

Employee Voice and Leader–Member Exchange (LMX): A Comprehensive Review and Implications for HRM

Ajaz Akbar Mir*, Summaira Farooq**, Shameema Khan***

Abstract

Employees in businesses are frequently confronted with situations in which they must choose whether to remain silent or speak up (i.e., voice) when they have potentially valuable information or opinions. Employee voice has assumed a significant part in decision-making and has been researched in a variety of disciplines, generating a massive amount of literature on the subject. However, employee voice has been conceptualised differently across a wide scope of fields, resulting in a paucity of integrative theories and frameworks on the subject. The theoretical, measurement, and analytic appropriateness of employee voice studies are examined in relation to research on the notion of in complete paper exchange. It is demonstrated that through time, the conceptual definitions of leader–member exchange and its sub-dimensions have varied, with little cause or reason given for the modifications. Similarly, the methods used to obtain employee voice have varied greatly and include a wide range of item content. The primary objective of this paper is to conduct a multidisciplinary review of academic research on employee voice and leader–member exchange. For the present study, about 60 research studies were analysed, of which 35 were found appropriate for the present literature review purpose. After reviewing these studies, the relationship between employee voice and leader–member exchange was found to be positive and significant. Some studies had revealed the reverse effect of leader–member exchange on employee voice, thereby stating it as the predictor variable of employee voice, while some have shown it as a consequence of employee voice in organisations.

Further, the study explores the possibilities/opportunities for further research on employee voice and leader–member exchange within other disciplines, and to show how this could lead to a better understanding of the concepts of employee voice and leader–member exchange.

Keywords: Employee Voice Behaviour, Leader–Member Exchange, Decision Making, Human Resource Management

Introduction

Nowadays, organisations face adaptive difficulties that need increasing effort, not only from management, but also from employees who observe and engage in daily operations (Van de Ven, 1999). Employees are expected to actively improve the overall performance of their organisations in a variety of ways, including coming up with innovative ideas (Anderson et al., 2014), presenting these ideas to management (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998), and implementing the creative ideas and solutions (Kanter, 1988). High-quality leader–member exchanges, an example of relationship-oriented leadership approach (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), has been shown to support such behaviours in the past (Anderson et al., 2014; Mumford & Licuanan, 2004; Van Dyne et al., 2008). “Employees with good LMX relationships are more likely to submit ideas to the organisation and use their synergy to find and solve problems” (Atwater & Carmeli, 2009; Hammond et al., 2011; Volmer et al., 2012). “Employee

* Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, Jammu & Kashmir, India.
Email: ajazakbar@uok.edu.in

** Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, Jammu & Kashmir, India.
Email: summaira.scholar@kashmiruniversity.net

*** Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, Jammu & Kashmir, India.
Email: shameema.msscholar@kashmiruniversity.net

voice has been found to help supervisors recognise company difficulties early and work with hierarchical progress, according to academic research” (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). In any event, voice is a type of decisive non-conformance that frequently undermines the authority of initiative, especially in a collectivist culture (Graham & Van Dyne, 2006). Workers who have a positive relationship with their employers may assume that their employers will exercise prudence in light of the circumstances, even if their voice cannot accomplish the optimal objectives (Hwang & Zhuo Qing Chu Li, 1997). “As a result, employees’ psychological safety, which is essential to their ability to speak up, may increase” (Detert & Burris, 2007). “With regard to this theme, experts have looked into the connections between the leader–member exchange (LMX) and employee voice” (Detert & Burris, 2007; Van Dyne et al., 2008).

Employee Voice

Employees’ correspondence of productive thoughts and ideas that can improve organisational performance, rather than only criticise the current state of affairs in an organisation, is termed as employee voice (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998). Employee voice, according to the CIPD (2017), is a method by which employees express their opinions to management and affect workplace decisions. Employees are given the best chance to take part in decision-making when they have a voice in the organisation (Kwon et al., 2016). Voice can be beneficial, since it alerts leaders to potential difficulties and concerns that need to be addressed to improve organisational understanding and performance (Detert & Burris, 2007). Hirschman inspired interest in the study of employee voice (1970); Hirschman defined voice as “any attempt, whether individual or collective, to change, rather than flee, a disagreeable state of things, whether through individual or group appeal to the management directly in charge, through a petition to a higher authority with the goal of forcing a management change, or by a variety of actions or protests, including those intended to stir public opinion”. Employee voice was first conceptualised using Hirschman’s (1970) exit-voice-loyalty paradigm, established from an economic perspective, which, instead of employees, laid stress on customers (Allen, 2014). In case of corporations where there was an “objectionable state of affairs”, Hirschman (1970) stated that unsatisfied

customers had 2 options: exit or voice; the voice option will be used when a client has both loyalty to the company and an aspiration to modify its practices, rules, and output. The literature of 1980s regarding employee voice (Farrell, 1983; Freeman & James, 1985; Lewin, 1987; Rusbult et al., 1988; Spencer, 1986; Withey & Cooper, 1989) voice, loyalty, and neglect-characterize a diverse group of more specific behaviors (e.g., turnover, absenteeism, lateness, talking to supervisor, requesting a transfer) had the primary focus on exploring and expanding Hirschman’s (1970) theory. Farrell (1983) was the first to adapt Hirschman’s (1970) paradigm to employees instead of customers; he also added neglect as a fourth dimension to this paradigm. With the work of Freeman and Medoff in 1984, the concept of employee voice became widespread in research literature. “For a long time, the term ‘voice’ was used to refer to employee collective bargaining and union membership” (Rees et al., 2013). The employee voice concept has widened its horizons, as the literature on the subject has developed. “Employee voice is now defined as different ways for employees to express their opinions on various issues within the firm and the circumstances in which employees are informed and consulted in the organisation’s collaborative decision-making process” (Liu et al., 2010; Wood & Fenton-O’Creedy, 2005). Employees are regarded to have engaged in the act of voice when they express their concerns and proposals with the assurance that they will not face any consequences (Rees et al., 2013).

