

Leader-Member Exchange and Employee Voice

Evidence Summary

Employee Voice

Employee voice consists of two elements: the expression of complaints or concerns (prohibitive) and the introduction of new ideas and participation in decision making (promotive)

One way of promoting employee voice is through upward appraisal but this can marginalise unions and be disturbing for managers.

Employees' likelihood to voice ideas has been linked to work satisfaction and "quality of the supervisor as voice manager." Employees who perceive their work as meaningful are also more likely to use voice behaviour.

Ditchburn (Ditchburn & Hames, 2014) found that voice encouragement was positively associated with work engagement and affective organisational commitment, while voice climate efficacy was positively related to work engagement.

Computer-mediated communication can enhance employees' ability to express their views and participate in decision-making. Two features facilitate this: the fact that discussions can be broadcast company wide and employees' efforts to form interest groups. Madsen (Madsen, 2018) examined the role of internal social media. Madsen distinguished three types: a quiet arena; a knowledge-sharing arena; and a participatory arena. "Participatory communication capable of changing the organisation only develops when co-workers perceive that they have a license to critique."

Sobo (Sobo & Sadler, 2002) describes a project to improve morale in one hospital by fostering employees' constructive expression of dissatisfaction and of innovative ideas to senior leaders in the context of Employee Leadership Council meetings.

One researcher found that a quarter of middle managers did not "feel free to express their views in terms of emotional and intellectual capital that could contribute to enhanced quality assurance and other measurable performance assets." Half of employees think that a lack of openness about how decisions are made and little employee input contributes to ineffective workplace practices. Timming (Timming & Johnstone, 2015) argued that some employees reject participation in decision-making on principle, preferring to defer to managerial authority and remain silent. Potentially fascistic personalities could be expected to derive pleasure in submission to the will of management.

Failure of open-voice systems can exacerbate employees' feelings of unfairness and discontent - 'open-door,' policies are particularly susceptible to this happening.

Upward feedback is rare and when it does occur it can be inaccurately positive. Senior managers are often unaware of such distortions and unwilling to contemplate the possibility that they exist. Senior managers have an exaggerated impression of how much feedback they receive and discourage the transmission of critical feedback. Managers often disregard what is already muted criticism and employees often suppress it in the first place. Rotteau (Rotteau, Shojania, & Webster, 2014) carried out a qualitative study of senior leaders' safety walkrounds. She found that senior leaders tended to regard executive visibility as an end in itself and

generally did not engage with staff beyond the walkround encounter. Some senior leaders believed they understood patient-safety issues better than front-line staff, and even characterised staff concerns as ‘stupid.’ Senior leaders acknowledged they often controlled the conversations, delimiting what counted as patient-safety problems and sometimes even steered the conversations to predetermined topics. A systematic review by Mauro (Mauro, 2016) concluded that “Organisation[s] may encourage input from below, but voice will remain silent without a conscious effort by management to diminish the perceived risk and futility of upward voice behaviour.” Donovan (Donovan, O’Sullivan, Doyle, & Garvey, 2016) found that management expressed willingness to act on employee voice on workplace problems concerning business improvements and employee performance but were very resistant to voice in regard to a change in working conditions or a manager’s performance. Employees and management couched employee voice in terms of technical knowledge exchange rather than being associated with employee dissatisfaction or having a say in decision making.

Allen (Allen, Yoerger, Lehmann-Willenbrock, & Jones, 2015) found that counter-productive meeting behaviour – engaging in irrelevant discussion, complaining about other attendees, arriving late etc – was negatively related to employee voice. This relationship was even stronger among people who went to relatively few meetings.

It has been argued that the target culture of the NHS precludes the development of effective voice mechanisms.

Employee surveys can be useful but employees should:

- Know their objectives
- Use employee-centric and performance-centric survey topics
- Start with the end in mind
- Invest organisational effort accordingly

Being a responsive and approachable supervisor encourages people to use employee voice whilst power distance reduced their tendency to speak up. Ethical leadership encourages voice behaviour by creating psychological safety even if leaders’ motivations are Machiavellian. Leader openness and psychological safety have both been identified as important factors in increasing employee voice in reviews of the evidence. Coaching leadership can also increase employee voice. Employees’ critical thinking and leaders’ inspirational motivation have also been linked to higher employee voice.

Adelman (Adelman, 2010) studied CEO behaviours and actions that promoted employee voice and upward communication in performance excellence award-winning health-care organisations. Her results suggested that award-winning CEOs facilitated employee voice and upward communication by being approachable, largely achieved through their regular presence throughout their organisation. By being consistently visible and available to employees, these CEOs fostered relationships, built trust, and promoted open, upward communication. Leaders created a cultural focus on continuous improvement largely built around transparency of information, and particularly looking for the bad news from their employees. Voice invitation and positive voice response from leaders reinforced critical upward feedback as not only welcome, but expected. Transformational – particularly individual consideration, empowering and servant leadership can create a climate in which people feel freer to speak up and make

suggestions. However, authoritarian leadership can reduce employee voice as does narcissism among supervisors and managers.

People who received less-favourable appraisals can be more reluctant to make their voices heard subsequently. Job insecurity has also been shown to reduce employee voice as can breaches of the psychological contract between employers and staff.

Conscientiousness and emotional stability are the strongest predictors of employees' voice behaviour.

Edmondson (Edmondson & Munchus, 2007) identified four dissent strategies: organisational silence; organisational rumbling; organisational communication and organisational blasting.

Van Buren (Van Buren & Greenwood, 2008) argued that employee voice had been 'turned down,' by the changing nature of the work; employer preferences for employee flexibility and change in public policy and institutional systems that have failed to protect workers.

