

January 2010

The *Acas Policy Discussion Papers* series is designed to stimulate discussion and debate about key employment relations issues.

This *Acas Policy Discussion paper* was written by John Purcell of the Acas Strategy Unit. The views expressed are those of the author and not the Acas Council.

We welcome your comments and opinions. These should be sent to the author c/o strategy@acas.org.uk

Building employee engagement

The MacLeod Report, published in July 2009¹, was significant both in the depth and scope of its enquiry into employee engagement and in its reception. The Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills, Lord Mandelson, said that “this timely report sets out for the first time the evidence that underpins what we all know intuitively, which is that only organisations that truly engage and inspire their employees produce world class levels of innovation, productivity and performance”. This view was widely shared by many commentators. The range of evidence collected in the report showing the links between employee engagement and organisational performance was comprehensive.

What this first report deliberately did not do, but which the second in 2010 may well, is to establish the practical steps that need to be taken to build higher levels of employee engagement. Instead, the report issues a challenge, asking for a ‘national discussion’ involving all the key stakeholders ‘which can bring together those with experience in developing engagement with those who wish to learn more or to develop their own strategies further’. Government funded organisations, which

include Acas, are tasked to align and coordinate their activities in this area into a ‘2010 group’ ensuring ‘that the procurers of resources and the resources themselves are fully aligned and equipped to give the support which organisations want’ (p120).

The aim of this discussion paper is to contribute to the national discussion. It looks in some detail at the building blocks of employee engagement and identifies some of the key policy implications for employers, trade unions and employees. It also considers some of the tools that can assist employers in their efforts to assess and enhance employee engagement in their workplace.

Just another fad?

It would be a waste of time to launch a ‘national awareness campaign’ and commit government funded organisations to action if employee engagement was just another ‘flash in the pan’ or management fad. There are good grounds for suggesting that this focus on engagement is more important and long lasting than other initiatives like, say, ‘quality circles’. One reason is that we have known for many

years that employees who are committed to their work and employer are much more likely to behave in positive, cooperative ways to the benefit of the firm and themselves. They are also less likely to take sickness absence or quit.

Employee engagement is not the only term used to describe the positive attitudes and behaviour of employees at work. Other terms commonly used are 'commitment', 'organisation citizenship behaviour' and the 'psychological contract'. The policy and practice implications of employee engagement are often captured in 'high involvement work practices' and 'high performance working'. This plethora of terms can sometimes confuse the debate but the fundamentals are the same. Taking all these approaches together the evidence for a strong link with organisational performance and worker wellbeing mounts up, sector by sector and country by country.

For example, the United Kingdom Commission for Employment and Skills' (UKCES) recent report on *High Performance Working*² reviews all the evidence over many years surrounding this central question of why some firms have substantially better labour productivity than others. This has been a matter of public concern for more than a decade. UKCES define high performance working (HPW) as

'a general approach to managing organisations that aims to stimulate more effective employee involvement and commitment in order to achieve high levels of performance' (p3). They go on to say that 'importantly, the HPW approach is specifically designed to enhance the discretionary effort employees put into their work, and to fully utilise and further develop the skills that they possess..... HPW is concerned with the efficient and effective use of the workforce *but with an important emphasis on creating good quality work, rather than simply focussing on making employees work 'harder'.*' (*ibid: emphasis added*).

This is the central premise of employee engagement.

There is another reason for supposing that employee engagement is more than a passing fad. It comes from a recognition that work in the modern enterprise is more complex and changes more frequently than it used to given the emphasis more on 'brain' than 'brawn'. This makes the task of managing more challenging. 'Command and control' management styles in most companies are now much less effective since employees often know the intricacies of the job better than managers. Increasingly what makes a competitive difference is not technology, which is often ubiquitous at the level of a sector, but the way in which employees choose to undertake their jobs in terms of how cooperative, how innovative, how caring and how responsive to customers they are. This is 'discretionary effort' which cannot be ordered since it is given by employees. Putting employees at the centre of the policy and practice debate means that the emphasis has to be placed on the management behaviour needed to build engagement more than on rules and regulations. As the MacLeod report makes abundantly clear, with case evidence and statistics, this is why employee engagement is important, does make a difference and will not go away.

