

## The role of front line managers in employee voice: a social exchange perspective

Dr. Margaret Heffernan

DCU Business School

Dublin City University

Dublin, Ireland

[margaret.heffernan@dcu.ie](mailto:margaret.heffernan@dcu.ie)

Prof. Tony Dundon

School of Business & Economics

National University of Ireland Galway

Galway, Ireland

[tony.dundon@nuigalway.ie](mailto:tony.dundon@nuigalway.ie)

Presenting author: Margaret Heffernan

## **Biographies**

Margaret Heffernan is Lecturer at DCU Business School, Dublin City University. Prior to this she lectured at National University of Ireland Galway and worked as a Research Fellow at the University of Limerick. Her main research interests focus on strategic human resource management, organisational justice and employee outcomes. She has presented at numerous academic and professional conferences and published academic journal articles in such journals as the International Journal of Human Resource Management and Journal of European and Industrial Training. She has also co-authored a number of book chapters, most recently a chapter in International Human Resource Management which was edited by A.W. Harzing and A. Pinnington and published by Sage.

Tony Dundon is Professor of Human Resource Management and Employment Relations at National University of Ireland Galway and Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences (FAcSS). Tony's research areas include 'employment relations, human resource management and organisational performance, employee voice and trade union organising. He previously worked at Manchester School of Management, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST) and has held a number of international visiting fellowships in Australia. He is currently (co)-editor in chief of Human Resource Management Journal (HRMJ).

## **The role of front line managers in employee voice: a social exchange perspective**

### **Abstract**

This paper examines the role played by line managers in explaining the link between employee voice and employee attitudes. The notion of employee voice has gained prominence in the last two decades with researchers from different perspectives examining the topic. By and large, this research has found that exercising voice in the workplace is related to positive attitudes toward jobs and organizations. Using data from 187 employees across three Irish organisations, we show that positive employee perceptions of voice report higher levels of affective commitment and work effort. The paper also highlights the important role of the front-line manager in managing voice and shaping employee attitudes at the workplace level. Drawing on social exchange theory, the mediating role of leader-member exchange (LMX) on the voice-outcomes relationships was tested. On the whole, results emphasise the importance of employee voice for employees. It also supported the idea that employees perceive the opportunity for voice within a social exchange perspective, whereby they reciprocate with increased affective commitment.

**Keywords:** employee voice, line managers, leadership member exchange, affective commitment, work effort

## **Introduction**

The notion of employee voice has gained prominence in the last two decades with researchers from different perspectives examining the topic. High performance work systems researchers have investigated voice in order to gain higher levels of organizational performance (Ichniowski et al., 1997). In contrast, those desiring better systems of employee representation have examined the notion from an industrial democracy perspective. These researchers have examined how voice can empower and engage employees more fully in their jobs by allowing employee expression of constructive ideas, information, and opinions about change in organizations (Bowen and Lawler, 1992; Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Botero and Van Dyne, 2009). By and large, this research has found that exercising voice in the workplace is related to positive attitudes toward jobs and organizations (Frese, Teng, and Wijnen, 1999; Van Dyne and LePine, 1998). McCabe and Lewin (1992) put forward two broad potential elements of voice. First, was the expression of grievances or complaints in workplace to management. Second, was participation of employees in the decision making process. In this paper we argue that the root of employee voice lies in employees having an ability to influence the outcome of decisions being made in the organisation through opportunities to advance ideas and have them considered. Therefore, we focus on the second dimension proposed by McCabe and Lewin (1992). In this paper, we propose a direct relationship between perceived levels of opportunity for voice and employee commitment and work effort. Secondly, we propose, at the employee-line manager level, that an indirect relationship mediated by leader-member exchange (LMX) theory also exists. LMX reflects the quality of the social exchange relationship between the employee and line manager. It has been acknowledged previously that line managers play a crucial role in implementing HRM (Purcell and Hutchinson, 2007; Redman and Snape, 2005). Boxall and Purcell (2008) point out that line manager action or inaction is often responsible for the difference between

espoused HR policies and successful enactment. The role of the line manager and employee voice in particular has not yet been explored. Based on social exchange theory, we examine the mediating role of the quality of employee–supervisor relationships (LMX) on voice and employee outcomes. There has been limited research to date on the mediating role of the quality of employee–supervisor relationships (LMX) on perceptions of voice and employee outcomes (Botoro and Van Dyne, 2009).

