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A B S T R A C T

This research paper used grounded theory as a research methodology with the main objective; to explore the applicability of Service Dominant Logic (S-D logic), to the concepts of management i.e. “Employee Engagement” and “Experiential Learning” by analyzing employee/employer behaviours of value co-creation in the commercial banking sector of Pakistan. In align, the theoretical contribution of this study is; the transformation of the conventional concept of management “employee engagement into a tentative theory of employee/employer service relation (EESR). In addition to this track, the study proposed a lens of S-D logic through experiential learning (EL) to draw a platform, which enables managers to adopt reciprocal and interconnected exchange relationships between actors to develop value co-creation for higher organizational performance (OP). Based on empirical evidence collected via interview method, the study substantiated that the narratives of processes and practices of S-D logic given by Vargo and Lusch are the foundation to establish proposed transformation. The outcome of employee/employer service relation suggested that employee/employer relationship (employee engagement) is based on service relationship (reciprocal exchange of service). Value is proposed through promising, an attractive and desired offer. Employer and employee as service actors play the role of resource holders and resource integrators in this relationship. Both service actors integrate their resources (operand and operant resources) to co-create value which is mutually benefited. However, the convergence of conventional logic of employee engagement into employee/employer service relation will first require a modification in the mind-set of commercial banking sector organizations.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Service-dominant (S-D) logic is a new emerging logic of marketing, which refers to services as fundamental rather than the goods only. Vargo and Lusch (2005) provided historical and philosophical concepts of S-D logic. Marketing adopted a model of exchange economics, which established on the exchange of goods, results in
manufactured output, which refers to Goods Dominant Logic (G-D logic) and experience economies refers to the transition of G-D logic into S-D Logic. The G-D logic focuses on operand resources on which an act is performed, such as goods, whereas S-D logic focuses on the action of operant resources those act upon other resources. The S-D logic emphasizes on intangible resources and embedded value. The S-D logic is always co-created by consumers and producers. The S-D logic is helpful in gaining a competitive advantage by analyzing how other firms use operant resources to cater consumers. Firms can also take advantage of engaging customers and value network partner through co-production and co-creation. Innovation and IT infrastructure play key role in collaboration and co-creation of values. Co-creation is an important concept of S-D logic.

This study conceptualizes the role of employee engagement, experiential learning and S-D logic in banking organizations through applying S-D logic on employee engagement and experiential learning to co-create the values. In addition, this process may contribute to the higher performance of commercial banking sector of organizations. The inspiration for the choice of the above-stated concept is the work of Vargo and Lusch on S-D logic in support of the general theory of marketing. They emphasized on “interaction” between buyers and suppliers, which is critical for value co-creation and proposition in firms. In the same way, employees’ knowledge is “operant resource” which is the core of S-D logic that may be the foundation for business networks. However, employee and employer “interaction” is as logical and significant for value co-creation as buyer and supplier interaction is. Moreover, the interaction between buyer and supplier is inevitable in marketing theory as discussed by Vargo & Lusch (2004), similarly, employee and employer interaction (old concept of management “employee engagement”) can be expressed as management theory based on S-D logic. In addition to previous arguments, according to Brodie et al., (2011), “to engage an employee”, involves “an active and intentional mind can relate to an activity, for example, co-creation, which encompasses both psychological state and behavior”.

In addition to the relationship of experiential learning, Trowler (2010) worked on the construct of student engagement and he refers it to learning and education literature, which shows more engaged students can acquire greater knowledge acquisition and
cognitive development in another way, this learning by (doing) engagement is expressed in experiential learning. This seminal work evokes the need of experiential learning in service management literature e.g. to integrate the influence of context and experience on employee engagement, customer engagement and supplier engagement etc. (Bolton et al., 2014).

1.1 Study Objectives

To explore that how organizations engaged their employees via experiential learning for value co-creation through the lens of service dominant logic.

1.2 Research Questions

1. How experiential learning persuades employee engagement in the banking sector?
2. How employee and employers exchange service for value co-creation?
3. How high performance of banking sector depends upon mutually co-creative efforts of employer and employees?

1.3 Research Gap

Despite a number of contributions in the domain of S-D logic, theoretical and empirical research gap exist, which is depicted in previous literature, particularly in the conceptual relationships of employee engagement, experiential learning, S-D logic, and value co-creation. Employee Engagement and S-D logic share a theoretical focus on the interaction between employees and employers, thus reflecting a significant conceptual fit of these perspectives, warranting its joint investigation. In general, S-D theory is focusing more towards customer engagement and has marketing perspective. However, the employee engagement focus discussed in this study is intended towards management perspective.

The tendency of S-D logic concept in management research is rare. However, the experiential learning is already discussed under the umbrella of S-D logic by Vargo and Lusch (2016). Conclusively, the study of employee engagement in management perspective in the lens of service dominant logic is novel and robust.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
In this section, the literature review regarding all constructs is presented.

2.1 Service Dominant Logic

Service dominant logic gives the new notion of reconfiguration of resources in which operant resources are more prioritized called service provision and has a focus on service exchange, rather than goods, are fundamental to economic exchange. Vargo and Lusch (2004) have provided philosophical assumptions to justify the Service dominant logic in the article of evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. S-D logic talks about services; however, it can be applied to any service as well as manufacturing system. Moreover, this logic replaces tangible to intangible, value to embedded value and transaction to relationship.

2.2 Goods Dominant Logic

As it is an established fact that goods dominant logic is based on economics, in this school of thoughts, the most important thing is manufacturing and delivery of objects (selling). The more profit means more value, as well as “goods” are the symbol of value. However, the focus on production process was limited in G-D logic. Moreover, the decision about value is decided by the price of an object.