Another way of putting this, to use the language of organisational psychologists, is the importance of recognising that the heart of the employment relationship is reciprocity. If employees believe that they are and will be supported by the employer, and especially by their line manager, in getting what they want out of work, beyond just money, they will respond with positive behaviour. One recent research paper provided evidence on the causes of this perceived organisational support, which leads to reciprocal, discretionary behaviour.

'The more people perceived promotional opportunities, the more they felt that the organisation implements procedures in a just and fair way, and the more people perceived an open communication environment, the more organisational support they received' (Edwards 2009:106)³



The chain which links employment policies through management behaviour to organisational performance is held together by employee responses and behaviour. There are clear policy and practice implications here which are explored later.

What will turn employee engagement into another short lived fad is if it is used by employers as a method to get people to work harder. It has been reported that there is some hesitation in trade union quarters to the engagement agenda since the emphasis on discretionary behaviour can be seen as merely working harder or giving more effort, in unpaid overtime for example. And it is true that in some cases of poor implementation of high performance working there have been incidents of increased stress and the intensification of work. If some managers take the view that employee engagement is about getting employees to work harder then union reluctance will be well founded, but the overwhelming evidence is of mutual gains. There is also evidence that some managers think that employee engagement is just about listening to their employees via an engagement attitude survey as a form of two way communication. This will kill off the interest in employee engagement quickly as employees realise it is a sham form of communication. Employee engagement is about much more than this. It is about building trust, involvement, a sense of purpose and identity where employees' contribution to business success is seen as essential.

Engaged with what or whom?

One attraction of the term 'employee engagement' is that it is simple and straightforward in a way that earlier terms like 'high performance work systems' (HPWS) or 'high commitment management' (HCM) were not. At the same time this simple term can cover a variety of meanings. It is worth remembering that engagement is a combination of an attitude and behaviour. The attitude is 'commitment'⁴, and the behaviour is action to cooperate or what is sometimes referred to as 'going the extra mile'. But committed or engaged with what or whom? This is important since the policy implications will vary according to the nature and direction of engagement.

Listening to management consultants who undertake 'employee engagement surveys' the impression can be given that engagement is wholly or mainly to do with engagement with the employer, the organisation people work for. It is usually measured in the extent to which people wish to stay with their employer, are proud to work for the firm and are prepared to exert extra effort on behalf of the organisation. This can sometimes be rolled together as an 'engagement index'. Although accurate, it is too narrow an interpretation. We know, for example, that commitment to a supervisor has a stronger link to performance than does commitment to the organisation⁵. It is not surprising to find that people have multiple loyalties. In some circumstances an employee, more often a professional worker like a nurse or a lawyer, may be ambivalent toward their employer but be passionate about their job, co-workers, team leader and client, customer or patient⁶.

This multi-faceted nature of employee engagement is well captured by the Employee Engagement Consortium at Kingston University. Here the researchers say that:

'fundamental to the concept of employee engagement is the idea that all employees can make a contribution to the successful functioning and continuous improvement of organisational processes. Engagement is about creating opportunities for employees to connect with their colleagues, managers and the wider organisation. It is about creating an environment where employees are motivated to want to connect with their work and really care about doing a good job.'⁷

The study notes how 'there is evidence that engaged employees perform better than others, take less sick leave and are less likely to leave their employer'. The authors distinguish between three types or dimensions of employee engagement:

- **Intellectual engagement:** the extent to which individuals are absorbed in their work and think about ways performance can be improved



- **Affective engagement:** the extent to which people feel positive emotional connections to their work experience and thus with the company
- **Social engagement:** the extent to which employees talk to colleagues about work related improvements and change.

All this points to the conclusion that engagement can have a number of dimensions and that what stimulates one group of employees to be engaged may differ from another. One size does not fit all⁸ and this means that employers have to understand the different drivers of engagement in different parts of their business, especially differences between occupations. This is quite possible if a good employee engagement survey is used as discussed below.

