New approaches to employee voice and participation in organisations

John W. Budd, Paul J. Gollan, and Adrian Wilkinson

Employee voice and participation are very broad terms with considerable width in the range of definitions given by authors (see for example Dietz, Wilkinson and Redman, 2009; Poole, 1986; Sashkin, 1976; Strauss, 2006). This width is particularly sharp across different disciplinary traditions from political science, psychology, law, management and industrial relations that have distinct perspectives on participation, voice, and other overlapping terms such as involvement, empowerment, and democracy (Wilkinson et al., 2009). As Heller et al. (1998: 15, emphases in original) noted:

> Definitions of participation abound. Some authors insist that participation must be a group process, involving groups of employees and their boss; others stress delegation, the process by which the *individual* employee is given greater freedom to make decisions on his or her own. Some restrict the term 'participation' to formal institutions, such as works councils; other definitions embrace 'informal participation', the day-to-day relations between supervisors and subordinates in which subordinates are allowed substantial input into work decisions. Finally, there are those who stress participation as a *process* and those who are concerned with participation as a *result*.

According to Marchington and Wilkinson (2005) participation can be differentiated into direct communication, upward problem-solving, or representative participation. The first two of these are essentially direct and individually-focused, often operating through face-to-face interactions between supervisors/first line managers and their staff. Some take the form of informal

oral or verbal participation, whilst others are more formalized in the form of written information or suggestions. The third form centers on the role that employee or trade union representatives play in discussions between managers and the workforce, via mechanisms such as joint consultation, worker directors or collective bargaining. Importantly, these arrangements raise major issues to do with the distribution of power and influence within organisations, and the legislative framework of the country in which the employing organisation is located. These forms of participation also raise questions about how the financial benefits are allocated, who makes decisions about their distribution, and how the financial and economic context impact on those decisions.

Debates and discussion about these topics are not new. The first century Roman farmer Columella consulted his slaves because "they are more willing to set about a piece of work on which they think that their opinions have been asked and their advice followed" (Columella, 1941: 93). The German parliament considered requiring workers' committees as early as 1848, and such committees were first required in the war-sensitive coal industry in 1905 to alleviate labour-management conflict (Müller-Jentsch, 2008). The early 20th century writings of Sidney and Beatrice Webb in Great Britain, John R. Commons in the United States, and other founders of the academic field of industrial relations frequently emphasized themes of industrial democracy and collective bargaining because of a belief in the importance of employee voice (Kaufman, 2004). By the mid 1920s, U.S. employers had created more than 400 employee representation plans covering more than one million workers, and a decade later the National Labor Relations Act encouraged the formation of independent labour unions as the only route to legitimate employee voice (Bernstein, 1960). However the decline of unions has led to greater interest in other forms of participation and voice, some of which are very different to earlier notions of participation which were rooted in industrial democracy.

Much research on individual employee voice has been dominated by applications of Hirschman's (1970) exit-voice-loyalty framework in which dissatisfaction can be expressed by quitting or complaining. Much of this research closely connects employee voice to the presence of labour unions. On an individual level, the exit-voice framework is used to posit that unionized individuals will be less likely to quit because unionized grievance procedures provide a voice mechanism (Freeman, 1980) and that loyalty affects the choice between exit and voice (Boroff and Lewin, 1997). At the organisation level, Freeman and Medoff (1984) asserted that unions not only provide employee voice, but that this collective voice is economically superior to exit and individual voice because of collective, majority-based decision-making. Much of the traditional research has therefore focused on analysing the degree to which labour unions affect compensation, benefits, and productivity (Bennett and Kaufman, 2007) and how voice works is an implicit rather than explicit part of this research.

