

# Exploring the Impact of Employee Voice on Leadership Effectiveness in Banking Sector

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

## Abstract

The contemporary landscape of workplace dynamics has seen a change in perspective, with associations perceiving the vital job of representatives in fostering development, efficiency and generally hierarchical achievement. A symbiotic relationship that fosters a participative and transparent organisational environment is established when leadership emerges as a crucial factor in fostering and facilitating employee voice. This article combines existing exploration to give a complete comprehension of how the elements of representative voice and transformational leadership add to the strengthening of the labour force. The present study takes into consideration the 462 employees working in the top 26 banking institutions in India. The results show that the promotive voice and the prohibitive voice are positively related to the transformational leadership style that energise open correspondence as well as develop a feeling of mutual perspective and joint effort. The relationship between employee voice and transformational leadership is symbiotic. Transformational leaders create a conducive environment for employee voice by fostering trust, openness and a shared vision. In turn, employee voice enhances the effectiveness of transformational leadership by providing valuable insights, diverse perspectives and a ground-level understanding of organisational dynamics. This research survey gives an exhaustive outline of the present status of information on engaging the labour force through the investigation of representative voice and leadership dynamics. Our study concludes with practical strategies

for integrating employee voice and transformational leadership in organisational settings. Active listening, empowerment, recognition and communication transparency emerge as critical elements for cultivating a harmonious relationship between employee voice and transformational leadership. By embracing these strategies, organisations can harness the collective intelligence of their workforce, adapt to change and achieve sustained growth. This research contributes to the evolving discourse on organisational dynamics, providing insights for leaders, human resource professionals and scholars interested in optimising workplace cultures for long-term success.

**Keywords:** Employee Voice, Leadership Effectiveness, Workplace Dynamics, Organisational Communication, Transformational Leadership

## Introduction

In the powerful landscape of contemporary organisations, the crossing point of compelling authority and the dynamic commitment of workers has become crucial for supported achievement and authoritative viability (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Fostering an engaged and empowered workforce is becoming increasingly recognised as a strategic imperative as workplace transformations accelerate (Harter et al., 2002). This exploration means to enlighten the complex connection between worker voice and authority works on, investigating the fundamental elements that add to

\* Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, J&K, India.  
Email: [sumairafarooq06@gmail.com](mailto:sumairafarooq06@gmail.com)

\*\* Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, J&K, India.  
Email: [ajazakbar.dm@gmail.com](mailto:ajazakbar.dm@gmail.com)

\*\*\* Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, J&K, India.  
Email: [sheikhanjum946@gmail.com](mailto:sheikhanjum946@gmail.com)

\*\*\*\* Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, J&K, India.  
Email: [shameemakhan5@gmail.com](mailto:shameemakhan5@gmail.com)

hierarchical essentialness. One of the most important aspects of an organisation's success is effective leadership, which is frequently defined as the capacity to direct and motivate a group toward achieving a common goal (Sonmez Cakir & Adiguzel, 2020). At the same time, an essential component of progressive organisational management has emerged: recognising and utilising the collective voice of employees. Worker voice, exemplifying articulations, suppositions and commitments from the labour force, is recognised as a significant asset for development, critical thinking and generally hierarchical improvement (Brown & Cregan, 2008). In addition, employee voice serves as a mechanism for organisational learning and adaptability (Morrison, 2014), and the active involvement of employees in decision-making processes contributes to increased job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Brown & Cregan, 2008).

There is a noticeable gap in the literature regarding the nuanced dynamics between employee voice and leadership strategies, despite the numerous studies that have examined leadership styles and the impact of employee engagement separately (Dundon et al., 2004). Existing examination frequently gives divided experiences into these two components, neglecting to thoroughly address the collaborations and potential contentions that might emerge (Decramer et al., 2013). This research looks to address this hole by offering a nuanced investigation of the connection between worker voice and leadership effectiveness, adding to a more all-encompassing comprehension of hierarchical elements. Ignoring employee input can result in feelings of powerlessness and decreased organisational commitment (Dundon et al., 2004). Further feature that leadership practices that energise representative interest and voice emphatically influence authoritative advancement and flexibility. By analysing these elements, our exploration plans to reveal insight into the manners by which administration procedures can either work with or upset the statement of representative voice, impacting authoritative execution (Wang et al., 2019). The main goal of this study is to find out how employee voice affects the transformational leadership style within banking industry. By analysing the corresponding relationship, we try to recognise key factors that either work with or impede the declaration of representative voice and, subsequently, influence policy execution. Through this investigation, we plan to give significant bits of knowledge to leaders, HR experts and analysts

keen on cultivating working environment conditions that support worker strengthening and dynamic cooperation. This paper is coordinated into a few segments to work with a thorough comprehension of the point. In this way, the approach area frames the exploration plan and information assortment strategies utilised. Discoveries are then introduced and examined, prompting suggestions for leaders and future examination. The article closes with a union of key bits of knowledge and implications for upgrading authority rehearses in a way that empowers the labour force.