The paper begins with an exploration of the role of voice and its relationship with employee outcomes. Drawing on social exchange theory, the importance of the employee-supervisor relationship is then examined. Specifically, leader member exchange theory is examined as a mediator between voice and employee outcomes. Following a description of the methodology, we present the results of the regression analyses. These findings are then discussed with implications of the study being identified.

### **Employee voice**

Danford et al. (2009) note that the concept of employee voice is highly imprecise. Wilkinson and Fay (2011) highlight that employee voice is a very broad term with ‘considerable width in the range and definitions authors assign’ (pg. 66). In general, the term refers to how employees are able to have a say regarding decision making issues within the organisation (Wilkinson and Fay, 2011; Freeman, Boxall and Hanyes, 2007). However, whilst voice is a necessary precursor to participation it does not in itself lead to participation. In management research, employee voice has been conceptualized in numerous ways. Much of the industrial relations literature, for example, views the articulation of grievances, either on an individual or collective basis, as the sole component of voice (Gollan, 2001; Dundon et al., 2004). This sees voice as representative with a focus on power and control. In contrast, some

organizational behaviour scholars see voice as behaviour rather than as a perception or an attitude (LePine and Van Dyne, 2001) and focus on autonomy and human needs. Examples of voice behaviours include bringing potential problems to a supervisor's attention and making cost-saving suggestions to managers (Withey and Cooper, 1989). HRM researchers focus on performance and would focus on consensual forms of voice (as proposed by Freeman and Medoff, 1984) whereby mechanisms or contributing ideas and conflictual forms of voice would improve organizational performance. This is done through informing and allowing employees an input into work and business decisions so they can make better decisions and this will lead to commitment. In thinking about voice, it is important to examine employee perceptions of voice rather than simply whether voice mechanisms exist within organisations. Research has shown that examining the mere existence of voice mechanisms is a very narrow way of measuring voice as it does not examine how deeply or successfully they are embedded into an organisation (Cox et al., 2003; Marchington, 2005). This paper defines employee voice as a set of rules or procedures that allow individuals affected by a decision to present information relevant to that decision (Folger, 1977). This draws on due process, employee rights and justice literature (McCabe and Lewin, 1992) focusing on the presence of due process procedures that enhance justice judgments and facilitate employee participation in decision making (Folger, 1977; Lind et al., 1990).

The pioneering work of Thibaut and Walker (1975) on procedural preference in a legal setting is credited with introducing the voice construct to organisational behaviour research, anchored on the conceptual understanding as to whether or not a procedure allowed people some control over the decision-making process. They advanced two criteria for procedural justice: *process control* (e.g. the ability to voice one's views and arguments during a procedure) and *decision control* (e.g. the ability to influence the actual outcome itself). In the legal setting, decision control (referred to as 'choice') refers to the individual's ability to

have a say in the determination of an outcome during the decision state of the dispute resolution process. Process control refers to individual's ability to control the nature of evidence presented on their behalf in the process stage of the dispute resolution process. Thibaut and Walker (1975) contend that procedures that vest process control in those affected by the outcome of the procedure are viewed as more fair than are procedures that vest process control in the decision maker. Process control was identified as an important determinant in procedural justice.

Thibaut and Walker's (1975) work on procedural fairness has been criticised in terms of its focus on the 'outcomes' of fairness. It has since been proven that procedural fairness on its own is actually more important than the outcome (Lind and Tyler, 1988). In the pioneering research by Folger and colleagues (e.g., Folger, 1977; Folger, Rosenfield, Grove, and Corkran, 1979), the focus shifted from the concept of process control toward investigating whether or not people have an opportunity to voice their opinion in the decision-making process (Thibaut and Walker had focused on dispute resolution procedures only). Folger (1977) focused on how procedural differences in opportunities for voice influence people's reactions to their experiences. The concept of 'voice' can refer to any manner of communicating with a decision maker (e.g. conveying opinions) and was borrowed from Hirschman (1970) who defined it as 'the political process, par excellence' (pg.16). As an end in itself, being given an opportunity to express one's own opinion is shown to be an important mediator (e.g. reflecting a certain amount of esteem that the other person implicitly acknowledges; obtaining access to rights that, if denied, would indicate being held in low esteem). It suggests that the opportunity to speak may have value in and of itself, even if its influence on the final decision outcome is minimal (Tyler, 1987). This 'voice effect' has been observed even when people have been told that their voice can have no influence on the decision since it has already been made (Lind, Kanfer, and Earley, 1990).