Leader-member exchange (LMX)

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) often develops in the first few weeks of a leader-follower relationship. Perceived similarity and liking are important factors as is followers' extraversion. Other important factors include:

- Socioeconomic differences
- Power differences
- Racial similarity

LMX has been linked to:

- Job performance
- Satisfaction with supervision
- Overall satisfaction
- Commitment
- Role conflict
- Role clarity
- Member competence
- Turnover intentions
- Delegation
- Being an 'inner-circle,' manager
- Interpersonal trust
- Similar views on the Protestant work ethic
- Similar preference for work environment
- Higher levels of organisational citizenship
- Reduced "retaliation behaviour."
- A reduced risk of burnout
- More flexible, family-friendly working
- Reduced work interference with family life
- Leading by example

- Competence
- Autonomy
- Relatedness
- Emotional intelligence
- Improved creativity

However, if LMX is different between a manager and different subordinates it can lead to a perception of unfairness and *reduced* job satisfaction and wellbeing. And it's better for performance if followers underestimate the quality of their relationship with their manager than if they think it's better than it is. Favouritism by the leader and the reliance on impression management by followers can lead to dysfunctional LMX which can, in turn, lead to negative reactions from group members and undermine work-group cohesiveness.

Evidence Review

Scandura (Scandura & Graen, 1984) found that a group who had initially low levels of leader-member exchange (LMX) benefitted most from a leadership intervention in terms of productivity, job satisfaction, and supervisor satisfaction.

Employee voice consists of two elements: the expression by employees to management of their complaints in a work-related context and the participation of employees in the decision-making processes of organisations (McCabe & Lewin, 1992)

Redman (Redman & Snape, 1992) discusses the issues around upward appraisal. It can generate problems around fairness, morale and acceptability. It has the potential to benefit employees by bringing their views and problems to the attention of senior management but unions can feel marginalised and some managers may find the initial experience of upward appraisal rather disturbing.

Liden (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993) found that leader and member expectations of each other assessed in the first five days predicted LMXs at two weeks and six weeks following the first day of the dyads' existence. Member expectations of leaders also predicted LMXs at six months. Perceived similarity and liking from both leaders' and members' perspectives predicted LMXs at most time periods.

Phillips (Phillips & Bedeian, 1994) studied 84 registered nurses and their supervisors and found that leaders' perceptions of leader-follower attitudinal similarity and follower extraversion were positively related to the quality of leader-follower exchanges.

Borchgrevink (Borchgrevink, 1995) found that socioeconomic differences and power differences were related to LMX which in turn influenced the communicative relationship. Racial similarity was also found to be positively related to communication.

Gerstner (Gerstner & Day, 1997) found that there were significant relationships between LMX and job performance, satisfaction with supervision, overall satisfaction, commitment, role conflict, role clarity, member competence, and turnover intentions.

Hughes (Hughes, 1997) found that liking and similarity accounted for a large portion of the variance in LMX

Schriesheim (Schriesheim, Neider, & Scandura, 1998) found that both subordinate and supervisor LMX were significantly related to delegation and had similar effects on subordinates' performance and satisfaction.

Janssen (Janssen, de Vries, & Cozijnsen, 1998) found that innovatively predisposed police officers were less likely to voice conventional ideas and more likely to voice innovative ones than adaptively-disposed ones. Employees' likelihood to voice ideas was linked to work satisfaction and "quality of the supervisor as voice manager."

Bishop (Bishop & Levine, 1999) found that computer-mediated communication enhanced employees' ability to express their views and participate in decision-making. Two features facilitated this: the fact that discussions could be broadcast company wide and employees' efforts to form interest groups.

In a sample of 195 nurse managers Goetze (Goetze, 1999) found that those deemed to be inner-circle managers had higher LMX and self-esteem.

Martin (Martin, 1999) found that there was a positive relationship between the quality of LMX and interpersonal trust. "For both leaders and members integrity was found to be more important than either ability or benevolence in developing interpersonal trust."

Dose (Dose, 1999) found that perceived similarity on the Protestant work ethic and preference for work environment were positively related to LMX

Oliver (Oliver, 2000) reported that a quarter of middle managers did not "feel free to express their views in terms of emotional and intellectual capital that could contribute to enhanced quality assurance and other measurable performance assets."

Morrison (Morrison & Milliken, 2000) discusses the conditions that create "organisational silence," and organisational silence's consequences.

Townsend (Townsend, Phillips, & Elkins, 2000) found that performance and citizenship were positively related to LMX and that LMX was negatively correlated with "retaliation behaviour." Subordinates in poor exchange relationships were more likely to engage in retaliation against the organisation than subordinates in high-quality relationships.

Maslyn (Maslyn & Uhl-Bien, 2001) found that for both managers and subordinates, higher-quality LMX relationships were reported and expectations met when the other member of the dyad put forth effort into relationship development. One's own higher effort coupled with lower effort by the other was associated with a lower-quality LMX relationship.

Harlos (Harlos, 2001) studied what happened when organisational voice systems failed finding they could exacerbate employees' perceptions of unfairness and discontent. She referred to this as 'deaf-ear syndrome,' and found that informal systems, namely open-door policies, were particularly susceptible to failure.

Sobo (Sobo & Sadler, 2002) describes a project to improve morale in one hospital by fostering employees' constructive expression of dissatisfaction and of innovative ideas to senior leaders in the context of Employee Leadership Council meetings.