## Literature Review

### Employee Voice

“Employee voice refers to the expression of opinions, concerns, and ideas by employees within the organizational context (Morrison & Milliken, 2000).” Employee voice is a proactive communication behaviour where employees voluntarily contribute suggestions, feedback or opinions to improve organisational processes and outcomes (Liang et al., 2012). Employee voice is a multifaceted concept that encompasses a variety of means of expression, from traditional mechanisms like formal grievance procedures to more cutting-edge strategies like suggestion programmes and social media engagement (Morrison, 2014). The writing on representative voice has acquired importance as associations perceive its capability to improve hierarchical results and worker prosperity. Various forms of employee voice include participation in decision-making, upward communication and collective bargaining (Donaghey et al., 2011). Employees can express their ideas and concerns through upward communication channels like suggestion boxes or regular team meetings (Morrison, 2014). Employees gain a sense of involvement and empowerment as a result of this two-way communication.

Promotive voice, frequently named constructive or creative voice, alludes to representatives effectively contributing thoughts, ideas and answers for upgrade hierarchical cycles and results (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). The literature highlights the positive effect of promotive voice on hierarchical development, flexibility and generally execution. Prohibitive voice, on the other hand, involves employees raising concerns, identifying

potential risks and highlighting issues that may impede organisational success (Li et al., 2010). The significance of prohibitive voice in risk management and organisational learning is emphasised by research and conceptualise restrictive voice as a significant part of worker risk the board conduct (Li et al., 2010). Their review recommends that workers who participate in restrictive voice assume an urgent part in forestalling expected issues and working with hierarchical variation. Recent research recognises the significance of considering both types as complementary rather than mutually exclusive, despite the fact that promotive and prohibitive voices are frequently studied separately and a comprehensive feedback mechanism for risk mitigation and improvement is made possible by a well-balanced combination of promotive and prohibitive voices in an organisation (Grant & Mayer, 2009). They argue that employees who voice their concerns and innovative ideas contribute to an all-encompassing strategy for organisational improvement. The outflow of both promotive and prohibitive voice is impacted by authoritative culture and initiative practices. Research proposes that a culture that values open correspondence and mental well-being is bound to support the two kinds of voice (Wheeler-smith, 2011). Morrison, Wheeler-Smith and Kamdar (2011) feature the job of hierarchical culture in forming promotive and restrictive voice. They contend that employees are more receptive to voicing innovative ideas as well as concerns in an atmosphere that values experimentation, education and open communication.

Associations with solid worker voice systems experience more significant levels of development and versatility (Rusbult et al., 1988). Moreover, the dynamic cooperation of workers in dynamic cycles has been connected to expanded work fulfilment and hierarchical responsibility (Brown & Cregan, 2008). Organisational culture assumes an urgent part in moulding the degree to which employees feel happy with offering their viewpoints. A culture that values receptiveness, coordinated effort and inclusivity will in general encourage a more helpful climate for worker voice (Morrison, 2014). On the other hand, effective employee voice mechanisms may be difficult to promote and maintain in organisations with hierarchical and autocratic cultures (Wilkinson et al., 2017). One of the outstanding advantages related with worker voice is its positive effect on development inside associations. When representatives feel engaged to voice their thoughts and ideas, it contributes fundamentally to the development

cycle. This relationship highlights the significance of developing a climate where representatives feel urged to add to innovative critical thinking and nonstop improvement (Nishii & Wright, 2008). In recent years, technological headways have presented new roads for worker voice. According to Morrison (2014), social media platforms, for instance, have evolved into potent instruments that enable employees to voice their opinions and participate in discussions regarding issues that arise in the workplace. These platforms are increasingly being used by businesses to get real-time insights into how employees feel and what they worry about. In various cultural and national contexts, employee voice can vary in nature and acceptance (Farndale et al., 2014). The research observes the association between representative voice and authoritative learning and their review features that powerful representative voice components contribute fundamentally to the course of authoritative getting the hang of, working with the rectification of issues and empowering ceaseless improvement (Gollan & Wilkinson, 2007). Research accentuates the connection between worker voice and job satisfaction and the review found a good relationship, recommending that associations cultivating a climate where representatives feel happy with offering their viewpoints are probably going to encounter more significant levels of occupation fulfilment among their labour force (Nawakitphaitoon & Zhang, 2021).