Furthermore, in perspective of G-D logic, the manufacturer does not touch customer in manufacturing ideas and treat them just outside entity or value destroyer (Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

2.3 Co-creation

The perspective of S-D logic claims value creation as: “the customer being better off when using a product or service”. In other words, “Value is created through the interaction process itself” (Gronroos, 1990). Moreover, co-creation of value takes place when individuals, individual organizations, individual nations or any other entity involved in exchanging intangible resources for mutual interest (Vargo & Lusch, 2008). In addition, in S-D logic, the source of competitive advantage is always the management of operant resources (Jaakkola & Hakanen, 2013). Accordingly, they can develop through “set of strategic capabilities that enable an organization to co-create value in service exchanges with value network partners, for example, customers, intermediaries, suppliers.
or employees” (Karpen, Bove and Lukas, 2011).

Essentially, the concept of resource integration as well as value creation represents the phenomenon of process orientation and this orientation involves distinguishing the currently discussed perspective of S-D logic with G-D logic as evidenced from the work of Lusch and Vargo (2007). In this article, they discussed “commitment to collaborative processes with customers and partners”.

**2.4 Value Proposition**

According to Ramirez, (1999), value proposition/ offer is an indicator of relationships but in a static way rather than dynamic. Anderson et al. (2006) suggested three approaches for developing value proposal: (1) all benefits, (2) favorable points of difference and (3) resonating focus. Service provider identifies and propose all possible benefits of service clients and focuses on identifying and proposing differentiating benefits to attain competitive edge to attract service client. Service providers focus on offering specific benefits or value which is desired by selected service clients (Kowalski et al., 2012).

**2.5 Institutions & Institutional Arrangements**

Institutions are beliefs, rules, and norms formulated by a human that enforce and restrain human actions and make social life meaningful and predictable (North 1990). Institutional arrangements are set of interrelated institutions. Institutional role and process is a key to understand structure and function of service ecosystem (Vargo & Lusch, 2016). Institutions can be informal and informal forms of codified laws, social norms, conventions and symbolic meanings. Institutions are governance mechanism for reciprocal service exchange and value co-creation. All social and economic actors integrate their private and public resources to co-create value through self-service and access to additional resources through reciprocal exchange of resources (Sebastiani, Corsaro & Vargo, 2013).

Institutions are dynamic, variable and changing. Institutions direct and guide the human actions but these actions remain unpredictable as actors have the capacity to choose to act otherwise (Jarzabkoski (2008). Institutions and institutional arrangements
enable social and economic actors to exchange service and to perform value co-creating activities in constraint cognition. Institutions shared by service actors in networking efforts of service ecosystem deliver more returns and potential benefits to all service actors. Institutions occupied a central role in process of value co-creation and service exchange (Vargo & Lusch, 2016).

2.6 Service Ecosystem

Management literature used the terms of network interchangeably and ecosystem (Battistella et al., 2012). With the emergence of service dominant logic, the term of service ecosystem was introduced to describe the networking of social and economic resource integrating and value co-creator actors in a complex environment which was earlier described as service system by Maglio and Spohrer, (2008). Wieland et al. (2012) differentiated system to view and network view’ Service ecosystem is an actor to actor networking or a community of interacting service entities (individuals and organizations) which depend upon each other for its survival and effectiveness and jointly evolve their capabilities. Service ecosystem is a “relatively self-contained, self-adjusting system of mostly loosely coupled social and economic (resource-integrating) actors connected by shared institutional logics and mutual value creation through service exchange” (Lusch & Nambisan, 2015).

2.7 Service Dominant Logic and Organizational Performance

Practitioners and scholars have defined performance in the setting of different disciplines: economics, engineering, sociology, management, marketing, management of information systems, human resources, accounting, and finance. All the operational procedures and activities in the organization called performance with a purpose to improve values (Lorino, 1997).

Most often, a commonly used approach to accurately describe the performance of an organization is the one that explains the concept of performance with effectiveness and efficiency with organization solitary (Devinney et al, 2005). In contrast, the concept of service dominant logic, the focus of performance in organizations is very little for the benefit of another entity. Due to this notion, every actor perceives performance
differently, which is missing the link in conventional management research. Every actor in the organization would have a different perception of performance (e.g. employee, employer, supplier, stakeholder, customer). The majority of empirical studies and theoretical developments have worked without questioning the epistemology and impact of mixed and incomplete research on “performance” from an overall G-D Logic. On the whole, researchers showed that performances are firm’s perspective-oriented as well as organizations are opportunistic behaviors oriented (Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

2.8 Social Exchange Theory and Value Co-creation

According to Robinson et al. (2004), the definition of employee engagement is “A positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its value. An engaged employee is aware of business context and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization”. The organization must work to develop and nurture engagement, which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee.

However, in view of Aryee et al. (2002) employee engagement should be proposed as “social or economic exchanges”. Another perspective of social exchange theory proposes that employee engagement social exchange may be started first by the organization’s treatment of its employees with the expectation that such treatment will eventually be reciprocated (Blau 1964).

While discussing some constructs i.e. employee engagement, employee commitment, and employment relationships, the discussion about Social exchange theory is inevitable as it has core fundamentals for other related theories as well e.g. leader-member exchange theory, transformational leadership, organizational support theory and service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

After studying the literature on social exchange theory, we can infer that the perspective of social exchange theory supports the perspective of S-D logic which is, all actors (e.g., employees, employers, suppliers, customers) are attached to exchange their resources and do value co-creation in the setting of organization (Vargo, 2011). In addition, in the extension of social exchange theory and its application on S-D logic, it
seems that actors develop favorable behaviors, cognitions and emotions for exchanging the resources to achieve mutual benefit for individuals, customers, organizations, and societies (Vargo and Lusch, 2008).

Additionally, Network theories also support the concept of S-D logic, as organizations are unable to do anything independently. According to networks theories, individuals cannot perform in isolation in the organization (Mele, 2011). They interact regularly in accordance with commonly accepted norms of behavior in order to create and maintain a shared determination to improve the co-creation processes (Polese, Moretta Tartaglione, 2007; Polese, 2009). However, network theory concentrates on the improvement of interactions continuously among the actors of a network (Castells, 1996).