Morrison (2011) says that there should be a greater emphasis on the type of information being given, and he stated 3 sorts of voice: suggestion-focused voice, which seeks to improve; problem-focused voice, which seeks to stop or prevent harm; and opinion-focused voice, which expresses disparity or opposing viewpoints. There has been a recent attempt by many academics to broaden the definition of voice behaviour. Liang et al. (2012) define 2 forms of voice: promotive voice and prohibitive voice, comparable to the voice categories given by Morrison (2011). “The concept of improvement-oriented voice was recently built by distinguishing between 2 types of speech: challenging voice, which is speaking up with the intent to alter the status quo; and supportive voice, which is speaking up with the aim to stabilise existing practices and policies and protect the status quo” (Burris, 2012). “The 4 additional types of employee voice behaviours: supportive, similar to Burris’ (2012) supportive voice; constructive, similar to

Van Dyne et al.'s (2003) pro-social voice; and defensive voice, which is opposed to changes in work policies and procedures when they are needed but destructive" (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014) it has focused almost exclusively on voice as a positively intended challenge to the status quo, even though some scholars have argued that it need not challenge the status quo or be well intentioned. Thus, in this paper, we create an expanded view of voice; one that extends beyond voice as a positively intended challenge to the status quo to include voice that supports how things are being done in organizations as well as voice that may not be well intentioned. We construct a framework based on this expanded view that identifies 4 different types of voice behavior (supportive, constructive, defensive, and destructive). Another notable distinction in the way employee voice has been analysed is the predominant focus on formal versus informal voice. The definitions of formal and informal voice seem to be in agreement, with formal voice being defined as voice that uses "codified, pre-planned, and consistent/concrete frameworks that enhance uniform implementation and minimise the discretionary abilities of voice managers" (Marchington & Suter, 2013). Informal voice, on the other hand, refers to ideas or concerns communicated openly and outside of an organised procedure and have no specific voice mechanisms through unplanned or ad hoc contacts between the management and personnel (Klaas et al., 2012).

Leader–Member Exchange

LMX theory, introduced as the "vertical dyad linkage" concept, is based on the idea that a leader's impact is grounded in the unique interpersonal exchange between a leader and an employee (Dansereau et al., 1975) this longitudinal study found that the degree of latitude that a superior granted to a member to negotiate his role was predictive of subsequent behavior on the part of both superior and member. Contrary to traditional views of leadership, superiors typically employed both leadership and supervision techniques within their units. With a select subset of their members, superiors developed leadership exchanges (influence without authority). As a result, LMX theory focuses on how the dyadic exchange between the leader and the employee determines leadership and provides an alternative to leadership perspectives that are primarily centred on the attributes

and behaviours of the leaders (Gerstner & Day, 1997). According to LMX theory, the connection between a leader and a subordinate is marked by a reciprocal exchange of advantages (Yukl, 2019), which may lead to beneficial outcomes for the leader, the employee, and the company (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Leaders and followers bring to the partnership a variety of resources to exchange. "Employees can accomplish more work, take on more responsibility, and commit to the leader's goals if leaders provide them with autonomy, open and honest communication, support, and confidence" (Dansereau et al., 1975) this longitudinal study found that the degree of latitude that a superior granted to a member to negotiate his role was predictive of subsequent behavior on the part of both superior and member. Contrary to traditional views of leadership, superiors typically employed both leadership and supervision techniques within their units. With a select subset of their members, superiors developed leadership exchanges (influence without authority). Through a series of exchanges, leaders and employees build their relationship over time (Bauer & Green, 1996; Nahrgang et al., 2009), in which they learn from each other's experiences (Gerstner & Day, 1997). According to Graen and Scandura (1987), the leader–member relationship evolves in 3 stages: sampling, role development, and commitment. In a series of feedback loops, the leader learns about the employee's capabilities during the sampling phase. During the role formation phase, a series of implicit negotiations shape the leader–employee relationship. Finally, during the commitment phase, mutual expectations are clarified and the relationship is formalised.