Equally much of the human resource management literature espouses the importance of participation and voice, although often in very specific ways in terms of getting employees to contribute more effectively to the business using their skills and knowledge. Participation consequently features in most definitions of high commitment human resource management. A review of studies by Handel and Levine (2004: 38) suggests that participation "can improve organisational outcomes if the reforms are serious." However while business imperatives may lead to more employee voice and participation initiatives, these initiatives are also embedded in concepts of industrial citizenship, and organisational democracy (Harrison and Freeman, 2004). Furthermore, these concepts are grounded in even more fundamental notions of free speech and human dignity for which supporting arguments are often expressed in political, moral and

religious terms (Budd, 2004). The empirical evidence on the effects of participation for workers' welfare, however, is mixed (Handel and Levine, 2004).

While the history of employee voice and participation is longstanding, there has been a sharp increase in interest in employee voice and participation among academics, practitioners, and policymakers in recent years. Among employers, the breakdown of the mass production era and the resulting quest for high-performance work practices that deliver flexibility and quality has generated widespread experimentation with methods for sharing information and consulting with employees, involving employees in workplace decision-making, and soliciting feedback (Boxall and Purcell, 2008). At the same time, the global decline in union membership has opened the door for alternative voice mechanisms while also prompting renewed debates over the need for union voice and supportive public policies.

These developments have significantly broadened the scope of research on employee voice and participation in organisations. Employee voice is being redefined in ways that go beyond the exit-voice framework's focus on expressing dissatisfaction (Dundon et al., 2004, Wilkinson et al., 2004). After reviewing the variety of meanings, Dundon et al. (2004: 1152) identify four different manifestations of voice. First, voice can be articulated as *individual dissatisfaction* that is aimed at a specific problem or issue with management. Second, voice can be an expression of *collective organisation* which is a countervailing source of power to management (for example through trade unions). Third, there are voice arrangements which contribute to *management decision-making* and are concerned primarily with efficiency and productivity improvements (often coupled with high involvement management and high commitment initiatives). Fourth, another form of voice can be expressed through *mutuality* of interest in the form of an employee-employer partnership aimed at securing long-term viability

and sustainability for the organisation and its employees. Overall, the application of and rationale for voice at the workplace may be based on economic, moral/ethical or pragmatic grounds. In light of the literature, two issues concerning voice can be highlighted: first, the way employers articulate employee voice in the light of regulation, and second the linkages between employee voice and employee satisfaction and its perceived effectiveness.

The centrality of voice in high-performance work systems has drawn management and behavioural scholars into the research domain on voice, and has elevated the importance understanding voice-performance linkages for individuals and organisations (Boxall and Purcell, 2008). Declining union membership has renewed interest in the fundamental importance of voice (Budd 2004) while also prompting inquiries into what forms of voice employees want (Freeman and Rogers, 2006; Freeman, Boxall, and Haynes, 2007) and what public policy reforms are necessary to support broad forms of voice (Befort and Budd, 2009). The rise of non-union voice mechanisms has sparked debates over the functioning and legitimacy of alternative forms of voice (Gollan 2006).

The research on employee voice and participation has therefore expanded from an earlier institutional focus to also include significant behavioural and strategic streams (Dundon and Gollan, 2007). The purpose of this symposium is therefore to extend our knowledge of employee voice and participation in terms of new organisational forms, practices and processes that affect the nature, structure and conditions of work and organisations by showcasing the breadth of contemporary research on voice and participation.

In 'If you build a remedial voice mechanism, will they come? Determinants of voicing interpersonal mistreatment at work,' Karen Harlos examines personal and situational factors that determine whether employee voice is used to remedy interpersonal mistreatment in the

workplace. Using data collected from graduate business students at a Canadian university who responded to a hypothetical scenario, the results support an integrative approach to modelling remedial voice that includes aspects of persons, situations, and their interactions. Specifically, gender, work self-esteem, and relative hierarchical power are found to be key determinants of using a formal employee voice mechanism, and two moderating relationships are supported: power relations between the offender and target appear to moderate between gender and remedial voice, and power relations appear to moderate the effect of work self-esteem on remedial voice. This article highlights the importance of power relations in understanding employee voice, and the usefulness of a social psychological perspective for researching employee voice and participation.