2.9 Employee Engagement

Recent scholarly work depicts that management and investment in invisible assets and intangibles are more valuable for sustainable and competitive business growth such as employee know-how, innovation, inter-firm alliances and customer relations (Kamukama, Ahiauzu & Ntayi, 2011). Therefore, we are going to study the value of employee engagement in the organization for value co-creation. As in S-D logic view, the more credence is given to customer engagement. However, employee engagement in management domain is considered important construct because the performance of an organization depends upon employees of the organization. Employee engagement involves “an active and intentional mind and can relate to an activity, for example, co-creation, which encompasses both psychological state and behavior” (Brodie et al., 2011).
2.9.1 The Core of Employee Engagement

According to Saks, (2005) employee engagement is “a distinct and unique construct that consists of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components” (Czarnowsky, 2008). In recent years, employee engagement is a construct, which is extensively used for the purpose of profit maximization (Macey and Schneider, 2008). Moreover, the next specification of employee engagement described by Saks (2005) is, it is an individual role performance. With this elaboration, Saks (2006) argues that an engaged employee is more attentive and mentally absorptive in their work even both cognitively and emotionally. Through the adoption of employee engagement behavior, individuals’ attachment with employers increased and turnover ratio decreased because they are safer and productive (Fleming and Asplund, 2007). However, unfortunately, the ratio of engaged employees is less (Harter, Schmidt and Hayes, 2002; Saks, 2006). Even so, positive business outcomes are associated with the term (Czarnowsky, 2008). Professionals from human resource development have worked on the construct of employee engagement but they faced criticisms on the conceptualizations and definitions.
due to disjoint literature (Macey & Schneider, 2008). To work on “something” needs its antecedents as well as consequences because it helps to make procedure improve and purposeful. In align, after viewing antecedents and consequences of employees’ engagement it seems little research is there on those parameters. However, Kahn’s (1990) and Maslach et al.’s (2001) work lightened the potential ontology as discussed in the figure given below.

![Fig. 2: Employee engagement, Source: Saks (2006)](image)

### 2.9.2 Employee Engagement in Perspective of Service Dominant Logic

Resource integration and value co-creation are two major components of S-D logic which highlight the process orientation that distinguished it from Goods-dominant logic (Lusch, Vargo, & Obrien, 2007). However, operant resources can be in form of specific skills, knowledge, and experience of an individual employee or specific policies and procedures of the business which drives value co-creation in service dominant logic. While all value-creation is driven by above mentioned operant resources (Vargo & Lusch, 2008). Now S-D logic is being used for multidiscipline research with the common assumption that humans are developing an alternative to traditional logics of exchange of resources for co-creation of value.

Consequently, S-D logic has been incessantly elaborated and extended. The most important extension of S-D logic is Axiom 5, which states that “Value co-creation is co-ordinated through actor-generated institutions and institutional arrangements” Institutions are according to Vargo and Lusch (2016) are: “Humanly devised rules, norms, and beliefs that enable and constrain action, and make social life predictable and meaningful,” and institutional arrangements as “Interdependent assemblages of institutions”.
After studying the description of Axiom 5, we can easily understand employee relationship with an organization’s institutionalization as well as the importance of employees for the organization. While, service systems are “value co-creation configurations of people, technology, organizations and shared information” (e.g., Language, Laws; Maglio and Spohrer, 2008, p. 18). Likewise, service ecosystems are “systems of resource-integrating actors connected by shared institutional logics and mutual value creation through service exchange” (Vargo and Akaka, 2012) and relational ecosystems are “webs of interconnections among relational entities that operate as a system and influence employee decision-making behaviors” (Henderson and Palmatier, 2010).

The above mentioned components of service dominant logic reflect serious conjunctions with this specific study research question by focusing employee engagement, interactivity and relationships as well as value co-creating intent, which should also be core to employee engagement and S-D logic (Vargo et al., 2015).

![Fig. 3: Engagement as an interactive actor-to-actor construct, Source: Finsterwalder, 2016](image-url)

2.10 Experiential Learning as a Driver for Employee Engagement

According to Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), the construct of engagement belongs to learning and education literature, which shows more engaged students can
acquire greater knowledge and cognitive development in another way, this learning by engagement expressed in experiential learning. This seminal work evokes the need of experiential learning in service management literature e.g. to integrate the influence of context and experience on employee engagement, customer engagement, and supplier engagement etc. (Bolton, 2011).

Moreover, it is a logical fact that employee engagement is in the hands of employers. For example, famous drivers of employee engagements are listening, communicating with employees and leading them through new and creative ways so that they can learn and adapt. In this way, employee engagement is useful in the performance of an organization. One of the main drivers of employee engagement is experiential learning. If an organization provides more chances of experiential learning to the employees, they will be more motivated and more engaged to the organization (Kahn, 1990).

To improve employee engagement, the employer should work on better interactions with their employees as S-D logic also stresses on interactions. Under S-D logic, employees’ engagement can be achieved through employee surveys, lunchroom meetings or one-on-ones meetings. Ask them honest questions and welcome honest answers. Also, create a clear offer of training and learning.

First, to increase employee engagement through experiential learning, it is required to change the mindset: for example, managers look like a boss to employees (Moon, 2004) and suppose to deliver task activities and orders to employees (Jarvis, 2004). Managers should be a facilitator in the experiential learning process so that employees will be more motivated and engaged. The primary role of a facilitator is to give confidence to employees to fulfill professional obligations via a direct connection, by providing experiential learning platforms for applying their own knowledge in current circumstances. However, better organizational performance will be achieved by developing a service ecosystem (exchange services) which encourages meaningful interactions among peers (Ison & Russell, 2000).

Furthermore, goods dominant logic only emphasizes on value creation for the organization. Conversely, S-D logic emphasizes value creation, uniquely determined by
the involved beneficiary, addressing experientially and phenomenological (Vargo et al, 2008; Vargo and Chandler, 2011). Moreover, the value proposition is a prominent indicator of S-D logic approach, which supports actors (employees and employer) engagement. Value proposition plays a role as a call from one actor to another to align their connections or to engage in service. Additionally, engagement depends on service dominant logic on the intensity of value proposition. The high intensity of value proposition is equal to higher actors’ engagement while a lower intensity of value proposition is equal to lower actors’ engagement.