Creating the opportunity for employee input into decision making is recognised as an important driver of positive employee outcomes including affective commitment and work effort. From a theoretical viewpoint, HRM literature proposes signalling theory as a lens in understanding the positive impact of voice on organisational and employee outcomes. HR practices (including involvement and voice) act as signals that send messages to employees about expected workforce behaviours and managerial intentions (Den Hartog et al., 2013). Subramony (2009) similarly suggests that involvement and empowerment related practices signal a coherent organisation system focusing on the employee, which can affect employee perceptions and behaviours including commitment and work effort. Organizational commitment represents a global, systemic reaction that people have to the company for which they work. Most measures of organizational commitment assess affective commitment, the degree to which employees identify with the company and make the company's goals their own (Allen and Meyer, 1990). In an exchange relationship, when employees believe they can influence a decision this has the potential to increase their levels of affective commitment (Korsgaard and Roberson, 1995). HRM researchers have suggested HR systems can be effective in achieving organisational goals by providing employees with the ability, motivation and opportunities to participate (Purcell et al., 2009; Combs et al., 2006; Arthur and Boyles, 2007). Bailey (1993) and Appelbaum et al. (2000) argued that opportunity to participate in decisions was a key to eliciting greater discretionary effort from employees. Similarly, Edwards (2003) saw voice as a means to secure workers consent to expend discretionary effort. Thus, we can hypothesise that:

*Hypothesis 1: There is a positive relationship between perceptions of employee voice and affective commitment.*

*Hypothesis 2: There is a positive relationship between perceptions of employee voice and work effort.*

### **Social exchange theory – the mediating role of LMX**

The relationship that employees and their line managers share is important (Townsend et al., 2012), particularly in managing the employment relationship. Research has shown that effective voice can be substantially influenced by the relationship employees have with their line managers. Furthermore, line managers who have strong people management skills are more capable of listening to the voices of their subordinates and can communicate effectively with the employees (Townsend et al., 2012). Applying Blau's (1964) exchange theory to the relationship between voice and employee attitudes and behaviours highlights two issues. Social exchange theory is helpful in understanding the relationship between voice and outcomes as it describes how social relationships are based on the exchange of benefits between parties (Moorman and Byrne, 2005). If employees consider having a voice in decisions and an opportunity to communicate as important then they are more likely to be motivated to reciprocate that benefit. This reciprocation could include greater commitment to the organisation or greater discretionary work effort. Three social exchange relationships have been identified as the primary relationships employees are involved in at work. They are leader-member exchange (employee-supervisor relationship), perceived organisational support (employee-organisation relationship) and co-worker exchanges (with other members of the organisation). Thus employees can form social exchange relationships at multiple levels (Lavelle et al., 2007). For the purposes of this paper, we focus on the employee-line manager level – this is known as leader member exchange (LMX) as research has shown that line managers can be a barrier or facilitator of effective voice systems (Townsend, 2014).

LMX is a theory that describes the quality of supervisor–subordinate relationships (Dansereau, Graen, and Haga, 1975) and reflects the degree of trust, respect and loyalty in manager – subordinate exchanges (Graen and Scandura, 1987). There are two types of leader-follower relationships identified in the literature: High-LMX (in-group) members share mutual trust, respect, reciprocal influence, loyalty, liking, and a sense of obligation with their leaders (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). Research suggests employees experiencing high LMX have more communication exchanges with their supervisor and benefit from greater work support and supervisor responsiveness (Fix and Sias, 2006). In contrast, low-LMX (out-group) reflects low quality relationships where contributions offered by both the leader and the follower only rise to the level of that required in the job. As a result, employees in low-LMX relationships have less access to their supervisors, fewer resources, and restricted information (Fairhurst and Chandler, 1989). Previous research has identified LMX as a strong predictor of job satisfaction (Gerstner and Day, 1997; Sparr and Sonnentag, 2008), commitment (Lee, 2005), turnover intentions (Ferris, 1985), job depression and feelings of control at work (Sparr and Sonnentag, 2008). There has been limited research however examining the relationship between voice, LMX and employee attitudes and behaviour.