Tourish (Tourish & Robson, 2003) studied upward feedback in a sample of 146 employees in a health-care organisation. He found that informal upward feedback was mostly absent; that

where it occurred the feedback was inaccurately positive, that senior managers were unaware of such distortions and unwilling to contemplate the possibility that they existed; that they had an exaggerated impression of how much upward feedback they received and that they discouraged the transmission of critical feedback. Tourish later argued (Tourish & Robson, 2006) that “there has been little examination of the sensemaking heuristics employed by both managers and non-managerial staff that stimulates the former to disregard much of the already muted critical communication they receive and the latter to suppress its transmission in the first place. This leads to the consequent elimination of critical upward communication.

Hepperlen (Hepperlen, 2003) found that LMX significantly predicted employee needs fulfilment. Needs fulfilment was found to mediate the association between LMX and job satisfaction and LMX and affective wellbeing in the workplace.

Bach (Bach, 2004) argued that the target culture of the NHS precluded the development of effective voice mechanisms.

Lo (Lo, Ramayah, & Jerome Kueh Swee, 2006) found that LMX had a significant impact on organisational citizenship behaviour performed by subordinates.

Wiley (Wiley, Brooks, & Lundby, 2006) discusses employee surveys. He argues that employees can “serve as keen observers of the effectiveness of their workgroups and the customer-service environment.” To make the most of employee surveys employers should: 1. Know their objectives. 2. Use employee-centric and performance-centric survey topics. 3. Start with the end in mind. 4. Invest organisational effort accordingly.

In a study of LMX scores Larson (Larson, 2007) found that higher LMX scores led to a lower risk of burnout

Ilies (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007) found a moderately strong, positive relationship between LMX and citizenship behaviours. LMX predicted individual-targeted behaviours more strongly than it predicted organisational targeted behaviours.

Hooper (Hooper & Martin, 2007) found that fostering different quality LMXs within a team ran counter to rules of consistency, which are important for maintaining perceptions of procedural fairness. “Leaders may need to be cautious about fostering very high-quality relationships with only a select subset of followers.” Hooper (Hooper & Martin, 2008) later found that a person’s perception of LMX variability in their team was negatively related to employee job satisfaction and wellbeing.

Erdogan (Erdogan & Enders, 2007) studied 210 subordinates and 38 supervisors of a grocery store chain. The positive relationship between LMX and job satisfaction was stronger when supervisors had higher perceived organisational support. LMX was related to performance only when supervisors had high perceived organisational support.

Fuller (Fuller, Barnett, Hester, Relyea, & Frey, 2007) found that people who were keen to manage the impression they made engaged in voice behaviour when they had received positive performance ratings but refrained from engaging in voice behaviour when they had received less-favourable appraisals. The voice behaviour of people who were less bothered about impression management was largely unaffected by their past performance ratings.

Bernerth (Bernerth, Armenakis, Feild, Giles, & Walker, 2007) studied the links between personality and LMX. He found that employees' conscientiousness, extroversion, openness and neuroticism all affected perceptions of LMX. For supervisors conscientiousness and agreeableness also affected employees' perceptions of LMX.

Edmondson (Edmondson & Munchus, 2007) argued that levels of trust and sense of urgency impel employees to voice opposition using four dissent strategies: organisational silence; organisational rumbling; organisational communication and organisational blasting. "Decision makers should be better equipped to identify and manage dissent strategies before they cause harm within their organisations."

Ansari (Ansari, Daisy Kee Mui, & Aafaqi, 2007) found that professional respect mediated the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment and turnover intentions.

Schyns (Schyns & Wolfram, 2008) found that follower-rated LMX was related to followers' attitudes and followers' wellbeing whereas leader-rated LMX was related to the performance of the group.

Van Buren (Van Buren & Greenwood, 2008) argued that employee voice had been 'turned down,' by the changing nature of the work; employer preferences for employee flexibility and change in public policy and institutional systems that have failed to protect workers.

Nikolaou (Nikolaou, Vakola, & Bourantas, 2008) found that conscientiousness and emotional stability were the strongest predictors of employees' voice behaviour.

Scandura (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2008) concluded that trust "~~appears to be vulnerable even in~~ high-quality LMX relations."

Landau (Landau, 2009) found that voice propensity was positively related to being a supervisor, self-efficacy, and having a supervisor who was responsive and approachable. Voice propensity was negatively related to high power distance.

Kacmar (Kacmar, Harris, Carlson, & Zivnuska, 2009) found that a common perspective, receptiveness and liking were more important for the development of LMX than superficial demographic similarity.

Cogliser (Cogliser, Schriesheim, Scandura, & Gardner, 2009) studied four types of LMX. 1) Where both leader and follower thought LMX was high quality 2) Where both leader and follower thought LMX was low quality 3) Where the leader thought the relationship was good and the follower didn't (follower underestimation) 4) Where the follower thought the relationship was good and the leader didn't (follower overestimation). She found that high and low-quality relationships were associated with high and low follower job performance, organisational commitment and job satisfaction. Follower underestimation was related to high levels of follower job performance whereas follower overestimation was associated with high levels of follower satisfaction and organisational commitment.

Sin (Sin, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2009) found that the extent of LMX agreement between leaders and subordinates increased as the length of relationship tenure and intensity of dyadic interaction increased.

Walumbwa (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009) found that ethical leadership influenced followers' voice behaviour as rated by followers' immediate supervisors, a relationship that was partially mediated by followers' perceptions of psychological safety.

Detert (Detert & Treviño, 2010) found that "a broad spectrum of leaders from supervisors to senior managers influences individual employee voice perceptions in both direct and indirect ways."