Conclusively, the experience of actors with one another engagement is also fleeting and continually changing, as are value propositions and every actor’s evaluation of those value propositions. Thus, every service experience is fleeting and continually changing (Chandler and Lusch, 2011).

![Process of experiential learning](source: Fell and Russell, 2000)

Experiential and action learning theories aim to address this issue by placing importance on the social, cultural and political aspects surrounding the learning process. Experiential learning theory has not been without its critics (see Holman et al., 1997). It has been criticized for replicating several aspects of cognition (dualism between mind / body, organism / environment), which fails to explore sufficiently transactional and
reciprocal relationship between persons and external world from a social constructivist, and activity theory perspective (which gives more emphasis to the interaction of learners with the context or events in which learning takes place). This view has found more voice in recent contributions promoting a situated view of learning in organizations, integral to the functioning of communities of practice (see Lave & Wenger, 1991; Brown & Duguid, 1991; Wenger, 1999; Exzngestroem & Miettinen, 1999). These perspectives have also helped bring to the forefront greater consideration of the psychoanalytic, emotional and aesthetic aspects of learning.

![Graphical Representation of Service Experience Source: Chandler and Lusch (2011)](image)

**Fig. 4: Graphical Representation of Service Experience Source: Chandler and Lusch (2011)**

### 2.12 Research Logic

The study has explored the applicability of Service Dominant Logic (S-D logic) to the concepts of management i.e. “employee engagement” and “experiential learning” by analyzing employee/employer behaviors of value co-creation in commercial banking sector organizations.

If an organization provides more chances of experiential learning to employees, they will be more motivated and more engaged to the organization (Kahn, 1990). To improve employee engagement, employers should work on better interactions with their employees, as S-D logic also stresses on the interactions.

To conduct this study, research logic was selected as abduction due to having some reasons. Abduction investigates the relationship between language and concepts
and creates ideas, framework and tentative theory (Thomas, 2010). Abduction is an associated strategy for interpretivism with the aim of exploring and understanding the social phenomenon (Jarvensivu & Tornroos, 2010).

The inspiration for the choice of above stated conceptual relationship between concepts is the work of Vargo and Lusch on S-D logic in support of general theory of marketing. They emphasized on “interaction” between buyers and suppliers, which is critical for value co-creation and value proposition in firms. In the same way, employees knowledge is “operant resource” which is the core of S-D logic, which may be the foundation for business networks. However, employee and employer “interaction” is as logical and significant for value co-creation as significant buyer and supplier interaction is. Moreover, the interaction between buyer and supplier is inevitable in marketing theory as discussed by Vargo & Lusch (2004), similarly, employee and employer interaction (old concept of management “employee engagement”) can be expressed as management theory based on S-D logic. Therefore, abduction logic research is the best to get desired outcome.

3. METHODOLOGY AND STUDY

This study aims to establish a tentative theory/framework of employee engagement via experiential learning under S-D logic. Grounded theory is most appropriate methodology to develop a tentative theory by using interviews method. Strauss & Corbin approach is concerned with interpretive paradigm acknowledge multiple realities and objectivity of the researcher that is similar to my research philosophy. Therefore, Strauss & Corbin GT methodology is most appropriate approach to use in this research. Strauss & Corbin approach of GT is more structured and practical to develop a tentative theory.

3.1 Context of the Study

Population of this study is banking sector. Moreover, the study has used purposeful sampling (theoretical sampling) method to select the necessary commercial banks. The unit of analysis for this research has included informants from the management positions, managers, deputy managers and assistant managers included similar position senior officers.
3.2 Transcription of Interviews and Analysis

The findings suggested that in banking sector organization there is no formal design/format of EL in practice. However, they have theoretical awareness with this concept and its importance but in practical, top management does not take the initiatives. Moreover, managers informally rely on the organizations resources and direction in terms of what to learn, as well as how they would go about fulfilling learning goal. The interview statement by a Manager is;

“Basically, the definition which you have given to EL before this interview is different from the practice which we are availing at the workplace. There is no proper concept regarding experiential learning. My boss intentionally did not provide us opportunities. Instead, by chance, in some situations, we find something as an opportunity for our career development”.

In addition, the answers by some managers express that according to the concept of experiential learning, the procedures of operations/working should be flexible, so that we can learn new skills and competencies. In contrary, we are bound to more for rules and regulation i.e. managers’ statement:

“Banking sector is rigid in policies, rules & regulations. In this ways, the standard thought is to be more mechanistic in your operations”.

“I always demotivated by my boss whenever I come up with my unique ideas. However, they emphasize to copy our seniors’ work”.

Furthermore, some more informants disagree with the point that in the competitive environment where jobs are less and jobless people are more to wait for formal format/design of experiential learning platform. The idea is derived from the situation that people should strive for learning informally, and should be more proactive for opportunities e.g. Managers’ statement:

“I think this is a matter of preference and perception. How do you have to learn from every situation? Wait for the ideal situation or any formal opportunity for experiential learning platform is useless. Even every training, seminar have some specific agenda”.

“A matter of opportunities and availability of resources or ease of accessibility of
information”

3.2.1 The Notion of Experiential Learning Pushed by S-D Logic

Service dominant logic emphasizes interactions between actors. Many studies suggested that workshops are an effective way of facilitating experiential learning. Through understanding and sharing experiences of others, one’s experiential learning can be increased. Experiential learning results to help individuals to connect with others for redesigning present approaches to achieve desired outcomes. In our conventional management system, the importance of experiential learning is missing. Organizations could engage their actors (employee & employer) with new communication mechanisms, both formal and informal. For example, formal communication methods, such as white papers, enable firms to share a common vision (or develop a shared worldview) with other actors in the service ecosystem and support their value co-creation activities. Informal mechanisms can be equally important. Social media and tools such as blogs and wikis facilitate interactions between a firm’s internal experts and other actors (including users or beneficiaries). For example, Microsoft has specially designated employees called “buddies” to serve as bridges between users in the online community and the organizations.

The interview data is evident e.g., “categorically in the name of experiential learning, we have no activities or agendas. However, some training sessions, seminars, standard protocols books, SOP’s books are there, in which we can learn new skills and competencies”.