At the same time there are key common factors linking the experience of work to organisational commitment and engagement for all employees, or the vast bulk of them⁹. Using the most authoritative employee survey – the 2004 WERS¹⁰ – it is possible to divide between eight main occupational groups and, using regression analysis, find the factors significantly linked to positive commitment for all or most occupations. These are:

- Employee trust in management (significant for all occupations)
- Satisfaction with the work itself (significant for seven of the eight occupations)
- Satisfaction with involvement in decision-making at the workplace (significant for six of the eight occupations)
- Quality of relationships between management and employees, sometimes called ‘employee relations climate’ (significant for five of the eight occupations)
- Satisfaction with the amount of pay received (significant for five of the eight occupations)
- Job challenge (significant for five of the eight occupations)

- Satisfaction with sense of achievement from work (significant for four of the eight occupational groups).

Trust in management was highly significant for all occupations closely followed by job satisfaction (doing the work itself) and involvement in decision-making, sometimes called ‘employee voice’. These factors are basic building blocks for employee engagement.

Not all employees are engaged and, indeed, the number who are ‘fully engaged’, meaning that they score highly on every dimension, can be surprisingly small, often less than one in five. The search for the ‘fully engaged employee’ may be something of a chimera or distraction since a worker can be highly engaged in one or two aspects of work but less so in others yet still be very effective and committed. On a scale of 1-5, where one is ‘fully disengaged’ and five is ‘fully engaged’ with three meaning ‘neither engaged nor disengaged’ the expectation would be that the bulk of employees in a well functioning firm would be ‘engaged’ (ie score 4) and the median¹¹ score would be over 3. One report of engagement across 10 countries showed that, on average, 70% of employees had ‘favourable’ levels of engagement¹².

It is helpful sometimes to look at the factors often associated with disengagement, or low levels of engagement, since these can point to basic failings in employment policy and practice. We know, for example, that where people work in jobs with very short task cycle times of a minute or less (found in some ‘phone contact centres and some manufacturing assembly work), where there is high stress linked to little autonomy and inflexibility and where there is a feeling of job insecurity, will tend to have lower engagement levels. These factors point to the need for ‘good jobs’ through better job design. Lower levels of engagement are also more likely to be found where there is perceived unfairness in rewards, where there is bullying and harassment and where people believe they are stuck in their jobs and feel cut off from open communications. This has implications for line manager behaviour.

What drives engagement?

According to the The MacLeod report there are four 'broad enablers/drivers' which are critical to gaining employee engagement. These are:

Leadership: 'a strong narrative that provides a clear, shared vision for the organisation is at the heart of employee engagement. Employees need to understand not only the purpose of the organisation they work for but also how their individual role contributes to that vision' (p76)

Engaging managers: 'engaging managers offer clarity for what is expected from individual members of staff, which involves some stretch and much appreciation and training.....treat their people as individuals, with fairness and respect and with a concern for employee's wellbeing.....(and) have a very important role in ensuring that work is designed efficiently and effectively' (p81)

Employee voice: 'an effective and empowered employee voice – employees' views are sought out; they are listened to and see that their opinions count and make a difference. They speak out and challenge when appropriate. A strong sense of listening and responsiveness permeates the organisation, enabled by effective communication' (p75)

Integrity: 'Most organisations have espoused values and all have behavioural norms. Where there is a gap between the two, the size of the gap is reflected in the degree of distrust within the organisation; if the gap is closed, high levels of trust usually result. If an employee sees the stated values of the organisation being lived by the leadership and colleagues, a sense of trust in the organisation is more likely to be developed and this constitutes a powerful enabler of engagement' (p104).

This is not a list based on statistical research but rather emerged from the numerous conversations MacLeod and Clarke had on their visits and meetings around the country. 'We were struck', they write, 'how often the same four broad enablers/drivers were cited' (p75).

These enablers come from the practical experience of a large number of organisations, big and small, public and private, which are trying to build employee engagement. The list of four drivers is more powerful because of this. And, in any case, the academic research does support this list. Summarising from many studies¹³ we can say that engagement is closely related to affective commitment such that the engaged employee would say:

I have a sense of belonging; feel I am part of something, able to contribute in a climate of cooperation. It is backed by my experience that the organisation supports me and encourages my development asking me to do an interesting job which can be worthwhile and challenging. The leaders of the organisation and especially my line manager are people I can trust and are good to work with, my opinions are listened to and my contribution is respected. I like working with able and committed work colleagues. It is good to work for a successful organisation or one that is striving to be so, with a clear mission and purpose and I know how what I do contributes to this.

