this is developed through common experience. This may promote a sense of psychological safety for workers and may support identification.

The focus groups with professionals offered a different perception, suggesting that workers and managers might acknowledge and respect that they have different areas of expertise and knowledge. It is possible that a manager who lacks the same occupational background as a worker might still be trained to have listening skills and could develop their emotional intelligence to allow them to display similar levels of empathy. This might form the advanced stages of a leadership training programme.

The value of shared experience was also evident in a response from the construction supervisors, who suggested that it led to respect (rather than a sense of empathy):

We’ve been in their position as well, see, they respect that when they’re doing the work we’ve done it ourselves… They know that when we talk to them or speak to them or ask them things they respect us because we’ve been there and done it.
9.3.3.5 Understanding individual motivations and encouraging role crafting

The call centre managers were asked what motivations ("drives") their workers had, leading to an exchange between two managers:

"Some people want to do well so they get promoted, some want to come in, do their work and go home."

"Recognition."

"Yeah, some people just want a thank you."

"Job security."

"I had a situation where my team was over-achieving...they never seem to get recognition from higher up, so I knew exactly what to do, I spoke to my manager and got her to send me an email saying "well done" which I just forwarded out. That was to motivate one person which in turn motivated the whole team because that person is very influential on the team."

"We were on about this the other day, weren't we?"

"Yeah, you need to pick out who your key influencers are on the team. If you win over that one person, you win the team over."

"You got like a captain within a team haven't you?"

"You have. You get the captain on board, you get the rest...on board."
The first part of the exchange revealed an understanding by one manager that different workers have different needs and motivations, while the other one spoke about more generic needs (recognition and job security).

The second part of the exchange talked about working through “captains”. These managers seem comfortable with the notion of not being the most influential person in the team. This corresponds with the code ‘leaders letting go of authority’ which arose during the interviews with professionals and academics.

Later one manager said that he was aware of a high performing individual in a different team who had said he was carrying his team (his own high sales figures were masking weaker performance by others). The manager said he would have:

*Used his skills to try to bring everybody up to his level…I would have had him to do team briefs, share best practice, recognition, maybe making him a bit more of a senior on a team*  

*Side-by-side coaching, things like that.*

The managers were asked what the pay-off would be for the worker who was being asked to do the coaching:

*It gives them a massive sense of self-belief.*  

*It gives them a bit of direction about where they might want to go in the future. So perhaps that person might feel they could be beneficial as a manager or perhaps a coach but they haven’t been given the opportunities to really shine.*
Managers are describing asking workers to participate in role-crafting: integrating promotive tasks and behaviours into their role definition to support the development and performance of the team. There is a recognition that the worker is doing this due to some intangible or potential personal ‘pay off’ (i.e. it meets their needs).

9.3.3.6 Favouritism

The call centre workers spoke negatively about managers having favourites. The call centre managers described treating people like individuals, and working through ‘captains’. The managers were asked how they avoided accusations of favouritism. One said he had private conversations with individuals to “build trusting relationships”.

However, it is possible that this approach could fuel speculation and rumours about which the workers spoke negatively. It could create a ‘charismatic’ leadership style, similar to the golf scenario from the focus groups, where an individual manager acts as a surreptitious gift-giver, building secretive alliances. An alternative approach could involve being very open in how decisions are made. These challenges could be addressed in the advanced stages of a leadership training programme.

Any engagement initiatives aimed at meeting individual needs will need to acknowledge and address the potential challenge of being accused of favouritism (or, on the flip side, discrimination).
9.3.3.7 Policies and procedures supporting individualism vs a ‘regimented’ approach

To test whether organisational procedures might encourage managers to treat workers like individuals, the call centre managers were asked whether their own organisation’s policies and procedures encouraged them to treat people the same or like individuals.

They want people to be treated the same, the same rules and regulations, processes that have to be followed, performance-wise, disciplinary-wise, behaviour-wise. How they are implemented, I believe, comes down to the manager. I implement things on my team very differently from another manager who’s down there. I don’t feel that chucking paper at people and telling them off every two seconds is a way to drive performance, I’d rather talk to somebody. If I took over a team I’d give everybody a month before I handed out any coaching plan, any action plans, any improvement plans so they’ve got a month to show me what they can do.

Later, two managers were comparing their approach to managing their teams and said that they had a similar approach. They contrasted this with another team on their floor:

Whereas other teams on the floor, they’re a lot more…regimented?

One team, definitely, yeah.

They’re just barked at.

Yeah. Sit by the desk, don’t leave the desk.

Do as I say.
But that’s always what’s worked for that – you can’t slate that person, because that person has probably felt very successful in that position, doing it that particular way. I think you need to be more in with the team rather than managing the team, because the team will manage themselves, if you put the right foundations in.

Being “in with the team” may indicate an attempt to have a more egalitarian relationship. The notion of teams self-managing may support the concept of managers letting go of authority and empowering teams to determine the most effective ways of achieving goals and objectives. Later, the managers were asked what the effect would be of being in a regimented team.

The issue with it is, after a period of time, they buy in to it but then they don’t take feedback off anyone else or they won’t take criticism off anyone else…so that person becomes like a regiment, they only take orders off their commander which makes it very difficult if what the commander is doing isn’t very successful.

A certain person was off the other day, I was asked to cover their team, but when it comes to be providing direction and instruction they didn’t want to take it…the words I actually got was “I don’t want it from you, I’ll only accept it if my manager is telling me”.

This offers an insight into how a specific group of workers, due to their experience of working under a particular management style, can attach certain norms to their role as a worker or employee and sustain certain management practices or culture. This
corresponds to the concept of “followership” which arose during the interviews. In this case, the norm appears to be to reject advice/instruction from other managers.

Later, the managers proposed that acceding to a regimented approach allowed the workers to avoid feeling personally accountable, blaming instructions or lack of instructions for any non-conformances. A strict transactional approach could, perhaps ironically, promote worker's sense of psychological safety as there are unequivocal rules and boundaries. This corresponds closely with the observations made during the interviews that workers will not universally seek high levels of autonomy.

This desire for certainty might be particularly noticeable in teams or organisations, such as the call centre, where there is perceived to be a culture of fear so that greater autonomy and therefore personal responsibility may present more personal risk.

This exchange reinforces the observation that some managers will be more open than others to the idea of meeting workers’ needs and the need to understand both managers’ and workers’ expectations and perceptions. The proposed structure for an engagement focus group in appendix 6 offers an approach for doing this.

9.3.3.8 Positive view of transactional management

The researcher asked the call centre workers to imagine that he had a magic wand and could turn them into senior managers: what would they do differently? This prompted an exchange between several participants which supported the idea that workers would sometimes look favourably on a more controlling leadership style. One worker acted out what he would do differently:
“Right, everyone in here for ten minutes, just a quick one guys, pow wow, you’re doing this, you’re doing this, you’re doing this”, at least everyone will know. Problem is, it gets to a point then when it comes down the grapevine and someone hears this and someone hears this and someone hear this.

And everyone starts chatting.

Yeah, “I heard we’re expected to do 20 sales a day” and that turns into 2000 sales a week by the time it gets into the corner, like.

I guess that’s what’s lacking on the floors: communication between the hierarchy and the advisors, even the hierarchy and the managers.

It would be good if, if all the managers are too busy to do stuff like that, I’d like it so that…someone in the team, if they wanted it, could have like a communications champion, so that person could cascade to everyone else and they could tell the manager or the team themselves so that takes the stress off managers of having to do stuff and it gives someone else extra responsibility which looks good on them.

There was then a discussion about how that role could be fairly allocated, making sure it was offered to people who might not already be making extra contributions.

This exchange touched on a number of important themes. These workers appear to prefer a transactional management style, in which decisions and expectations are clearly communicated but not discussed or explained, to an unclear or laissez-faire approach in which there is a lack of clarity which can then be a source of confusion or worry (e.g. about sales targets). This echoes the coding of bad leaders from the earlier
focus groups (which provided quotes such as “changing their mind on a whim” and “Hypocrisy – say one thing do something else”). It confirms the notion that it is important to first meet basic needs (e.g. for psychological safety) and reinforces the importance of evaluating the current culture and ensuring that basics are in place (e.g. clear communication). Finally, these insights could lend support to the proposal by Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi’s (2000) that autonomy is not universally desired.

Of particular importance is the illustration of how workers can seek out new roles or expand work roles to meet their needs (or the needs of their group). In this case, the worker proposed that workers could become communications champions. It became apparent that this hypothetical position was being seen as a ‘perk’ even though it involved “extra responsibility”. In part this may because it was seen to meet the needs of individuals as it “looks good on them”. Jha and Jha (2013) found that being part of a “special project team” could lead workers to become part of an in-group and more highly engaged with managers due to the time and attention they receive from managers and the heightened status they associate with their position.

This role also addressed a perceived need of the workforce for clear and timely communication. Earlier, it became clear how important information was to workers. This champion would essentially be trading in a valued commodity which might help explain why status was attached to that role. Such a proposal challenges pre-conceived notions about how information should filter through an organisation. In this model, workers move from being recipients of information to sources and distributors of knowledge. This offers an insight into how workers want, and might be given, greater control and power over the organisation or operation of the workplace, even if they do not have control over how they do their work tasks.
9.3.3.9 Managers taking personal risks and letting go of authority

Earlier, it was proposed that some managers recognise that they are not the most influential person on the team. This theme reappeared when the call centre managers discussed why a ‘regimental’ manager had not used a high performing team member to coach others. One suggested this would have stopped the manager from feeling “superior” and he had not done it because “it puts himself at risk”.

*It’s a massive thing. I’ve seen it all before. Managers don’t put themselves at risk.*

*Well, certain managers. A competent manager would.*

The ability to take risks is a defining quality of transformational leaders (Bass 1985). This exchange reveals that even with no formal training, some managers recognise these higher order leadership qualities.

Later the managers were asked about their own managers. They contrasted one, described as a “people person”, with another who they again called “regimented”:

*If something goes wrong, it’s explosions, the world’s coming to an end.*

*If something’s going right, but it’s meant to go right so let’s just leave it.*

This ‘management by exception’ approach is the polar opposite of safety differently which is based around trying to understand what makes things go right rather than trying to avoid things going wrong (Green 2016, Beach 2017). A direct consequence is that the manager is most visible when there are problems, and their appearance is
seen as something negative: a harbinger of doom (“the world’s coming to an end”). The managers were asked what they think should happen when things go right:

*The same as you do within your team. Recognition, share best practice, reward people.*

*Just use that positivity to keep the managers geared up, if you like.*

It is interesting to note that the culture of the call centre, seen through the eyes of workers, was one of fear leading to strict control and blame. The call centre managers suggested that at an individual level, fear about losing status or control drove “ regimented” behaviour by a manager.

9.3.3.10 Not wanting to know workers as individuals

The CyCEE model revolves around treating workers as individuals. During the focus group with construction managers, in response to a question about the link between how people are treated and their behaviour, a more senior manager said:

*You don’t really know what people are going through. So, you’re on a job, there’s hundreds of people, you don’t know who’s going through a difficult divorce or who’s got financial problems or a drinking problem or who’s extremely happy and life’s going brilliantly…we try and just to treat everybody equally in a professional way.*

It is understandable why, from a more senior perspective, it may seem impossible to get to know people as individuals so the default position is to treat everyone the same.
In response to this statement, the supervisors were asked how they would know whether someone was having a difficult time and how they would deal with it. One supervisor said he would find out due to “loose lips” and a manager said he might notice someone was “distracted by things outside work”. He went on to say

It’s a repetition of poor behaviour, cutting corners, that’s the thing, that’s hopefully what we’re here to remind people…you can’t get too casual about safety standards.

A supervisor said he would like to feel a worker would talk to him:

I’ve had people chat to me about personal issues and they stay with me. You can’t take everybody’s emotional issues on board… A lot of young people, I would say myself, I give advice to, they don’t have to accept it, but listen to me “don’t do that, do this” and they come back and say “I took note”, but personally I think that if any of the guys had an issue they wouldn’t speak to us.

This exchange reinforces the potential benefit of providing training to ensure that managers possess simple communication skills. The interviews with professionals and academics demonstrated the importance of selecting the right venue and ‘props’ for these discussions due to the signals that these send (e.g. talking over a cup of tea). Advanced stages of management training would need to introduce the idea of workers being individuals with unique needs and motivations.
9.3.3.11 Treating workers as individuals, recognising individual needs and securing behaviour change

The call centre managers had a different perspective to the construction supervisors as they seemed to recognise the importance of treating workers as individuals.

In response to a question about what qualities made a good sales person, one suggested “willing to adapt and take on feedback” prompting agreement from another manager:

*Definitely that ability. I mean we’ve got things that can change on a daily basis. We can be doing something a certain way for weeks and we’ll get a new brief perhaps from compliance saying this needs to be changed and then we need to literally change everyone’s on the floors habits. Stop doing it that way, start doing it this way and that’s got to be done with immediate effect. We can’t gradually do it, phase it in, it’s got to happen straight away.*

This description of a dynamic work environment conforms to the perceptions of the call centre workers. This appears to be driven by organisational demands and procedures arising from different parts of the business (“compliance”). The fact that there is a function called ‘compliance’ reflects the way organisational culture dictates organisational structures, the roles of different functions and how they are performed.

 Asked how behaviour change is achieved, the call centre managers again revealed an awareness of individual needs. Initially, one manager said it involved:
The researcher suggested that “the art in getting this to work is in how you coach”. This provides a small illustration of how the focus group was a discussion, involving the researcher sharing his perceptions. This prompted a manager to say:

Some people you got to be a lot more direct with, whereas there’s people you know are going to take a little bit longer so you got to continually remind them and explain why they got to do something.

This is demonstrating an appreciation of the value of explaining rather than simply instructing. The managers were asked what the benefit is of explaining:

You give them a bit of empowerment don’t you? Nobody likes to do something or change the way they’re doing something without knowing why.

This is more than teaching a worker how to do something, i.e. their normative expectations. Instead, the manager is describing explaining why, in other words describing the underlying purpose and benefits of behaviour. This process could also be conveying (or could be used to convey) the manager’s own beliefs and values. The interviewee also said it was important to have decisions or instructions explained:
Maybe I don’t like rules…I don’t like being told what to do, you know, in terms of “you will do this”. OK, give me a good reason and I might consider it. But if I’m told “just do this”, I certainly won’t react well.

In contrast, rather than asking for explanations, call centre workers primarily wanted information and clear instructions as those basic foundations were not in place.

The researcher asked the call centre manager what he meant by “empowerment”. Another manager replied:

I always treat my team as individuals, I don’t look at them as a team. You coach them individually, you look at their needs, you look at their drives, you look at their behaviours…Other people just say if you do this, you get this, you know like a reward scheme. I think once you start knowing your team and treating them like individuals the team aspect comes together on its own.