Factors that influence when workers participate in a formal voice mechanism are also analyzed by Christina Cregan and Michelle Brown in 'The influence of union membership on workers' willingness to participate in joint consultation.' Specifically, this articles focuses on individual receptivity to participating in a joint consultation committee (JCC) in a unionised environment at a large Australian public sector organisation. Uniquely, the authors apply a theoretical approach derived from consumer services to generate hypotheses regarding employee participation in collective activities. Their survey data reveal that in combination with other factors, union membership status had a significant impact on employee willingness to participate in a JCC. Importantly, the interaction results suggest that that the relationships between this willingness to participate with respect to each of ideological outcomes, instrumental outcomes, and HRM issues and collective bargaining issues, was influenced by whether a worker was a union member or not. Overall, the findings suggest that union members did not perceive joint consultation as a separate domain from union-based collective voice and were willing to

participate in a JCC in order to extend the boundaries of consultation. However, a separate domain thesis was supported by the finding that non-members viewed the JCC as an alternative form of employee representation in which sectional interest and associated membership costs were not required.

A traditional framework for considering when workers choose to use voice is the exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect model. This model has been extensively analyzed in western countries, and Kamel Mellahi, Pawan Budwhar and Baibing Li's 'A study of the relationship between exit, voice, loyalty and neglect and commitment in India' refreshingly extends this line of research to a new cultural context. Moreover, previous research has found that employee commitment is an important determinant of whether dissatisfied individuals choose exit, voice, loyalty, or neglect, but a singular focus on organisational commitment has not allowed research to capture the impact different types of commitment have on employees' actions. Using data from a survey of Indian managers, this article explicitly distinguishes between team commitment and organisational commitment. Contrary to what one might expect, no form of commitment had a direct and significant association with exit. The authors consequently speculate that the growth of the Indian economy might have enabled high levels of mobility for all employees, or in the collectivist culture of India employees might subordinate personal goals for the sake of the organisation regardless of attachment to the organisation. They find some support for the assumption that attitudinal commitment is associated with the use of voice which is consistent with western research that shows how staff with high attitudinal commitment are more likely to use voice, but is contrary to the ideas about voice in high power distance cultures. More research on voice and participation across different cultural contexts is needed.

Turning from the determinants of individual participation in voice mechanisms to the effects of employee voice and participation, Jaewon Kim, John Paul MacDuffie and Frits Pil analyze the effects of team voice and worker representative voice, as well as their interaction, on labour productivity in 'Employee voice and organisational performance: Team vs. representative influence.' Of particular note, this research centers on teams' influence on key work-related issues and worker representatives' influence on collective voice issues rather than simply assessing the presence of teams or unions. Drawing data from automotive assembly plants from around the globe, the findings reveal that when examined solely, neither channel of voice has a significant effect on labour productivity. Rather, the influence of team voice and representative voice on worker efficiency depends on the interaction between these channels of voice. These findings challenge the conventional assumptions of advocates of both direct and indirect voice because neither type of voice on its own consistently predicts better labour productivity. Significantly, even when the two forms of voice are combined, these findings suggest their relationship with labour efficiency is complex because the positive effects of one type of voice are partly offset by them being partial substitutes. Consequently, the two forms of voice can interfere with, or neutralize, each other's positive effects on productivity. The findings suggest that this occurs more frequently than the mutual reinforcement some might expect. However, consistent with recent European policy-making on employee participation and voice, the combination of both forms of voice does ultimately have a positive impact on performance and productivity. Overall, the findings therefore reinforce the importance of increasing various forms of employee voice for greater positive organisational outcomes.