Othman (Othman, Ee, & Shi, 2010) reviewed the literature and found that favouritism by the leader and the reliance on impression management by followers can lead to dysfunctional LMX which can, in turn, lead to negative reactions from group members and undermine work-group cohesiveness.

Adelman (Adelman, 2010) studied CEO behaviours and actions that promoted employee voice and upward communication in performance excellence award-winning health-care organisations. Her results suggested that award-winning CEOs facilitated employee voice and upward communication by being approachable, largely achieved through their regular presence throughout their organisation. By being consistently visible and available to employees, these CEOs fostered relationships, built trust, and promoted open, upward communication. Leaders created a cultural focus on continuous improvement largely built around transparency of information, and particularly looking for the bad news from their employees. Voice invitation and positive voice response from leaders reinforced critical upward feedback as not only welcome, but expected.

Markham (Markham, Yammarino, Murry, & Palanski, 2010) found that LMX and performance were most strongly related and displayed the strongest dyadic-level effects when superior and subordinate assessments of LMX and values are in agreement.

Venkataramani (Venkataramani, Green, & Schleicher, 2010) found that leaders who had higher quality relationships with their bosses and who were more central in their peer networks were perceived by their subordinates as having greater status in the organisation and, therefore, were able to form higher quality relationships with them. The effects of the leaders' perceived status on LMX were stronger when subordinates were less central in their own peer network.

Erdogan (Erdogan & Bauer, 2010) found that LMX differentiation was related to more negative work attitudes and co-worker relations, and higher levels of withdrawal behaviours *only* when justice climate was low.

Morrison (Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011) found that group voice climate was highly predictive of voice and explained variance beyond the effects of individual-level identification and satisfaction, and procedural justice climate. The effect of identification on voice was stronger in groups with favourable voice climates. "Voice is shaped not just by individual attitudes and perceptions of ... work ... but also by group-level beliefs."

Major found that high-quality LMX could help with the development of family-friendly work roles, use of organisational family-friendly policies, and the negotiation of flextime and flexplace accommodations. (Major & Morganson, 2011)

Sumanth (Sumanth, 2011) found that both highly exclusive and highly inclusive leaders negatively influenced the quality of comments upwards people provided.

Carioti (Carioti, 2011) found that transformational leadership helped to create an organisational atmosphere that was an incubator for employees to bring forward opportunistic ideas and suggestions for process improvement. The most important aspect of transformational leadership was individual consideration.

O'Donnell (O'Donnell, Yukl, & Taber, 2012) found that supporting, delegating and leading by example were statistically-significant predictors of LMX.

Avey (Avey, Wernsing, & Palanski, 2012) found that employee voice mediated the relationship between ethical leadership and psychological wellbeing

Hsiung (Hsiung, 2012) found that employee positive mood and LMX quality mediated the relationship between authentic leadership and voice behaviour.

Brotherton (Brotherton, 2012) reported a survey which found that half of employees thought that a lack of openness about how decisions were made and little employee input contributed to ineffective workplace practices.

Lawrence (Lawrence & Kacmar, 2012) found that role conflict and job involvement partially mediated the relationship between LMX and stress.

Gajendran (Gajendran & Joshi, 2012) found that LMX could enhance member influence on team decisions when it was sustained through frequent leader-member communication. The effect was strengthened as team dispersal increased. At the team level member influence on team decisions had a positive effect on team innovation.

Rockstuhl (Rockstuhl, Dulebohn, Ang, & Shore, 2012) carried out a meta-analysis of 282 studies covering 68,587 people in 23 countries. Relationships between LMX and organisational citizenship behaviour, justice perceptions, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and leader trust were stronger in Western, more individualistic countries. However, national culture did not affect the relationship between LMX and task performance, organisational commitment and transformational leadership.

Burris (Burris, Detert, & Romney, 2013) studied 7,578 employees and 335 managers in a national restaurant chain. He found that agreement between employees and managers that employees display a high level of voice led to favourable outcomes for employees. Negative outcomes arose when employees overestimated their voice relative to their manager's perspective and positive outcomes resulted when employees underestimated their upward voice.

In a study of 225 employees Schermuly (Schermuly, Meyer, & Dämmer, 2013) found that empowerment mediated the effect of LMX on innovative behaviour.

Boichuk (Boichuk & Menguc, 2013) found that supervisor support for employee's voice only led to creative solutions from dissatisfied employees if the employee's commitment to continuing in the job was high.

Graves (Graves & Luciano, 2013) found that employee's perception of the quality of LMX was positively related to satisfaction of the needs for competence, autonomy and relatedness.

Tse (Tse, Lam, Lawrence, & Huang, 2013) found that when employees had dissimilar levels of LMX those with high levels of social comparison felt contempt for one another and felt that they got less help from one another.

Johnson (Johnson, 2014) found that emotional intelligence was related to LMX

In a study of 108 acute-care nurses Boyle (Boyle, 2014) found that managerial approachability and prosocial voice were positively correlated. Nurses use of prosocial voice was positively correlated with their level in the organisation but negatively correlated with their perception of managerial responsiveness.

Ditchburn (Ditchburn & Hames, 2014) found that voice encouragement was positively associated with work engagement and affective organisational commitment, while voice climate efficacy was positively related to work engagement.

Xie (Xie, Chu, Zhang, & Huang, 2014) found that voice self-efficacy partially mediated the relationship between proactive personality and voice behaviour.

Li (A. N. Li & Liao, 2014) found that at the individual level LMX quality positively contributed to customer-rated employee performance through enhancing employee role engagement. At the team level LMX differentiation exerted negative influence on teams' financial performance through disrupting team coordination. LMX differentiation also strengthened the relationship between LMX quality and role engagement.