This single quote confirmed the validity of core elements of the CyCEE theory.

9.3.4 Organisational and management practices that facilitate team cohesion

The focus group with construction supervisors/managers revealed that principal contractors can facilitate effective relationships by selecting firms of sub-contractors who have a history of working well together. Later, this group talked about pre-task workshops involving supervisors from different trades who discussed their scheduled activities and the potential impact one team could have on another.
These practices could promote identification between disparate crews and supervisors, facilitates the flow of information and draws on supervisor’s experiences and insights. Potentially, it helps supervisors feel valued.

Elsewhere, there are positive accounts by call centre workers of working in open plan offices and being allowed to socialise.

Some management practices were described which could create bonds between team members, such as having team members mentor each other. One manager stated that a team naturally came together when individual needs were met. This statement was not explored, but it may indicate a belief that it is only once people are satisfied in themselves that they will have the resources or motivation to emotionally invest in relationships or attend to the needs of others. A similar view emerged in an interview.

Self-determination or social identity theories which would suggest that people will feel their needs are met by forming positive relationships and gaining the sense of achievement that comes from working towards group goals, rather than only attending to the group’s goals and needs only once one’s own needs are met.

In reality, due to individual differences (values, needs, personality traits etc.), it is likely that some people will be naturally inclined to be more attentive to their own needs while others will attend to the needs and norms of the group.

The call centre workers illustrated that a perceived, adversarial performance culture, in which a number of their individual needs are not met by the organisation or managers, encouraged workers to identify with and then support each other, providing
another avenue for individuals to meet their needs. To some extent, this supports the concept that has emerged that engagement can occur because of, not despite of, a crisis and existential threat to a group.

This suggests that organisations may need to take a multi-faceted approach to meeting workers’ needs, by seeking to meet individual needs, promoting a sense of community and meeting the needs of that community (which may be different from meeting the needs of individual members).

9.3.5 Perception of needs being fulfilled

A number of exchanges with the call centre workers and the interviewee offered insights into their perceived needs and the extent to which those needs are met.

9.3.5.1 Sense of control and financial drivers

Asked what the organisation could do to ensure his ongoing motivation and commitment, the interviewee first said “more money”. He then immediately corrected himself stating that he wanted more control over aspects of organisational structures and processes (which he went on to describe), which impacted on his own job so that “I would feel I could make a difference”.

In this case, control meant more than control over the performance of his own role (which might be described as autonomy). Instead, control referred to changing the way work is organised beyond the boundaries of their own role to better meet their own higher order need for a sense of purpose.
The exchange also revealed that even someone who declares themselves as being driven by money will sometimes rate other factors as more important motivators. This corresponds closely with Herzberg’s (1968) differentiation between motivators and hygiene factors: feeling that he had control and was making a difference was a more important motivator than money which is a hygiene factor. The perception of having insufficient money would, according to Herzberg (1968) lead to dissatisfaction.

The interviewee later revealed perceptions that people’s remuneration should but did not equate to their (perceived) capabilities and knowledge.

The subject of remuneration arose in the discussion with call centre workers. In that instance, managers were described as using money as a way of silencing complaints:

> The main thing that's big in this place at the minute, when everyone signed up, everyone knew it was a twenty grand job and I think the one thing that gets used a lot is, it's a twenty grand job, we want top people, which is why we pay that much. So when someone does have a complaint along the lines of it's too hard or the workload is this, sometimes the fact that we've offered you this amount of money for this reason, I've heard that sometimes.

Call centre workers expressed their negative views of bonuses being based upon performance measures across a department rather than being measured at an individual or team level. Again, they voiced a lack of control over those outcomes: it was largely out of their own control whether or not they earned a bonus.
9.3.5.2 Achievement and control

The interviewee said he had a large element of control over his work:

*I’m probably 75 to 80% in control of my workload. The other 25% is the management above me kind of steering me in terms of long-term goals. My boss will say we need to achieve these sort of things in this sort of timeframes, work out what needs to happen, individual tasks, and then we can try to resource time against it. Professionally, that’s how we work… Agile working, we take a big problem, we break it down into lots of different tasks and then we resource them and prioritise them with our client… And actually I think that’s one of the things that’s kept me sane is moving to agile working because it shows me that achievement without actually having a product at the end of the day…however you describe it, there is an achievement measure.*

The quote illustrates the worker’s desire for control over his work and a need to have a sense of achievement. His manager appears to help the worker engage with his work role (or, at least, “kept me sane”) by using transformational approaches. This includes working collaboratively with the interviewee to break down problems and agree goals and timeframes without, it appears, micromanaging how they perform the tasks. As well as fulfilling a need for achievement (which may be linked to a need for a sense of purpose and/or to feel competent), this approach may help the worker feel valued and psychologically safe, as it offers clarity about their roles and goals. Using workers’ experience to formulate plans of work may also bolster their self-efficacy.
While the call centre managers referred to the importance of praise and recognition, they also spoke about a worker gaining an intrinsic sense of satisfaction from being a mentor. Although external recognition could be significant (albeit to varying degrees) for most people, transformational leaders help workers and teams to reflect on and acknowledge their achievements (Bass 1985). In this way, high performance can be more self-sustaining and less dependent on the leader.

These management practices are clearly very different from the “regimented” approach attributed to some call centre manager and requires a manager to recognise and value the abilities and contributions of the worker and let go of control.

Later, the interviewee described how if he was the head of his department he would be in “a meeting every hour…where’s the achievement? What am I actually doing?...It doesn’t feel very good but then the paycheck at the end of the day helps”. In contrast, he seems to derive a sense of achievement by meeting or tangibly progressing towards goals or targets (which seem likely to be beneficial to the organisation).

This particular worker therefore seems naturally driven to ‘achieve’ and have tangible outcomes. This confirms that some workers are likely to be naturally engaged, or naturally motivated to invest high levels of resources into performance of work roles (e.g. Macey and Schneider 2008).

Collaborative methods of managing staff might be discussed during intermediate and advanced stages of a leadership development programme.
9.3.6 Resources/Obligation/Identification

9.3.6.1 Social exchange theory / reciprocation / role crafting and norms

Continuing a conversation about the dissemination of information within the call centre, and how non-compliance is managed, one worker said:

“It’s got to a point now where we have to tell people as advisors to other advisors, “by the way guys, when you do this you’re going to get marked down on this”

Researcher: So you’re looking out for each other?

Yeah, you’ve got to.

We all listen to each other on the phone now. “You can’t say that! You can’t do that! Shhh!”

Researcher: You don’t have to do that, clearly. What’s making you look out for your colleagues?

I treat someone how I want them to treat me. If I for example, help him, I’ll expect, well, not expect, it would be nice then to go “well he helped me today, he said that wrong, [name] quick, go and…”.

Well, our bonuses are based not on ourselves but on the whole department…last year we were one percent away from getting a bonus…If things were nipped in the bud…we could have got our bonus.

It’s not like it’s one of those centres where there’s like 2000 people and you know only 6 of them. There’s so little people left now you got to know each other, so, I think that helps.
Later in the session a participant recounted an incident in the previous week where one word had been changed (from “may” to “will”) on a page of script. Workers were not told but were (in their words) “shit on by compliance” for deviating from the script.

Workers appear to identify themselves as a group (and is distinct from functions such as compliance) and have adopted norms that encourage workers to informally coach each other and point out non-conformances (i.e. they have expanded their roles as workers or team members to encompass promotive and protective norms).

This is not altruistic: there is a sense of creating and repaying favours that promote mutual protection the face of a perceived, adversarial performance culture. This reinforces the value of social exchange theory as one explanatory framework for engagement. Measuring performance at team level also means it is in individuals own interest to maintain team performance. This came at a cost of workers feeling they lacked control over whether they earned a bonus. It would seem a fairer compromise for bonuses to be divided between personal, team and organisational performance.

This exchange demonstrates that workers can and do participate in role crafting, including adopting protective and promotive norms, in order to meet their own needs and the needs of the team. The call centre managers illustrated how they could facilitate this by explaining or consciously encouraging people to expand their role (e.g. to become a mentor). The interviews revealed that workers can be encouraged to discuss and reach a consensus about pro-safety norms, beliefs and values. However, this requires workers to participate in and invest their emotional and cognitive in the process. The CyCEE model proposes that this relies on meeting workers’ needs.
9.3.6.2 Identification, trust, reciprocation and norms in construction

Following a brief exchange about what workers get from their jobs, a site manager said “seeing the different gangs, I do think that people like working with the teams”

This prompted an exchange between different supervisors:

*It works well if you use the same subbies...you know the way they work then. You know for instance your tools are safe or something. It’s a big problem on site. Tools gets stolen, batteries get stolen. It’s nice to know, like, if you worked with these subbies before, you go off to your break, you haven’t got to clear your workplace up and take all your tools with you. You obviously get to know how they work.*

*They tend to borrow of each other as well. “Can I borrow your tool? Mine’s in my van”*

*Classic example, our sheds are open, he might be short of something and pops in and takes out of our shed, I might pop into his shed and take something, it’s swings and roundabouts.*

Later, this point was returned to:

*For the last 15 or 20 years, we’ve worked side-by-side...If I left something out, my tool kit...I know he would pick it up and put it in the shed for me and I’d do the same for him.*

The site manager commented:

*If they need to get into somewhere, they tend to talk amongst themselves more than have to come to us because they’ve already got*
A working relationship that they’re comfortable with. And that’s the guys on the tools as well, not just the supervisors.

A supervisor illustrated this with an example of a painter needing to paint a number of rooms but negotiating the sequence with other trades who need to work in those areas.

There’s trust then… You know you’ve got a program to work to. You work together, you end up as one big team you, not just different subbies. You end up as a team and work around each other.

This point was reiterated later by another supervisor:

Earlier when we said you plan your day, your day doesn’t always go that smooth, you want someone to give you a bit of leeway, can you move from there to somewhere else please, the guy’s just set his tools up. Okay, because he knows it’s going to be a favour the next day…if you hold a grudge you get nowhere…When you look on the financial side of it, the QSs, what instruction? Get an instruction to do this, do that, do that. Between ourselves we’re not bothered with paperwork because it’s tic-for-tac to help each other out.

In terms of social identity theory, construction supervisors differentiate themselves from QS (quantity surveyors) who are perceived to have formalised, less trusting and transactional approach to exchanges as they require written instructions. The description of collaborative work practices echoes Törner and Pousette’s (2009) finding that a pro-safety culture naturally develops when there is a collaborative culture. They are reminiscent of responses from the original survey that engaged workers would “touch base and check on each other throughout the different stages of a job to
make sure we are still on track” and an interview quote saying “We would see and hear communication” when workers are engaged.

This led to a discussion about trust (described as “commercial trust”) between organisations. The contractors stated that they were prepared to act on verbal instructions issued by the principal contractor, before written instructions were given, because of the trust between the organisations.

For these supervisors, the ability to trust and enter into reciprocal (“swings and roundabouts”) arrangements between workers and teams appears to be important. There is a clear sense of favours being ‘traded’. This serves as an illustration of social exchange theory in practice.

The quote also illustrates the day-to-day workarounds that construction workers employ, supporting each other to complete tasks without needing to lose time off the job or involve site managers. This supports the supposition of safety differently that workers proactively deal with the realities of work (Green 2016, Beach 2017).

This exchange reveals some of the unwritten rules, or norms, for construction workers; do not steal from each other (this is a ‘protective’ norm akin to not harming others); look after each other’s tools and equipment; co-operate to help each other complete work; be flexible with your own work patterns to accommodate the needs of other workers; return favours. There may be beliefs and norms about not placing faith in paperwork and perhaps pride in not formalising the exchanges between workers.
Underlying and facilitating this, were organisational processes and practices around engaging the same sub-contractors.

The focus group did not explore how the norms of mutual co-operation are agreed or embedded. It was evident that the group agreed that they were beneficial. It may be, as social exchange theory assumes, that they develop over a period of time (in this case, two decades) through give-and-take exchanges. Social cognitive theory would predict that new starters would observe ‘role models’ co-operating with each other, may hear people ‘grumbling’ about workers who breach these rules or may encounter approval or disapproval themselves based on how they behave. Finally, ‘elders’ might explain the reasons for these informal arrangements and co-operation. In other words, these norms might be ‘absorbed’ through modelling or informal tuition and then reinforced when they are put into practice and lead to beneficial exchanges.

Mitropoulos and Cupido (2009) illustrate the working practices/norms of a high reliability construction crew. Adages such as “go a little slower to avoid mistakes” (page 272) illustrate that the emphasis is on the avoidance of mistakes with the result of creating a calm, planned and safe approach to work.

A possible implication of these revelations is that organisations could create safe working conditions simply by focussing on bolstering collaboration and, in line with Safety II and Safety Differently, putting effort into helping workers to plan and perform duties, mobilising resources and trying to minimise obstacles and frustrations, rather than into discrete initiatives to improve safety performance.
9.3.7 Motivation

9.3.7.1 Motivation arising from a sense of purpose

The interviewee referred to his experience of volunteering for charities and being more motivated to invest more resources into that role when compared to work roles. Potentially this is derived from an overarching sense of serving “something that one believes is bigger than the self” (Seligman et al. 2006).

*You’re less likely to say “no” in a charity environment. You know, if it was like “we’ve got this thing, I know we said you could leave at seven… If you could help, and it means you finish at nine, I’d probably say “yes”, but if it was work offering me, and I’m tired, I’ve been there since 10, I’ve done 12 hours, and they’re asking me to stay for another two, I’d be like “It’s taking the piss”…I don’t know why.*

This may highlight the value of having a strategic narrative which emphasises the higher function of a worker’s role and the organisational mission. However, this quote illustrates the potential risk of fatigue and burnout if workers are highly engaged.

9.3.7.2 Workers consciously withdrawing resources and disengaging / need for positive feedback

The call centre workers said that concerns about their working arrangements (such as their bonus arrangements) had been brought to the attention of managers:
But nothing seems to change and it just gets put back on yourself. There’s a big thing a while ago where they turned around and they were saying they’re always marking you down on the bad but never audited you on the good…now we get one newsletter a week that comes out that tells you that you had no fails or you are on a fail list. Well, not on a fail list, you get one saying you’re C3 which means you haven’t screwed up any calls, that’s the only positivity I get from this place. It’s got to a point now where some people don’t bother trying to change it now because people are like “I’ve tried, I’ve tried but it’s not working so I’m just going to sit here and just plod along”.

The meaning of just ‘plodding’ along was not explored but could mean doing the minimum to meet targets and avoiding breaches. This suggests that co-workers are perceived to choose not to invest additional cognitive and emotional resources in work roles if the way work is organised or the way they are being managed is not meeting their needs (and particularly if they tried but failed to change it).

The last quote reveals that this worker has an unfulfilled need for “positivity” (i.e. he receives no praise and was not helped to feel valued). At best, he was told he had not made any mistakes.