In line with social exchange theory, employees who experience employee voice through participation in decision making feel valued by their line manager (who was the enabler in giving them the opportunity for employee voice) as they see it as a status confirmation (Farndale et al., 2011). This, in turn, leads to employees reciprocating by showing higher levels of employee commitment (Korsgaard et al., 1995) and work effort (Rosen et al., 2011) through upholding the organizations values and speeding the achievement of its objectives (Luchak, 2003), even when this involves undertaking behaviours that extend beyond a job’s in-role requirements (Shore and Wayne, 1993). For example, Stamper, Masterson, and Knapp (2009) suggest that when individuals develop high

quality social exchanges with their employers, they are more likely to behave in pro-organizational ways that are consistent with those perceptions. This non-instrumental effect of voice may also be more relevant to long-term relationships with one's manager than to the immediate decision (Lind and Tyler, 1988). Therefore, we predict that employees who experience high opportunity for voice in decision making will have higher affective commitment and display greater discretionary work effort, in part because of the quality exchange relationships with their supervisors. Thus, the two final hypotheses for this study are:

*Hypothesis 3: The relationship between perceptions of employee voice and affective commitment is mediated by LMX.*

*Hypothesis 4: The relationship between perceptions of employee voice and work effort is mediated by LMX.*

## **Methodology**

The current research utilises a cross-sectional questionnaire as its main method. Data was collected from employees across three organisations, each selected to reflect variation in terms of corporate performance and HR architecture. All three organisations operated in the service sector. A total of 795 questionnaires were distributed across a sample of employees and 209 returned. Due to missing data, 22 surveys were removed from the data leaving a sample of 187. These 187 responses were pooled together and treated as one dataset (whilst controlling for organisational and occupational variations).

## **Measures**

The operationalisation of variable constructs is explained next. Unless otherwise noted, all items were measured using a five-point Likert response scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

*Employee voice* was measured using a scale derived from Folgers (1977) definition of voice in decision making procedures involving HR decisions i.e. procedures that allow individual to present information relevant to a decision or gives input into organisational decisions. These items (adapted from Tyler and Blader, 2000) measured the degree to which employees believed their managers provided opportunity to comment on procedures or give input into decisions across pay decisions, performance appraisals, grievance procedures and employee involvement mechanisms. Sample items include ‘I am provided with reasonable opportunities to express new ideas, concerns or become involved in decision making’ and ‘My supervisor gives me the opportunity to express my views and feelings on pay setting issues and pay decisions’. This five item scale had a Cronbachs alpha value of .834.

The most consistently used measure of *leader-member exchange* (LMX), the seven-item LMX-7 scale developed by Graen et al., (1982) (see Graen and Scandura (1987) for a full review) was used in this study. Two illustrative items are ‘I always know how satisfied my supervisor is with what I do’ and ‘My supervisor recognises my potential some but not enough (reverse code)’, The reliability of this 7-item scale was high at ( $\alpha = .901$ )

*Affective commitment* included five items from Meyer and Allen (1997), such as ‘I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organisation’. This again demonstrated reliability with Cronbach’s alpha value of .932. *Work Effort*, was measured using a two item scale adapted Danford et al. (2005), which sought to capture discretionary effort. An example of the statements used includes ‘I often put effort into my job beyond what is required’. The 2-item scale had a Cronbach’s value of .830.

*Control variables:* The control variables included organization size, HR sophistication, gender, age, education, nature of employment contract. Research has shown that these variables affect employee job attitudes and behaviors in particular (Greenberg and Wiethoff, 2001). Similarly, Boselie et al., (2005) found that individual-level HPWS studies tended to control for personal characteristics such as age, gender, tenure and educational attainment.

### ***Analytical strategy***

Multiple regression analyses were used to test all hypotheses. To evaluate the mediation hypothesis, we drew on the conditions set forth by Baron and Kenny (1986). Mediation is indicated when the following conditions are met: the independent variable has a significant effect on the mediator in the first regression; the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable in the second regression; the mediator has a significant effect on the dependent variable in the third regression; finally the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable is less in the third regression than in the second regression.