In addition, the responses of our informants are supportive of our inquiry that experiential learning has a great impact on our employee engagement. Moreover, if there is less experiential learning environment than it also lows engaged employees. Moreover, mainly employer is mainly responsible for employee engagement as well as experiential learning platform e.g. Responses are:

“We learn when we seek to learn. We behave innovatively at challenging task and learn due to the positive mindset of our boss. Our learning depends on what our boss expects, as he is lead man.

Further, some interview statements show that our banking sector is still
bureaucratic and conventional setup, which is famous for opportunistic mechanism work patterns e.g. responses of manger:

“My boss busies me in the working which he feels beneficial either for his career development or other benefits of him. Moreover, he indulges me just routine works and not encouraging me to explore opportunities and to develop my career”.

“One hinder is a personal choice we only adopt those factors which we feel meaningful to present job work”.

The findings in relation to what is their personal view for more productivity in the work and what are some barriers they feel in experiential learning. They defined that if organization/head office management changes their’ mindset that maybe our bosses’ mindset of working can be changed and ultimately the relationship will also be positive between them e.g. views of manager are:

“According to my wish in contrary banking environment rigidness, I want to give Experiential learning environment. This would be participative, interactive, and applied. When we will face exposure to processes that are highly variable and uncertain, the environment will allow us to interact with autonomy and bring the innovative solutions to deal with problems. However, new skills and competencies will easily take place as well as everyone can avail more chances of his career development”.

“Some formal experiential learning practices should practice; the cognitive counseling should be done by seniors and should care for experiential learning”

“The culture of acceptance instead of rejections should developed” (managers).

3.2.2 Conventional Mindset to S-D Logic

The lens of service dominant logic gives the perspective that employer not only contains operant resources but employee also contains operant resources. In other words, the easier it is for actors to access experiential learning platform and resources therein, the richer the opportunity for resource integration. As this occurs, diverse actors learn from one another through interaction, and this, in turn, stimulates innovation. Similarly, the more diverse the communication channels, the richer are the opportunities for knowledge integration and service exchange.

When we have asked from our informants what is the role of psychological
factors, i.e. cognitive, emotional and behavioral. They replied not only in professional circumstances but also in any case, according to them, wherever you are in your life matters, these factors normally undertook. Every individual has some emotional, cognitive and behavioral sides of his personality. In the light of this perspective, everyone, whenever he is in the role of employee or either at the same time he is someone’s boss (employer), should use these psychological factors e.g. you can emotionally excite for some certain project of higher performance. Secondly, you can check their cognitive abilities either they are suitable for this specific kind of project or they can improve their level of abilities. Ultimately, two ways communication processes can improve with the help of these indicators of the personality of employees, as well as an employee, can also handle employers. Through, the employee & employer relationship can be more productive e.g. interview statements by managers are:

“As a manager, I always tried to promote a positive work environment to help increase employee engagement. The examples of the positive workplace for employee engagement are meaningful conversations, practicing active listening, and preparing employees for change”.

“To engage employees, it is very helpful to trigger your employees cognitively, emotionally and behaviorally as they are well educated and skilled worker. So, if they are emotionally attached they will outperform. In the same way, when they feel that they have chances to career advancement, they will try to improve their cognitive abilities. In consequence, they will put their workplace more positive behavioral practices”.

“I am not an authoritarian boss; I always permit my juniors while living within the boundaries of rules and regulation of banks, they can perform according to their individual cognitive abilities to make suitable improvements”.

The second thought is; in banking sector while living in hierarchal culture people become teams to achieve their current purposes. In some moments, for everyone (employer and employees) become important their common purpose. They start to cooperate with each other and share their skills and competencies to achieve the success of a branch (bank) informant’s responses are:

“My boss is responsible for the overall goals and we participate the improvement
of the program.”

“I always take as a role model of my boss; because he is really committed to fulfilling his duties as well as for his quick learning ability to do things better. He always tried to motivate people by self-improvement activities”.

“To better my projects performances; I always receive extra Proposals or suggestions from my boss. Moreover, my boss motivates us through telling us about opportunities which we can avail from our existing projects.”

According to the informants, in the banking sector, the top management, especially those who are an elderly person is less innovative, encouraged and adopted. In contrary, new blood is more innovative, risk-taking and encouraging for the uncertainties and its innovative solutions.

“Yes, he is moderately welcome new ideas and approaches. With every new idea, he proactively mentioned me the implementation criteria/rule of the bank. Due to this nature of my boss, in so many matters, I feel a communication gap due to his bossy attitude”

“Many times, I have done my work out the way and offend my boss but ultimately, in the long run, I learned a lot for my career developments despite the conflicts between me and my boss”.

3.2.3 Value Co-creation in the Perspective of S-D Logic

Actors (employee & employers) can play a diverse set of roles in resource integration and for value co-creation. In align; actors can proactively support the process of value co-creation by establishing new organizational mechanisms and making appropriate changes to their internal processes.

The research demonstrated another perspective that even elderly boss is less innovative or slow to adopt change but their experience and way of working have worth which is unique from new blood e.g. years of experience, knowledge of history, respect, role model, patience responses are;

“Due to experience and seniority, I always respect his coaching and mentoring and it also helps me out to smoothness in my workings”.

“Kindness, love, respect are always factors of motivation”
“Healthy communication, two-way communication, exchanging knowledge and skills are better option to make the workplace more productive”.

In the answer to the questions, in your view, what is the main barrier to employee engagement they argued that the opportunistic behavior, risk giving and less collaboration and cooperation.

“Basically, co-operation is there in our relationship (boss & employee) but at the level where my responsibility ends and that of others begins. In some way, opportunistic behavior, I have found in the banking sector. Instead of risk sharing risk giving culture is more in the workplace”.

“Sometimes, people wrap your innovative ideas and on your face did not give importance to your ideas. After some time, you came to realize someone working on your ideas and take the lead”.