This helps confirm the idea of workers dynamically reviewing how to define their work roles and how much of their own resources they are prepared to invest in those roles. Those decisions appear to be based on the extent to which their needs are met by other aspects of the workplace, not necessarily the work itself.
9.3.7.3 ‘Trade-off’ of different needs

The interviewee said that his diligent approach to work came at the cost of working beyond his contracted hours.

The ideal would be I can do 37 hours a week. That would be lovely. Or, 37 hours plus some overtime, you know, because money, money’s nice, but that would change it a lot.

This hints at a potential downside of engagement: the risk of burnout as a result of workers expending too many personal resources in work (MacLeod and Clarke 2014). The interviewee recognised that different people come to different conclusions about how much they should commit themselves to work roles as they have different needs (such as, he said, needing to collect children from school). The sense of weighing up and ‘trading off’ different needs re-emerged when the interviewee suggested that financial drivers might take precedence over the need for a sense of achievement.

This reinforces the need for organisations to be aware of the needs of individuals, to be aware that they have different needs and that these could change over time (e.g. due to changing family or financial commitments).

9.3.7.4 Motivation and norms arising from personal standards

After saying that he would like to be able to work set hours, the interviewee said it was not possible. Initially he said this was due to the nature of the work but then stated:
If I’ve started something I don’t want to just stop it and then it be forgotten or be crap and you give bad service. A bit of pride stops me doing that, that’s for sure, or if I’ve made a promise to someone then that’s that, that professional promise you’ve made, you know? At [company] you seem to be able to get away with promises, if I was sick or something. If I was in the private sector and said I’m going to do it tomorrow, and I didn’t do it tomorrow, I’d be out on my ear. The university sector allows for pride not to be a thing. To me, it’s pride that I wouldn’t just get up and leave at 3 o’clock I’d want to make sure I’ve got to the end or a logical stopping point.

For this individual, keeping “professional promises” and finishing what he has started (or not leaving things incomplete) appear to be norms which he attached to his work role. He infers that he would not feel proud of himself if he broke promises (i.e. he would evaluate himself negatively). Investing resources to conform to those norms meets a need to maintain his self-esteem or self-image. These norms may be fuelled by personality factors, such as conscientiousness, and/or values, beliefs or self-identity that shape his perceptions of what behaviours or qualities are important. Belanche et al. (2017) notes that personal norms may be connected to a person’s sense of identity and may exert influence on behaviour through a person’s anticipated emotions, such as shame or pride (Rezvani et al. 2017).

The interviewee appeared to believe that other people in his organisation and sector do not share these norms. This is interesting as it suggests that the norms are personal norms and sustained by self-evaluation and not the result of social norms/evaluation. Therefore, it seems important to understand people’s personal standards. The person-
centred safety approach, in Appendix 6, is proposing this can be done by asking them how they think an “ideal” worker would perform the role.

9.3.8 Role definitions and behaviours

This section sheds further light on how people define those roles and exemplify how role definitions are translated into behaviour. This begins with a quote from a construction supervisor who said:

*I’m more hands-on with the tools… I’ve just got one person with me, so I get him sorted then I go off and do my bit then and obviously see him again later so we have slightly different roles through the day.*

This illustrates that people might explicitly describe themselves occupying and moving between different roles which have different functions and objectives (e.g. between the roles of supervisor and worker). Participants in a person-centred safety intervention may be comfortable with and able to relate to these concepts (and will be included in the model in Appendix 6).

9.3.8.1 Pro-Safety Motivations and Norms

During the conversation with construction supervisors, a manager said:

*When we’ve done behavioural training what it tended to focus on is the constant reminder about what the guys are going home to, wife and kids, friends, they tend to push that message that you don’t want to put us at risk.*
The supervisors were asked what impact these videos had, evoking different reactions

_They’re usually the emotional videos that get you going._

_Nobody needs to be told, do they, that no one comes to work to get hurt._

This latter quote suggests that, as predicted by Safety II, workers already hold basic pro-safety norms and motivations (not harming themselves and others) and, as Andersen _et al._ (2015) found, could find it condescending if managers point out the obvious to them. Nonetheless, the research was stimulated by evidence that while individuals might not set out to hurt others, they do not always appear to have a felt responsibility for others or felt responsibility does not always translate into action.

The construction supervisors were asked how building effective relationships between workers influenced safety on site. This led to a quick exchange between supervisors

_You’re responsible for each other._

_You look out for each other, then._

_If you had a bad relationship you wouldn’t be too worried about them._

_If I was doing something unsafe but I didn’t realise…I’d expect somebody to say that “Hang on a minute, you’re doing that wrong”._

_Plus, it comes back to if I haven’t got a bit of kit, but he’s got a bit of kit, any chance I could borrow that for an hour?_

_If they seen them doing something wrong, a ground worker down in a trench with no shoring, they’d say “hang on a minute, mate, you need to get out of there”. None of us would want to go out on site thinking “shit, why have they walked past that guy?”_
These responses revealed perceptions that promotive, mutually supportive and reciprocating behaviours could be a consequence of positive working relationships (as suggested by Törner and Pousette 2009). Protective behaviours are also perceived to develop, perhaps as workers identify with or have (what an earlier interview called) greater ‘emotional investment’ with co-workers. In comparing these responses with the survey results (i.e. when the researcher was employing ‘constant comparative analysis’), a new insight arose. Engaged workers were described as pulling “visitors and new team into line” while involved workers may precipitate “discussions amongst workers on doing the ‘right thing’”. Workers with higher levels of engagement in safety may need lower or no levels of emotional investment to feel motivated to act on pro-safety norms that benefit others as they are theorised to have greater intrinsic motivation to act on the norms.

A manager asked the construction supervisors if they had the confidence to stop each other’s workers. A supervisor gave an example of working for a particular company who stated that they expected and supported supervisors to:

*approach someone else’s subbies and say, you know, “you need to stop what you’re doing by there, look, you’re hanging off the scaffold, maybe you’re going to fall” but we need your backing and the other supervisors backing to say “no, if he’s told you to stop, you stop, come back and see me.”*

A manager for the principal contractor immediately said that they fully support that approach. This illustrates how, as discovered during the interviews, it is possible to facilitate conversations in which pro-safety beliefs and norms can be discussed and, possibly, participants can seek to reach a consensus.
9.3.8.2 Motivation for expanding roles

After saying that he would like to work a fixed 37 hours a week, the interviewee was asked to imagine he was offered a data inputting job (a relatively monotonous task) offering fixed hours with the same pay. He said he would not take it:

*I’ve never had a job where it’s predictable every day and I don’t think I’d be able to cope in that environment, mentally, without trying to come up with some innovative way of making things quicker. I’d always be trying to change it to make it better. I’d hate the fact that it was so inefficient.*

This and previous quotes showed that the interviewee had and is aware of his need for variety, challenge, purpose and achievement in their work. This aligns closely with numerous theories which suggest that people seek to be engrossed in work (Bandura 2001, Seligman *et al.* 2006).

The interviewee appears to hold a ‘chronically salient’ norm to innovate to make things more efficient (which possibly creates more personal challenge). He seems naturally inclined to expand the definition of his work roles and proactively expend resources on discretionary, ‘promotive’ activities to make work processes more efficient. Of course, workers are individuals and the focus group with call centre workers suggested that not all workers place equal value on roles which offer challenge or unpredictability.

The way that this particular worker is managed, with “agile” working practices, appears to help meet some of his work-related needs.
After the call centre workers were thanked for participating in the focus group they were asked whether they had other examples of making voluntary contributions. They were all involved in another group which organised activities “just to keep the morale of the floor up”. Asked what made them make these extra efforts, one initially said it was to “get off the ‘phones for an hour”.

Suspecting this was not the complete answer, the researcher asked if they got anything else from these activities, leading to responses from three participants:

   Just be involved though, innit, have a look at what goes on.

   Yeah, and you get recognised more if you do stuff for people.

   And it’s good to put in your folder, that’s one of the big things I wanted to do it for. If you ever go for another job and, you know, you were helping towards lifting floor morale or, you know, organising things like that, I suppose, it looks good on the CV.

This latter quote appears incredibly similar to the observation by Sherman and Morley (2015: 164) that “an employee may be willing to take on extra work but only in return for future promotion opportunities”.

Asked what other people might think of the worker who has these extra-curricular activities on their record, they responded “people oriented” and “positive”. The group were asked if this “positive” approach might be displayed in other aspects of their work:

   It’s just like general results in work. If you’re going to be half-arsed, you’re going to do a half-arsed job and get half-arsed stats.
9.3.8.3 Review of the associations between engagement and role definitions

Construction supervisors described protective and promotive behaviours on site (e.g. warning colleagues of dangers, lending materials or accommodating other workers to help them achieve their own objectives) which benefit both safety and productivity. They indicated that if someone disengaged from their team they might not show consideration or concern for co-workers. Earlier interviews similarly indicated that people may need emotional or cognitive resources to be aware of and respond to (or ‘emotionally invest’) in the needs of others.

The supervisors distinguished this informal co-operation and exchange of favours from other groups (quantity surveyors), illustrating how norms and beliefs can be associated with group identity. The call centre workers likewise differentiated themselves from ‘compliance’ and appeared to hold norms encouraging mutual protection and co-operation. This helped confirm that a worker’s beliefs and norms about how a role should be performed may be shaped by identification with their team (or trade), and this could be socially reinforced by the exchange or withdrawal of favours or co-operation. Organisations may therefore want workers to form and engage with communities in the workplace to encourage co-operation, ‘emotional investment’ and to allow them to agree their goals and how best to meet them.

Social exchange theory and social identity theories therefore appear to remain useful theoretical frameworks to explain engagement.

As the earlier interviews suggested, the notion of ‘group climates’ could be problematic for organisations wanting or needing uniformity (e.g. on pharmaceutical production
lines when consistency is paramount). It could be problematic if co-worker norms are patently anti-safety. Andersen et al. (2015) and Choi et al. (2017) propose that organisations may promote a site or company identity to overcome ‘negative’ co-worker norms. An alternative approach, which will be incorporated into the cultural model in Appendix 9, is to consciously place workers with roles, teams or managers that suit their needs. For example, matching transactional managers and workers who place less value on autonomy. A person-job mismatch was evident in the participant who felt unable to use his initiative and personality to do his job (to sell products).

Construction workers were perceived to co-operate with other teams on site, not just their own. Self-categorisation theory proposes that people might occupy multiple identities/roles. They might attach a norm of co-operating/exchanging favours to their role/identity as a member of a particular team, but also to a broader role/identify as (for example) a construction worker (which is distinct from the perceived identity and norms of quantity surveyors etc.). This indicates how particular norms could be integrated into numerous role definitions and/or a person’s core professional identity.

The call centre workers did not appear engaged in work roles or in relationships with some managers or their organisation. However, they had sufficient resources from other aspects of their life or work to invest in distinctly discretionary activities (to improve the morale on their floor). They took on new roles, or expanded definitions of existing roles, with ‘scripts’ which prompt voluntary contributions that benefit others.

As predicted by the CyCEE model, discretionary behaviours appeared to be motivated by the workers’ desires to meet their own needs. This might be doing something different and maybe more enjoyable than work. Workers also wanted to; “have a look
at what goes on” (which might be a route to find a greater sense of meaning in their work or give access to information); be recognised (perhaps increasing their status or esteem in the organisation and potentially start a cycle of social exchanges with managers), and; increase future employability. From the perspective of SDT, these motivations represent identified regulation (the worker sees practical benefits).

An example of intrinsic motivation (which was not apparent in their answers) would be a worker deriving satisfaction from seeing that their team is happy. Potentially, other workers might have participated in these activities to meet their own relatedness needs or as a reciprocation mechanism. These call centre workers did not appear to feel a great sense of obligation to repay managers or the wider organisation, however.

The response that “you get recognised more if you do stuff for people” is a statement of belief pointing towards a belief in a reciprocity norm (if a person does ‘stuff’ it will be noticed and repaid). This could derive from long-held personals belief and/or be shaped be by perceived social norms as the worker observes management practices. It offers further support for the use of social exchange theory as an explanatory framework.

The perception that the call centre workers who participate in voluntary activities might also produce better work results, perhaps supports the notion of engaged workers applying their cognitive, emotional and physical resources to both core tasks and expanding their work roles to encompass voluntary, discretionary activities.

These voluntary activities might never fulfil some of their perceived benefits (e.g. helping secure a new job). In the short term, however, workers may have a sense of
being more employable than colleagues which could bolster their self-esteem, meeting a need to evaluate themselves positively, or they could feel in control of their destiny.

Given the distant and uncertain possibility of some positive outcomes, it is feasible that only workers with particular traits would undertake these voluntary activities. Indeed, when discussing the idea of a communications champion, the workers stated that it was the same people who took up voluntary opportunities. Workers with traits such as a strong belief in a reciprocity norm, a strong future focus (Probst et al. 2013, Shipp et al. 2009) or optimism bias (Caponechcia 2010) might be more prepared to voluntarily invest their resources compared to workers who desire more immediate gratification or have little confidence that ‘good deeds’ are noticed and reciprocated.

The focus groups with construction supervisors confirmed earlier findings that teams can openly discuss pro-safety norms and beliefs, for example whether it is acceptable to intervene with workers who ‘belong’ to another supervisor. The fact that it has to be discussed infers that there are norms about not challenging other supervisors’ workers. However, people need cognitive and emotional resources to invest in that discussion. The focus groups confirmed that pointing out the obvious impacts of unsafe behaviour may not always be received positively. Safety differently almost side-steps safety by instead focussing on the resources people need to complete tasks efficiently and overcome obstacles. For example, the construction supervisors illustrated that safety could be a ‘bi-product’ of close working relationships.

The role of individual factors means it could be challenging to predict the outcomes of engagement initiatives. For example, due to the interviewee’s personal standards (and associated sense of shame and pride), ambition, desire for challenge and to innovate
and be more efficient would mean he would appear highly engaged in whatever role he was in. He stated that these qualities were genetical, saying that his father and grandfather were very similar. Whether those qualities were inherited or learned at a young age, workers do not join organisations as proverbial blank-slates. This highlights the need for managers to understand the individual needs and motivations of their workers. Potentially, the CyCEE model of engagement will be an important tool for managing workers who are not intrinsically highly motivated.

9.4 Discussion

The intention of this study was to establish whether the CyCEE model offers a reasonable representation of workers’ perceptions and experience of their work life and how that is shaped by the influence of organisational culture on organisational procedures, management practices and sense of community. Further, it was an opportunity to confirm whether there was support for the theoretical assumptions about the psychosocial processes involved, including how people define their roles.