Empirical research has indicated that the quality of a connection grows through time, influenced by a succession of interactions (Bauer & Green, 1996; Liden, Wayne & Stilwell, 1993; Nahrgang et al., 2009). Analysts have given leader–member exchange (LMX) a lot of emphasis in recent years because of its effects on employees' task execution (Epitropaki et al., 2016; Schwepker, 2017; Siyal & Peng, 2018). LMX is one of the most well-known ideas that deal with a leader's and subordinates' dual interaction (Graen & Wakabayashi, 1994; Brower et al., 2000; Pellegrini et al., 2010). "This core concept of LMX theory is that pioneers cultivate a variety of relationships with their subordinates, ranging from low (out-group) to high (in-group) quality" (Graen & Wakabayashi, 1994; Green et al., 1996; Brower et al., 2009; Dulebohn et

al., 2012). A high-quality LMX leads to increased data exchange, trust, competence, responsibility, job clarity, higher job satisfaction, and less work pressure (Wang & Yi, 2011; Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014; Martin et al., 2016; Lebron et al., 2018). A low-quality LMX, on the other hand, results in limited collaboration, formal relations, counterproductive behaviour, mental disengagement behaviour, representative turnover, reduced job satisfaction, and increased job stress (Harris et al., 2005; Wang & Yi, 2011; Lebron et al., 2018). According to LMX, leaders evaluate their subordinates on a variety of dimensions, including agreeability, competence, conscientiousness, locus of control, neuroticism, extraversion, openness, and positive and negative affectivity (Erdogan & Liden, 2002; Dulebohn et al., 2012; Clarke, 2016; Inanc, 2018). On the other hand, contingent reward behaviour, transformational leadership, the supervisor's expectations of followers, appropriateness, and extraversion are used to evaluate leaders (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Anand et al., 2011; Bedi et al., 2016).

Relationship between Employee Voice and Leader–Member Exchange (LMX)

A high-quality LMX relationship is shared by mutual trust, regard, equal impact, and steadfast loyalty and understanding of others' expectations (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). For the following 4 reasons, high-quality LMX can support employee voice. First, employees with

strong LMX ties have more access to and communication with their bosses, giving them more flexibility to speak up (Botero & Van Dyne, 2009). Second, in high-quality LMX interactions, subordinates have a higher level of trust in their managers and benefit from more solid work support and boss responsiveness. These characteristics allow subordinates to believe that speaking up has no personal cost or danger, and that their ideas will most likely be heard (Botero & Van Dyne, 2009; Hsiung, 2012). Third, when representatives recognise that they are treated well, they want to return the favour by using their voice to assist the company (Botero & Van Dyne, 2009; Burriss et al., 2008). Employees who have positive exchange connections with their managers are more likely to contribute to job extension, have a stronger sense of responsibility, and have a strong natural desire to improve their immediate working environment (Burriss et al., 2008; Hsiung, 2012). Finally, excellent LMX indicates that the leader–member connection has advanced to the point of partnership (Hsiung, 2012; Uhl-Bien et al., 2000). Employees in high-quality LMX relationships will generally understand their directors' attitudes and opinions, will be more likely to contribute various ideas to the organisation, and will strive to achieve goals that benefit both subordinates and supervisors (Hsiung & Tsai, 2009; Hsiung, 2012). When subordinates perceive a high-quality LMX relationship with their supervisors, several empirical research have found that they are more likely to participate in employee voice behaviour (Botero & Van Dyne, 2009; Burriss et al., 2008; Hsiung, 2012).

Literature Review of Employee Voice and Leader–Member Exchange

<i>Author</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Sample Size/Methods Used</i>	<i>Employee Voice Measurement</i>	<i>Leader–Member Exchange Measurement</i>	<i>Findings Related to Employee Voice and Leader–Member Exchange</i>
Van Dyne et al., 2008	To study how voice as an IRB (in-role behaviour) enhances the impact of high-quality LMX on voice.	n = 218; Engineers and managers of Fortune 500 refineries in India.	The 7-item Van Dyne and LePine Scale (1998) was adopted.	Liden and Maslyn's (12-item) scale was used to evaluate LMX.	In-role perceptions, according to this study, boost the favourable influence of high-quality LMX relationships on voice.

Author	Purpose	Sample Size/Methods Used	Employee Voice Measurement	Leader–Member Exchange Measurement	Findings Related to Employee Voice and Leader–Member Exchange
Botero & Van Dyne, 2009	The purpose of this research is to find out how LMX and power distance together affect employee voice, and how LMX and power distance predict employee voice.	Study 1 conducted in US with n = 109 individuals (57% public sector, 30% private sector, and 13% non-profit). Study 2 conducted in Colombia with n = 138 employees (52% public sector, 40% private sector, and 8% non-profit).	The 6 items based on the scale developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998) were used to assess the employee voice.	Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp's (1982) 7-item scale for employee was used. (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).	In Study 1, the beta for LMX was positive ($\beta = .49$ and $p < .01$), showing significant relation with the employee voice. Likewise, in study 2, there was a positive relation between LMX and employee voice ($\beta = .33$, $p < .01$).
Zhao, 2014	The motive of this research was to see how relative leader–member exchange (RLMX) affected employee voice.	The sample consisted of 358 employee-supervisor pairs who gave data on distinct questionnaires and at different times.	6-item scale by Van Dyne and LePine (1988) was used.	Graen and Uhl-Bien's (1995) scale was used to measure LMX.	RLMX was positively related to employee voice ($\beta = 0.18$, $p = 0.05$). RLMX was also significantly correlated to employee voice ($r = 0.21$, $p = 0.01$).
Zhang et al., 2015	To investigate how paternalistic leadership (authoritarian, benevolent, and moral) impacts employee voice from leader–member exchange (LMX) and status-judgment perspectives.	n = 470; Data was collected from 4 companies located in Beijing in Mainland China.	5 items were used to measure employee voice. 2 from Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004); the other 3 from Tierney, Farmer, and Graen (1999).	7-item scale developed by Scandura and Graen (1984).	Authoritarianism hinders voice behaviours; benevolence encourages subordinate voice via growing notable LMX; morality undoubtedly affects worker voice best via LMX.
Wang et al., 2016	To see if employee psychological empowerment has a mediating influence on the leader–member exchange (LMX)–employee voice interaction.	n = 350; Employees and supervisors from 9 Chinese companies were surveyed using questionnaires.	2 items from Farh et al. (2007) were used.	Liden and Maslyn (1998) 12-item scale was used to measure LMX.	LMX was positively related to psychological empowerment, which in turn was positively and significantly related to employee voice ($\beta = 0.30$, $p = 0.01$). Thus, LMX is indirectly associated with employee voice.
Ward et al., 2016	To examine the relationship between contextual communication orientation and 2 types of employee voice (prohibitive and promotive).	Survey 1 n = 1,690 Survey 2 n = 140 Recruitment e-mails were sent to faculty members from U.S. research universities.	Liang et al.'s (2012) scale from Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) pro-social voice items were used.	Scale by Liden and Maslyn's (1998) was used.	The relation between contextual communication orientation and promotive voice was moderated by leader–member exchange (LMX), which was unfavourable when LMX was low.