Despite the danger of such lists and statements being ranked with 'motherhood and apple pie' they do provide critical clues to practical action. The paper considers how employers might address questions of engagement. First, there is a need to have a mechanism for measuring employee engagement – and this can be achieved via a structured survey. The list of drivers presented earlier from the MacLeod report and other research provides the basis for choosing both what questions should be asked and what actions should be taken in responding to the survey results. Second, there is the question of what policies and practices are likely, if effectively implemented, to build employee engagement. This is considered at the end of the paper.

The employee engagement survey

In 2004, WERS reported that 42% of workplaces employing 10 or more people had conducted an

employee survey in the previous two years prior to the survey¹⁴. The incidence was greater in workplaces where there was a specialist HR manager. Surveys were much more likely in the public sector (over two thirds) than in the private sector (37%) and were much more often found in large workplaces. We have no earlier data so we cannot say for sure if this is a growing trend but evidence from survey companies does indicate a considerable growth in interest in recent years even in the recession. The obvious reason for this is that it is hard to assess in any meaningful or useful way the level of employee engagement without systematically consulting the employees themselves. The days have, hopefully, long gone when the CEO would ask his chauffeur ‘what are the workers thinking’?

The great advantage of surveys is that they are able to provide data which not only provides evidence on levels of employee engagement, and variations between parts of the organisation but can also show, with appropriate statistical analysis, the factors leading or contributing to engagement. The survey results can also be used alongside other data such as absence and labour turnover, customer satisfaction, sales, quality measures etc to help provide explanations for variances. The MacLeod report provides some fascinating data from the Nationwide Building Society showing the difference in the business performance of 41 areas according to whether the staff engagement scores were high, medium or low (p39-41). This is a powerful use of metrics.

But the engagement survey must be effective and well designed and must have the confidence of the employees as well as the senior managers. There are 10 key steps in running an effective and authoritative employee engagement survey.

Ten steps to running an effective employee engagement survey

1. Top management active support

There must be strong support from top management to conducting the survey, publishing the results, taking action in the light of issues identified and committed to repeating the survey at regular intervals. Survey aims, design and actions to be taken following the results should be on the agenda of the Executive Board and/or the Board of Directors.

2. Alignment with business strategy

The survey needs to be closely aligned to business strategy so that key areas of importance to the business can be identified. This could be innovation, leadership, quality, absence etc. To do this will involve discussions with appropriate senior managers.

3. Involve employees in the design

Equally, the survey needs the support of the employees and must cover items of importance from their perspective. This means discussing the survey with the recognised trade unions or employee representatives. Focus groups with employees can help identifying key issues that need to be covered in the questionnaire.

4. Decide on the arrangements for the survey

The decision must be taken whether to survey all employees or rely on a sample. In very large organisations a sample is possible but the authority of the survey in the eyes of the employees tends to suffer since people say ‘well, they didn’t ask me’! Will the survey be filled in by hand in a hard copy or completed online? Employees may be given a choice about which method suits them best. It is usual for around two weeks to be given to complete the survey.

5. Encourage everyone to take part

Deliberate and considered action needs to be taken before and during the survey to publicise it and encourage everyone to take part. Most surveys can achieve a response rate of around 60-70% if there has been a concerted effort via all communication media to 'sell' the survey. One of the key issues is to ensure confidentiality – see 6 below. Stories abound of managers whose pay is linked to response rates and survey results either bullying staff to complete the survey and answer questions in a certain way, holding back bad news or giving rewards during the survey period¹⁵.

6. Ensure confidentiality

Confidentiality is essential. Staff must be confident that their answers cannot be traced back to them and that they are able to say what they really think and feel. Using an external agency to conduct the survey helps protect confidentiality. If the survey is on line and an agency is not being used then a remote external server is essential. Confidentiality is also achieved by following the rule that data is never broken to groups of less than 10 people. While it is important to collect some demographic data such as ethnicity, age, gender and disabilities, it is important to ensure that this does not then inadvertently identify someone from a minority group.