The model stood up to scrutiny while offering subtle, new revelations such as managers acting as information brokers. Other interesting insights were a sense of fear pervading the culture of the call centre and confirmation of the role of gender norms in influencing behaviour. The study illustrated how psychosocial processes, such as reciprocation and identification, work in practice. It also illustrated that people can explicitly perceive themselves as occupying different roles. There was evidence to support the idea of roles being an amalgamation of norms and that workers and
supervisors can adopt new roles or integrate protective and promotive norms into role definitions, because they help meet their needs.

There was evidence of enormous variations in management practices, from empowering approaches which recognised and responded to individual needs and capabilities to less sophisticated approaches, including treating everyone the same and (as indicated in an earlier interview) losing their temper periodically. As a result, a tiered leadership training programme was advocated at various point in the analysis. The foundation level of the programme would consist of positive transactional management practices and basic assertiveness and communication skills. An intermediate level would focus on collaborating with workers to understand how to resource and organise work tasks to free workers to use their skills and talents. These align, broadly, with Safety I and Safety II, respectively. The advanced level could address emotional intelligence, transformational leadership and an appreciation of individual needs and motivations. These have been recorded on the cultural framework in appendix 9 to show what management skills or qualities may be evident in, or are needed to sustain, the different cultural levels.

Some workers appear naturally inclined to be highly engaged but, without understanding these dynamics, organisations may be left over-relying on the heightened efforts of a small number of workers.

Engagement exerted a subtle influence, equipping workers with resources and motivation to be aware of the needs of and collaborate with colleagues (and maybe feel greater ‘emotional investment’), to be aware of and motivated to conform with
social norms and to have the resources and motivation to participate in discussions (which, it was shown, can explicitly focus on safety-related norms and beliefs).

In showing that no new codes arose and that the CyCEE model offered a reasonable representation of the psychosocial processes involved there is evidence that data saturation has been achieved (which was the test of saturation used by Brunstad and Hjälmhult (2014)). Further, it demonstrated that the theory has practical adequacy and explains real events, which are criteria for establishing the validity of qualitative research (Maxwell 1992, Kempster and Parry 2011, Zachariadis et al. 2013).
Chapter 10 Conclusion

10.1 A summary of the research

This study was initially prompted by a desire to understand how workers could be encouraged to take more active interest in the safety of others. As a result of that small kernel of an idea, this research has made an original contribution to knowledge by creating a novel psychosocial model of engagement and its association with safety behaviours. This model synthesises a range of extant theories and explains the psychosocial processes that link a worker’s perception of how their needs are met in the workplace, their level of engagement in different roles (i.e. their motivation to invest their resources in performing the role) and their level of motivation to integrate pro-safety norms into their role definitions (which was termed ‘engagement in safety’).

The original objectives were:

- Objective 1: Revealing definitions and antecedents of engagement and its association with safety citizenship behaviour (SCB).
- Objective 2: Exploring associations between engagement and safety (essentially whether and why engagement might influence safety behaviour).
- Objective 3: Understanding whether/how engagement promotes different types of safety behaviours (i.e. how engagement influences safety behaviour).
- Objective 4: Developing a functional model.
Informed by a critical realist ontology and a constructivist epistemology, grounded theory was adopted as the methodological framework. This led to an inductive design in which one study contributed to the development of the theory and determined the design of the next study. Each study formed a separate chapter of the thesis, presented in chronological order, showing the academic journey of the author and the gradual evolution of the theory over six separate studies conducted over five years.

These studies consisted of; an initial literature review; a qualitative survey with safety professionals; a second, focussed literature review; focus groups with safety professionals; interviews with practitioners, industry experts and academics; an interview and focus groups with workers and managers. This final study was undertaken to confirm whether data saturation had been achieved.

**Objective 1:** Prior to this research, there had been very limited investigation of the association between engagement and safety behaviours. Only a single study (Chmiel et al. 2017) had examined engagement’s association with ‘safety citizenship’ role definitions (described as discretionary efforts that improve safety) but that research treated safety citizenship as a uniform construct. Numerous gaps, conflicts and confusions were found in the engagement literature to the point of raising questions about the benefit of investigating engagement when practices such as ‘worker involvement’ seem easier to apply and to have logical, practical benefits.

An initial theory emerged in which engagement was seen to rely on managers valuing and caring for workers. This equips workers with physical, emotional and cognitive resources and a sense of obligation to repay their manager through how they perform and define their roles. This could include encompassing safety citizenship behaviours.
within role definitions and being more attentive to their work and environment, improving safe work practices. The surveys eventually led to a new and much broader, core theory: engagement revolves around meeting workers’ needs.

Worker involvement and positive management/leaderships practices were revealed to be important and ‘tangible’ antecedents of engagement which enable organisations and managers to meet the needs of workers as well as helping fulfil organisational goals. The focus groups and interviews with professionals, industry experts and academics revealed the need to understand the wider context in which engagement occurs, such as the organisational culture, organisational structures and procedures and the person’s relationship with co-workers. This led to a more complex and richer picture of people experiencing different levels of engagement in different roles. The initial models were also shown to have failed to convey the agency of the worker in the engagement process or sufficiently convey the psychosocial processes involved.

**Objective 2:** The defining qualities of an engaged worker were revealed to be their level of motivation, and self-efficacy, to adopt particular roles and invest their resources into performing those roles. Those resources can be directed at performing the role in the way that they envisage a prototypical actor would perform it (thereby enhancing core role performance) and/or to expanding the role definition by integrating (and acting on) new norms into their definition of the role. These motivations are fuelled by perceptions that adopting and acting upon these norms will meet the workers’ needs at that moment in time.

The engagement process was perceived to influence worker’s behaviour, by influencing their role definitions, in different ways. If they are engaged in their
relationship/role with a particular group or person, they may integrate perceived social norms into their own role definitions. This may occur as a result of identification and/or as a reciprocation mechanism. These processes could also lead to changes in underlying beliefs and values about the significance of the role and particular norms. It also emerged that workers and managers can explicitly discuss the norms they attach to work roles and their underlying beliefs and values. Workers who are engaged (e.g. in their role as a co-worker or follower) may be more willing to participate in these discussions, giving another route by which workers may re-evaluate the meaning and norms they attach to work roles, and the underlying beliefs and values. Finally, it emerged that people who are engaged in their role as, for example, a co-worker may naturally attach protective and promotive norms to that role definition leading them to safeguard or promote the interests of their co-workers.

**Objective 3:** The concept of ‘safety citizenship behaviour’ was abandoned. The evidence did not support attempts to differentiate between ‘compliance’ and discretionary safety behaviours. The evidence revealed a much more nuanced picture of people participating in both protective and promotive behaviours for different reasons in different roles and contexts. It was revealed that an organisation or manager did not have to do anything unique to engage workers in safety. The underlying psychosocial mechanisms are the same.

‘Engagement in safety’ describes the level of motivation a person feels to invest their resources in adopting and acting on pro-safety, protective and promotive norms. It is fuelled by perceptions that attaching pro-safety norms to particular work roles will meet the needs of the worker. These can, like any other norm, be informed by someone’s personal beliefs and values or a perception that certain norms are prototypical of a
role. This explains why pro-safety behaviour was sometimes presented as being context-specific, i.e. only performed when someone was inhabiting a particular role.

**Objective 4:** This process led to the development of the third and final iteration of the psychosocial model: The CyCEE model (the Cycles of Employee Engagement). This drew from and synthesised extant theories: Social exchange theory, the job demands-resources model, social identity theory, social cognitive theory, self-determination theory, role theory, self-categorisation theory and norm and norm-activation theories.

Other outputs include a framework for understanding organisational cultures and how this may influence how workers are managed (appendix 9) and a new person-centred health and safety toolkit (appendix 6) which consists of a summary of the theory and the structure for a focus group.

The toolkit distils the CyCEE model, and all the underlying theories, into something usable in practice. This offers further evidence of the validity of the research as it demonstrates its practical adequacy (Kempster and Parry 2011). This toolkit is designed to enable a health and safety professional to gain insights into what needs are being met in the workplace, what role(s) people are engaged with and what pro-safety norms they attach to those roles. Where pro-safety norms are apparent, the focus group will help establish the nature and strength of the motivation for enacting those norms and the person's capability to act on those norms.

The only comparable models that were discovered during the research are the Loughborough University Safety Climate Measurement Toolkit (undated) and the use of motivational interviewing with a group to improve safety behaviour (Navidian et al. 2019).
2015). However, the questions posed in those focus groups replicated safety climate surveys or sought to increase motivation around specific safety behaviours.

The toolkit therefore appears to be a unique contribution to the practice of health and safety, and is informed by a novel and robust theory regarding pro-safety motivation.

10.2 Discussion and reflections on the process

It took the researcher over two years to fully understand and be confident about his ontological and epistemological position. He had not previously heard of (or attached significance) to these terms. It was only then that he became clear and confident in his choice of methodology. In hindsight, he would have tackled these issues earlier.

Using grounded theory allowed a theory to emerge and evolve in an organic but logical manner. Writing up the research chronologically was true to grounded theory and helped make this demanding process more manageable to a part time student.

In reviewing the vignettes, which were produced relatively early in the process, it appears some of the researcher’s core values have evolved. The notion of ‘flourishing’ was particularly impactful and led to another article, proposing that ‘humans must flourish’ would be a good motto for the safety profession (Bell 2017b).

The researcher experienced ‘eureka’ moments when a code emerged which make sense of a morass of frustrations and woolly concepts. Chief amongst these was the idea of engagement as relying on needs fulfilment and the way in which work roles are defined, negotiated, resourced and activated. Some insights were very subtle, such
as the idea of managers hiding their true selves or forming secret pacts with workers. The focus group with the call centre managers highlighted the researcher’s prejudices. One participant was a burly, tattooed, bearded man and, contrary to the researcher’s expectations, revealed deep insight and consideration into the needs of his team.

The emergence of the new safety paradigms (safety differently and Safety I and II) in 2014 was evidence that new ways of thinking about safety management were becoming ‘mainstream’. While this bolstered the researcher’s resolve he was, for a time, very concerned that the wind had been taken from his sails until he realised what differentiated the new safety paradigm from his own model. It highlights how major shifts in theory or practice can occur during the long stretch of a PhD project.

Several surprises arose precipitating mini-crises as the model (and the researcher’s own worldview) had not accounted for them. These included the realisation that some workers do not have their most basic needs met and that some workers want to be managed in a transactional manner. If the researcher was to undertake the bracketing vignettes now, with the benefit of this theory and hindsight, one of them would have been a reflection of the researcher’s own needs and role perceptions. This may have revealed hidden assumptions about what people need from managers and their work.

At various points the researcher had to let go of pre-existing theories or models, such as the concept of safety citizenship behaviour. A huge amount of time and effort had been invested in the 8 Lane Model and that too had to be abandoned.

It has been a challenging and valuable experience giving rise to a theory with real life applications.
10.3 Limitations of the research

At the outset of this research and through each subsequent study, this study has acknowledged and sought to mitigate potential methodological weaknesses. The key measures for ensuring the validity of qualitative research were found to be:

- Adopt a framework
- Adopt a sampling strategy
- Ensure systematic and transparent data collection and analysis
- Ensure claims and analysis match the data
- Provide functional theories

Grounded theory was adopted as a framework to ensure all these criteria were addressed in a systematic manner. The functionality of the theory was established in part by the final study, which also demonstrated that data saturation had been achieved. In addition, the development of a novel approach for safety interventions illustrates that the theory has practical applications.

More studies, involving more or different participants, would certainly have generated additional quotes. It is less certain that they would have generated new codes or a different, final theory. The final study confirmed the validity of the theory by demonstrating that it has practical adequacy (Kempster and Parry 2011) or explains real events (Maxwell 1992, Zachariadis et al. 2013). This method of confirming data saturation was used by Brunstad and Hjälmhult (2014). In reaching this stage, the research met its original objectives and conformed to the plan of work.
It is feasible that another reviewer would have interpreted the data in different ways, thereby generating different codes, or placing different emphasis on certain codes, and potentially making different connections between codes all of which could have resulted in a different theory. At the outset, it was recognised that grounded theory relies on abduction, which draws on the researchers own experience and judgements (Glaser and Strauss 1967, Thornberg 2012, Bruscaglioni 2016).

Residual concerns about the validity of the research or the applicability of the model could potentially be addressed in future research as explained next.

10.4 Future research

It is possible to quantitatively test different aspects of the theory. To that end, the researcher co-authored three research papers (Manu et al. 2017a, 2017b, 2017c). These make the case for investigating worker’s safety values and used question sets derived from Schwartz’s (1992) model of human values, Fleming’s (2012) safety motivation questions (which were based on self-determination theory), and questions regarding safety compliance and safety citizenship behaviours taken from Neal and Griffin (2006). These questionnaires were issued, as a pilot study, to Thai and UK construction workers. The findings began to suggest that workers’ personal values had some predictive effect on safety motivation and behaviour. These were purely pilot studies with relatively small sample sizes and at that time the research teams could not make definitive claims or suggest whether or how an employer might influence safety values and motivations.
A core element of the theory arising from this present research could be tested quantitatively by establishing whether there are associations between workers perceived needs-fulfilment (and the extent to which they believe their workplace should and does help them meet those needs) and their motivation to perform work roles. These findings could also be correlated with self-reports of wellbeing which could help to establish whether wellbeing is associated with needs fulfilment. Staff surveys, which are used by some organisations, might provide some of this data and could be correlated with absenteeism, sickness or turnover figures.

Various studies (e.g. Chmiel et al. 2017), as well as safety climate surveys, already investigate which safety norms people attach to work roles. As an extension of this, participants could be asked what the perceived rationale/benefit may be of different types of safety behaviour perhaps using safety motivation questions based on self-determination theory (SDT) such as those devised by Fleming (2012). Kines and Pederson (2011) also developed a motivation scale that broadly aligns with the typologies of motivation from SDT. These findings could be compared with the participants’ perceptions of subjective norms and the degree to which they identify with other actors in the workplace (using an approach similar to Andersen et al. 2018).

The efficacy of the proposed person-centred safety intervention could potentially be enhanced and measured by issuing pre- and post-intervention questionnaires. Those questionnaires might ask similar questions to those outlined above, regarding safety norms, motivations and behaviours. It could also be useful to research the assumptions and concepts informing the different organisational cultures proposed in appendix 9, perhaps using frameworks such as Schwartz’s (1992) model.
10.5 Implications for practice

The research has reinforced the importance of a number of practices that some organisations, and health and safety professionals, may already appreciate to be important in improving employee performance and wellbeing. These include ensuring workers are satisfied, managers have effective leadership skills and that managers at all levels are able to discuss and model the behaviours, beliefs and values that employees are expected to demonstrate or ascribe to.

The research has also reinforced much extant understanding about how to meet workers’ needs (going back to Herzberg et al. (1959) and beyond). This extends beyond reasonable pay and job security into the quality of relationships and work. Although wellbeing was specifically not investigated as a central theme of these studies, the research highlights potential, functional benefits of enhancing worker wellbeing (such as giving them greater resources to apply to work).