Author	Purpose	Sample Size/Methods Used	Employee Voice Measurement	Leader-Member Exchange Measurement	Findings Related to Employee Voice and Leader-Member Exchange
Chan and Yeung, 2016	To study the impact of leader-member exchange (LMX) on employee voice and the moderating role of empowerment.	n = 314, which included leader-follower dyads from manufacturing firms in China. Questionnaires were used to collect data.	Van Dyne and LePine (1998) scale was used.	7-item LMX scale developed by Liden et al. (1993); Scandura, Graen, and Novak (1986); and Scandura and Graen (1984) was used.	Results indicate that LMX was positively related to voice behaviour ($\beta = 0.24, p < 0.01$).
Park and Nawakitphaitoon, 2018	To study the influence of national culture on the relationship between leader-member exchange (LMX) and employee voice, as measured by conflict avoidance.	n = 200–500; 2 service industries in the United States and 2 in Korea. Questionnaires were utilised to gather information.	9 components adapted from Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) voice and scale by Liu, Zhu, and Yang (2010). A seven-point Likert scale was employed.	5 items from Graen and Uhl-Bien's (1995) study. 7-point Likert scale was used.	In both studies, LMX was associated with employee voice in a favourable and substantial way. (Korean sample, $r = .29, p < .01$; U.S. sample, $r = .30, p < .01$).
Huang et al., 2018	To analyse how employees' frequency of voicing and their leader-member exchange quality act as 2 main variables that regulate the effects of promotive voice and prohibitive voice on managers' evaluations.	Study 1 n = 164 employees + 31 supervising managers. Study 2 n = 779 employees + 97 supervising managers. Study 3 n = 63 supervising managers + 392 employee respondents were included from Commercial Bank China, University of Nebraska-Lincoln US, and financial services company in the US, respectively.	A 5-item, 7-point scale created by Liang et al. (2012) was used to assess both promotional and prohibitive voices.	Five-point LMX-seven scale (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).	Significant positive impact of promotive voice and LMX on overall performance ($\beta = .21, p = .05$). Positive relationship between promotive voice frequency and overall performance is stronger in high, than in low, LMX dyads.
Ling Yuan, Manh-Cuong Vu, Thi-Trang-Nhung Nguyen (2018)	To study the role of ethical leadership to predict employee voice behaviour and the mediating role of leader-member exchange (LMX).	n = 1000 employees and their direct supervisors of 50 different organisations in Vietnam.	To assess employee voice behaviour, 6 items developed by Linn Van Dyne and Jeffrey A. LePine, 1998 were used.	Scale by Graen and Cashman (1975) and Liden and Graen (1980) were employed.	LMX is positive and significantly related to employee voice behaviour ($r = 0.517, p < 0.01$).