### **Results**

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations for all variables used in the analysis are presented in Table 1. Tables 2 and 3 present the regression results from testing the effects of voice on affective commitment and work effort and the mediating effects of LMX while controlling for demographic variables and the organisation. Considering employee voice and affective commitment (see Table 2), the results show a significant positive relationship ( $\beta = .498, p < .001$ ), which confirms Hypothesis 1, explaining 39.6% of variance. There is also a positive relationship between employee voice (the predictor variable) and LMX (the mediating variable,  $\beta = .498, p < .617, p < .001$ ) and between LMX and affective commitment ( $\beta = .560, p < .001$ ). The above results fulfil the first three conditions of testing for mediation. Finally,

results for mediation show that the direct effect between employee voice and affective commitment significantly decreases. When affective commitment was regressed on the predictor variable (voice) and LMX (the mediating variable), the effect of LMX was found to still be significant ( $\beta = .344, p < .001$ ). However, the formerly significant relationship between voice and affective commitment, whilst still significant, has decreased (from  $\beta = .498, p < .001$  to  $\beta = .301, p < .01$ ). This would imply only partial, rather than complete, mediation with respect to the mediating variable (Baron and Kenny, 1986). The Sobel tests of the indirect effect of procedural justice on affective commitment revealed significant statistics ( $t = 6.11, P < .01$ ). These results partially support Hypothesis 3: the relationship between perceptions of employee voice and organisational commitment is partially mediated by LMX.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

We tested Hypothesis 4 in a similar fashion – applying Baron and Kenny’s (1986) three step process (see Table 3). We regressed work effort on to the predictor variable (employee voice) first and found a significant positive relationship between voice and work effort ( $\beta = 0.19, p < .05$ ) explaining 15.5% of variance. The next steps, found a significant positive relationship between the predictor variable and the mediating variable, LMX ( $\beta = .617, p < .001$ ) and between the mediator and work effort ( $\beta = .218, p < .01$ ). Finally, when work effort was regressed on employee voice and the mediator, neither variable was found to significantly influence the dependent variable. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported; the relationship between employee voice and work effort is not mediated by LMX.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

## **Discussion**

The primary purpose of this study was to examine to what extent employee perceptions of employee voice affect affective commitment and work effort and the mediating influence of LMX on this relationship. Consistent with our expectations, the results of this study provide strong support for the importance of employee voice and positive employee outcomes. This reinforces the important role of voice in engendering positive attitudes towards the organisation based on perceived ability to influence decision making in an organization. This is consistent with previous research. For example, in a change context, Farndale et al. (2011) found that opportunity for voice results in employees responding with greater organizational commitment. Support was also found for voice and discretionary work effort. Hence, mechanisms or strategies that encourage employees to believe they have a voice or influence can engender other positive effect such as work effort (Balogun, 2006, Appelbaum et al., 2000).

The study showed that perceptions of voice engendered affective commitment based on ability to influence decision making and a high leader-member exchange relationship. When employees believed they had an opportunity to voice their opinions and more importantly when these were taken into account, this built a good relationship with their manager and in turn impacted affective commitment. This is consistent with work by Folger and Konovsky (1989) and Folger (1977) who suggest that voice can have both instrumental and non-instrumental effects where voice impacts the final outcome and the fair process itself. This also highlights the role of the line manager in ensuring voice exists in organisations. Dundon et al (2004) warn against measures of voice which report frequencies

as they “assume a static and unambiguous definition of what a particular mechanism actually means in practice” (pg. 1152). This research counteracts this criticism by asking employees to rate their perceptions of voice.

Contrary to expectations, LMX did not mediate the relationship between voice and work effort. It might be that an outcome such as organisational citizenship behaviour might be a more appropriate outcome given its link to line management relationships (Wayne et al., 1997; Farndale et al., 2011). An alternative explanation could be that perceived organisational support might represent a more appropriate mediator. POS refers to employees ‘global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being’ (Eisenberger et al, 1986: 501) or more simply, POS is viewed as a measure of an organisation's commitment to its employees (Shore and Tetrick, 1991). Allen et al. (2003) for example found that human resource practices (particularly opportunity to participate in decision making, fairness of rewards, and growth opportunities) contributed to employees’ perceived organisational support, which in turn mediated the relationships between HRM practices and organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and employee turnover.