The last interview question of the study was while living in this opportunistic environment how you gain and put the value in your workplace? Most of the informants replied that if our work environment is opportunistic than we become more sharp, proactive and active in a way, how we can generate value from our existing opportunities and continually explores hidden opportunities.

Moreover, as a manager, they replied that we put our tacit knowledge towards our juniors and motivates them to put their abilities hundred percent.

“It is obvious in every assignment/job value is present. It depends on our interest how much we taking benefit from it. Personally, I engaged myself in formal and informal learning activities”.

“I am fond of taking feedback from others and in the light of it, to improve myself”.

“Many times my working patterns and ideas become beneficial for my juniors as well as seniors. The things which I learned in years through good interaction I transfer to my juniors within months”.

3.3 Open Coding

In this phase of open coding, data is examined, compared closely and carefully by breaking down it into distinct parts (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In this research, open
coding was based on empirical evidence through interviews in two perspectives: one core
concepts of employee engagement under conventional management perspective and
second, extracting the grounded data on experiential learning with the connection of
employee engagement under the framework of service dominant logic. A number of
concepts emerged during the collection of empirical evidence via interviews as well as by
the review of the literature. By comparing the differences and similarities of both
conventional and emerging concepts, main categories emerged.

3.3.1 **Open Coding (Conventional Management Perspective)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee engagement; personal and career development; tendency to engagement is a product of the interaction between employee and manager; perceived encouragement by the manager, clear about the future direction of career; mobility, risk and uncertainty; loyalty; tactic to individuals, political game; psychological; cognitive and behavioral dimensions; encouraging to copy others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer; personal, organizational, societal, cognitive, behavioral and psychological factors affect managers’ attitudes towards learning and the way managers are likely to interpret, employees are resource holder,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee; personal, organizational and societal cognitive, behavioral and psychological factors affects employees’ attitudes towards learning and the way employees are likely to interpret; resource holder but within certain limits as banking organizations do not contain so much flexibility in rules and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer interest; opportunities and availability of resources; managers’ preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee interest; opportunities and availability of the chances of personal growth;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual distance; gap identification; work handling; image creation; mutual relationship; observations, confidence; trust opportunistic behavior; preferences and perceptions; own protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation; qualification; work experience; pay level; superior rank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experiential learning; only adopts those factors which they feel meaningful to them, new horizons, continue procedure, professionalism, organization’s resources and direction in terms of what to learn, organization’s HRM strategy, confused and unclear as to what they need learn and whether the organization would value it; rigid banking structure and senior people determine what should be made available to people. If they have mindsets which consider learning is not important, then no one else does (think it is important)”. Learning in a mechanistic fashion;

Authoritarian behavior; audit parameters; management approach; no creativity; no freedom; no ideal situation;

Insufficient two-way communication; Insufficient encouragement; fewer rewards; less supportive environment; instability

Resources are supplied by actors; resources as a function of human appraisal; nature of resources; relationship of resources with actors; organizations deploy operant and operand resources;

Threat; push by threatening with negative consequences;

Coaching; mentoring; training; benchmark expertise; set criteria’s for learning; theoretical learning; learning by experience; learning by relationship development;

3.3.2 Open Coding (New Emerging Service System Perspective)

(Employees) resource holders; actor; resource integrator; social and economic actors; the experience of actors within the integrating resources; actors have ongoing desire to improve his condition; social actors are aware of their operant resources

(Employer) value co-creator; holding operand resources; perceives maximum value through interaction and collaboration; focus on other’s wellbeing; acknowledge other’s operand resources; maximize his operand resources through service exchange

Based on service; service exchange for service; employee/employer service relation

Social context; relationship; institutional context; social context lead to qualitative aspects of reputation, satisfaction, guilt, shame, honor trust etc.

Extrinsic motivation; qualification; work experience; pay level; superior rank

Organizational context; organizational culture and environment; management behavior; rules and regulation; policies; strategies; interaction among employees; organizational hierarchy;
value realization; need for exchange; rare and differential skills and knowledge; knowledge sharing; service context, service ecosystems, collaborative networked; service system; basics of exchange; knowledge sharing; transfer of specialized skills and competencies; exchange of interests; exchange of operant resources; exchange of service for service; social exchange; rare and differentiated resources are bases of exchange; service as a learning process

actor to actor relation; exchange of competences and skills; mutual benefits; experiential relation; exchange of operant resources for value creation; collaboration; cooperation; the well-being of others; balance self; alignment of goal; service interaction; service relation; resource integration; value proposition; value co-creation

governance mechanism; governance goal is to facilitate effective, mutual gain coordination between parties; mechanism of relational governance; benefits of participation;

experience; experiential learning; experiential value;

individual learn in the process of interactions; operative learning (learning of new act; relational learning/evaluative learning (learning about motives and intentions); new knowledge; competences and skills

value is experienced through resource integration; value is experiential.; greater value on goal convergence; greater value in cooperative behavior; interest alignment and collective behavior has greater utility than individualistic self-serving behavior

(Experiential learning) Learning by doing; Learning by participation; Continue procedure;

Teamwork; Consultant; Facilitator, experiencing value

(Innovation) New ideas; Initiatives; coordination; convergence, innovative while living certain boundaries

Construction of own knowledge; worldview; Motivation to learn; Perceived knowledge