Consequently, in order to gain insights into the current level of engagement, and levels of engagement in safety, it appears vitally important to understand workers’ perceptions of how their needs are being fulfilled, who or what they perceive to be helping them to meet their needs, how they perceive their work role, what norms they attach to that role and their motivation for performing the role and adopting and enacting those norms. The person-centred health and safety toolkit (appendix 6) has been designed to help organisations undertake focus groups to gain these insights.
The facilitator could use the answers to make judgements about the culture of the organisation (perhaps using the typology proposed in appendix 9) and tailor interventions to the current culture.

The research suggests that there is no right way of managing staff to promote pro-safety norms. The nature of any management training (as detailed in the final row in the table in Appendix 9) should initially be developed around the managers’ and wider organisation’s current culture and perceptions of how to manage workers. Of more importance, at least initially, is deploying workers to find an optimal match between the way the managers approach their role, the risks and demands of the work and the needs and expectations of the workers.

The insights from person-centred safety could allow organisations and managers to communicate much more effectively to increase levels of engagement in safety (as described in Bell et al. 2016). For example, someone who is naturally motivated to care for their team may be more motivated to accept ‘caring’ roles, such as first aider.

The examination of the concept of Safety I and II suggests a need for further evolution of the new safety paradigms. Securing pro-safety behaviour appears to be subtler than seeking to tightly control workers or ensuring workers have the right information and resources and then allowing them to use their skill and judgements. It may be appropriate for organisations and managers to use a blend of those approaches but securing the best performance, including in relation to health and safety, appears to revolve around understanding workers’ needs and perceptions and the psychosocial mechanisms that help to shape those perceptions.
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Appendix 1: The Bracketing Vignettes

Vignette 1: A near miss

What?

One day in 2009 I walked into my office and my colleague (an experienced building surveyor) showed me the photograph below of a contractor working on the roof of an adjacent building (owned and operated by a major public sector organisation which had no connection to our own organisation).

Figure 8: A contractor at risk of a fatal fall

The worker had climbed out of the basket of the Mobile Elevated Work Platform (MEWP) and crawled along the roof to repair the gutter. He had tied himself to the
basket using a rope. This was a tremendously dangerous situation. If the contractor fell (which was entirely possible given it is a pitched roof and there was nothing preventing the fall) he would have, in all probability, died. The rope is completely ineffectual as a control measure.

I asked my colleague, about the circumstances behind the photograph: He had taken it roughly half an hour previously and had done nothing about it. I immediately went across to speak to the building officer managing the building but the contractor had already left. The building officer said no one else had reported it.

So what?

This situation caused me considerable concern and raised a number of questions:

- What made the contractor put his own life at risk to complete the task? It should have been self-evident that he was at risk. It is also probable that the contractor had received instruction (during training etc.) to never leave the cage.

- How might the client or contractor’s employer influence how the worker might perceive risks and weigh up decisions? For example, the client should have arranged unrestricted access to the perimeter of the building. The employer should have assessed, planned and assigned appropriate equipment for the tasks. It is possible to understand that a worker with a series of jobs to complete might have convinced himself that the situation was reasonably safe (“I really want to get this job done…maybe it isn’t actually so dangerous”).

- What stopped the surveyor from intervening? To put it bluntly, he was not prepared to act to prevent someone from dying.
Potential biases

Perhaps underlying my strong emotional reaction are beliefs that human life is sacrosanct and that people should take responsibility for each other. In that respect, I share the view that organisations should strive for a workplace safety culture where workers actively care for one another (e.g. Geller et al. 2012). I may lean towards collectivism (feeling duties to in-groups (Oyserman et al 2002)). Psychological consequences of collectivism include deriving identity from group membership, valuing traits such as the ability to maintain good relations and taking satisfaction from fulfilling social roles and obligations (Oyserman et al 2002).

The scenario in Figure 1 suggests that I believe these obligations extend to strangers. Collectivism is quite different to the individualism pervading Anglo-North American culture (Charmaz 2017), which is the author’s cultural milieu and the culture in which this research is undertaken. A consequence could be a lack of consensus that people should care for each other. I therefore need to be alert to and explore alternative perspectives and possible cultural differences.

My negative evaluation of the surveyor suggests that I also need to monitor my own response if I encounter individuals who do not accept or act on their responsibility to protect others.

My questions regarding the role and responsibility of the client and employer in Figure 1 are potentially a manifestation of a perception that workers lack autonomy or the capacity to look after themselves. This may co-exist with a belief that those in positions of authority have the ‘wisdom’ to dictate what is or is not safe and the responsibility to
protect those who they deem to lack power or capability. Such beliefs (which appear quite paternalistic) might arise from my position as a white, middle class male and an ingrained sense of moral authority. These beliefs could lead to a conclusion that workers should be not be allowed to apply their discretion and should instead follow prescribed rules (which is very much in line with the perception offered by Zohar *et al.* (2015) of how safety is managed in practice).

My research will need to hear the voices and perceptions of workers and ensure that I recognise their own agency and understand what they perceive to be their responsibilities for themselves and each other.

*Now what?*

The scenario left me with two questions which formed the initial motivation for my PhD research: what would it take for someone to think beyond their own wellbeing and actively care for others in work (whether they are colleagues, contractors, employees or complete strangers)? Could engagement provide that mechanism? Workers’ voices need to be heard during this process.
Vignette 2: Workers are stupid

What?

When I show the photo of the worker on the roof, a common response from professionals is (I paraphrase) “it doesn’t matter how much training you give to people, you can’t be there all the time and when you turn your back they do something stupid.”

This belief was neatly summarised by a conference talk I attended in 2015 which presented the primary explanation that managers give for why workers do not follow procedures: workers are lazy, complacent, stupid. Seeing it written down had a strong impact on me and it felt wrong to label people in this way.

Figure 9: Perception of workers

My reaction can be partly explained by my belief that risk-taking or rule-breaking by workers are influenced by external factors beyond their control, such as poor design or lack of planning by others. Workers are convenient scapegoats as they are most
immediately involved in the incident. I am aware that I could be accused of defending blatant negligence or having a patronising view of workers as little more than children, with no personal agency or accountability. This feels equally wrong.

However, I feel hypocritical: I thought the surveyor should have acted to prevent harm and I evaluated him negatively as a result of his failure to do so. Perhaps I would have described him as lazy and complacent. I wanted to understand the thought processes underlying his behaviour and felt frustrated that I could not explain those processes.

*So what?*

The vignette suggests I hold the following beliefs:

1) Humans are not stupid and complacent: They are fundamentally rational.

2) Humans can come to different conclusions about how to respond to the same situation. We might not always be able to understand or interpret the rationale for their behaviour as we hold different perceptions and motivations.

3) It is important to understand the motivation and perceptions driving behaviour if we are to change it. In other words, I appear to believe that behaviour is a result of internal processes (thoughts and feelings).

*Now what?*

The implications are that I will be seeking out and developing psychological theories or models that reflect a belief in human rationality and agency. I will need to provide a rational justification for the models I use and develop and also those I reject.
**Vignette 3: Football Card Schemes to Control Behaviour**

**What?**

In 2009-2012 I undertook a Masters Degree in Occupational Health and Safety. I used my dissertation to investigate the use of football card systems on construction sites.

I discovered that where cards were employed by major contractors they were principally being used as a disciplinary tool to manage transgressions by subcontractors. The site manager would issue yellow and red cards for perceived unsafe work practices or breaches of site rules. A yellow card typically led to retraining while a red card (or two yellows) led to someone being ejected from site.

The dissertation examined the psychological rationale/principles behind these schemes. I was keen to understand whether and why card schemes might influence safety performance on site and whether the inclusion of green cards (as a source of recognition and praise) might produce different results.

**So what?**

The study identified that when used as a tool for reward and punishment, card schemes were grounded in behaviourist traditions. There were, however, found to be a number of questions about and critiques of ‘behavioural safety’. For example, does following a rule actually make us safe? If we are conditioned to follow rules, what happens if we face a situation not covered by the rules? The red/yellow card schemes were enforcing compliance with a fairly narrow set of rules. They did little to encourage individuals to
reflect on their perception of risk, the reasons for their behaviour or think more broadly about the impact they could have on others. The cards sometimes even referred to the recipient as ‘an offender’. The systems were not being used to help uncover underlying and root causes of unsafe acts and conditions and did not require workers to be involved in finding solutions. I recall feeling quite angry that major contractors were taking this approach. Having undertaken the reflections in vignettes 1 and 2, I now understand that this is because the contractors’ approach conflicted with some of my own core beliefs.

My review of the literature revealed an attraction to Social Cognitive Theories (e.g. Bandura 2001) and the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen 1991). Using these theories as a starting point, I came to realise the complexities that people face when weighing up a multitude of competing goals and they hold a myriad of different and competing beliefs and attitudes about the anticipated outcomes of behaviours.

My Masters research suggested that these conflicts can be managed, in part, by improving the supervisor’s leadership skills so that they can meaningfully discuss safety. However, workers needed to identify with their managers and with their values, norms and beliefs (i.e. feel enough of a bond with their manager that they begin to care about the things that are important to their manager). This could be achieved through a transformational leadership style.

There was a short section in the dissertation titled ‘workforce engagement and empowerment’ which set out how card schemes could be supported by worker engagement. However, it did not explore in any depth what the concept of engagement means.
Now what?

My Masters research had sown some seeds for an investigation of worker engagement. It revealed the limitations of compliance-driven safety management systems. The research began to cement my belief that workers needed to be treated respectfully and seen as sources of knowledge and experience rather than as problems to be managed. This view can also be seen in comments such as “people are thoughtful, ingenious and attentive, most of the using their cognitive and physical abilities to get the job done” (Gibbs et al. 2016: 36) they are also a source of wisdom about safety and not sources of risk (Green 2016).

These ideas were solidified in an article I wrote for the Safety and Health Practitioner Magazine (Bell, Powell and Sykes 2015) regarding transformational leadership.

My current research is clearly commencing with the theoretical presuppositions emerging from my Masters degree.
Vignette 4: Positive Psychology and my work as a Probation Officer

When I studied Psychology in the early 1990’s, and afterwards when I undertook training as a counsellor, I was attracted to positive psychology. I was influenced by humanistic psychologists such as Carl Rogers and their perception of human’s being innately motivated to reach their potential. The role of the therapist was to be respectful and non-judgemental and help an individual live a fulfilled life rather than ‘fixing’ them.

In the mid 1990’s I trained then worked as a Probation Officer. I remember conversations with colleagues: We believed that people usually understood that they were committing a crime and that their offences typically served some purpose (they were functional behaviours). However, we recognised that the individual’s perceptions and choices (even their ability to logically think through their actions) were often influenced by their background. We increased the individual’s awareness of the impact of their behaviour and their motivation and ability to change through techniques such as motivational interviewing.

This is an oversimplification of criminality. One man I interviewed (before joining the Public Protection Unit) was a wealthy individual who bizarrely ended up in Crown Court for poaching a salmon. He could easily afford to buy the fish. During the interview, I formed the opinion that he wanted to experience the peacefulness and primal satisfaction from sitting by a river, in quiet solitude, as dawn broke while ‘hunting’ for his food. However, he saw little harm in his behaviour and little appreciation of what would happen to fish stock if there was uncontrolled fishing.
Shortly after being asked to join the Public Protection Unit I trained to deliver the West Midlands Sex Offender Treatment Programme. I facilitated groupwork sessions with various colleagues from the Unit over several years to numerous different groups of sex offenders. It was based on cognitive-behavioural theory, and consisted of making men aware of the patterns of thoughts and feelings that underpinned their behaviour.

During the training, and when delivering the course, I learned the power of praise to encourage disclosure: I believe it helped create a sense of respect. I was also told, in the words of one of the trainers, about the need to be “relentlessly positive”. To me, this meant maintaining respect and a belief in people’s capacity and motivation to lead ‘a good life’. It was fully in line with the tenets of positive psychology.

The experience of working with murderers and sex offenders (and sometimes having conversations with victims or victim’s families) had a profound impact. It showed me the importance of empathy in regulating behaviour and the potentially destructive impact when an individual lacks empathy. One of the most distressing offences I had to deal with was a man (a psychopath) who tortured then murdered a friend by pushing a pen through his eye socket into his brain. I met him in Prison, and just prior to the meeting I read the psychiatric report which recorded how the man laughed about his crime in interview. I was physically shaking when I left the Prison. Thankfully we had mandatory counselling and I was able to reflect on why I had been unusually affected (as a victim of bullying as a child I had identified with the victim of the crime). Another young man was part of a group who kicked a man to death. When I visited him in prison, his dreams were being haunted by the dead man. I took it as a sign of his remorse for a terrible act that he knew cannot be undone.
So What and Now What

I see in positive psychology a foundation of my belief in workers as sources of knowledge and autonomous, respect-worthy individuals. As a Probation Officer I came to believe that empathy was an essential quality governing human behaviour.

I cannot expect these beliefs and values to be universally shared. I will be tempted to seek or develop theories or interventions that recognise emotional drivers for behaviour. Gibbs et al. (2016) concur that empathy, intuition and affective responses inform people’s safety knowledge and hence influence their health and safety behaviours. I believe that I am in search of a theory that will help explain how we can engender greater empathy and a sense of collectivism in the context of occupational health and safety. I wrote an article (Bell 2016b) to help formulate and crystallise my growing belief in the importance of empathy.

This reflection also revealed that I am experienced and skilled in facilitating discussions about experiences and perceptions with individuals or in groups. I also see myself an ‘agent of change’ but am a realist who looks at the world through the eyes of the participant rather than assuming that the world is a perfect place. These considerations could fundamentally drive my choice of methodology. There is, for example, nothing in my professional background to indicate I have interest or skills in generating or manipulating large volumes of quantitative data or perceive this to be a particularly helpful way of understanding or influencing an individual’s perceptions.
Vignette 5: A moment of personal, existential crisis

What?

In 2012 I left the Public Sector and joined a global insurance company as a risk consultant. Within a few weeks I felt completely abandoned. I was a ‘home worker’, I had few jobs to attend, few learning opportunities and had next to no contact with my so-called mentor. At one point I went a couple of weeks without talking to anyone.

The organisation claimed to be a ‘high performance culture’. I was informed I would be evaluated on hours worked, reports completed etc. and was in competition with colleagues: We were ranked against each other and if we did not keep continually ‘improving’ (i.e. doing more and more), we would be overtaken. It felt like I was told to participate in a sprint event without being allowed to train and with my legs bound.

The degree of control and micro-management was soul destroying and led to hours of utterly pointless, joyless bureaucracy. I would work 70 hour weeks, completing tedious surveys of small enterprises across the UK, spending 14 nights a month in hotels etc.