Rotteau (Rotteau et al., 2014) carried out a qualitative study of senior leaders' safety walkrounds. She found that senior leaders tended to regard executive visibility as an end in itself and generally did not engage with staff beyond the walkround encounter. Some senior leaders believed they understood patient-safety issues better than front-line staff, and even characterised staff concerns as 'stupid.' Senior leaders acknowledged they often controlled the conversations, delimiting what counted as patient-safety problems and sometimes even steered the conversations to predetermined topics.

Huang (Huang, Wang, & Xie, 2014) found that followers' identification with the leader mediated the influence of LMX on organisational citizenship behaviour. The relationship was stronger for people scoring high on perceived group leader's reputation than it was for those scoring low.

Tucker (Tucker & Turner, 2015) studied safety voice among younger workers. He found that people who were more likely to have ideas about how to improve safety and had high affective commitment to the organisation reported the highest level of safety voice. Supervisor openness to voice moderated the relationship between safety voice and future work-related injuries. Future work-related injuries were most frequent when high levels of safety voice were combined with low supervisor openness to voice.

Timming (Timming & Johnstone, 2015) argued that some employees reject participation in decision-making on principle, preferring to defer to managerial authority and remain silent. Potentially fascistic personalities could be expected to derive pleasure in submission to the will of management.

Schreurs (Schreurs, Guenter, Im, & De Cuyper, 2015) found that felt job insecurity negatively affected voice among both high- and low-punishment sensitive people. Felt job insecurity was also negatively related to voice in both high- and low-reward-sensitive people.

Allen (Allen et al., 2015) found that counter-productive meeting behaviour – engaging in irrelevant discussion, complaining about other attendees, arriving late etc – was negatively related to employee voice. This relationship was even stronger among people who went to relatively few meetings.

Liden (Liden, Wu, Cao, & Wayne, 2016) presents an overview of LMX measurement

Kahrobaei (Kahrobaei & Mortazavi, 2016) found that, in teams, LMX indirectly affects involvement in creative work via affective, cognitive and behavioural energies

Wharton (Wharton, 2016) reviewed 57 research studies and found that leader openness and psychological safety were the most salient voice antecedents.

A systematic review by Mauro (Mauro, 2016) found that managers did attribute voice behaviours that challenged or supported the status quo as a relative measure (positive vs negative) influencing the evaluation of an employee's performance. However, employee perceptions of managerial behaviours in response to their voice behaviours often contrasted with those of management. These contrasting perceptions lead to inaccuracies concerning the intent of the message by the manager and judgements concerning the risk and futility of speaking up by employees. "Organisation[s] may encourage input from below, but voice will remain silent without a conscious effort by management to diminish the perceived risk and futility of upward voice behaviour."

Svendsen (Svendsen & Joensson, 2016) found that transformational leadership had no effect on change-related voice although there was an indirect effect via affective commitment to change.

Wang (D. Wang, Gan, & Wu, 2016) found that psychological empowerment mediated the positive relationship between LMX and employee voice and that stronger role clarity strengthened this indirect relationship.

Donovan (Donovan et al., 2016) found that employees on training contacts had a high propensity to remain silent on workplace problems. Quiescent and acquiescent forms of silence were evident. Management expressed willingness to act on employee voice on workplace problems concerning business improvements and employee performance but were very resistant to voice in regard to a change in working conditions or a manager's performance. Employees and management couched employee voice in terms of technical knowledge exchange rather than being associated with employee dissatisfaction or having a say in decision making.

Chou (Chou & Barron, 2016) argued that employee voice behaviour can be classified into self-centred vs other centred; improvement focused vs prevention focused and present-oriented vs future oriented.

Wang (Y. Wang, Yuan, & Zhu, 2017) found that coaching leadership was positively related to employee voice behaviour, and moreover, that follower psychological capital mediated the relationship between coaching leadership and employee voice behaviour.

Zhou (Zhou, Liao, Liu, & Liao, 2017) found that trust and suspicion both played significant mediating roles in the relationship between leader impression management and employee voice behaviour.

Liu (P. Liu, Chen, Wang, & Hou, 2017) found that institutionalised socialisation tactics were highly correlated with newcomer adjustment and voice behaviour.

Guo (Guo, 2017) found that psychological contract breach was negatively associated with employees' promotive and prohibitive voice. In addition, organisational trust played a completely mediating role in this relationship, and managerial openness moderated the relationship between organisational trust and employees' promotive and prohibitive voice.

Kwak (Kwak & Shim, 2017) found that Machiavellian supervisors' ethical leader behaviours were seen as genuine by subordinate employees, and that ethical leadership promoted supervisors' extra-role voice behaviours. The effects of Machiavellian supervisors' ethical leader behaviours on employee voice were intensified in the particular organisational context of higher vs lower employee power distance orientation.

Maslyn (Maslyn, Schyns, & Farmer, 2017) examined the links between attachment style and LMX. Secure and anxious attachment styles were associated with LMX only by affecting the exertion of effort specifically aimed at relationship development with the manager. An avoidant attachment style was directly and negatively linked to LMX but not associated with effort undertaken to build a high-quality relationship.

Hsi-An Shih (Hsi-An & Nikodemus Hans Setiadi, 2017) found positive effects of team member exchange (TMX) on both voice behaviour and creative work involvement. A positive effect of voice behaviour on creative work involvement was found. Voice behaviour partially mediated the relationship between TMX and creative work involvement.