Author	Purpose	Sample Size/Methods Used	Employee Voice Measurement	Leader–Member Exchange Measurement	Findings Related to Employee Voice and Leader–Member Exchange
Hu et al., 2018	To investigate how leader–member exchange (LMX), psychological safety, and psychological empowerment have an impact on employee voice behaviour.	n = 308; employees operating for a state-owned telecommunications organisation in China have been included.	11-item scale developed by Liang et al. (2012) was used.	Leader–member exchange was measured using Scandura and Graen's (1984) LMX-7 scale.	Ethical leadership promotes employees' voice behaviour through improved LMX, which also results in greater feelings of psychological safety and psychological empowerment.
Şimşek and Gürler, 2019	The purpose is to examine the impact of leader–member exchange on employees' voices, based on the teacher's opinions.	n = 713; Teachers working in 40 public schools (kindergarten, elementary school, middle school, preparatory school) in the Ayash, Beipazarı, Gudul, and Sinjan regions of Ankara, Turkey.	Scale developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998) was used.	The scale developed by Janssen and Van Yperen (2004) was used.	LMX mean = 3.27, which refers to moderate degree; mean for employee voice = 3.79, which refers to high degree. Results showed that leader–member exchange ($S = .93$) has more homogenous distribution than employee voice ($S = .50$).
Opoku et al., 2019	To study how psychological safety acts as a mediator in the relationship between leader–member exchange (LMX) and voice behaviour.	A sample of 207 employee-supervisor dyads working in Ghana were selected.	The 3-item scale by Burriss (2012) was used to measure voice behaviour.	The 7-item scale by Graen and Uhl-Bien was used to measure LMX.	The study found that psychological safety is a mediating mechanism through which LMX affects voice behaviour.
Carnevale et al., 2020	To study the relationship between LMX and employee voice.	At a prominent Chinese Internet finance corporation, managerial and non-managerial workers from 688 work units were selected. This study's final sample includes 256 employees and 256 supervisory managers.	Scale by Liang et al. (2012) was used.	The LMX 7-item scale by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) was used to assess employees' perceptions of LMX with their supervisor.	Employees' feelings of obligation to make good changes were positively connected with LMX ($r = .37, p < .01$) and employee's promotive voice ($r = .27, p < .01$).
Nazir et al., 2020	Using leader–member exchange (LMX) and employee voice behaviour to examine the mediation between paternalistic leadership and innovative work behaviour in the workplace.	n = 550; Information technology (IT), manufacturing, financial services, pharmaceuticals, and healthcare were among the industries represented in this study in Pakistan.	A 6-item scale developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998) was used. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was 0.90.	7-item scale developed by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) was used.	LMX uses the voice of employees to mediate the relationship between authoritarian leadership and moral leadership, rather than the mediation between benevolent leadership and voice behaviour.

<i>Author</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Sample Size/Methods Used</i>	<i>Employee Voice Measurement</i>	<i>Leader–Member Exchange Measurement</i>	<i>Findings Related to Employee Voice and Leader–Member Exchange</i>
Jin et al., 2020	To examine how leader–member exchange (LMX) influences employee voice.	In Beijing, there are 231 supervisory subordinate dyads operating in 7 branches of a high-end hotel chain owned and operated by a Chinese corporation.	Scale of Van Dyne and LePine (1998) was used to collect data.	7 items from Scandura and Graen (1984) were used.	LMX and employee voice were significantly positively correlated ($r = 0.190, p < 0.01$).

Discussion

This study contributes significantly to the development of our comprehension of employees' voice behaviour and leader–member exchange. The study by Joo Young Park and Kritkorn Nawakitphaitoon (2017) takes into consideration the effect of leader–member exchange on employee voice in the cultural settings of the United States and Korea. According to the empirical results, LMX has a positive relationship with the employee voice in both the Korean and U.S. samples, taking into consideration correlation among the key variables (Korean sample, $r = .29, p < .01$; U.S. sample, $r = .30, p < .01$). Employees with high LMX in both Korean and American settings were more willing to express their opinions to their employers. Employees are more likely to retaliate through employee voice when they are properly treated by their leaders, according to social exchange theory (Ng & Feldman, 2012). Workers in various Asian societies may be hesitant to speak up since their statements could be misinterpreted as an expression of conflict or dissatisfaction with coworkers or the organisation itself. On the other hand, the workers in Western countries are more willing to share their thoughts, because disagreements are seen as an accepted and a natural part of social life in the West (Nahrgang et al., 2009; Ohbuchi & Takahashi, 1994). The studies by Nazir et al. (2020) and Zhang et al. (2015) we investigate how paternalistic leadership - authoritarian, benevolent, and moral - affects employee voice from leader-member exchange (LMX revealed that authoritarian leadership is negatively connected to LMX, while 2 elements of paternalistic leadership (benevolence and morality) are positively connected to LMX. This is connected to the social exchange viewpoint that an authoritarian

leadership style degrades the interaction between leaders and followers by negatively impacting employees' perceptions of LMX (Cheng, 1995; Cheng & Farh, 2006; Gu et al., 2018). The leader-subordinate connection is strengthened by a good authority style, which includes respecting subordinates, confiding in them, treating them legitimately (Chen & Farh, 2012), and demonstrating compassion (Wuet al., 2012). This research also discovered a positive and significant link between LMX and employee voice behaviour. The results of this study comply with prior empirical findings stating that leaders alter employee voice behaviours (Detert & Burris, 2007; Graham & Van Dyne, 2006; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Zhang et al., 2015). Another study (Carnevale et al., 2020) looked into how LMX quality influences employee promotional voice. Employee FOCC may cause LMX to have a curvilinear influence on promotional voice. First, employees with strong LMX relationships are expected to perform as the leader's "trusted supporter" by not breaking the leader's expectations or putting pressure on the leader to make changes (Dansereau et al., 1975) this longitudinal study found that the degree of latitude that a superior granted to a member to negotiate his role was predictive of subsequent behavior on the part of both superior and member. Contrary to traditional views of leadership, superiors typically employed both leadership and supervision techniques within their units. With a select subset of their members, superiors developed leadership exchanges (influence without authority). As a result, these personnel focus on maintaining their relationship with the boss rather than listening to promotional voices that benefit the firm. The findings suggest that ethical leaders can encourage employee voice activity by facilitating leader–member exchange (Ling Yuan, Manh-Cuong Vu

& Thi-Trang-Nhung Nguyen, 2018). The researchers implied that high-quality leader–member exchange boosts voice.