7. What questions to ask

The range of questions should include measures of engagement itself and those key parts of people management and employment relations which theory and practice suggest are likely to be causal factors. These are likely to include¹⁶:

Attitudes toward the nature of work (autonomy, discretion, responsibility, control)

Attitudes toward the nature of the job (workload, pace, monitoring, skills)

Attitudes towards management and unions (communication, involvement, representation)

Attitudes toward management (trust and the climate of employee relations)

Attitudes toward the company (advocacy, pride, loyalty)

8. Benchmark the questions to compare results

The design of the survey should not be seen as a one-off event but as part of a continuous effort to monitor and build employee engagement. It is important to be able to benchmark the results over time to plot changes in levels of engagement and compare the results with those in the same sector and the economy as a whole. External survey agencies should offer this service by ensuring that the questions replicate those asked elsewhere. An important additional reason for using standard questions is that they will be likely to be tried and tested. This suggests that a core number of questions will be used in every survey. It is possible to add additional questions to cover areas of particular concern or interest. The only caveat is that overall the questionnaire should not take more than 15 minutes to complete otherwise response rates will fall. Most surveys use a five point scale giving the respondent a choice of how satisfied or dissatisfied they are with a neutral middle position.

9. Analyse the results

Simple descriptive analysis of the results provides the basis for understanding the overall picture of employee engagement. But more sophisticated statistical analysis will allow questions to be grouped together to explore patterns of behaviour and attitudes, what factors contribute to engagement and how these differ for instance between types of employee, departments or locations.

10. Reporting back and taking action

It is good practice to report the results of the engagement survey within two months of the closing date. Full results need to be reported to senior management and in some instances to union or employee consultative committees. There needs to be discussion of areas where action has to be taken to help build levels of engagement or deal with weaknesses identified through the survey results. It is common practice, and a good one, for the results to be provided to employees using various forms of company media but especially via team meetings or briefings where there can be a discussion of the meaning of the results and reports on planned actions. Some employers make the engagement survey results one of the key performance indicators for line managers.

The policy and practice implications for building employee engagement

One of the great advantages of a focus on building employee engagement is that it does not generally require the adoption of new policies or employment practices. It is not like calls for a new form of performance related pay which require organisations to devise new policies and invest in computer software. In many ways it is helpful to see employee engagement as an outcome, something that flows from the practice of good employment relations. In this sense attention turns to the building blocks of effective employment relations and then focuses on effective implementation.

In the spring of 2010 Acas will launch an interactive diagnostic tool allowing employers to assess the quality of their employment relations policies and practices. This 'model workplace diagnostic tool' will have 10 practice areas where the manager, and anyone else so interested such as an employee representative, can assess how well current company practice meets a reasonable standard with advice provided on action needed to make improvements, if identified. The 10 areas of the model workplace are:

- Recruitment, selection and induction
- Pay and reward
- Performance management
- Flexible working and work-life balance
- Equality and diversity
- Communication and involvement
- Employee representation
- Discipline and grievance
- Managing business change
- Key performance indicators.

The key drivers of employee engagement as listed by the MacLeod report – namely strategic leadership, engaging managers, employee voice and integrity – lie behind the Acas model workplace. The Acas experience is that the area where much remains to be done is improving the effectiveness of line managers. We have noted how engagement between employees and their manager is more likely to have positive performance outcomes than just engagement with the organisation. In modern employment relations the line manager plays a central role, involved in all the areas listed in the Acas Model Workplace. While a professional human resource department will design appropriate policies it is line managers who bring them to life. Unfortunately it is also line managers who are most often implicated in areas of poor employment practice which come to Acas' attention through individual conciliation linked to applications to employment tribunals.

Dame Carol Black in her report on Health, Work and Wellbeing¹⁷ also identified the crucial role that line managers play. Acas has been asked to coordinate the informed views of a range of public and private bodies to try to find ways of improving line manager activity in promoting good practice. With the CIPD, Acas has produced a list of people management competencies to

provide guidance on line manager roles and the type of support that they need to be effective¹⁸. This is divided into five areas:

- Managing work now and in the future
- Managing the team
- Managing the individual
- Managing conflict and difficult situations
- Managing yourself.

Line managers are, of course, themselves employees and their engagement with the organisation and with the job they do is vital. It is dangerously easy to place too much emphasis on the vital role that line managers play in building engagement among their teams while ignoring the support and help that they need. We know that the factors which are closely linked with line management organisational commitment are, in rank order of importance, the need for a positive and supportive relationship with their senior manager, providing career opportunities, achieving a good work-life balance, the opportunity to raise matters of concern with their manager and believing that their job is secure¹⁹. This is where the MacLeod report's emphasis on strategic leadership and integrity is so important since without these line managers can never be effective. It also points to the need to ensure that line managers are right for the job by having the necessary behavioural competencies (implying careful selection), access to training, coaching and guidance, key performance indicators linked to reward which include people management and gain confidence in communicating and consulting with their team and individuals.