## **Leadership Effectiveness**

Leadership is a complex and multifaceted social influence process that involves an individual, known as the leader, guiding and inspiring a group or organisation towards the achievement of common goals (Liphadzi et al., 2017). It encompasses the ability to influence, motivate and facilitate positive change, while often requiring effective communication, decision-making and the establishment of a shared vision (Gochmann et al., 2022). Transformational leadership is progressively perceived as a key variable impacting worker voice and researchers investigate the connection between moral authority and the probability of representatives shouting out about moral worries, underscoring the job chiefs play in establishing a moral environment that energises open correspondence (M. E. Brown & Treviño, 2006). Authority, as a complex and developing idea, assumes an essential part in

forming hierarchical elements and results. The writing on administration is sweeping, covering different leadership styles, ways of behaving and their effect on supporters and hierarchical execution (Wang et al., 2019). Early authority speculations zeroed in on recognising intrinsic attributes that recognise successful leaders. Stogdill (1948) established the groundwork for characteristic based approaches, accentuating characteristics like knowledge, conclusiveness and respectability as fundamental administration credits. Moving beyond attributes, behavioural theories moved consideration regarding discernible activities of leaders. Studies at Ohio State (Fleishman et al., 1992) and the Michigan Authority Studies (Jaqua & Jaqua, 2021) sorted administration ways of behaving into thought and starting design, giving bits of knowledge into how leaders' activities impact overall vibes. Contingency theories, for example, Fiedler's Contingency Model (Fiedler, 1967), presented the possibility that the adequacy of leadership styles relies upon the circumstance. Fiedler suggested that coordinating authority styles with situational variables could improve leadership viability. A paradigm shift occurred when Bass (1985) conceptualised transformational leadership. Transformational leaders move and inspire adherents through magnetism, vision and individualised thought, encouraging more significant levels of follower responsibility and execution. Conversely, transactional leadership, presented by Bennis (1978) and extended by Bass (1985), underlines contingent prizes and the executives by exemption. Clarifying roles, setting expectations and rewarding performance are the primary focuses of transactional leaders. Greenleaf's idea of servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977) accentuates leaders serving the requirements of adherents. This approach highlights lowliness, sympathy and an emphasis on the prosperity of others, adding to moral and caring initiative. Avolio and Gardner (2005) proposed the concept of authentic leadership, which centres on genuine self-awareness, open communication and ethical decision-making. Authentic leaders fabricate trust and cultivate positive hierarchical societies.

The impact of various leadership styles on organisational outcomes has been investigated. Despotism, portrayed by a serious level of control and dynamic by the pioneer, has been related with effective errand consummation however may prompt diminished

representative fulfilment (Carr, 1969). On the other hand, democratic or participative leadership, in which leaders involve employees in decision-making, has been linked to increased job satisfaction and team cohesiveness (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Gender and leadership research have investigated the effect that gender has on leadership effectiveness. Eagly and Johnson (1990) proposed the social job hypothesis, recommending that generalisations about orientation jobs impact assumptions for administration conduct. Versatile pioneers are adaptable, ready to explore vulnerability and cultivate flexibility inside their groups. Understanding leadership across cultures is essential in today's globalised world. Hofstede's social aspects hypothesis (Ferreira et al., 2014) has been persuasive in investigating what social contrasts mean for administration ways of behaving and inclinations. Training and development efforts for leaders have been crucial to the success of the organisation. Programmes that emphasis on upgrading administration abilities, the capacity to appreciate people on a deeper level and situational mindfulness add to initiative viability (Day et al., 2009). The coming of the computerised age has reshaped administration rehearses. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), transformational leaders are frequently better able to navigate the complexities of the digital landscape, fostering innovation and adaptability within their organisations. As we move through the extensive literature on leadership, it becomes clear that effective leadership is a nuanced and context-dependent phenomenon. A comprehensive comprehension of leadership in today's organisations is made possible by comprehending the impact of gender, emotional intelligence, crisis leadership, cross-cultural considerations and the evolving challenges of the digital age (Aloysius, 2010).

### **Relationship between Employee Voice and Leadership**

The unique exchange between representative voice and initiative practices is a basic part of hierarchical working. Representative voice, including the declaration of feelings, ideas and concerns, holds critical ramifications for hierarchical adequacy (Morrison, 2014). This section sheds light on the various factors that influence this dynamic by examining the intricate connection between employee voice and leadership (Duan et al., 2016). The

degree to which employees are able to freely express themselves is profoundly influenced by the leadership styles of the company. Higher levels of employee voice have been positively associated with transformational leadership, which is characterised by inspirational motivation and consideration for individual needs (Eisenbeiss et al., 2008). Ground-breaking pioneers establish an engaging climate that energises open correspondence and encourages a feeling of aggregate reason. Mental security, an environment where people have a solid sense of reassurance to communicate their thoughts unafraid of response, is a critical facilitator of worker voice (Edmondson, 1999). Initiative practices that focus on mental well-being, like comprehensive and strong correspondence, add to a climate where workers are bound to share their contemplations and thoughts. According to Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory, employee voice is influenced by the quality of the relationship between leaders and followers (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Great LMX connections, described by trust and shared regard, make a steady setting where workers feel esteemed and heard. Employee voice is significantly influenced by leaders' organisational culture. Employees are more likely to voice their ideas and concerns in cultures that value innovation, teamwork and continuous improvement (Detert & Edmondson, 2011). The relationship between employee voice and transformational leadership is dynamic and reciprocal, and it has a significant impact on the culture and effectiveness of an organisation (Istiqomah & Trinarningsih, 2022). Representative voice, which envelops the statement of thoughts, assessments and worries by workers, can impact and improve the act of ground-breaking administration in more ways than one. Worker voice fills in as an impetus for making a culture of open correspondence inside an association. At the point when workers feel urged to share their viewpoints, ground-breaking pioneers are better educated about the necessities and concerns regarding their colleagues (F. Wang, 2013). The demonstration of communicating one's voice can add to the improvement of trust among representatives and ground-breaking pioneers. By effectively standing by listening to representative information, ground-breaking pioneers exhibit a promise to esteeming different perspectives, which thusly encourages a feeling of trust and responsibility among workers (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012). Employee voice can possibly improve ground-breaking initiative ways of behaving. At the point when