The influence of LMX and the moderating influence of empowerment on employee voice behaviour were investigated by Simon C. H. Chan and Davey Yeung in 2016. The findings back up previous research that shows that the LMX-employee voice relationship is beneficial. When LMX quality and empowerment were both high, the highest levels of voice behaviour occurred. In the case of Columbia and US samples LMX and power distance predicted voice (Botero & Van Dyne, 2009; Zhao, 2014). Hongdan Zhao's 2014 study looked at the impact of RLMX on employee voice in a Chinese cultural environment, using data from employees and their immediate supervisors. RLMX was discovered to be favourably associated with employee voice. Using social persuasion theory (Brinol & Petty, 2009; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998), Whiting et al. (2012) asserted the experimental study on managers' reactions to voice by analysing the combined effect of frequency of voice, content of challenging voice, and relational context of LMX that are relevant to the organisational context. The frequency of challenging voices alerts management to employees' levels of exertion, allowing them to initiate changes that will improve the organisation's performance. The major contents of challenging voice are captured by promotional and prohibitive voice (Liang et al., 2012) felt obligation for constructive change, and organization-based self-esteem. As a result, empirical research has looked into how leadership actions influence employee voice habits (Detert & Burris, 2007; Graham & Van Dyne, 2006; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). Employees' behaviour might question and disrupt an organisation's and its power holders' current state of affairs (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). It is the sharing of information with employees in a confidential manner, with the goal of improving their organisational and operational performance (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998). If it is of a constructive nature, it may be used to advance beneficial company improvements (Zhou & George, 2001).

Implications for HRM

This study provides crucial insights into significant exploring done by different researchers on the employee

voice and leader–member exchange (Botero & van Dyne, 2009; Carnevale et al., 2020; Nazir et al., 2020; Park & Nawakitphaitoon, 2018; Şimşek & Gürler, 2019; Zhao, 2014) measured by conflict avoidance, on the relationship between leader–member exchange (LMX). More broadly, it examines why and how leader–member exchange affects employee voice, how they fluctuate across societies, and how the different leadership styles affect the employee voice and leader–member exchange. The study demonstrates that conflict avoidance was a critical basic indicator of voice in a culture like South Korea, but not in the United States, and that by providing another indicator of representative voice, which has never been tried in previous studies, the study has significantly contributed to the understanding of employee voice, particularly in non-Western cultures (Park & Nawakitphaitoon, 2018). Employees in South Korea who have good ties with their managers may be less likely to express their ideas if they think it will be regarded as disagreement or dissatisfaction with the entire company. However, in the case of the United States, it will be seen as a positive step forward in the organisation's development and the cessation of undesirable actions (Park & Nawakitphaitoon, 2018). According to the findings, authoritarian leadership stifles innovative activity by limiting employee speech. As a result, authoritative leadership approaches should be avoided when fostering innovative behaviour and employee voice, and it is critical for firms to build pleasant relationships if they want their employees to communicate their thoughts to enhance innovation (Nazir et al., 2020) this study utilized the social exchange theory to investigate the indirect effect of 3 distinct dimensions of paternalistic leadership style on innovative work behavior through LMX and employee voice behavior. Design/methodology/approach: Self-reported questionnaires were used to collect data from 397 employees in Pakistan. Hypotheses were tested using structural equation modeling (SEM). Authoritarian leadership can be avoided by avoiding autocratic decision-making and instead listening to people's thoughts and ideas (Zhang et al., 2015).

As a result, leaders should demonstrate trustworthiness and honesty, treat their people fairly, and use their influence to benefit individuals (Tang & Liu, 2012). Leaders can act morally by giving favourable comments when they receive useful information (Chan, 2014). Moreover, this

research suggests that leaders can encourage employee voice by sharing expertise with subordinates and establishing efficient communication channels for task-related discussions (Chan, 2014); leaders should also take part in leadership training programmes (Gu et al., 2015). Previous research has revealed that there are 2 key reasons why some employees are open and find it easy to communicate with their bosses. The first reason is that employees who have a good relationship with their bosses will take fewer chances to give suggestions, to keep that relationship (Waldron, 1999). In contrast, the second reason states that those who have good relationships get distinctive credits, which gives them more flexibility to share potentially risky information with their bosses (Hollander, 1958). The findings of these studies support the second approach, which states that high-quality interactions improve voice.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This study has several limitations. First, this study focused only on 2 variables, i.e. employee voice and leader–member exchange. It excluded empirical studies that looked at employee voice and other relevant factors (e.g., psychological safety). As a result, future research should look for other factors that can mediate and moderate the association between psychological safety and employee voice behaviour (Ling Yuan, Manh-Cuong Vu & Thi-Trang-Nhung Nguyen, 2018). The scope of the current study is limited because it only focuses on leader–member exchange and employee voice. Second, using a sample of service companies in Vietnam, China, and the US restricts the generalisability of the results to other sectors and places.