Jonathan Lavelle, Patrick Gunnigle and Anthony McDonnell examine the incidence of direct and indirect employee involvement mechanisms within multinational corporations

(MNCs) in 'Patterning employee voice in multinational companies'. They note that the traditional vehicle for voice via unions has declined but that there is the potential for new forms stimulated by the European Information and Consultation Directive, and they use a new framework to identify a number of approaches to employee voice. Using a sample from Ireland, they point to MNCs having significant levels of engagement with all forms of voice. But weaker voice mechanisms are more prevalent than stronger voice mechanisms, a finding which reflects recent research indicating employers have a preference for communication based channels over participatory ones. They note that the move towards non-union structure could be significant especially with overall declining density and the potential for MNCs to act as innovators. As well as reporting on the incidence of voice, they also discover four different approaches. The most common was to only employ an indirect voice structure (either union or non-union representation). Second was a dualistic approach where there was both direct and indirect voice. Third was an emphasis on direct voice and the final was a minimalist approach. Regression analyses further identify factors such as country of origin, sector, the EU directive and date of establishment as having varying impacts on the approaches to employee voice adopted by MNCs.

In 'Antecedents and outcomes of information disclosure to employees in the UK, 1990-2004: The role of employee voice', Howard Gospel, Riccardo Peccei, Helen Bewley and Paul Willman use the Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS) to analyze information sharing with British employees. A number of literatures, including from the fields of accounting and also IR/HRM, predict that information disclosure should be increasing, and the authors use time lagged probit regression to analyze the effects of voice mechanisms on disclosure and the impact of disclosure on financial performance. Of particular concern is whether there has been a

decoupling of disclosure from representative voice with the result that over time union and joint consultation has a diminishing impact on levels of information sharing. The argument is that as unions decline, they are less able to extract information from management on key aspects of the business. This article finds that there was an upward trend in disclosure between 1990 and 1998 but this levelled off between 1998 and 2004, consistent with a progressive decoupling of information sharing from representative voice mechanisms. Whether information disclosure is being channelled via more direct forms of participation is not clear. A pay off in terms of higher financial performance is also found, but despite this, many managers show little inclination to share information and the proportion of workplaces where this is the case has not decreased.

Taken together, these articles highlight the stimulating breadth found in today's research on new approaches to employee voice and participation—breadth that spans multiple disciplines, incorporates new behavioural and strategic questions, uses diverse empirical methodologies, and attracts interest from all corners of the globe. These new approaches not only greatly enhance our understanding of employee voice and participation, but hopefully will also help policymakers, employers, and employee advocates design more effective voice and participation mechanisms that serve the multiplicity of interests inherent in the modern employment relationship

References

Befort, S.F & Budd, J.W. *Invisible hands, invisible objectives: Bringing workplace law and public policy into focus*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Bennett, J.T. & Kaufman, B.E. (Eds.). *What do unions do? A twenty-year perspective*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2007.

Bernstein, I. *The lean years: A history of the American worker, 1920-1933*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960.

Boroff, K.E. & Lewin, D. Loyalty, voice, and intent to exit a union firm: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 1997, *51*, 50-63.

Boxall, P. & Purcell, J. *Strategy and human resource management*, 2nd Ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Budd, J.W. *Employment with a human face: Balancing efficiency, equity, and voice*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Columella. *De re rustica*, trans. H.B. Ash. London: William Heinemann, 1941.

Dietz, G., Wilkinson, A. & Redman, T. Involvement and Participation. In Wilkinson, A., Bacon, N., Redman, T. & Snell, S. *The Sage handbook of human resource management*. London: Sage, 2009.

Dundon, T., Wilkinson, A., Marchington, M. & Ackers, P. The meanings and purpose of employee voice. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2004, *15*, 1149-70.

Dundon, T. & Gollan, P.J. Re-conceptualizing voice in the non-union workplace. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2007, *18*, 1182-98.

Freeman, R.B. The exit-voice tradeoff in the labor market: Unionism, job tenure, quits, and separations. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1980, *94,* 643-73.

Freeman, R.B., Boxall, P. & Haynes, P., (Eds.). *What workers say: Employee voice in the Anglo-American world*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007.

Freeman, R.B. & Medoff, J.L. *What do unions do?* New York: Basic Books, 1984.

Freeman, R.B. & Rogers, J. *What workers want*, updated edn. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Gollan, P.J. *Employee representation in non-union firms*. London: Sage, 2006.