### 3.3.3 Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub Categories</th>
<th>Key Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Facilitator, mentor, governor, work handler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee and employer interest</td>
<td>Resource holder, partner, co, producer, Value co-creation, value in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process perspective</td>
<td>Way of doings,</td>
<td>Network, mind set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging issues in conventional system</td>
<td>Self interest</td>
<td>Authoritarian behavior; audit parameters; management approach; no creativity; no freedom; no ideal situation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging solutions in emerging service system</td>
<td>Balance Self interest Goal convergence</td>
<td>experience; value; learning; knowledge; mutual interest competences and skills; Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value co-creation</td>
<td>Value in Context Value in use Only the user can identify the created value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resources Operant Resources Operand Resources Resource integration</td>
<td>bargaining power of employees or employers; supplied by actors; social and cultural resources of organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>informal and formal groups; adaptive and dynamic environment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-D Logic</td>
<td>Service system</td>
<td>basis of exchange; application of operant resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee &amp; employer Service relationship</td>
<td>Positive (alleviation of opportunism)</td>
<td>process centric view; a shift in the logic of exchange;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Learning by doing Learning by participation Continue procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution and Institutional arrangements</td>
<td>Management approach</td>
<td>Teamwork, Consultant, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>New ideas Initiatives Coordination</td>
<td>An active and intentional mind co-creation, which encompasses both psychological state and behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operant Resource</td>
<td>Integration Exchange</td>
<td>Knowledge, skills, competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operand resources</td>
<td>Physical resource</td>
<td>Books library, mentors hiring, equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimuli/responses</td>
<td>Culture of the organization Cognitive approach Behavioral approach</td>
<td>New behaviors and changes in behaviors through stimuli and response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic</td>
<td>Relationship development</td>
<td>Alliances via application and exchanging of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service ecosystem</td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>network of actors; broad perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiencing value</td>
<td>Value in use</td>
<td>Only the user can identify the Created value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldview</td>
<td>Conventional and modern</td>
<td>Construction of own knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to learn</td>
<td>Self-efficacy beliefs, normative beliefs</td>
<td>Active learner, wish to take lead, maximum benefit from available opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption</td>
<td>Perceived knowledge</td>
<td>On a right track, convergence, innovative while living certain boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Implementation of knowledge</td>
<td>Creates value by applying new acquired knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 **Constant Comparison Analysis**

The constant comparison method involves comparison of one segment of data with another to determine similarities and differences. The dimension is tentatively given a name it then becomes a category. The overall object of this analysis is to identify the patterns of the data. These patterns are arranged in relationship to each other in the building of a grounded theory.

3.5 **Axial Coding**

During the phase of axial coding, the paradigm model was utilized to identify the relationship among categories, subcategories, and concepts. The paradigm model was used in both perspectives: the traditional perspective of employee engagement and service perspective of employee/employer service relation. By examining the key concepts of the traditional perspective of employee engagement, with influencing the effect of experiential learning and dissimilarities of service dominant logic, eight main categories were identified which provide the basis for establishing core category.

![Axial Coding Model](image)

*Fig. 6: The Axial Coding Model of Employee/Employer Service Relation under the Logic of Conventional Management*
Fig. 7: The Axial Coding Model of Employee/Employer Service Relation under the Logic of Service Dominant

3.6 Outcome Categories of Constant Comparison Analysis of Subcategories

Following are the outcome categories after comparison:

3.6.1 Service Actors / Resource Holders

In employee/employer service relation, actors have involved value sharing, mutual benefit, value proposition, the central focus on operant resources, experience value co-creation, strategic advantage collaborative & Cooperative, service relationship instead of profit sharing, goal conflict, focus on operand resources, incentives outcome, competitive advantage.

3.6.2 Service Perspective

S-D logic uses the singular term service to reflect the process of doing something beneficial for and in conjunction with some entity, rather than units of output, immaterial
goods as implied by plural services.

### 3.6.3 Employee / Employer Service Relation

In conventional perspective, the different self-interest of employer and employee leads them to do effort for their personal benefits but S-D logic introduces the concept of mutual benefits. It uses the operant resources for the benefits of another party. Employee engagement proposes such relationship where the manager is trained to interact with his employee for the organizational benefit. But if we give the S-D logic to our managers, who focuses on the value proposition to attract the employee to come with the employer to co-create value willingly then they will more engage. Another important difference is the utilization of resources. Employee engagement logic mainly focuses on operand resources and use monetary incentives (salary, bonus, equity sharing) and focus on the development of information system for the monitoring of employees actions but S-D logic talks about the operant resources working behind the operand resources. It focuses on competencies, knowledge, and skills of employer and employee, which both apply to co-create proposed and expected value. Involvement and participation of the employee in decision making, policy making and creating a memorable experience for each other are key solutions to resolve emerging issues in GD logic employee engagement.

### 3.6.4 Value

In service perspective financial gain or money are not the basis of service exchange. These play the role of delivery vehicle for value and value is raped in those products. Value exists behind the money in the form of service, which is applied in operations.

### 3.6.5 Co-creation

Instead of establishing information system and doing the efforts to monitor the employee’s actions, an employee/employer service relation employer proposes a beneficial value to the employee and both integrate their operant resources to co-create value, which is mutually beneficial.

### 3.6.6 Context

Employee/employer service relation is supported and reinforced by established
service system mechanism, service practices, and processes within the organization, which is based on service context. If institution and institutional arrangements are supported by service mechanism, then it will force service actor to engage in value co-creating activities and ultimately organization will gain higher organizational performance.

3.6.7 Experiential Learning

Under the supervision of S-D logic, actors are involved in establishing new communication mechanisms, both formal and informal. For example, formal communication methods, such as white papers, enable firms to share a common vision (or develop a shared worldview) with other actors in the service ecosystem and support their value co-creation activities. Informal mechanisms can be equally important. Social media and tools such as blogs and wikis facilitate interactions between a firm’s internal experts and other actors. Ultimately, the mechanism supports the employee/employer service relation.

3.6.8 Worldview

In a service ecosystem, the diverse actors who are cognitively distant from one another need shared institutional logics that enable them to obtain a common perspective of their environment that is, adopt a shared worldview to ensure the ecosystem’s survival.

4. PROPOSITIONS

Propositions were generated using the deep insight of empirical evidence through interviews in perspective of experiential learning with the connection of employee engagement under the framework of service dominant logic. These linkages describe how categories and subcategories generated during the process of open coding are related to core category or key phenomenon of employee/employer service relation.

Proposition 1

To shift the conventional management mindset with service exchange (reciprocal exchange of operant resources) leads service actors (employers and employees) to support the spirit of experiential learning and employee/employer service relation.

Proposition 2
Value co-creation and high performance of an organization depend upon employee/employer service relationship achieve through interaction/collaboration rather than individual efforts.