Why is it so hard to get good practice adopted?

We are still left with a dilemma, despite these efforts. How can more organisations be persuaded to devote greater amounts of time and money to building

employee engagement? It would have been hoped that the incentive of better performance, better wellbeing at work and lower recorded sickness absence and less labour turnover and would have been sufficient. To call this 'market failure' as economists tend to, is not very helpful. If the prime reason is ignorance then the concerted debate called for in the MacLeod report is appropriate. If enough of the critical actors in employee relations and people management, backed by government support, provide a consistent message it may help spread good practice.

Another reason often given for lack of action on employee engagement is resistance to change. The impression can be given that building employee engagement means that action is needed on every aspect of people management. This can include designing better jobs, building more effective voice systems, adopting a radical change in the way line managers are selected, rewarded and trained, to transforming top management vision, values and leadership. This, then, becomes too daunting a list and it is unclear how long it would take for positive improvements to feed through.

In practice the Acas experience at working with companies is that an obvious starting position is to focus on those areas where there are known problems and where action will have a quick positive benefit. This can be helping line management deal with conflicts and difficulties, tackling sickness absence or declining rates of quality or building better systems of communication. It is here that working cooperatively with trade unions and employee representatives can be especially beneficial in problem-solving. Trade union and employee representative involvement in programmes to boost employee engagement will help ensure that such gains are maximised and shared.

The employee engagement survey can provide very useful information to support the diagnosis and search for better alternatives. Once one area is tackled it is easier to build on this to move to other items on the change agenda. The blockbuster approach to change is rarely successful.



Engagement comes about when enough people care about doing a good job and care about what the organisation is trying to achieve and how it goes about doing it. This caring attitude and behaviour only comes about when people get satisfaction from the jobs they do, believe that the organisation supports them and work with an effective line manager. The pursuit of employee engagement is not something that managers can do effectively on their own without involving employees.

We have shown that employee engagement is built on established evidence that gaining employee commitment and attachment has positive benefits for the organisation and employees themselves. It does not require complex or expensive investment in new ways of working but it does need wholehearted support of senior managers through their leadership and strategic vision and through the enactment of line managers. This is a familiar agenda but the power of the message and the call to action at government, sectoral and organisational levels does not diminish by its repetition.

- ¹ David MacLeod and Nita Clarke (2009) *Engaging for Success: enhancing performance through employee engagement. A Report to Government*. London, Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.
- ² UKCES (2009) *High Performance Working: A synthesis of key literature*. August. London, UK Commission for Employment and Skills.
- ³ Edwards, C. (2009) 'HR, perceived organisational support and organisational identification: an analysis after organisational formation' *Human Resource Management Journal* Vol 19 No 1 pp 91-115.
- ⁴ Technically it is 'affective commitment' which is important, meaning 'I am committed because I like my work/boss/workmates/the organisation' as opposed to 'continuance commitment' where I stay because the costs to me to move jobs are too high. A third variant is 'normative commitment' meaning 'I stay in this job because it is important work'
- ⁵ Becker, B. and Gerhart, B. (1996) 'The impact of human resource management on organisational performance: progress and prospects' *Academy of Management Review* Vol 39 pp779-801. See also Redman, T. and Snape, E. (2005) 'Unpacking commitment: multiple loyalties and employee behaviour' *Journal of Management Studies* Vol 42 No 2 pp 301-28.