This paper suggests that voice is an important issue for human resource professionals. Our research suggests that positive perceptions of voice are closely linked to affective commitment and work effort. This highlights the importance for HR practitioners to establish and implement voice mechanisms in their organisations. In the case of affective commitment, this positive relationship with voice was explained further when employees had a strong relationship with their line manager. Purcell et al. (2003) claimed that the line managers’ role is to implement and bring to life to HR policies and practices. However, these same managers can have a determining influence on the outcomes of many of these HR processes as HR decisions are locally configured by line managers.

## **Limitations**

While the study makes important contributions regarding the mediating role of LMX in voice research, it also has a number of limitations that suggest caution while interpreting the results. First, the cross-sectional nature of the study does not allow for causal inferences to be made. The second limitation concerns the effects of common method bias. All variables were measured from the same source and it is possible that the results are contaminated by common method bias. Finally, this study used shortened scales to measure the employee voice variable. Full scales rather than shortened versions could be used in future studies to avoid concerns about comparability of results. The voice scale only examines employee perceptions regarding influence on decisions; it does not investigate the subtleties of employee voice mechanisms/practices in practice such as depth and breadth of employee voice arrangements. Future research should extend this research further by incorporating formal employee voice arrangements and their implementation in terms of organisational justice.

## **Conclusion**

Building on the social exchange perspective, this study examined the relationships between employee voice perceptions and affective commitment and work effort and the mediating role of leader member exchange. Overall, the results provided theoretical and empirical support for the hypothesis that high LMX acts as a mechanism through which favourable evaluations of voice impacts affective commitment. Whilst, voice did positively influence work effort positively, LMX was not found to mediate this relationship. On the whole, results emphasised the importance of employee voice for employees. It also supported the idea that employees perceive the opportunity for voice within a social exchange perspective, whereby

they reciprocate with increased affective commitment. This highlights the important role of the front-line manager in shaping employee attitudes at the workplace level. These findings suggest that intangibles such as employee-management relations can be argued as central to the success of employee voice mechanisms.

## References

- Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M. and Griffeth, R. W. 2003. "The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process". *Journal of Management*, 29, 99–118.
- Appelbaum, E., T., Bailey, T., Berg, P., and Kalleberg, A. 2000. *Manufacturing advantage: why high-performance work systems pay off*. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- Baron, R. and Kenny, D. 1986. "The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51:1173-1182.
- Bailey, T. 1993. "Discretionary effort and the organization of work: Employee participation and work reform since Hawthorne". Unpublished work. Teachers College and Conservation of Human Resources, Columbia University.
- Blau, P. M. 1964. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Botero, I. and Van Dyne, L. 2009. "Employee Voice Behavior: Interactive Effects of LMX and Power. *Management Communication Quarterly* 23: 84 -104.
- Boselie, P., Dietz, G., and Boon, C. 2005. "Commonalities and contradictions in HRM and performance research". *Human Resource Management Journal*, 15(3): 67-94.
- Bowen, D. and Lawler, E, III 1992. "The empowerment of service workers: what, why, how and when", *Sloan Management Review*, pp.31-9.
- Combs, J., Liu, Y., Hall, A., and Ketchen, D. 2006. "How much do high-performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance." *Personnel Psychology*, 59(3): 501-528.
- Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R.N. 1988, "The empowerment process: integrating theory and practice", *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3): 471-82.