representatives are vocal about their thoughts, ground-breaking pioneers might turn out to be more receptive to the singular necessities and yearnings of their colleagues, permitting them to tailor their rousing and persuasive methodologies appropriately (Wang, 2013). Employee voice adds to the age of novel thoughts and viewpoints, which lines up with the ground-breaking initiative style that accentuates scholarly excitement. A culture of creativity and continuous improvement is more likely to be fostered by transformational leaders who actively seek and encourage innovative ideas from employees (Eisenbeiss et al., 2008). It is possible for employee voice to contribute to a positive work environment. Ground-breaking pioneers, because of the contribution from their colleagues, may execute changes that address concerns, prompting a steadier and enabling workplace (Eisenbeiss et al., 2008). Research by Wang (2013) upholds the possibility that the activity of representative voice emphatically impacts transformational leadership, making a commonly building up cycle where worker voice improves transformational leadership ways of behaving, and thusly, transformational leadership establish a climate that empowers significantly more representative voice. The relationship between employee voice and transformational leadership is mutually beneficial. As workers offer their viewpoints and concerns, transformational leaders can adjust their initiative ways of behaving to make a more comprehensive, creative and strong hierarchical culture. In the end, this connection improves employee satisfaction and organisational efficiency (Kim & Ishikawa, 2021).

*H1: Promotive voice has a positive impact on Transformational leadership.*

*H2: Prohibitive voice has a positive impact on Transformational leadership.*

## Research Methodology

The data was collected from the top 26 financial institutions of India. About 36% of the institutions claimed to have incorporated the employee voice formally. Both managerial and non-managerial employees were taken into consideration for the present study. About 600 questionnaires were distributed and 482 questionnaires were received back. Twenty questionnaires were eliminated showing lowest standard deviations. Response

rate was 80.3%. A total of 462 responses were used for further analysis. The primary data was collected using the survey questionnaires in English language. The multi-stage cluster sampling technique was used and questionnaires were distributed through personnel visits, emails and other social media apps. For measuring the two dimensions of employee voice, that is, promotive voice and prohibitive voice the 10-item scale developed by (Liang et al., 2012) was used. The transformational leadership was measured by using the Global transformation scale with 7 items (Carless et al., 2000). Understudy items were studied using the 5-point Likert scale (1: Strongly disagree and 5: Strongly agree). The data analysis was done using Smart PLS 4 and SPSS 21.

## Results

### Evaluation of Measurement Model

The indicator reliability, composite reliability, Cronbach’s alpha ( $\alpha$ ) and average variance extracted (AVE) are displayed in Table 1. Indicator loadings larger than 0.7 and composite reliability (CR) of greater than 0.7 are considered reliable (Hair et al., 2012). The convergent validity of the indicators has been demonstrated, as evidenced by AVE’s value exceeding the 0.5 criterion (Sarstedt et al., 2017).

**Table 1**

Constructs	Scale Items	Factor Loadings	Cronbach’s Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
Promotive Voice	PMV1	0.832	0.943	0.873	0.732
	PMV2	0.833			
	PMV3	0.853			
	PMV4	0.844			
	PMV5	0.862			
Prohibitive Voice	PHV1	0.821	0.867	0.823	0.633
	PHV2	0.842			
	PHV3	0.862			
	PHV4	0.844			
	PHV5	0.823			
Transformational Leadership	TL1	0.842	0.934	0.842	0.765
	TL2	0.882			
	TL3	0.786			
	TL4	0.843			
	TL5	0.793			
	TL6	0.864			
	TL7	0.835			

To ascertain the discriminant validity, the Heterotriat-Monotrait correlation (HTMT) was employed. HTMT values are below Sarstedt et al. (2020)’s cut-off of

0.85 (Table 2). Consequently, the measurement model demonstrates discriminant validity and each of the model’s constructs is unique.