One job I had was an audit of a Housing Association, conducted over a few weeks, and I thought I had free reign about my approach to the work and report. I spent evenings and weekends honing the report and was in a state of exhaustion. I issued it to my mentor and when we finally met I discovered it needed a complete overhaul. I burst into tears on the way home.
I put coping strategies in place: A promise to only stay two years and to start my PhD to give me a sense of fulfilment and achievement as work was so deeply unfulfilling. I kept both promises and gave up the security of full time permanent employment and became self-employed to give me the flexibility to blend PhD with work.

When I did leave, I raged at my exit process from the organisation: I was asked to fill in a questionnaire with Likert-scale questions and a few text boxes. I wanted to look at someone across a table and tell them how unhappy I had been. I took away messages about the real culture of the organisation: it does not care enough to simply talk with employees and had no real interest in learning how it might improve.

*So what?*

The experience left me believing that humans can be lost inside large organisations, becoming small and replaceable cogs inside soulless machines. Regardless of how humane managers may be, the strengths and aspirations of individuals can be suffocated by the demands of a bureaucracy. I possibly see worker engagement as an antidote, a way of recognising and releasing human creativity and potential.

I often jokingly refer to myself as an anarchist, but I think that the experience with the insurance company (which sought to tightly regulate behaviour) gave me a strong aversion to organisations and managers who control and/or do not appear to care for their workers. I once visited a ‘fulfilment centre’ for an online retailer: I recall feeling a cold chill down my spine. Bags were searched, workers had to stand in set locations, toilet times were measured etc. It was little different to a prison. This clashes with my core beliefs and values which developed from my exposure to positive psychology and
my time as a probation officer. Further, I am sure I believe (when it comes to organisations) ‘Big is Bad and Small is Beautiful’, which is grossly naïve.

Now What?

As with the other vignettes, this reflection has highlighted beliefs and values which help explain the direction this research is taking and will shape how I gather and interpret data. I am aware from past experience that some health and safety practitioners (and managers) believe that strict behavioural control is appropriate. It is feasible that either I will not seek the views of these individuals or, if I do, could disregard their perspectives. It could be useful to adopt a methodology that allows me to hear a diverse range of opinions. Similarly, I must be aware that I could be prone to assume the worst about large organisation and should seek a range of perspectives.

I wrote an article, “Saving the Soul of Safety” (Bell 2016a) to help structure my thoughts about the limitations of and the beliefs underpinning behavioural safety interventions and contrasted them with the tenets of positive psychology.

From a methodological perspective, I find the notion of trying to reduce human experience into numbers, like the exit questionnaire, is a depersonalising experience in which the unique voice of an individual is lost in the quest for objectivity and measurability. My beliefs and values are pushing me toward qualitative methods that allow me to use my strengths in interviewing and facilitating groups, as discussed in vignette 4, and allow me to hear the voices of participants.
### Appendix 2: Open Coding of the Survey Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept identified</th>
<th>Representative answers relating to worker involvement</th>
<th>Representative answers relating to worker engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers Opinions</td>
<td>“Taking their opinion” “Ask them what they want to see. Ask them where they feel most at risk” “near miss reporting” “providing input and ideas”</td>
<td>“Asking workers opinions” “Able to feed in ideas/receive feedback” “Encourage ideas” “Suggestion boxes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting on Worker’s ideas</td>
<td>“Asking them to identify the hazards and proposing solutions which are implemented” “discussing issues with workers and gauging their reactions, taking on board their comments and coming up with a solution that works for all parties”</td>
<td>“listen and act on workers concerns” “take the operators and their complaints, worries and concerns seriously and do something about it” “engagement has a planned follow up and feedback”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining</td>
<td>“communicate with them the benefits or consequences of best practice” “explain why tools such as hazard reporting will help improve safety” “educate – courses/tool box talks”</td>
<td>“by explaining why the H&amp;S procedures are necessary and will benefit staff” “make the data personal and relevant to the teams” “Talking plainly (without jargon)” “worker ‘involvement’ suggests a one way street as opposed to ‘engagement’ where there is a two way interaction”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>“Communication” “Presentations, training, forums” “team briefs/1:1/newsletters etc.” “Tool box talks” “Meetings, workshops” “Good two way communication on all aspects of h&amp;s”</td>
<td>“notice boards, tool box talks, relevant courses” “Suggestion boxes” “Communicate to workers best practice”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to learn</td>
<td>“An involved worker has an interest in learning and a knowledge of health and safety issues.” “Knowledge of OHS issues”</td>
<td>“An engaged workers will strive to learn about other processes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praising workers</td>
<td>“reinforce positive, praise” “catching people doing it right/safely”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership qualities</td>
<td>“this is mostly about ensuring systems are in place that encouragement involvement and that leaders have the skills to capitalize on the involvement” “champion for H&amp;S” “identify champion to collaborate”</td>
<td>“Is a bit of leadership walking the walk” “provide good leadership example” “this would be as easy as walking around and catching people doing it right/safely and then promoting the upside of safety. This has shown to be much more valuable than being a warden that names and shames people for making a mistake” “Being open, honest and helpful” “Involve then by asking what they think not telling them” “Identify key influencers. Strong vision and values, ‘walk the walk’, do what you say, lead by example”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>“Wears correct PPE” “Compliant” “Working to SSW” “positive behaviours towards compliance/reporting etc.” “Ensuring that workers understand the fact that they have to do certain tasks not necessarily why”</td>
<td>“Follow agreed H&amp;S procedures” “Sticking to health and safety procedures/SSOW/method statements” “Adhering to all controls. Following procedures”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept identified</td>
<td>Representative answers relating to worker involvement</td>
<td>Representative answers relating to worker engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Thinking about safety | “‘Doing it’ because you have to as opposed to ‘doing it’ because you want to”  
“Involved workers will be safe because they want to keep their job”  
“Self Critical. Self Correction” | “Have ‘hazard hunts’ where we get workers engaged in spotting hazards and thinking about safety rather than just following procedures and pretending that a procedure will make me safe”  
“making sure the rules make sense”  
“There is much more value in building an engaged culture towards a generative environment rather than clamping down and putting more rules in place for people to obediently follow”  
“We all wear ear defence because we know we could cause harm if we don’t”  
“Engaged workers will be safe because that’s the best way that they can protect themselves and their co-workers” |
| Taking and tracking actions | “Near miss reporting”  
“Providing input and ideas”  
“Involved workers will ask questions and follow up on actions”  
“Raise issues and assist with solutions”  
“staff taking ownership of health & safety and driving improvements” | “proactive, positive approach”  
“identify hazards as they walk around and take action to deal with them”  
“will use their stop work authority”.  
“I fix hazards when I see them”  
“following up/through”  
“actually doing it themselves”  
“worker is comfortable to raise issues and drive outcomes because he feels valued” |
| Viability of ideas | “making viable suggestions on H&S improvements to managers” | “targeting key issues”  
“focus on relevant topics (specific)” |
| Participation | “Use them as part of teams of audits, risk assessments etc.”  
“Participation in work activities that involve some form of H&S, be it daily checks, use of PPE etc.”  
“Risk assessments are the best way of getting workers involved in health and safety”  
“Involved them at every step from hazard identification to develop-ment of safe systems of work”  
“volunteering for key roles re: risk assessors/fire wardens/first aid” | “I believe involving people in ‘special project’ team to be beneficial to engagement both for the project and process of building engagement”  
“volunteering for key roles re: risk assessors/fire wardens/first aid”  
“ensuring those that are consulted are actively taking part and not just by-standers”  
“not just active participation but also involved in the process & part of it” |
| Participating without buy in | “Participating in something but not necessarily having ‘buy in’”  
“Inductions might be a good example where the worker is “involved” in an induction when they sit and listen, it is obvious that not all are “engaged” in the process”  
“Willingness to contribute and take ownership of issues. Perhaps not putting body & soul into it?”  
“Workers are involved in the start up meeting, and the attendance sheet shows everyone was there; tick the box |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept identified</th>
<th>Representative answers relating to worker involvement</th>
<th>Representative answers relating to worker engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept identified</td>
<td>that people attended. Unfortunately the meeting last for 10 minutes and only the supervisor speaks, there is no employee input and it’s as if everyone has silently agreed to keep the meeting short and no participate “The word involvement is less ‘committed’ than the word engagement: Engagement is above and more.”</td>
<td>“Engaged in consultation” “H+S Committees” “Union involvement”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>“Consultation” “Trade unions” “makes me think of the consultation reg and safety committee regs”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>“empower” “empowerment” “involving workers in the whole process, including the cost”, “granting staff ownership of programs and processes” “make them responsible for the changes to their environment and give them ownership” “given roles and responsibilities”</td>
<td>“Allowing the team and individuals to be drivers of health and safety saving money in the process but initially needing the resources and tool they require” “ownership of problem solving input and output” “involve workers in the process from start to finish so they also take ownership of good H&amp;S” “Empowering them and giving them responsibility and targets and goals to achieve so their engagements can be measured.” “The worker feels empowered to deal with simple issues themselves and only involve senior staff members when the issues become complex”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Foundation</td>
<td>“If workers don’t have the necessary equipment and tools to work safely resentment will erupt and SWMSs and procedures will go out the door”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion/Motivation</td>
<td>“enthusiasm, motivation” “Enthusiastic approach to all H&amp;S policies and procedures” “They may occasionally take the message home” “passion+motivated speeches”</td>
<td>“Engaging means winning hearts and minds” “Proactive/evangelist” for H&amp;S” “Fully committed to health and safety in the workplace, they practice what they preach, is not afraid to speak up” “Engaged is being converted, a true believer” “Demonstration of passion, motivation from the worker” “motivated advocate” “actively engages in safety in the home.” “practices safe behaviours in the home e.g. mows lawn with correct PPE”. “Applying discretionary effort to make Health and Safety better” “Striving to perform work to the highest possible health and safety standards”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting/advising others</td>
<td>“Offering unprompted h+s advice to colleagues” “Advising others without being asked” “Discussions amongst workers on doing the ‘right thing’ if they observe someone taking risk” “Being a leader”</td>
<td>“Talking openly about safety in the field/amongst themselves and visitors” “You will hear more talking when work is going on because people will comment about the work, the safest way to do a job, and they will stop each other to make the job safer rather than shrugging their shoulders and not intervening.” “we touch base and check on each other throughout the different stages of a job to”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept identified</td>
<td>Representative answers relating to worker involvement</td>
<td>Representative answers relating to worker engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging/ enforcing</td>
<td>“challenging”, “peer pressure”, “enforcing rules to others”, “say if something is being done incorrectly or unsafely”, “You must wear ear defence because this is required/a procedure we must follow” “worker challenging a manager for not conforming to HSE standards”</td>
<td>“enforcing rules that have been collectively agreed” “Talk/advise his fellow workers that they are acting in an unsafe manner”. “We also see fellow workers pulling visitors and new team into line, (but we don’t see it formally) if you get my drift”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualities of workers</td>
<td>“Supportive, courteous, loyal, respect”</td>
<td>“Self-esteem” “professional, honesty, willingness, positivity” “commitment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for each other</td>
<td>“interest in maintaining a safe environment for all”.</td>
<td>“Teamworking. Care for each other” “workers taking responsibility for their &amp; their colleagues H&amp;S”, “strong vision and values”, “mates looking after mates” “watching each others backs.” “we have each other’s backs” “care for each other” “safety is the way we do things around here” “engaged workers will be safe because that’s the best way that they can protect themselves and their co-workers”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: The IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum

IAP2 Spectrum
of Public Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public participation goal</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.</td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
<td>To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Copyright Permission to use IAP2 Framework

Nick Bell, PhD student
Cardiff Metropolitan University
5 Sharps Way
Chepstow, Gwent NP165TG
United Kingdom
10 July 2015

Ref: Request for permission to copy, reproduce or publish IAP2 Federation copyrighted materials.

Dear Nick,

Thank you for demonstrating your interest in the work and in the copyrighted materials of the IAP2 International Federation.

As you may be aware, IAP2 is a Not-for-Profit International organization and a pre-eminent actor in the field of public participation globally. Remaining faithful to our mission, we believe in the importance of conserving the integrity of our publications and our training course materials which are a product of the generous volunteer contributions of numerous individuals from around the world.

On behalf of the IAP2 International Federation, this message is to confirm that we grant you permission to use the following IAP2 material for the purposes as stated in your request:

IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation

We understand you agree to clearly acknowledge the IAP2 Federation as the source. Kindly also note that updated versions of the SPECTRUM, Code of Ethics and Core Values are available on the IAP2 website, http://www.iap2.org under the P2 Practitioner Tools link.

Please use the (IAP2 Federation brand logo) in the letter head of this message, when you recognise and acknowledge the source, as appropriate. We would appreciate receiving a copy of your publication once final, so that we can inform our contributors, as we do at the end of each year, about the global reach of our work.

We wish you success in your endeavours. Let me know if you need anything else.

Regards,
Ellen Ernst
Executive Manager, IAP2 Federation - International Headquarters
Email: operations@iap2.org
## Appendix 5: Comparing safety climate with engagement

### Table 12: Overlaps between measures of safety climate and engagement in safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety climate element</th>
<th>How it may help assess engagement in safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and competence</td>
<td>This may measure self-efficacy to perform their roles and act upon safety norms. Additionally, it may give insights into whether the employee feels that the organisation invests in their development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security and job satisfaction</td>
<td>This appears to be measuring work engagement with questions about work motivation and job satisfaction. It may infer that workers have adequate resources to invest in their roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for production</td>
<td>This is a measure of the descriptive and injunctive norms displayed by management regarding the priority of safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>There are items that relate to employee voice and potentially insights into the quality of co-worker relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of personal involvement in health and safety</td>
<td>This assesses employee voice in relation to, for example, development of safety procedures and the planning of work. This item may help establish whether the worker feels valued and trusted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents/ incidents/ near misses</td>
<td>This appears to evaluate norms relating to accident reporting but also investigates whether managers are seen to care by taking corrective actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of organisational/management commitment to health &amp; safety – General</td>
<td>These appear to describe normative expectations about, for example, whether employees should report hazards. Some items seem to be testing perceptions of managers' commitment to safety (i.e. the strength of pro-safety beliefs and norms) with questions about whether managers would ignore rules being broken, respond slowly or decisively to safety concerns and whether sufficient resources are made available to work safely. Other items also appear to be testing elements of employee voice and involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of organisational/management</td>
<td>These questions assess people’s opinion of supervisors and managers (whether they can be trusted and appear to be...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety climate element</td>
<td>How it may help assess engagement in safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment to health &amp; safety – Specific</td>
<td>“genuinely concerned about the health and safety of people” (item 8.1 page xiv).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits of the health and safety procedures/ instructions/ rules</td>
<td>These items assess attitudes towards rules and permit to work systems (e.g. whether they support safety, are over the top or are impractical).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule breaking</td>
<td>The items are asking about the tendency and motivation for rule breaking, including the influence of co-worker and manager norms (e.g. item 10.12 (page xv) “My workmates would react strongly against people who break health and safety procedures/ instructions/ rules”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce view on state of safety/ culture</td>
<td>Questions include whether the respondent feels at risk or whether there is a no-blame culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Person-Centred Health and Safety Toolkit

The Person-Centred Health and Safety Toolkit (PCHaST) has been developed by Cardiff Metropolitan University.