Duan (Duan, Li, Xu, & Wu, 2017) found that leaders' voice expectation and employees' voice role perception mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and voice behaviour.

Morganson (Morganson, Major, & Litano, 2017) found that high LMX was linked to reduced work interference with family; perceptions of managerial support; perceived career consequences; and organisational time demands. However, the benefits of high LMX were attenuated in the presence of low work-group LMX for all outcomes except managerial support.

Jiang (Jiang, Gao, & Yang, 2018) found that employees' critical thinking and leaders' inspirational motivation both had a positive effect on employees' voice and that voice efficacy mediated the relationship among employers' critical thinking, leaders' inspirational motivation, and employees' voice.

Duan (Duan, Bao, Huang, & Brinsfield, 2018) studied authoritarian leadership and employee silence. Authoritarian leadership had a positive relationship with employee silence behaviour. Both psychological safety and organisation-based self-esteem partially mediated the relationship between authoritarian leadership and employee silence. The relationship between authoritarian leadership and employee silence was stronger for employees with high (as opposed to low) power-distance orientation. The mediating effects of both psychological safety and organisation-based self-esteem were stronger for employees with low power-distance orientation.

Wang (Y. Wang, Zheng, & Zhu, 2018) found that psychological capital fully mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and voice behaviour. The effect of psychological capital was stronger when organisational identification was higher.

Wang (H.-Q. Wang, Zhang, Ding, & Cheng, 2018) found that supervisor narcissism had a significant positive impact on employee silence, and negative anticipations played a partial mediating role between them. The positive correlation between supervisor narcissism and negative anticipations was stronger when LMX was low and weaker when LMX was high.

Ding (Ding, Li, Quan, & Wang, 2018) found a significant negative relationship between supervisor narcissism and employee prohibitive voice, with the relationship being mediated by employee voice efficacy.

Li (H. Li, Huang, Shu, & Liu, 2018) found that empowering leader behaviour promoted employee prosocial voice via organisational citizenship behaviours towards individuals, whereas it prohibited employee acquiescent voice and defensive voice via task performance. Work stress attenuated empowering leader behaviour's indirect effect on prosocial voice via organisational citizenship behaviours towards individuals, whereas it augmented empowering leader behaviour's indirect effects on employee acquiescent voice and defensive voice via task performance, respectively.

Lapointe (Lapointe & Vandenberghe, 2018) found that affective commitment mediated a positive relationship between servant leadership and voice behaviours.

Chen (Chen, Wang, & Lee, 2018) found that perceiving work as meaningful was positively related to promotive and prohibitive voice behaviours. Employees who saw their work as meaningful were found to fully mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and promotive voice behaviour but not prohibitive voice behaviour.

Subhakaran (Subhakaran & Dyaram, 2018) found a significant positive effect of employee proactive personality and manager pro-voice behaviour on employee upward voice. These links were significantly mediated by employee voice efficacy.

Madsen (Madsen, 2018) examined the role of internal social media. Madsen distinguished three types: a quiet arena; a knowledge-sharing arena; and a participatory arena. "Participatory communication capable of changing the organisation only develops when co-workers perceive that they have a license to critique."

Lin (Lin, Ma, Zhang, Jenny Chen, & Jiang, 2018) found that benevolent leadership worked through LMX to improve employee creativity. This effect was stronger for employees high in power-distance orientation.

Muldoon (Muldoon, Keough, & Lovett, 2018) found that organisational change, perceptions of politics, and interpersonal conflict at work all mediated the relationship between LMX and turnover intention.

Emelifeonwu (Emelifeonwu & Valk, 2019) found that fear of victimization and the state of the labour market could result in employee silence.

Robinson (Robinson, 2019) argued that supervisor relationships are the main factor determining whether public-sector employees share ideas or remain silent and that employees do not feel comfortable speaking to those above them about any issues or concerns.

He (He & Feng, 2019) found that leader behavioural integrity positively affected employee voice via team independence climate but only when ethical values are emphasised in organisations.

Islam (Islam, Ahmed, & Ali, 2019) found that ethical leadership had a positive and significant effect on both organisational identification and voice behaviour but a *negative* and significant effect on workload, poor working conditions and bullying.

Son (Son, 2019) found that perceived supervisor's voice behaviour was positively related to an employee's own voice behaviour and trust in supervisors. In particular, trust in supervisors mediates the relationship between perceived supervisor's voice behaviour and employee's own voice behaviour. The relationship between trust in supervisor and employees' voice behaviour was stronger for female employees.

Liu (F. Liu, Irene Hau-Siu, Gong, & Huang, 2019) examined the role of humour. Affiliative humour had a positive indirect effect on employee voice through LMX and subsequently through organisational identification, while leader aggressive humour had a negative indirect effect on employee voice through LMX and subsequently through organisational identification.

Zhao (Zhao, Liu, Li, & Yu, 2019) found that LMX was negatively related to evasive hiding and playing dumb but not to rationalised hiding.

Umamaheswara (Umamaheswara Rao & Mukhopadhyay, 2019) found that empowering leadership was best at promoting high-quality LMX and "promotive and prohibitive," voice over transformational and ethical leadership.

Adelman, K. S. (2010). *Employee voice and upward communication: A phenomenological collective case study of leadership behaviors in performance excellence award winning health organizations*. (3427805 Ph.D.), Capella University, Ann Arbor. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/815412227?accountid=48232> Health Research Premium Collection database.

Allen, J. A., Yoerger, M. A., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Jones, J. (2015). Would you please stop that!? *The Journal of Management Development*, 34(10), 1272-1287.