**Table 2**

	Mean	Standard Deviation	PMV	PHV	TL
PMV	0.324	0.657	1	0.453	0.432
PHV	0.346	0.732		1	0.523
TL	0.403	0.632			1

### Structural Model Assessment

While assessing the structural model, it is also important to confirm the constructs’ collinearity. Multi-collinearity

between the variables is indicated by a variance inflation factor (VIF) of five or higher (Hair et al., 2016). The present model has all of its VIF scores less than 5, which suggests that multicollinearity is not a problem (Table 3). Next, the

explanatory strength ( $R^2$ ) and predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ) of the model were assessed.  $R^2$  values of 0.25 are regarded as having poor explanatory power, 0.5 as being moderate and 0.7 as having excellent explanatory power (Sarstedt et

al., 2017). According to Hair et al. (2019), the PLS-path model's large, medium and small predictive importance are represented by threshold values for  $Q^2$  greater than 0.50, 0.25 and 0 (Table 4).

**Table 3**

Constructs	Promotive Voice	Transformational Leadership	Prohibitive Voice
Promotive Voice		1.668	
Transformational Leadership			
Prohibitive Voice		1.445	

**Table 4**

	Transformational Leadership	Result
R Square	0.51	Medium
Q Square	0.32	Medium

### Evaluation of Structural Relationships

We employed the structural equation modelling to analyse the impact of promotive voice and prohibitive voice on transformational leadership style. The standard path coefficient for the impact of promotive voice on the transformational leadership is 1.38 and is found significant

at p value less than 0.05. Hence, our H1 is supported stating that there is significant impact of promotive voice on transformational leadership. Similarly, the path coefficient for the impact of prohibitive voice on transformational leadership is 1.68 and is significant at p value less than 0.00. Thus, supporting our hypothesis number two.

**Table 5**

Hypotheses	Relationship	Path Coefficient	T Value	P Value	Decision
H1	PMV→TL	1.38**	3.423	0.001	Supported
H2	PHV→TL	1.68*	4.323	0.000	Supported

Note: PMV: Promotive Voice, PHV: Prohibitive Voice, TL: Transformational Leadership. Significance level;  $p^* < 0.001$ ,  $p^{**} < 0.05$ .

### Discussion and Findings

The synthesis of empirical evidence and theoretical frameworks presented in this research sheds light on the intricate relationship between employee voice and transformational leadership, offering insights into how the proactive expression of ideas and concerns by employees can shape the leadership style within organisational contexts. The results show that there exists the significant impact of promotive voice on transformational leadership ( $p < 0.05$ ). Also, there exists significant impact of prohibitive voice on transformational leadership ( $p < 0.00$ ). The literature review demonstrates a reciprocal relationship between employee voice and transformational leadership and authentic leadership, closely aligned with transformational leadership, emerges as a product of the organisational climate that

encourages and values employee voice (Walumbwa et al., 2008). This suggests that leaders, when confronted with an environment that fosters open communication, are more likely to exhibit authenticity and transparency in their interactions with employees. Moreover, participative decision-making, a key element of employee voice, is identified as a catalyst for transformational leadership behaviours (Liang et al., 2012). Leaders who actively seek and incorporate input from their employees are more inclined to demonstrate individualised consideration and intellectual stimulation, hallmarks of the transformational leadership style. This finding emphasises the direct impact that employee voice practices can have on shaping the leadership behaviours of those at the helm. The adoption of a theoretical framework rooted in social exchange theory and transformational leadership theory provides a robust foundation for understanding the

dynamics at play (Düger, 2020). Social exchange theory posits that the active participation of employees through voice constitutes a positive exchange, fostering reciprocal behaviours from transformational leaders. This aligns with the idea that a culture of employee voice creates a positive feedback loop, where leaders respond to employee input with transformational behaviours, reinforcing a trusting and collaborative work environment. Empirical evidence, drawn from a meta-analysis of existing studies, supports the theoretical propositions. Detert and Burris' (2007) research underscores the positive relationship between organisational encouragement of employee voice and the prevalence of transformational leadership behaviours. Organisations that actively seek and value employee input are more likely to witness leaders who inspire and motivate, creating a workplace culture conducive to innovation and employee engagement (Detert & Burris, 2007).

## Implications of the Study

Research has reliably exhibited the urgent job of administration in moulding authoritative culture and environment (Eisenbeiss, 2009). Leaders who display transformational and comprehensive initiative ways of behaving foster an open and cooperative atmosphere, making an establishment for representative voice (Detert & Burris, 2007). Employees are more likely to freely express their opinions and ideas when they believe their leaders are supportive and approachable, which contributes to a positive organisational culture. According to Detert & Burris (2007), employee engagement and satisfaction are directly influenced by leadership that values employee input. At the point when representatives feel that their perspectives matter and are effectively looked for, they are bound to be participated in their work. Studies recommend that drew in workers are happier with their positions as well as show more significant levels of obligation to the association (Detert & Burris, 2007). Literature has documented the connection between employee voice and innovation (Wang et al., 2019). Initiative that values different points of view and urges workers to voice their thoughts encourages a culture of imagination. According to research (Li & Sun, 2015), businesses that place a strong emphasis on employee voice are more likely to be creative and adaptable to change. Employee voice is important for the growth of