We propose the following recommendations for HRD researchers, based on our analysis of the literature. First, additional validation studies or the development of an alternative assessment of employee voice and leader–member exchange should be pursued. We found contradictory results across measurements; therefore, establishing a better measurement or doing further validation experiments could help HRD researchers conduct more rigorous studies. Second, more research on the relationship between employee voice and leader–member exchange is needed. Many researchers have

claimed that there is a beneficial association between employee voice and LMX. Employees may be afraid to express their voices in various Asian cultures, according to Joo Young Park and Kritkorn Nawakitphaitoon (2017), because their statements could be regarded as an explicit expression of disagreement or unhappiness with other employees or with the firm itself. Employees in Western countries, on the other hand, are more comfortable discussing their views, because disagreement is seen as a natural part of social life in the West (Ohbuchi & Takahashi, 1994). If HRM researchers can establish a more balanced understanding of the positive and negative aspects of employee voice and LMX, they will be better equipped to assist and support employees' voice in a way that benefits both the employees and the businesses. Third, we suggest that future research take into account a wider range of job circumstances and cultural backgrounds. Because of cutting-edge technology and quick changes in business, the work environments of the future will be different from those of the past. These social and technological components of work and work environments should be considered in future research of employee voice and LMX. To improve the external validity of findings, more diverse cultural situations should be studied (Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002). Employee voice stresses employees' active participation in decision-making and interactions with leaders, and it was developed in a Western cultural framework marked by low power distance and high individualism. Future research should encompass a wider range of cultural situations to see if the current results can be replicated in other cultures. Fourth, we suggest that future studies use a broader range of approaches, such as multilevel design, meta-analysis, and qualitative methods. Multilevel analysis is important as it preserves and estimates information about individual and organisational features (Turner, 2015). Future research should use qualitative methods to further scholars' understanding of the relationship between employee voice and LMX. Qualitative research allows academics to have a better grasp of participants' inner self, as well as the significance of employee voice and LMX in other cultures.

Conclusion

By reviewing employee voice and LMX, this article discussed a facet of human resource management that has sparked academic interest. We proposed many key

research gaps and future research directions for HRM academics based on this review. Employees' readiness to give fresh ideas for fixing problems, to improve managerial decision-making, promote organisational agility, and ensure greater development chances, has been demonstrated in prior studies. Employees may feel more comfortable raising their voices in the presence of high-quality LMX because a communication channel exists between them and their supervisors. Researchers and practitioners in HRM should strive to improve the connections between employee voice, LMX, and HRM. This would benefit both organisations and individuals, since a better understanding of employee voice and LMX would improve employees' well-being, safety, and performance, by allowing them to participate in the organisation's decision-making process.

References

- Anderson, N., Potočnik, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297-1333. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527128
- Atwater, L., & Carmeli, A. (2009). Leader-member exchange, feelings of energy, and involvement in creative work. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 264-275. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.07.009
- Bauer, T. N., & Green, S. G. (1996). Development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(6), 1538-1567. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/257068
- Botero, I. C., & Van Dyne, L. (2009). Employee voice behavior: Interactive effects of LMX and power distance in the United States and Colombia. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 23(1), 84-104. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909335415
- Botero, I. C., & Van Dyne, L. (2009). Employee voice behavior. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 23(1), 84-104. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909335415
- Burris, E. R. (2012). The risks and rewards of speaking up: Responses to voice in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 851-875.
- Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Quitting before leaving: The mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(4), 912-922. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.912
- Carnevale, J. B., Huang, L., Uhl-Bien, M., & Harris, S. (2020). Feeling obligated yet hesitant to speak up: Investigating the curvilinear relationship between LMX and employee promotive voice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 93(3), 505-529. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12302
- Chan, S. C. H., & Yeung, D. (2016). The impact of leader-member exchange (LMX) and empowerment on employee voice behavior. *Nang Yan Business Journal*, 4(1), 44-55. doi:https://doi.org/10.1515/nybj-2016-0004
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations. A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13(1), 46-78. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(75)90005-7
- Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869-884. doi:https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.26279183
- Farrell, D. (1983). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 596-607. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/255909
- Freeman, R. B., & James, L. (1985). What do unions do? *ILR Review*, 38(2), 244-263. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/001979398503800207
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827-844. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.827
- Graen, G. B., & 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. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5
- Graham, J. W., & Van Dyne, L. (2006). Gathering information and exercising influence: Two forms of civic virtue organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 18(2), 89-109. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-006-9007-x
- Hammond, M. M., Neff, N. L., Farr, J. L., Schwall, A. R., & Zhao, X. (2011). Predictors of individual-level innovation at work: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 5(1), 90-105. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018556