Handel, M.J. & Levine, D.I. Editors' introduction: The effects of new work practices on workers. *Industrial Relations*, 2004, *43*, 1-43.

Harrison, J.S. & Freeman, R.E. Democracy in and around organizations: Is organizational democracy worth the effort? *Academy of Management Executive*, 2004, *18*, 49–53.

Heller, F., Pusić, E., Strauss, G. & Wilpert, B. *Organizational participation: Myth and reality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Hirschman, A.O. *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organisations, and states*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Kaufman, B.E. *The global evolution of industrial relations: Events, ideas, and the IIRA*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 2004.

Marchington, M. & Wilkinson, A. Direct participation and involvement. In S. Bach (Ed.), *Managing Human Resources*, 4th edn. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005, pp. 398-423.

Müller-Jentsch, W. Industrial democracy: Historical development and current challenges. *Management Revue*, 2008, *19*, 260-73.

Poole, M. *Towards a new industrial democracy: Workers participation in industry*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.

Sashkin, M. Changing toward participative management approaches: A model and methods. *Academy of Management Review*, 1976, *1*, 75-86.

Strauss, G. Worker participation: Some under-considered issues. *Industrial Relations*, 2006, *45*, 778-803.

Wilkinson, A., Dundon, T., Marchington, M. & Ackers, P. Changing patterns of employee voice: Case studies from the UK and Republic of Ireland. *Journal of Industrial Relations,* 2004, *46*, 298-322.

Wilkinson, A., Gollan, P., Marchington, M. & Lewin, D. Conceptualising employee participation in organizations. In Wilkinson, A., Gollan, P., Marchington, M. & Lewin, D. (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of participation in organizations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009 (forthcoming).

Bios

John W. Budd is the Industrial Relations Land Grant Chair in the Carlson School of Management, and chair of the Center for Human Resources and Labor Studies, University of Minnesota. His books include *Invisible Hands, Invisible Objectives: Bringing Workplace Law and Public Policy Into Focus* (with Stephen F. Befort, Stanford University Press), *Employment with a Human Face: Balancing Efficiency, Equity, and Voice* (Cornell University Press), and *Labor Relations: Striking a Balance* (McGraw-Hill/Irwin). His current research interests include multidisciplinary conceptualizations of work and life-cycle aspects of labour union membership.
[E-mail: jbudd@umn.edu]

Paul J. Gollan is an Associate Professor in the Department of Business at Macquarie University. He is also Associate Fellow in the Employment Relations and Organisational Behaviour Group in the Department of Management at the London School of Economics. He is also currently an Adjunct Professor at MGSM, Visiting Senior Fellow at the Australian School of Business at the University of New South Wales and Fellow of the Australian Human Resource Institute. His latest book *Employee Representation in Non-Union Firms* (Sage Publications) was published in 2007. Another book, *Oxford Handbook of Employee Participation* (Oxford University Press) is due for release in 2009. He is a co-editor of *Advances in Industrial and Labor Relations* and consulting editor for the *International Journal of Management Reviews*. His current research interests include theoretical dimensions of employee voice and management strategies and union responses towards non-union collective voice.
[E-mail: p.j.gollan@lse.ac.uk]

Adrian Wilkinson is Professor of Employment Relations and Director of the Centre for Work, Organisation and Wellbeing at Griffith University. He has written extensively on many aspects of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations. He has written eight books, one hundred articles in refereed journals, as well as numerous book chapters and other papers. His latest book is the *Sage Handbook of Human Resource Management* in 2009 and another book, the *Oxford Handbook of Employee Participation* (Oxford University Press) is due for release in 2009. He is a Fellow and Accredited Examiner of the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development in the UK and a Fellow of the Australian Human Resource Institute. He is on the editorial board of several refereed journals and is also Chief Editor for the *International Journal of Management Reviews* and an Associate Editor for *Human Resource Management Journal*.

[E-mail: Adrian.Wilkinson@griffith.edu.au]