The PCHaST is a method for undertaking safety-related interventions which help assess and increase levels of ‘engagement in safety’ (an idea that is described below). It is based on the University’s ‘Cycles of Employee Engagement’ (CyCEE) model which explains; what engagement is; what it is that people engage with; how and why people become engaged and how and why that engagement is translated into behaviour.

The PCHaST is formed of two parts. Part A provides a summary of the theory, Part B contains the toolkit.
Part A: Summary of the theory behind the PCHaST

People occupy a variety of roles (parent, spouse, worker, co-worker etc.). They perform those roles according to particular scripts (or ‘norms’). Some of those norms can be described as ‘pro-safety’ and will be ‘protective’ or ‘promotive’. Protective norms may lead people to wear protective equipment or warn colleagues of a hazard. Someone who is particularly motivated might actually deal with the hazard. Promotive norms could include mentoring a new starter, volunteering for safety roles or suggesting how safety could be improved.

Promotive norms may need higher levels of motivation as they require people to do more than following or enforcing rules or reacting to a hazard. They may demand more thought and attention to identify what improvements are needed (e.g. to notice a colleague is struggling or identify problems with a system of work or the organisation of a workplace). Those solutions may require higher levels of effort (e.g. informally coaching someone rather than just issuing a warning). Promotive norms and behaviours may require greater pro-activity as they might not be seen as a core role requirement (whereas people might assume that they are expected to prevent harm).

The more that someone is engaged in a role that they occupy, the more ‘resources’ (mental, emotional or physical energy and effort) they are willing to invest in either performing the role in the way that they think it should ideally be performed or expanding the role to add extra lines of script to it. In other words, the more they will commit their head, heart and hands into the role. Our motivation for performing or expanding particular roles comes from a belief that doing so will meet our needs.
The more a person is ‘engaged in safety’, the more resources they invest into acting upon pro-safety norms that are attached to particular roles (e.g. diligently undertaking pre-start checks) or the more willing they are to add pro-safety norms to roles that they occupy (e.g. informally acting as a mentor for new starters). They might also seek to take on distinct, safety-related roles such as acting as a fire warden or first aider. Organisations should therefore offer a range of mechanisms for individuals to be involved in safety (e.g. planning tasks, consultation etc.) as this gives opportunities for workers to ‘invest’ their resources in safety and makes use of, and signals respect for, the workers’ experience and ideas which can help to meet their needs.

People cannot perform all the roles, and enact all the associated norms, that are available to them at the same time. A norm to report a hazard will only be relevant if a hazard is spotted. Different roles and norms are ‘activated’ depending on a person’s perception of which needs and goals are most salient at that moment. Someone who is deeply engrossed in a work task may not immediately report the hazard because, at that time, they are in a role where other needs and norms appear more relevant.

Some people might perceive that pro-safety norms help meet needs such as to keep healthy or complete work without incident. For others, the norms could satisfy a need to care for team mates. In some cases, pro-safety norms may offer benefits beyond health and safety. For example, someone may take part in safety workshops to add new challenges to their work, as an opportunity to feel involved or to ‘repay’ a manager.

Understanding what people perceive to be the benefits of pro-safety norms (i.e. what needs they serve and how important those needs are) will help managers to understand how strongly motivated people are, and could even help managers to
allocate tasks or decide how to motivate people. For example, someone who seems highly motivated to care for colleagues could respond positively to a request to act as first aider. That person might not respond so positively if the manager stated that the key benefit was to receive a notional, goodwill payment or to improve their CV.

Some norms may be considered a core part of a role. If someone is motivated to perform the role well, they will put energy into following the script. Someone might then wear protective equipment like a uniform, without considering it’s purpose. The behaviour might stop when the person steps out of the role (e.g. taking off the equipment when they leave their work area, regardless of whether or not there are hazards outside that the equipment might protect against). When pro-safety norms are instead informed by a worker’s beliefs and values, the norms may be incorporated into a range of roles. For example, they might adopt safe work practices at home.

As well as motivation, people need the resources and confidence (or self-efficacy) to act on those pro-safety norms. They also need to be confident that they can predict what the results of their efforts will be. Therefore, recognition and feedback can help give people confidence that they are doing the ‘right thing’.

Workers are likely to have goals and norms urging them to complete work tasks (as this serves important needs). Some work-related norms can be ‘pro-safety’ as they may encourage workers to plan work and take their time over complex operations to avoid mistakes. Even when motivated to complete work promptly, in most instances people find a balance between their various roles, goals and norms, carrying out work in a considered way and find ‘work arounds’ when they encounter problems.
Organisations will sometimes impose safety norms (i.e. tell people what pro-safety norms that they must incorporate into role definitions). If these appear to conflict with a person’s current goals and needs they may not become incorporated into a person’s definition of their role or will be given scant attention. For example, highly experienced workers may be resistant to follow safety instructions that they perceive to be ‘micro-managing’ them and devalue their expertise (i.e. prevents them from meeting their need to feel competent and in control). Therefore, some norms can support or conflict with a person’s sense of professional or personal identity.

When a group of individuals become (or ‘identify’ as) a team, they will adopt protective and promotive norms that safeguard the interests of the group. For example, team members may conform to a norm to collaborate with each other to complete work tasks. Members will enter into ‘give and take’ relationships in which favours are informally exchanged (or could be withheld from those who do not conform to group norms). They are likely to have greater ‘emotional investment’ in co-workers (i.e. have greater empathy for them and felt responsibility to safeguard their interests). That mutual co-operation will give the team resources that help members manage the real demands and variabilities of work so is likely to naturally support safer working practices. Team dynamics therefore influence what norms, including pro-safety norms, people attach to work roles and the importance of those norms. These dynamics will help meet some workers’ ‘relatedness’ needs. Therefore, it is important to understand how close a team is and whether a sense of community can be built.
Using engagement to support safety

Interventions aimed at influencing safety behaviours could be structured as follows:

1) Meet workers needs to provide workers with more resources to invest in work roles (or, more precisely, to invest in enacting the norms that they attach to those roles). When workers are more engaged in work roles they will be more attentive to and better able to respond to hazards, design glitches etc.

2) Ensure managers have the skills, awareness and motivation to help them meet individual needs and build positive relationships so that workers are motivated to invest their resources in work roles. Managers should be role models (not necessarily evangelists) for pro-safety norms, beliefs and values. Managers should actively involve workers in planning work.

3) Actively seek to build a sense of community within teams to provide them with more resources and the motivation to naturally build norms into their role definitions that protect and promote the interests of their group.

4) With those resources and positive relationships in place, create opportunities for workers to discuss what norms should be attached to work roles, including pro-safety norms, and explore the beliefs underpinning those norms (e.g. the needs or functions they serve).

5) Safety messages and interventions can be tailored to suit the nature and strength of worker’s motivations.

6) Provide a range of opportunities for workers to get involved in safety above and beyond conforming to/enforcing rules, reporting hazards etc.

Some organisational cultures will be more open or resistant to these ideas. Safety interventions would, therefore, ideally include a review of the organisational culture.
Part B: The Person-Centred Health and Safety Toolkit

This toolkit consists of eight main questions (with sub-questions) following by two reflections. It is intended that this could be done as a focus group with existing teams and could last about an hour. The workshop might be presented as a wellbeing workshop as this is sufficiently broad to cover health and safety and engagement.

The reason for using existing teams, and for undertaking this as a focus group, is to give participants more confidence than they might feel being interviewed one to one. It also enables participants to ‘bounce ideas’ off each other or to support or challenge each other’s perspectives.

The purpose of this toolkit is to enable a health and safety professional to gain insights into what needs are being met in the workplace, what role(s) people are engaged with and what pro-safety norms they attach to those roles. Where pro-safety norms are apparent, the focus group will help establish the nature and strength of the motivation for enacting those norms and the person’s capability to act on those norms.

The focus groups could be run as a standalone exercise or used alongside staff/engagement surveys and/or health and safety climate surveys.

It is strongly recommended that anyone facilitating the focus groups have training in active listening or coaching skills and it would be beneficial for them to have group work experience. This will enable them to manage the process effectively.
The questions have drawn on motivational interviewing by helping participants to view an issue from different perspectives and consider the potential benefits, if any, of change and the resources available to them to make that change. This approach has been successfully used in industry (by Navidian et al. (2015)).

It is important to recognise that focus groups are more than fact-finding exercises. They are a safety intervention in their own right. Participants will be challenging and reinforcing each other’s beliefs and creating perceptions of social norms.

The cultural framework (which can be found in appendix 9) forms part of this toolkit as facilitators need to make judgements about the organisational culture which will enable them to make recommendations tailored to the organisation.

The questions, and their rationale, are given below. These questions could lend themselves to quite imaginative approaches and exercises: they do not need to be confined to discussions. The actual wording can be tailored to suit the audience.

**Key to the focus group questions**

- This is a primary question to be posed to the group
- These are follow up questions that will help explore the issues introduced by the primary questions
- These are the issues for the facilitator to consider to help them interpret the answers (and decide what other follow up questions might be needed)
**Wellbeing Workshop Questions**

**Introduction:** *Introduce yourself.* This wellbeing workshop will last about an hour. The purpose is to hear what you think and feel about your time in work and discuss how this affects how healthy and safe people are in the workplace. I hope to be able to tell the company what it is good at, and therefore what it could do more of and get ideas about what the company could do better. I will keep notes about the answers you give, but I will not record or say who told me something. Have you any questions before we start? Are you still happy to help?

*Ask participants to introduce themselves.*

Before we start, I want to explain that there are no right or wrong answers. You’ll be hearing people’s personal thoughts and feelings. If you have another opinion, please listen before giving your own point of view.

**Question 1:** What do you look forward to most on your way into work?

**Follow up:** What makes [x] important to you? What don’t you look forward to? What gets in the way of having a great day?

**Consider:** This could lead to a wide range of answers – money, the work itself, friends/the team etc. This will start to give insights into what needs are being met or frustrated in work and who or what is seen to help workers to meet those needs.

**Question 2:** What is the function or goals of your work role?

**Follow up:** How important are those goals to you? What makes them important? How do your goals support the goals or mission of the company? What are your thoughts about that mission?

**Consider:** This will begin to reveal whether workers are likely to see their role as personally meaningful. This will influence how likely they are to invest their resources into performing the role. The follow up questions will help to identify whether there appears to be ‘shared values’ with the organisation.

**Question 3:** How much control do you have over how you perform your work?

**Follow up:** How are you involved in planning work (*e.g. how do or could you give your ideas or opinions about how work or the workplace could be organised*)? What are the benefits or downsides of having control over your work? Can you give any examples of rules that have to be followed? How does the company, managers or co-workers make sure that this happens?
Question 4: Imagine there was a ‘model’ employee who you respected for how they did their work. How would they perform their work role?

Follow up: What would be the downsides of performing the job that way? What would be the benefits?

Consider: This will give insights into the culture of the organisation (e.g. perceptions of whether workers may have useful insights or the degree of control workers need) and the management style adopted by managers. These questions will shed light on whether the groups’ needs for autonomy are being met (but note that people do not universally want high levels of autonomy (and the responsibility that goes with it)). The questions will therefore help reveal whether workers want/ have the flexibility to shape their work roles. These answers will influence how they think an ‘ideal’ worker would perform their role.

Question 5: How similar or different are you to this ‘model’ employee?

Follow up: What explains the difference? What are the pros and cons of performing the role the way you do? If you wanted to be more like the ‘model’ employee, how could you do it?

Consider: This will reveal the ‘script’ or norms of a ‘prototypical’ performer of a work role. Are any ‘norms’ preventing harm to or promoting the interests of others (e.g. co-operating with co-workers to get work done)? Could some of them indirectly support safety (e.g. diligently completing checks at the start of a task)? If so, spend time discussing the perceived benefits. What are the motivation for enacting these norms (e.g. Does the behaviour earn rewards/avoid punishment? Do people see logical, practical benefits? Do they feel ‘right’ for the worker (are they personally important)? Do they lead to more satisfaction in their work? ‘Employee’ could be changed to ‘team member’ to give insights into the norms attached to the role of being a member of a particular team. This approach might be adopted with a team with a strong identity.

Question 6: How close are you to other people in the workplace?

Follow up: What explains the closeness? Please describe how a ‘perfect’ co-worker would behave? How would a ‘perfect’ manager behave? How close are managers to being perfect?

Consider: These questions reveal who people might be engaged with and whether there is a sense of community. This may give more insights into who or what is helping workers to meet their needs and whether workers are likely to ‘identify’ with co-workers and managers. The questions will reveal what norms, including preventive and protective norms, people attach to the role of co-worker.
Consider: These final questions gives people permission to be imaginative in articulating their needs, concerns or ideas. Depending on the audience it could be presented as “If I had a magic wand…”

Thank you for taking part. Before we wrap up, I’d like to ask: how did you find today? Were there any surprises?

Consider: First, consider the process itself: What questions or exercises worked well (e.g. created constructive dialogue)? What would you do the same or differently next time? Do you need to spend more or less time on particular questions or the whole focus group? Did the mix of participants help or hinder the discussion? Why might that be?

In relation to their answers: Who or what is helping workers to meet their needs and how well are their needs met? How engaged are they in their work role, their role as a co-worker/team member or as a follower? Do they have clear perceptions of the core norms attached to their roles? To what extent are these norms ‘pro-safety’? What resources and motivations do they have to act on pro-safety norms?

In the ideal world, what recommendations could help to meet workers’ needs, give them resources to expend in work and/or strengthen their motivation to adopt and enact pro-safety norms? What pro-safety messages would be most motivational for this group?

Based on what you have heard, how would you describe the culture of the organisation? What gaps, suggestions or ideas might they be motivated to address? What issues may they struggle to accept but are important to resolve?
Appendix 7: Focus Group Presentation Slides

**From Involvement to Engagement**
Presentation by NICK Bell
E-mail: nick.bell@university.ac.uk
Phone: 01234 567890
Area: Risk, Compliance

**Introductions**
- 45 Minutes
- Interactive
- Question sheets
- Help with PhD

**Themes we will cover**
- What is involvement/engagement
- Why bother?
- How do we do it?

**Q1. What does 'involvement' mean?**
- What can we do to involve workers in health and safety?
  - Near miss & hazard reports
  - Suggestion schemes
  - Fatigue/information consultation
  - Pre-task briefings
  - Participation in:
    - Risk Assessments
    - Pre-active Monitoring
    - Accident Investigations
Q2. What are the benefits?