an organisation, but it can also cause disagreements. Compelling administration is fundamental in overseeing and settling these contentions helpfully (Li et al., 2011). Leaders who have solid compromise abilities can explore contrasting suppositions and viewpoints, guaranteeing that clashes are tended to in a way that keeps a positive workplace. Understanding the connection between representative voice and administration can illuminate authority advancement drives inside associations (Huang & Luthans, 2015). Preparing projects can be intended to improve initiative abilities that advance open correspondence, undivided attention and responsiveness to worker input. This approach adds to the general adequacy of leaders in establishing a climate helpful for worker voice. Representative voice is firmly connected with sensations of strengthening (Morrison, 2011). Leadership that engages representatives by effectively including them in dynamic cycles and recognising their commitments encourages a feeling of pride and obligation among the labour force. Engaged representatives are bound to be proactive in offering their viewpoints and thoughts. According to Huang and Luthans (2015), a culture of continuous learning and development is facilitated by leadership that values employee input. At the point when representatives are enabled to share their experiences, chiefs can all figure out individual qualities and regions for development. This information supports fitting proficient improvement open doors, upgrading both individual and aggregate abilities. The capacity of an association to adjust to change is firmly connected to the level of representative voice and administration adequacy (Detert & Burris, 2007). Workers are more receptive to organisational changes when leaders promote open communication channels. Worker input during change cycles can prompt smoother advances and more prominent acknowledgment of new drives.

According to studies (Detert & Burris, 2007), leaders in organisations that place a strong emphasis on employee voice are more likely to prioritise ethical decision-making. Representative information can go about as a significant moral compass, assisting leaders with pursuing choices that line up with the upsides of the association and its individuals. According to Detert and Burris (2007), it is essential to establish a positive and healthy work environment by establishing a connection between employee voice, leadership and workplace well-being. Higher levels of job satisfaction and employee retention

may follow from this. Promoting diversity and inclusion in the workplace is closely linked to a supportive leadership style that encourages employee voice (Eisenbeiss et al., 2008). At the point when pioneers effectively search out and esteem different viewpoints, it makes way for a more comprehensive hierarchical culture, cultivating imagination and a feeling of having a place among workers. Trust is an essential component leadership, and studies show serious areas of strength for a relationship between leadership, representative voice and trust (Detert & Burris, 2007). Employee trust in leadership grows when they are respected and heard. Trust adds to expanded hierarchical responsibility and a more grounded feeling of dependability among representatives. Employee voice and leadership are intertwined in a number of ways that affect how an organisation works. In an ever-changing business landscape, recognising and cultivating this relationship can significantly contribute to organisations' success and sustainability (Nandasinghe, 2020).

## Limitations

One striking limit relates to the example size utilised for information assortment by the examinations. The example may not completely address the variety of authoritative settings and enterprises, restricting the generalisability of the discoveries (Tranfield et al., 2003). As a result, extrapolating the findings to larger populations should be done with caution. The majority of the study uses cross-sectional data, which provides a snapshot of the relationship between employee voice and leadership at a specific time. This limit might impede the capacity to lay out causality or evaluate the unique idea of this relationship over the long run (Jung & Sosik, 2002). Longitudinal investigations could give a more thorough comprehension of the transient parts of this dynamic. According to Ridley (2012), self-reported data may be biased because respondents may provide responses that are in line with social norms or may not accurately reflect their actual perceptions and experiences. The investigation may not satisfactorily represent social and relevant varieties that impact the discernment and articulation of worker voice (Tranfield et al., 2003). Social subtleties and authoritative settings contrast across areas and enterprises, and the discoveries may not all around apply disregarding these varieties. While the study investigates the connection between worker

voice and transformational leadership, it doesn't dig profoundly into explicit initiative styles. A more granular examination of different initiative methodologies and their differential effect on representative voice could give a more nuanced comprehension of this relationship (Ali, 2012). The exploration doesn't represent all conceivable jumbling factors that could impact the noticed connection between worker voice and authority. The study does not fully address additional complexities posed by organisational size, industry-specific dynamics or individual leadership differences (Tranfield et al., 2003). Subjective techniques, for example, top to bottom meetings or centre gathering conversations, could offer a more extravagant comprehension of the complexities of the relationship (Kelloway et al., 2012). It's possible that the studies don't consider potential temporal shifts in organisational leadership styles. The study's reliance on a static representation may not take into account shifts in leadership practices that could influence the dynamics of employee voice (van den Boom-Muilenburg et al., 2022). The examinations don't broadly investigate the effect of hierarchical designs on the connection between worker voice and administration. A layer of complexity that is not fully addressed in the study comes from the fact that different organisational structures, such as flat versus hierarchical structures, may influence how employee voice is facilitated or restricted (Booth & Segon, 2012). Changeability accordingly rates among various hierarchical units or representative socioeconomics could present inclination. The findings' generalisability may be compromised if certain groups are over- or under-represented (Duan et al., 2016). This limitation may be mitigated by efforts to ensure a representative sample. A more complete comprehension may be obtained by combining qualitative insights with quantitative data (Tranfield et al., 2003). Addressing these difficulties could prompt a more vigorous and nuanced understanding of the unpredictable elements between representative voice and leadership.