- ⁶ Buchanan, D., Fitzgerald, L. and Ketley, D. (2007) *The Sustainability and Spread of Organisational Change*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- ⁷ Rees, C., Alfors, K., Gatenby, M., Soane, E. and Truss, K. (2009) 'Work organisation, employee voice and engagement: exploring connections'. Paper given at the British Universities Industrial Relations Association Annual Conference, Cardiff July 2009.
- ⁸ Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., Purcell, J., Rayton, B. and Swart, B (2005) 'Satisfaction with HR practices and commitment to the organisation: why one size does not fit all'. *Human Resource Management Journal* 15 (4) 9-29
- ⁹ See Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., Swart, J., Rayton, B. and Hutchinson, S. (2009) *People Management and Performance* (see especially chapter 6). London: Routledge.
- ¹⁰ WERS stands for the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey see endnote 14 for further details.
- ¹¹ The median is the middle of a range of data with an equal number of observation above and below.
- ¹² ISR (2005) presentation at the Society for Industrial and Organisational Psychology, Measuring affect in organisations. (ISR is now Towers Perrin ISR)
- ¹³ See for example Hannah, D. and Iverson, R. (2004) 'Employment Relationships in Context: implications for policy and practice' in J. Coyle-Shapiro, L. Shore, S. Taylor and L. Tetrick (editors) *The Employment Relationship: examining psychological and contextual perspectives*. Oxford, OUP pp 332-50.
- ¹⁴ Kersley, B., Alpin, C., Forth, J., Bryson, A., Bewley, H., Dix, G. and Oxenbridge, S. (2006) *Inside the Workplace: Findings of the 2004 workplace employment relations survey*. London: Routledge (table 5.8, p 135)
- ¹⁵ Maitland, R (1994) *Employee Opinion Surveys: the seven deadly sins*. London: ISR International Survey Research Ltd.
- ¹⁶ Rees, C., Alfors, K., Gatenby, M., Soane, E. and Truss, K. (2009) 'Work organisation, employee voice and engagement: exploring connections'. Paper given at the British Universities Industrial Relations Association Annual Conference, Cardiff July 2009.
- ¹⁷ Black, Dame Carol (2008) *Working for a healthier tomorrow*. London: TSO
- ¹⁸ www.acas.org.uk/index.aspx?articleid=2390
- ¹⁹ Purcell, J. and Hutchinson, S. (2003) *Bringing Policies to Life: the vital role of front line managers in people management*. London, CIPD.



Did you know?

Acas has a range of services and products aimed at helping employers and managers in organisations – many of which are free. These include leaflets and booklets offering advice. Go to www.acas.org.uk for more information. You will also find on our website e-learning packages that can be dipped into wherever and whenever you have a few minutes to spare.

We also deliver training on good practice in employment relations as well as updates on new employment legislation especially designed for small businesses. These are held locally all around the country and can be booked and paid for online. For more details go to www.acas.org.uk/training.

Please fill in the details below if:

- You would like to be added to the mailing list for *Policy Discussion Papers*
- You need to tell us about any of your details that are incorrect, or you would like to change the way in which you receive the publication

Name

Job title

Organisation

Address

.....

email address:.....

I am a new subscriber

I would like to receive the publication by email in hard copy by post

I am an existing subscriber

I would like to receive the publication by email in hard copy by post

If you would like to receive Acas' customer newsletter you can sign up at www.acas.org.uk/subscribe

Acas Strategy Unit, 22nd Floor, Euston Tower, 286 Euston Road, London NW1 3JJ
strategy@acas.org.uk



Acas can help with your employment relations needs

Every year Acas helps employers and employees from thousands of workplaces. That means we keep right up to date with today's employment relations issues – such as discipline and grievance handling, preventing discrimination and communicating effectively in workplaces. Make the most of our practical experience for your organisation – find out what we can do for you.

We inform

We answer your questions, give you the facts you need and talk through your options. You can then make informed decisions. Contact us to keep on top of what employment rights legislation means in practice – before it gets on top of you. Call our helpline **08457 47 47 47** or visit our website **www.acas.org.uk**.

We advise and guide

We give you practical know-how on setting up and keeping good relations in your organisation. Look at our publications on the website or ask our helpline to put you in touch with your local Acas adviser. Our Equality Direct helpline **08456 00 34 44** advises on equality issues, such as discrimination.

We train

From a two-hour session on the key points of new legislation or employing people to courses specially designed for people in your organisation, we offer training to suit you. Look on the website **www.acas.org.uk/training** for what is coming up in your area and to book a place or call our Customer Services Team on **08457 38 37 36**.

We work with you

We offer hands-on practical help and support to tackle issues in your organisation with you. This might be through one of our well-known problem-solving services. Or a programme we have worked out together to put your organisation firmly on track for effective employment relations. You will meet your Acas adviser and discuss exactly what is needed before giving any go-ahead.