Greater:
- Awareness of hazards
- Knowledge & ownership of controls
- Influence organisation of tasks/workplace...to what?

More acute benefits e.g. involving workers is an opportunity...
- To demonstrate management’s attitude to workers’/&
- For workers to feel valued/tiered to have a sense of control

Engagement

"An individual employee's cognitive, emotional, and behavioral state directed toward desired organizational outcomes."
- Shuck and Wasko (2010)
- Organisations do ‘stuff’ for their workers
- Workers have individual thoughts & feelings about that ‘stuff’
- Thoughts & feelings influence behaviour
- Nice ‘stuff’ = behaviours that benefit the organisation

Spectrum and Outcomes of Engagement

Low  Engagement  High
Turnover/Intentions to quit
- Profitability
- Absenteeism
- Innovation
- Safety Performance
- Wellbeing

"There is no duty more indispensable than that of returning a kindness. All men distrust one forgetful of a benefit."
Cicero (Roman Philosopher, 106BC-43BC)
**Behavioural outcomes of engagement**
- Better Performance of Core Tasks
  - e.g. more attention to detail
  - One attains less engagement with better compliance
- ‘Organisational Citizenship Behaviours’
  - discretionary actions that improve organizational performance e.g.
    - Making suggestions
    - Volunteering for unpopular jobs
    - Acting as an ambassador for the company

**Results from a survey**
Engaged workers may be more likely to:
- Deal with hazards... not just report them
- Mentor/help co-workers who are working unsafely... not just ignore/challenge them
- Comply as they know/care about the benefits of compliance... not just because they have to
- Apply good practice at home
- Apply good practice outside their immediate work area
- Question rules/procedures that don’t seem safe/healthy

---

**Reflection on Past Leaders**
- Q3. Please think about the worst leader/manager you have had or heard about [respect their privacy]. What is it that made them so bad?
- Q4. Please think about the best leader/manager you have had or heard about [respect their privacy]. What is it that made them so good?

**Less Effective Leaders**
- Don’t listen
- Bully
- Poor communication skills
- Don’t trust subordinates
- Don’t appear to care about subordinates and/or the job
- Expectations are unclear/shifting/unrealistic
- No ‘pat on the back’
- Always finds fault

---

**Transactional Leadership**
- Sets goals/targets
- Provides tools and resources
- Measures/monitors performance
- Gives feedback
- Rewards and sanctions

**Transformational Leadership**
- Uses transactional techniques and...
- Creates a vision
- Walks the talk – has integrity
- Coaches subordinates – helps them find the solutions
- Supports subordinates development
- Show consideration for subordinates
- Places appropriate trust in subordinates
- Emotional intelligence: Knowing which skill to use when
**Engaging Workers**

- **Engagement**
  - Low
  - High

- **Basics:**
  - Reasonable pay
  - Reasonable working conditions

- **Support:**
  - Learning/using skills
  - Autonomy
  - Trust
  - Meaningful work
  - Aligning values

**Demands vs. Resources**

**Individual Factors**

- People will not respond the same to engaging managers
- Different needs, personalities, experiences and values
- Spectrum of different approaches are needed

**Summary**

- Involving workers has practical benefits
- Also creates a foundation for engaging workers
- Engagement = winning heads, hearts and hands
- Behaviours include improved task performance and discretionary behaviour
- Engagement requires investment in workers and managers
- Managers need transformational leadership skills
- Organisations need to have a clear sense of values
- Engagement leads to a range of organisational benefits

**Wrap Up**

- Next steps for me
- Q&A: Next steps for you?

```plaintext
nick@nickbellink.com
www.nickbellink.com
```
### Appendix 8: Qualities of good and bad leaders

Quotes in green were taken from the first focus group, the remaining quotes came from the second focus group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Code</th>
<th>Bad Leader</th>
<th>Good Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approachable/</td>
<td>“Unapproachable”</td>
<td>“visiting workplace and talking to staff”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>“Insular”</td>
<td>“Visibility” “approachable”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Shut themselves in their office”</td>
<td>“Always stopped to talk – dealt with issues”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“poor communication”</td>
<td>“Available and willing to assist”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“no people skills”</td>
<td>“Openly talks to all staff at all levels and listens”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“poor listener”</td>
<td>“gives feedback to all workers on queries/concerns”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“someone who doesn’t bother to take time to listen to their workforce”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“uninterested”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“doesn’t answer questions/ queries”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“No feedback”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>“Dictatorial” “Autocratic” “Prescriptive”</td>
<td>“Democratic” “Reasoning/explaining decisions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>“Unbending/Inflexible” “Doesn’t listen”</td>
<td>“Open-minded”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Not open to criticism” “single minded”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“not interested in ideas different from theirs”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“people are afraid of 360s...managers don’t like them because they can’t cope with what comes back.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>“Lack of skills, knowledge, experience and training”</td>
<td>“makes successful decisions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Lack of knowledge”</td>
<td>“knowledgeable” “experience”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Lack of understanding”</td>
<td>“well resourced”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Too chummy/relaxed – not business focussed”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“disorganised/panics”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“that person is always offloading their own work on to me because they don’t know how to do that work.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountable</td>
<td>“Doesn’t pay attention to their instructions”</td>
<td>“delegate but not abdicating tasks”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable/</td>
<td>“Hypocrisy – say one thing do something else”</td>
<td>“Lead by example”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>“Will not practice what he preaches”</td>
<td>“Believing in what they preach”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Do a I say, don’t do as I do”</td>
<td>“Consistent”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Inconsistent role”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Not being prepared to lead by example”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Changing their mind on a whim”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfish</td>
<td>“Selfish” “Self-Centred” “Egotism”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Self-aggrandisement”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Code</td>
<td>Bad Leader</td>
<td>Good Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Code</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Pushing own agenda regardless of staff thoughts/opinions&quot; (which is also similar to ‘dictatorial’)  &quot;Empire Building&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Praising           | "No positive feedback"  
"Finding fault" (which might also be inferred as unfair or uncaring) |  
praises  
praises positive behaviour and outcomes  
gives initiatives and say thank you for taking pride in their work |
| Respectful         | "Make them feel as if they are just a number and not a person with a profession"  
"Not respecting you"  
"Did not show respect – did not treat me the way I would treat them" |  
respectful  
understands work carried out by workforce  
know how to address/speak to individuals on a professional level  
Get to know everyone as individuals  
equality |
| Fair/Just          | "Unfair/unjust behaviours"  
"Has favourites"  
"Favours others who were not so knowledgeable"  
"Blames” or “passing the blame onto others"  
"cannot trust them"  
"someone who passes off your work as their own" |  
fair  
proportionate  
fair, open and honest |
| Caring             | "Bully” “Aggressive”  
"Being scary!”  
"Not caring"  
"Lack of patience”  
"put people down who showed any enthusiasm" |  
encourage  
care about people  
"buys a round"  
good sense of humour!  
gets to know everybody as individuals |
| Empowering          | "Micro-management”  
"Micro-manages”  
"control-freak”  
"Unable to delegate" |  
empowering  
Empowered you to be able to deal with things yourself  
Give them ownership/freedom to work  
Challenged my thinking and was interested in my views  
gives initiatives and say thank you for taking pride in their work  
be able to walk away and not worry that the jobs not being done  
allows you to self manage |
| Team               |                                                                             |  
team effort. All feel valued/informed  
supports improvement in team competence “Team feels needed” |
| Inspiring           | "uninspiring”  
"seeking easy way out" |  
inspiring  
engaged themselves  
enthusiastic |
| Flexibility in management style | "Unbending/Inflexible" |  
Although I personally don’t like [a transactional] approach and I don’t like it when a line manager uses it on me, I know that some people in my team much prefer that than me to try to empower them and get them to do something over and above what they think they should be thinking about |
Appendix 9: Levels of organisational culture impacting on safety

The table which follows is an attempt to create a structure to convey different types of organisational culture. The table came into existence during the focus groups with health and safety professionals in response to the emerging evidence that organisations have distinct cultural characteristics. Initially, the table only referred to Culture I and Culture II in order to convey the beliefs, values and perceptions that underpin Safety I and Safety II.

The interviews and focus groups with professionals and workers added further examples to this table. However, they also revealed examples of even basic needs not being met or managers using anger to control workers or withholding work-related information. This gave rise to the concept of Culture 0. Finally, person-centred safety is also informed by beliefs and value which appear distinct from the other cultures. This led to the addition of Culture III.

Gibbs et al. (2016) proposed that there was a third or middle ground between Safety I and Safety II in which organisations intentionally and consciously used a blend of control (Safety I) over, for example, higher risk activities and allowed more autonomy (Safety II) when dealing with highly competent workers. Culture III partly reflects this position but goes beyond it by acknowledging and harnessing the psychosocial mechanisms involved in shaping behaviour.
## Representation of four levels of organisational culture arising from the research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature of the Culture</th>
<th>Assumptions that are likely to be made in four different organisational cultures arising from this research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0: Autocratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: Paternalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II: Idealist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III: Realist/Individualist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core beliefs about workers</td>
<td>Workers are untrustworthy, lazy and/or stupid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workers are prone to error and are a source of weakness and risk. They are childlike rather than immoral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workers are capable, motivated and knowledgeable. They are a source of strength and wisdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workers are individuals who make rational decisions about how to perform work roles and invest their energies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers are motivated...</td>
<td>By money. Managers need to use fear (e.g. the threat of losing a job) and anger to get the best out of workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why should an organisation meet the needs of workers?</td>
<td>The organisation should not meet the needs of workers: Workers are there to meet the needs of the managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workers’ basic needs should be met to conform to Regulatory requirements. Everyone is treated the same (as management practices are also strictly controlled).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk should be transferred to workers (e.g. use of zero hour contracts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk should be minimised through rules. This will address how to perform tasks, deal with hazards etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People make calculated risks all the time while working. They should be helped to take and manage risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People attach norms to work roles. Some of them are ‘pro-safety’ as they influence what they do to protect people from harm or promote health and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents happen because...</td>
<td>Workers are stupid and usually to blame if things go wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People did not know or follow the rules or applied the wrong rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People did not have the resources or discretion to manage the realities of work or followed unsafe rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Pro-safety’ norms were insufficient to manage the risks that people actually faced. People prioritised a role, norms or needs so they did not notice/address a risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>The managers’ status and authority is paramount and is displayed through props (e.g. better welfare facilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Power’ is the authority to monitor and enforce compliance with rules. These functions may be devolved to workers who may be given special status or benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers are prepared to let go of control and authority. They work collaboratively, maybe through ‘champions’. The approach is egalitarian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different people or functions will have more authority, or need to exert more control, depending on the needs or demands of the situation or individuals they are managing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams...</td>
<td>Are necessary insofar as they help to complete tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should conform to rules and ideally help monitor and enforce compliance. The formation of micro-cultures is a threat to conformity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can help agree the most effective ways of completing tasks and will help each other deal with the realities of work. Different team may adopt different practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are crucial for helping workers to meet their needs and to adopt norms which protect and promote the interests of others. Formation of micro-cultures is expected. Workers can ‘emotionally invest’ in each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Managers should be the most knowledgeable person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The most important knowledge is how and when to apply rules. This is conveyed through formal training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workers are sources of knowledge, insight and experience and pass these on informally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers recognise that they and workers have different areas of expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Feature of the Culture

#### Assumptions that are likely to made in four different organisational cultures arising from this research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature of the Culture</th>
<th>0: Autocratic</th>
<th>I: Paternalistic</th>
<th>II: Idealist</th>
<th>III: Realist/Individualist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rules and procedures…</strong></td>
<td>Workers should do what managers tell them (even if managers do not do it themselves)</td>
<td>Are paramount for determining how work is performed and the organisation operates.</td>
<td>Can never reflect reality and at worst are unsafe. They may stifle innovation or prevent people using tried and tested methods of work.</td>
<td>Are needed in some situations, can help people feel safe but can obstruct others from meeting their needs. Different teams may need/generate different procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involving workers…</strong></td>
<td>Is not necessary.</td>
<td>Can be used to find weaknesses in rules, procedures or systems of work. Potentially, workers can be used to help write more effective rules and (they are then more likely to know what those rules are).</td>
<td>Should be a collaborative exercise to understand the realities of work and the challenges that need to be managed or the resources that workers require.</td>
<td>Is an opportunity for workers, teams and managers to share information and gain insights into each others’ perceptions and priorities. It signals respect for each others’ opinions and builds relationships so helps meet various, personal needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The norms, beliefs and values of workers…</strong></td>
<td>Are largely unimportant.</td>
<td>It may be important to address ‘incorrect’ perceptions or gaps in knowledge which may lead to non-conformances.</td>
<td>Workers are assumed to be motivated to complete assigned tasks and do not come to work to harm themselves or others.</td>
<td>Behaviour is driven by perceptions of how a role should be performed which is informed by beliefs, values etc. Managers can be positive role models. People can discuss and agree the norms they attach to roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How work resources are managed</strong></td>
<td>Managers distribute resources/information to signal their favour/disfavour and authority</td>
<td>Procedures determine what resources to allocate to which tasks.</td>
<td>Collaborate with workers to understand the challenges of work and how work resources need to be allocated most effectively.</td>
<td>Resources are more than work-related materials or knowledge: they are physical, mental, emotional etc. Organisations meet workers’ needs to enhance resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview of management training needed to achieve and sustain this culture</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Positive transactional management skills (providing clear information, goals, feedback and contingent rewards). Assertiveness training. Communication skills. Training skills and learning styles (how to effectively explain both the content and reasons for procedures). Use of praise. Giving constructive criticism. Recognition of workers’ basic needs. Awareness of HSE stress management standards. Integrity in modelling the rules.</td>
<td>Training will introduce some transformational approaches. Reinforcing perceptions of workers as capable and the concept of letting go of authority and control. Facilitating discussions with teams and individuals about their work, obstacles, resource requirements etc. Discussing workers’ unwritten rules/norms about how they plan/manage work tasks. How to facilitate effective collaboration between workers and teams. Appreciating that risk is ‘normal’.</td>
<td>Training will focus on the full suite of transformational leadership skills. Treating people like individuals, without showing favouritism or discriminating. Finding a fit between individuals and managers or groups. ‘Emotional intelligence’ and empathy: understanding and responding to socio-emotional needs. Being a role model, articulating beliefs and values. Using them to inform decisions. Creating an inspiring vision, linking personal and organisational goals and values. Facilitating constructive discussions about norms, beliefs and values. Flexible management: moving between transactional and transformational approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>