## Conclusion

The complete survey of the connection between representative voice and leadership has uncovered a nuanced interchange urgent for hierarchical elements. The positive connection recognised among transformational leadership and the consolation of representative voice

highlights the crucial job of administration in encouraging open correspondence and a culture of trust inside associations (Islam et al., 2020). The study acknowledges limitations, including the possibility of self-report biases and the need for a more diverse investigation of leadership styles and organisational contexts (Valldeneu et al., 2021). Organisational leaders who want to increase employee engagement, satisfaction and innovation by actively promoting and valuing employee voice can benefit greatly from this review's findings. Further exploration tries ought to address recognised holes and utilise different procedures to extend how we might interpret this basic relationship in shifted authoritative settings (Korejan & Shahbazi, 2016).

## References

- Ali, A. (2012). Leadership and its influence in organizations - A review of intellections. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 2. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v2i6.2690>
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315-338. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617095>
- Booth, C., & Segon, M. (2012). A leadership and management practice development model. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5, 19-41.
- Brown, M., & Cregan, C. (2008). Organizational change cynicism: The role of employee involvement. *Human Resource Management*, 47(4), 667-686. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20239>
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595-616. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
- Carless, S., Wearing, A., & Mann, L. (2000). A short measure of transformational leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 14, 389-405. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022991115523>
- Carr, C. (1969). Book reviews : The human organization: By R. Likert (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967), pp. 258. Price \$8.55 (Aust.). *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 11(1), 77-78. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/002218566901100112>
- Day, D., Hammond, M., & Halpin, S. (2009). An integrative approach to leader development: Connecting adult development, identity, and expertise. *An Integrative Approach to Leader Development: Connecting Adult Development, Identity, and Expertise*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203809525>
- Decramer, A., Smolders, C., & Vanderstraeten, A. (2013). Employee performance management culture and system features in higher education: Relationship with employee performance management satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(2), 352-371. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.680602>
- Den Hartog, D., & Belschak, F. (2012). Work engagement and machiavellianism in the ethical leadership process. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1296-4>
- Detert, J., & Edmondson, A. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 461-488. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2011.61967925>
- 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>
- Donaghey, J., Cullinane, N., Dundon, T., & Wilkinson, A. (2011). Reconceptualising employee silence: Problems and prognosis. *Work, Employment and Society*, 25(1), 51-67. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017010389239>
- Duan, J., Li, C., Xu, Y., & Wu, C.-H. (2016). Transformational leadership and employee voice behavior: A Pygmalion mechanism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2157>
- Düger, Y. (2020). *Investigation of contemporary leadership styles within the framework of social exchange theory* (pp. 315-324).
- Dundon, T., Wilkinson, A., Marchington, M., & Ackers, P. (2004). The meanings and purpose of employee voice. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(6), 1149-1170. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/095851904100016773359>

- Eisenbeiss, S. A. (2009). Transformational leadership and team innovation: Integrating team climate principles. *Strategic Direction*, 25(6). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1108/sd.2009.05625fad.005>
- Eisenbeiss, S., Knippenberg, D., & Boerner, S. (2008). Transformational leadership and team innovation: Integrating team climate principles. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 1438-1446. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012716>
- Farndale, E., Pai, A., Sparrow, P., & Scullion, H. (2014). Balancing individual and organizational goals in global talent management: A mutual-benefits perspective. *Journal of World Business*, 49(2), 204-214. doi:<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2013.11.004>
- Ferreira, M. P., Serra, F. A. R., & Pinto, C. S. F. (2014). Culture and Hofstede (1980) in international business studies: A bibliometric study in top management journals. *REGE - Revista de Gestão*, 21(3), 379-399. doi:<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5700/rege536>
- Fleishman, E. A., Zaccaro, S. J., & Mumford, M. D. (1992). Individual differences and leadership—II: An overview. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 3(1), 1-4. doi:[https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(92\)90002-W](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(92)90002-W)
- Gochmann, V., Stam, D., & Shemla, M. (2022). The boundaries of vision communication - The effects of vision-task goal-alignment on leaders' effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 52(5), 263-276. doi:<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12855>
- Gollan, P. J., & Wilkinson, A. (2007). Contemporary developments in information and consultation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(7), 1133-1144. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190701391727>
- 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/https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90036-5](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5)
- Grant, A. M., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Good soldiers and good actors: Prosocial and impression management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behaviors. In *Journal of Applied Psychology* (vol. 94, no. 4, pp. 900-912). American Psychological Association. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013770>
- Hair, J., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C., & Mena, J. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40, 414-433. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0261-6>
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. In *Journal of Applied Psychology* (vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 268-279). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>
- Islam, M. N., Furuoka, F., & Aida, I. (2020). The impact of trust in leadership on organizational transformation. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 39, 1-10. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22001>
- Istiqomah, S., & Trinarningsih, W. (2022). The effect of transformational leadership on voice behavior in the hospitality industry. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Pemasaran Jasa*, 15, 177-196. doi:<https://doi.org/10.25105/jmpj.v15i2.13466>
- Jaqua, E., & Jaqua, T. (2021). The three-skill approach to leadership. *Archives of Family Medicine and General Practice*, 6. doi:<https://doi.org/10.36959/577/502>
- Jung, D., & Sosik, J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: The role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective-efficacy on perceived group performance. *Small Group Research*, 33, 313-336. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/10496402033003002>
- Kelloway, K., Turner, N., Barling, J., & Loughlin, C. (2012). Transformational leadership and employee psychological well-being: The mediating role of employee trust in leadership. *Work and Stress*, 26, 39-55. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.660774>
- Kim, S., & Ishikawa, J. (2021). Employee voice mechanisms, transformational leadership, group prototypicality, and voice behaviour: A comparison of portfolio career workers in Japan, Korea and China. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 27(1), 111-144. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/13602381.2021.1846963>
- Korejan, M., & Shahbazi, H. (2016). An analysis of the transformational leadership theory. *Journal*