- Cox, A., Zagelmeyer, S. and Marchington, M. 2003. 'The Embeddedness of Employee Involvement and Participation and its Impact on Employee Outcomes: An Analysis of WERS 98'. Paper presented at the 19th Colloquium of the European Group for Organizational Studies (EGOS) Conference, Copenhagen, July.
- Danford, A., Richardson, M. and Upchurch, M. 2005. *New unions, new workplaces: A study of union resilience in the restructured workplace*. London: Routledge.
- Danford, A., Durbin, S., Richardson, M., Tailby, S. and Stewart, P. (2009). "Everybody's talking at me': the dynamics of information disclosure and consultation in high-skill workplaces in the UK." *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19: 337-354.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G.B., & Haga, W. 1975. "A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership in formal organizations". *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Den Hartog, D., Boon, C., Verburg, R.M. and Croon, M.A. 2013. "HRM, Communication, Satisfaction, and Perceived Performance A Cross-Level Test". *Journal of Management*, 39: 6, 1637-1665.
- Dundon, T., Wilkinson, A., Marchington, M and Ackers, P. 2004 , 'The meanings and purpose of employee voice'. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15 (6):1150-1171.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R, Hutchinson, S. and Sowa, D. 1986. "Perceived organizational support". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71:500-507.
- Fairhurst, G.T., & Chandler, T.A. (1989). "Social structure in leader-member exchange interaction". *Communication Monograph*, 56, 215-239
- Farndale, E., Van Ruiten, J., Kelliher, C., and Hope-Hailey, V. 2011. "The influence of perceived employee voice on organizational commitment: An exchange perspective". *Human Resource Management*, 50(1): 113-129.

- Folger, R. 1977. "Distributive and procedural justice: Combined impact of "voice" and improvement on experienced inequity". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35(2), 108–119.
- Folger, R., Rosenfield, D., Grove, J., & Corkran, L. 1979. "Effects of "voice" and peer opinions on responses to inequity". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37: 2243-2261.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. 1989. "Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions". *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115–130.
- Freeman, R. B., and Medoff, J. L. 1984. *What do unions do?* New York: Basic Books.
- Freeman, R.B., Boxall, P. and Haynes, P. (Eds.), 2007. *What workers say: Employee voice in the Anglo American workplace*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University.
- Frese, M., Teng, E., and Wijnen, C.J.D. 1999. "Helping to improve suggestion systems: Predictors of making suggestions in companies". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1139–1155.
- Gerstner, C.R., and Day, D.V. 1997. "Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6): 827-844.
- Graen, G. B., Liden, R. C., and Hoel, W. 1982. "Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67: 868-872.
- Graen, G. B., and Scandura, T. A. 1987. Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 9: 175-208. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Graen, G. B., and Uhl-Bien, M. 1995. "Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years:

- Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2): 219-247.
- Gollan, P. (2001. "Be Aware of the Voices". *People Management*. 22 March: 55.
- Greenberg, J., and Wiethoff, C. 2001. "Organizational justice as proaction and reaction: Implications for research and application". In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice*: 271-302. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hirschman, A. O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,
- Ichniowski, C., Shaw, K. and Prennushi, G. 1997. "The Effects of Human Resource Management Practices on Productivity: A Study of Steel Finishing Lines". *The American Economic Review*, 87:291-313.
- Korsgaard, M. A. and Roberson, L. 1995. "Procedural justice in performance evaluation: The role of instrumental and noninstrumental voice in performance appraisal discussions". *Journal of Management*, 21(4), 657-669.
- Lavelle, J., Rupp, D. and Brockner, J. 2007. "Taking a Multifoci Approach to the Study of Justice, Social Exchange, and Citizenship Behavior: The Target Similarity Model". *Journal of Management*, 33:841-866.
- Lee, J. 2005." Effects of leadership and leader-member exchange on commitment". *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(8): 655-672.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. 1988. *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. New York: Plenum.
- Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R. and Earley, P. C. 1990. Voice, control, and procedural justice: instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59: 952-961.

- LePine, J.A., and Van Dyne, L. 2001. "Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2): 326-336.
- Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. C. 1990. Voice, control, and procedural justice: Instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59: 952-959.
- Luchak, A. A. 2003. "What kind of voice do loyal employees use?" *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41, 115–134.
- Marchington, M, 2005. "Employee Involvement: A Tale of Partial Participation," In Harley, B, Hyman, J. and Thompson, P. (eds) *Participation and Democracy at Work: Essays in Honour of Harvie Ramsay*. London: Palgrave, (pp. 20-54)
- McCabe, D. and Lewin, D. 1992. "Employee voice: A human resource management perspective". *California Management Review*, 34(3), 112–123.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. 1997. *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., Swart, J., Rayton, B., and Hutchinson, S. 2009. *People Management and Performance*. London: Routledge.
- Shore, L. M., and Tetrick, L. E. 1991. "A construct validity study of the survey of perceived organizational support". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76: 637-643.
- Sparr, J. L., and Sonnentag, S. 2008. Fairness perceptions of supervisor feedback, LMX, and employee well-being at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(2): 198 - 225.