**Proposition 3**

To be built service system instead of conventional system institutions and institutional arrangements facilitate, and moderate the impact of employee/employer service relation through strengthening the service governance mechanism in an organization.

**Proposition 4**

Experiential learning practices lead to improve employee/employer service relation and strengthen service employer and service employee engagement through the realization of reciprocal exchange of operant resources, learning, and experience.

**5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The findings of the study are based on the deep insight of empirical evidence through interviews in perspective of experiential learning with the connection of employee engagement under the framework of service dominant logic. More specifically, this empirical study gives evidence how the theory of employee engagement is not practiced in the commercial banking sector. According to Gallup and Dernovsek (2008) employee engagement is based on the involvement of working with enthusiasm and a positive attitude, emotional attachment and employees’ commitment. Moreover, Robinson et al. (2004) argued that an engaged employee is aware of business context, and work with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of an organization by efforts of the organization must work to develop and nurture engagement, which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee. Furthermore, S-D logic is less satisfied with this concept, we think this is more push strategy. However, it can be a pull strategy, if we apply the concept of S-D logic. The propositions explain how S-D logic enables employers to engage their employees through service ecosystem with the notion of self-contained, self-adjusting system of most loosely coupled connected by shared institutional logics and mutual value creation through
service exchange (Lusch & Nambisan, 2015).

The critical evaluation of the conventional concept of employee engagement exposes various flaws; those causing employees are needed to be monitored and forcefully push to perform work. Such a behavior made employers’ mind up to deal employee as a self-centered entity that will definitely be involved in moral hazard activities. According to the informants of the study, the problems of conventional employee engagement are self-interest and divergence of goal between employee and employer. The literature exposes job characteristics, perceived organizational support, rewards and recognition, procedural justice and distributive justice are antecedents of employee engagement (Saks, 2006) so, this list evident that it is not the self-running system as the notion of service system’s service ecosystem is. Therefore, existing defined way of employee engagement contains various loose points e.g. the informants declared in response of interview question their bosses work in their self-interests i.e. they distribute uneven justice, jobs, support in the organizations, which needs to be transformed for example, despite all efforts why ratio of engaged employees is low (Harter, Schmidt and Hayes, 2002; Saks, 2006). To resolve these issues, this specific study offers the solution in service perspective. As the concept of S-D logic service ecosystem suggested that service ecosystem is a “relatively social and economic (resource-integrating) actors once you develop service ecosystem win-win situation (employee and employer can take the benefit at the same time) will happen in the banking sector.

This study provides the tentative theory of employee/employer service relationship, which is more concerned with collaboration, goal convergence and trust between service actors in commercial banking service system. It focuses on self-running experiential learning platform, which is more interactive and resources integrating collaborating relation between service actors. The notion is to demolish the sense in which everyone thinks about his self-interest. If employers will think positive for their employees ultimately employees are more willing to co-create value. In the same way, to provide a supportive environment, for example, “experiential learning” into organizations that will cause higher co-creation by actors of organizations. The concept of service
dominant logic, the focus of performance in organizations is very little for the benefit of another entity. Due to this notion, every actor perceives performance differently, which is a missing link in conventional management research. Every actor in an organization would have a different perception of performance (e.g. employee, employer, supplier, stakeholder, and customer). The majority of empirical studies and theoretical developments have worked without questioning the epistemology and impact of mixed and incomplete research on “performance” from an overall G-D Logic. Overall, the researchers showed that performances are firms’ perspective oriented as well as organizations are opportunistic behaviors oriented (Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

This study has great implications for banking sector organizations as a service system in perspective of S-D logic. Commercial banking sector organizations need to clear the vision in the lens of S-D logic as well as should set their institutionalized arrangements according to the above-discussed manner. It is already well discussed in this specific study, the S-D logic emphasized on value co-creation and coordinated through actor-generated institutions and institutional arrangements.

Concluding, Length of relationship develops trust among service actors, which further motivate actors to engage in service related to co-create value. Relationship development through value co-creation motivates employees and employers to perform as a partner and further remain engage in value co-creating activities. Employers intend to hire loyal and retained employees for the organization but employees’ retention depends upon their relational experience within the organization. If service actors desired to get long-term, relations with each other than value may be realized in terms of relationship. Relationship value strengthens employee/employer service relation and enforces them to engage in resource integration and value co-creation repeatedly.

**PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS**

Following are the practical implications for banking sector organizations.

- In the framework of S-D logic, the definition of service is skills and knowledge within/outside organization where anyone can be a service provider like customer, supplier or employee. If you are open to accepting variety of services,
the ultimate choice is S-D logic. Give value to others and take value from others.

- The study has given an emerging philosophy to policymakers in align they should try to engage actors in exchanging of skills or knowledge (services) which is operant resources as well as heart of service science which can provide competitive advantages for getting higher performances as only tangible product or raw material cannot completely satisfy customer or manufacturer/service providers.

- The purpose of employee engagement is already well established as well as used by business organizations; however, the use of experiential learning as an antecedent for employee engagement can be more fruitful. Moreover, the present logic is supported by S-D logic. The reason for adding experiential learning into the equation is aimed for excellence, linked to the co-creation of value.

- The classical mindset is needed to be changed. For example, a manager is a boss, and employees are subordinates and employees perform only by ordering tasks. In contrary, our tentative theory reset the mindset that managers are a facilitator, which is discussed by the logic of experiential learning as well as S-D logic. The primary role of a facilitator is to give confidence to the employees to fulfill professional obligations via a direct connection. It can be achieved by providing experiential learning platforms for applying their own knowledge in current circumstances.

- To create a better experiential learning environment in organizations, the study proposes following arrangements:

  - Guidelines and strategies should be shared openly
  - Do trust employees and respond openly to their questions
  - Credible words must be followed by action
  - Leaders must treat all employees with respect
  - Providing them with equipment, resources, and knowledge appropriate to carry out their tasks
- Creating a safe working environment, both from a physically, psychologically and emotionally
- Arrange employee surveys, lunchroom meetings or one-on-ones
- Ask them honest questions and welcome honest answers
- Create clear offer training and learning
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