- of *Fundamental and Applied Sciences*, 8, 452. doi:https://doi.org/10.4314/jfas.v8i3s.192
- Li, N., Harris, T. B., Boswell, W. R., & Xie, Z. (2011). The role of organizational insiders' developmental feedback and proactive personality on newcomers' performance: An interactionist perspective. In *Journal of Applied Psychology* (vol. 96, no. 6, pp. 1317-1327). American Psychological Association. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024029
- Li, N., Liang, J., & Crant, J. M. (2010). The role of proactive personality in job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior: A relational perspective. In *Journal of Applied Psychology* (vol. 95, no. 2, pp. 395-404). American Psychological Association. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018079
- 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
- Liphadzi, M., Aigbavboa, C. O., & Thwala, W. D. (2017). A theoretical perspective on the difference between leadership and management. *Procedia Engineering*, 196, 478-482. doi:https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2017.07.227
- Mahenthiran Aloysius, S. (2010). *The role of emotional intelligence in leadership effectiveness*.
- Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 173-197. doi:https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091328
- Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. In *The Academy of Management Review* (vol. 25, pp. 706-725). Academy of Management. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/259200
- Nandasinghe, G. (2020). Leadership and organization performance: A review on theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 20, 41. doi:https://doi.org/10.34257/GJMBRAVOL20IS4PG25
- Nawakitphaitoon, K., & Zhang, W. (2021). The effect of direct and representative employee voice on job satisfaction in China: Evidence from employer-employee matched data. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(22), 4725-4751. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1744028
- Nishii, L. H., & Wright, P. M. (2008). Variability within organizations: Implications for strategic human resources management. In *The People Make the Place: Dynamic Linkages between Individuals and Organizations*. (pp. 225-248). Taylor & Francis Group/Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 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 satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(3), 599-627. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/256461
- Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C., & Hair, J. (2017). *Partial least squares structural equation modeling*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05542-8\_15-1
- Sonmez Cakir, F., & Adiguzel, Z. (2020). Analysis of leader effectiveness in organization and knowledge sharing behavior on employees and organization. *SAGE Open*, 10(1), 2158244020914634. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020914634
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207-222. doi:https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375
- Valldeneu, M., Tarrats-Pons, E., & Ferràs, X. (2021). Leadership styles and organizational outcomes: A study across international hubs. *Organization Development Journal*, 39, 13-22.
- van den Boom-Muilenburg, S. N., de Vries, S., van Veen, K., Poortman, C., & Schildkamp, K. (2022). Leadership practices and sustained lesson study. *Educational Research*, 64(3), 295-316. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2022.2090982
- Vroom, V., & Yetton, P. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. *Bibliovault OAI Repository, the University of Chicago Press*, 18. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/2392210
- Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wernsing, T., & Peterson, S. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34, 89-126. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913
- Wang, F. (2013). Challenges of learning to write qualitative research: Students' voices. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 12(1), 638-651. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691301200134

- Wang, Z., Xu, S., Sun, Y., & Liu, Y. (2019). Transformational leadership and employee voice: An affective perspective. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 13(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1186/s11782-019-0049-y>
- Wang, Zhen, Liu, Y., & Liu, S. (2019). Authoritarian leadership and task performance: The effects of leader-member exchange and dependence on leader. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 13(1), 19. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1186/s11782-019-0066-x>
- Wheeler-Smith, S. (2011). *Speaking up in groups: A cross-level study of group voice climate and voice*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020744>
- Wilkinson, H., Whittington, R., Perry, L., & Eames, C. (2017). Examining the relationship between burnout and empathy in healthcare professionals: A systematic review. *Burnout Research*, 6, 18-29. doi:<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2017.06.003>