- Stamper, C. L., Masterson, S. S. and Knapp, J. 2009. "A Typology of Organizational Membership: Understanding Different Membership Relationships Through the Lens of Social Exchange". *Management and Organization Review*, 5: 303–328. d
- Subramony, M. (2009). "A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between HRM bundles and firm performance." *Human Resource Management*, 48: 745-768.
- Thibaut, J., and Walker, L. 1975. *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thibaut, J., and Walker, L. 1978. A theory of procedure. *California Law Review*, 66, 541-566.
- Townsend, K., Wilkinson, A. and Burgess, J. 2012. "Filling the gaps: Patterns of formal and informal voice." *Economic and industrial Democracy*, 34(2) 337–354.
- Tyler, T. R. 1987. "Conditions Leading to Value-Expressive Effects in Judgments of Procedural Justice: A Test of Four Models". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52: 333-344.
- Tyler, T.R. and Blader, S.L. 2000. *Cooperation in groups*, Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Van Dyne, L. and LePine, J. A. 1998. "Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity." *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108-119.
- Whitey, M.J. and Cooper, W.H. 1989. "Predicting exit, voice, loyalty and neglect." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34:521-539.
- Wilkinson, A. and Fay, C. 2011. New times for employee voice? *Human Resource Management*, 50: 65-74.

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics and correlations for study variables**

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Size	-	-	-									
2. HRM	-	-	-.166*	-								
3. Gender	.4011	.49	.069	-.091	-							
4. Age	2.26	.995	-.031	.175*	.028	-						
5. Education	-	-	-.283**	.215**	-.077	-.107	-					
6. Tenure	5.27	5.82	-.257**	.240**	-.001	.540**	.063	-				
7. Voice	3.57	.83	-.067	-.172*	-.084	.023	-.033	.177*	(.834)			
8. LMX	3.70	.93	-.080	-.115	-.104	.037	-.086	.153	.660**	(.901)		
9. AC	3.35	.98	-.039	-.071	-.074	.236**	-.085	.283**	.572**	.643**	(.932)	
10. Work effort	3.97	.99	-.161*	.095	.147*	.232**	.115	.131	.185*	.222**	.251**	(.830)

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ . 174\* N = 188

**Table 2: Multiple regression results for mediating role of LMX on voice and affective commitment.**

		<b>H1</b>		<b>H3</b>	
	<b>Affective Commitment</b>	<b>Affective Commitment</b>	<b>LMX</b>	<b>Affective Commitment</b>	<b>Affective Commitment</b>
	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$
<b>Control variables</b>					
Org size	-.015	.012	.005	-.002	.005
HRM	-.209*	-.084	-.078	-.095	-.066
Gender	-.092	-.045	-.067	-.020	.001
Age	.148	.178*	.203*	.061	.120
Education	-.028	-.029	.007	-.027	-.034
Tenure	.299	.162*	.013	.197*	.162
Employee voice		.498***	.617***		.301**
LMX				.560***	.344***
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	.174	.396	.460	.437	.693
<b><math>\Delta</math> R<sup>2</sup></b>		.222	.340	.285	.300
<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>	.136	.363	.430	.409	.447
<b>F</b>	4.629***	12.257***	15.349***	15.422***	14.437***

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, p < .001

N = 188

**Table 3: Multiple regression results for mediating role of LMX on voice and work effort.**

		<b>H2</b>		<b>H4</b>	
	<b>Work Effort</b>	<b>Work Effort</b>	<b>LMX</b>	<b>Work Effort</b>	<b>Work Effort</b>
	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$
<b>Control variables</b>					
Org size	-.059	-.047	.005	-.086	-.021
HRM	.131	.180*	-.078	.194*	.194*
Gender	.202*	.222**	-.067	.228**	.227**
Age	-.056	-.040	.203*	-.055	-.024
Education	.053	.053	.007	.036	.063
Tenure	.211*	.156	.013	.104	.181
Employee voice		.199*	.617***		.165
LMX				.218**	.042
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	.119	.155	.460	.160	.413
$\Delta R^2$		.035	.340	.043	.034
<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>	.080	.110	.430	.117	.118
<b>F</b>	3.004**	3.450**	15.349***	3.777**	3.215**

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, p < .001

N = 188