- Hsiung, H. H. (2012). Authentic leadership and employee voice behavior: A multi-level psychological process. *Journal of Business Ethics, 107*(3), 349-361. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1043-2
- Hu, Y., Zhu, L., Zhou, M., Li, J., Maguire, P., Sun, H., & Wang, D. (2018). Exploring the influence of ethical leadership on voice behavior: How leader-member exchange, psychological safety and psychological empowerment influence employees' willingness to speak out. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*(SEP), 1-10. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01718
- Huang, X., Xu, E., Huang, L., & Liu, W. (2018). Nonlinear consequences of promotive and prohibitive voice for managers' responses: The roles of voice frequency and LMX. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(10), 1101-1120. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000326
- Jin, X., Jiang, J., Li, P., & Li, B. (2020). LMX and voice: A test in the Chinese hospitality industry. *Anatolia, 31*(1), 131-141. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2020.1716259
- Klaas, B. S., Olson-Buchanan, J. B., & Ward, A. K. (2012). The determinants of alternative forms of workplace voice: An integrative perspective. *Journal of Management, 38*(1), 314-345. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311423823
- Kwon, B., Farndale, E., & Park, J. G. (2016). Employee voice and work engagement: Macro, meso, and micro-level drivers of convergence? *Human Resource Management Review, 26*(4), 327-337. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.04.005
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(6), 853-868. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.853
- Lewin, D. (1987). Dispute resolution in the non-union firm. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 31*(3), 465-502. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002787031003004
- Liang, J., Farh, C. I. C., & Farh, J. L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(1), 71-92. doi:https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0176
- Liu, W., Zhu, R., & Yang, Y. (2010). I warn you because I like you: Voice behavior, employee identifications, and transformational leadership. In *Leadership Quarterly, 21*(1). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.10.014
- Marchington, M., & Suter, J. (2013). Where informality really matters: Patterns of employee involvement and participation (EIP) in a non-union firm. *Industrial Relations, 52*(SUPPL.1), 284-313. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/irel.12004
- Maynes, T. D., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2014). Speaking more broadly: An examination of the nature, antecedents, and consequences of an expanded set of employee voice behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(1), 87-112. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034284
- Mumford, M. D., & Licuanan, B. (2004). Leading for innovation: Conclusions, issues, and directions. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*(1), 163-171. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.010
- Nahrgang, J. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Ilies, R. (2009). The development of leader-member exchanges: Exploring how personality and performance influence leader and member relationships over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 108*(2), 256-266. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.09.002
- Nazir, S., Shafi, A., Asadullah, M. A., Qun, W., & Khadim, S. (2020). Linking paternalistic leadership to follower's innovative work behavior: The influence of leader-member exchange and employee voice. *European Journal of Innovation Management. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-01-2020-0005*
- Ohbuchi, K., I, & Takahashi, Y. (1994). Cultural styles of conflict management in Japanese and Americans: Passivity, covertness, and effectiveness of strategies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*(15), 1345-1366. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb01553.x
- Opoku, M. A., Choi, S. B., & Kang, S. W. (2019). Servant leadership and innovative behaviour: An empirical analysis of Ghana's manufacturing sector. *Sustainability (Switzerland), 11*(22). doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226273
- Park, J. Y., & Nawakitphaitoon, K. (2018). The cross-cultural study of LMX and individual employee voice: The moderating role of conflict avoidance. *Human Resource Management Journal, 28*(1), 14-30. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12158
- Rees, C., Alfes, K., & Gatenby, M. (2013). Employee voice and engagement: Connections and consequences. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*(14), 2780-2798. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.763843

- Rusbult, C. E., Farrell, D., Rogers, G., & Mainous, A. G. (1988). Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: An integrative model of responses to declining job status satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, *31*(3), 599-627. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/256461
- Şimşek, Y., & Gürler, M. (2019). A study on employee voice and its effect on work engagement: explicating from the Turkish teachers' perspectives. *International Education Studies*, *12*(7), 80. doi:https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n7p80
- Spencer, D. G. (1986). Employee voice and employee retention. *Academy of Management Journal*, *29*(3), 488-502. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/256220
- Tang, T. L. P., & Liu, H. (2012). Love of money and unethical behavior intention: Does an authentic supervisor's personal integrity and character (ASPIRE) make a difference? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *107*(3), 295-312. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1040-5
- Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2008). Exploring non-linearity in employee voice: The effects of personal control and organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, *51*(6), 1189-1203. doi:https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2008.35732719
- Uhl-Bien, M., Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (2000). Implications of leader-member exchange (LMX) for strategic human resource management systems: Relationships as social capital for competitive advantage. In *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (vol. 18, pp. 137-185). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D., & Joireman, J. (2008). In-role perceptions buffer the negative impact of low LMX on helping and enhance the positive impact of high LMX on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(6), 1195-1207. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.6.1195
- Volmer, J., Spurk, D., & Niessen, C. (2012). Leader-member exchange (LMX), job autonomy, and creative work involvement. *Leadership Quarterly*, *23*(3), 456-465. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.10.005
- Wang, D., Gan, C., & Wu, C. (2016). LMX and employee voice: A moderated mediation model of psychological empowerment and role clarity. *Personnel Review*, *45*(3), 605-615. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2014-0255
- Ward, A. K., Ravlin, E. C., Klaas, B. S., Ployhart, R. E., & Buchan, N. R. (2016). When do high-context communicators speak up? Exploring contextual communication orientation and employee voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(10), 1498-1511. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000144
- Withey, M. J., & Cooper, W. H. (1989). Predicting, exit, voice, loyalty and, neglect. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *34*, 521-539.
- Wood, S. J., & Fenton-O'Creevy, M. P. (2005). Direct involvement, representation and employee voice in UK multinationals in Europe. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, *11*(1), 27-50. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0959680105050399
- Zhang, Y., Huai, M. Y., & Xie, Y. H. (2015). Paternalistic leadership and employee voice in China: A dual process model. *Leadership Quarterly*, *26*(1), 25-36. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.01.002
- Zhao, H. (2014). Relative leader-member exchange and employee voice: Mediating role of affective commitment and moderating role of Chinese traditionality. *Chinese Management Studies*, *8*(1), 27-40. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-01-2013-0016
- Zhou, J., & George, J. M. (2001). When job dissatisfaction leads to creativity: Encouraging the expression of voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*(4), 682-696. doi:https://doi.org/10.5465/306941