Ansari, M. A., Daisy Kee Mui, H., & Aafaqi, R. (2007). Leader-member exchange and attitudinal outcomes: role of procedural justice climate. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28(8), 690-709. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730710835443>

Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Palanski, M. E. (2012). Exploring the Process of Ethical Leadership: The Mediating Role of Employee Voice and Psychological Ownership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(1), 21-34. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1298-2>

Bach, S. (2004). Employee participation and union voice in the National Health Service. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 14(2), 3-19.

Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., Giles, W. F., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Is personality associated with perceptions of LMX? An empirical study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28(7), 613-631. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730710823879>

Bishop, L., & Levine, D. I. (1999). Computer-mediated communication as employee voice: A case study. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 52(2), 213-233.

Boichuk, J. P., & Menguc, B. (2013). Engaging Dissatisfied Retail Employees to Voice Promotive Ideas: The Role of Continuance Commitment. *Journal of Retailing*, 89(2), 207-218. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2013.01.001>

- Borchgrevink, C. P. (1995). *Antecedents of leader-member exchange*. (AAM9512021), Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/618745216?accountid=48232> PsycINFO database.
- Boyle, L. L. (2014). *Relationship between managerial responsiveness, managerial approachability, and prosocial voice among acute-care registered nurses*. (3731742 D.M.), University of Phoenix, Ann Arbor. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1734472534?accountid=48232> Health Research Premium Collection database.
- Brotherton, P. (2012). More Employee Input and Accountability Yield More Effective Practices. *T + D*, 66(5), 18.
- Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Romney, A. C. (2013). Speaking Up vs. Being Heard: The Disagreement Around and Outcomes of Employee Voice. *Organization Science*, 24(1), 22-38.
- Carioti, F. V. (2011). *A windfall of new ideas: A correlational study of transformational leadership and employee voice*. (3473155 Ph.D.), Capella University, Ann Arbor. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/894428596?accountid=48232> Health Research Premium Collection database.
- Chen, S.-J., Wang, M.-J., & Lee, S.-H. (2018). Transformational leadership and voice behaviors. *Personnel Review*, 47(3), 694-708.
- Chou, S. Y., & Barron, K. (2016). Employee voice behavior revisited: its forms and antecedents. *Management Research Review*, 39(12), 1720-1737.
- Cogliser, C. C., Schriesheim, C. A., Scandura, T. A., & Gardner, W. L. (2009). Balance in leader and follower perceptions of leader-member exchange: Relationships with performance and work attitudes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 452-465. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.03.010>
- Detert, J. R., & Treviño, L. K. (2010). Speaking Up to Higher-Ups: How Supervisors and Skip-Level Leaders Influence Employee Voice. *Organization Science*, 21(1), 249-270,306,308.
- Ding, Z.-H., Li, H.-C., Quan, L., & Wang, H.-Q. (2018). Reluctant to speak? The impact of supervisor narcissism on employee prohibitive voice. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 46(10), 1713-1726. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.7233>
- Ditchburn, G. J., & Hames, K. (2014). Voice Climate Perceptions: A Multidimensional Model as a Determinant of Affective Commitment, Work Engagement, Neglect and Exit. *The Australasian Journal of Organisational Psychology*, 7, 9. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/orp.2014.3>
- Donovan, S., O'Sullivan, M., Doyle, E., & Garvey, J. (2016). Employee voice and silence in auditing firms. *Employee Relations*, 38(4), 563-577. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ER-05-2015-0078>
- Dose, J. J. (1999). The relationship between work values similarity and team-member and leader-member exchange relationships. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 3(1), 20-32. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.3.1.20>
- Duan, J., Bao, C., Huang, C., & Brinsfield, C. T. (2018). Authoritarian leadership and employee silence in China. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 24(1), 62-80. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2016.61>
- Duan, J., Li, C., Xu, Y., & Wu, C.-h. (2017). Transformational leadership and employee voice behavior: A Pygmalion mechanism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(5), 650-670. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.2157>
- Edmondson, V. C., & Munchus, G. (2007). Managing the unwanted truth: a framework for dissent strategy. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20(6), 747-760. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534810710830993>
- Emelifeonwu, J. C., & Valk, R. (2019). Employee voice and silence in multinational corporations in the mobile telecommunications industry in Nigeria. *Employee Relations*, 41(1), 228-252. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ER-04-2017-0073>

- Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2010). Differentiated leader–member exchanges: The buffering role of justice climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(6), 1104-1120.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020578>
- Erdogan, B., & Enders, J. (2007). Support from the top: Supervisors' perceived organizational support as a moderator of leader-member exchange to satisfaction and performance relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 321-330. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.321>
- Fuller, J. B., Barnett, T., Hester, K., Relyea, C., & Frey, L. (2007). An Exploratory Examination of Voice Behavior from an Impression Management Perspective. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 19*(1), 134-151,139-110.
- Gajendran, R. S., & Joshi, A. (2012). Innovation in globally distributed teams: The role of LMX, communication frequency, and member influence on team decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(6), 1252-1261. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0028958>
- 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:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.827>
- Goetze, C. M. (1999). *The relationships among inner and outer circle membership in nurse managers and leader-member exchange, self-esteem, and mutuality.* (9930039 Ph.D.), Adelphi University, Ann Arbor. Retrieved from
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/304490722?accountid=48232> Health Research Premium Collection database.
- Graves, L. M., & Luciano, M. M. (2013). Self-determination at work: Understanding the role of leader-member exchange. *Motivation and Emotion, 37*(3), 518-536.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11031-012-9336-z>
- Guo, Y. (2017). Effect of psychological contract breach on employee voice behaviour: evidence from China. *Social Behavior and Personality, 45*(6), 1019-1028.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6326>
- Harlos, K. P. (2001). When organizational voice systems fail: More on the deaf-ear syndrome and frustration effects. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 37*(3), 324-342.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0021886301373005>
- He, P., & Feng, W. (2019). How and When Does Leader Behavioral Integrity Influence Employee Voice? The Roles of Team Independence Climate and Corporate Ethical Values. *Journal of Business Ethics, 1-17*. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04114-x>
- Hepperlen, T. M. (2003). *Leader-member exchange (LMX) or fulfillment? The role of basic psychological needs in LMX relationships.* (AAI3074080), Retrieved from
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/620241792?accountid=48232> PsycINFO database.
- Hooper, D. T., & Martin, R. (2007). Measuring perceived LMX variability within teams and its impact on procedural justice climate. In A. I. Glendon, B. M. Thompson, & B. Myers (Eds.), *Advances in organisational psychology* (pp. 249-267, Chapter xii, 524 Pages): Australian Academic Press, Bowen Hills, QLD.
- Hooper, D. T., & Martin, R. (2008). Beyond personal Leader--Member Exchange (LMX) quality: The effects of perceived LMX variability on employee reactions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(1), 20-30. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.12.002>
- Hsi-An, S., & Nikodemus Hans Setiadi, W. (2017). Team-member exchange, voice behavior, and creative work involvement. *International Journal of Manpower, 38*(3), 417-431.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJM-09-2015-0139>
- Hsiung, H.-h. (2012). Authentic Leadership and Employee Voice Behavior: A Multi-Level Psychological Process. *Journal of Business Ethics, 107*(3), 349-361. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1043-2>

- Huang, J., Wang, L., & Xie, J. (2014). Leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior: the roles of identification with leader and leader's reputation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42(10), 1699-1711. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.10.1699>
- Hughes, S. A. (1997). *Transformational leadership, leader-member exchange, and the effects of leader/member similarity and liking*. (AAM9735931), Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/619261298?accountid=48232> PsycINFO database.
- Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 269-277. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.269>
- Islam, T., Ahmed, I., & Ali, G. (2019). Effects of ethical leadership on bullying and voice behavior among nurses. *Leadership in Health Services*, 32(1), 2-17. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/LHS-02-2017-0006>
- Janssen, O., de Vries, T., & Cozijnsen, A. J. (1998). Voicing by adapting and innovating employees: An empirical study on how personality and environment interact to affect voice behavior. *Human Relations*, 51(7), 945-967.
- Jiang, J., Gao, A., & Yang, B. (2018). Employees' critical thinking, leaders' inspirational motivation, and voice behavior: The mediating role of voice efficacy. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 17(1), 33-41. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000193>
- Johnson, L. M. (2014). *Emotional intelligence and leader-member exchange: Do emotional competencies matter?* (AAI3602340), Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1614374732?accountid=48232> PsycINFO database.
- Kacmar, K. M., Harris, K. J., Carlson, D. S., & Zivnuska, S. (2009). Surface-Level Actual Similarity Vs. Deep-Level Perceived Similarity: Predicting Leader-Member Exchange Agreement. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 10(3), 315-334.
- Kahrobaei, S., & Mortazavi, S. (2016). How leader-member exchange can uplift team's energy to increase creative work involvement. *Team Performance Management*, 22(1/2), 75-91.
- Kwak, W. J., & Shim, J. H. (2017). Effects of Machiavellian ethical leadership and employee power distance on employee voice. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 45(9), 1485-1498. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.5896>
- Landau, J. (2009). To speak or not to speak: predictors of voice propensity. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 13(1), 35-54.
- Lapointe, É., & Vandenberghe, C. (2018). Examination of the Relationships Between Servant Leadership, Organizational Commitment, and Voice and Antisocial Behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(1), 99-115. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-3002-9>
- Larson, J. E. (2007). *The relationship between leader member exchange and burnout in psychiatric rehabilitation workers*. (3231923 Ed.D.), Roosevelt University, Ann Arbor. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/304721208?accountid=48232> Health Research Premium Collection database.
- Lawrence, E. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (2012). Leader-Member Exchange and Stress: The Mediating Role of Job Involvement and Role Conflict. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 14(1), 39-52.
- Li, A. N., & Liao, H. (2014). How do leader-member exchange quality and differentiation affect performance in teams? An integrated multilevel dual process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(5), 847-866. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037233>
- Li, H., Huang, S., Shu, J., & Liu, C. (2018). Employee work performance mediates empowering leaders behavior and employee voice. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 46(12), 1997-2008. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.7124>
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Stilwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 662-674. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.662>

- Liden, R. C., Wu, J., Cao, A. X., & Wayne, S. J. (2016). Leader-member exchange measurement. In T. N. Bauer & B. Erdogan (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of leader-member exchange* (pp. 29-54, Chapter xviii, 435 Pages): Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Lin, W., Ma, J., Zhang, Q., Jenny Chen, L., & Jiang, F. (2018). How is Benevolent Leadership Linked to Employee Creativity? The Mediating Role of Leader–Member Exchange and the Moderating Role of Power Distance Orientation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 152(4), 1099-1115. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3314-4>
- Liu, F., Irene Hau-Siu, C., Gong, Y., & Huang, M. (2019). Affiliative and aggressive humor in leadership and their effects on employee voice: a serial mediation model. *Review of Managerial Science*, 1-19. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11846-019-00334-7>
- Liu, P., Chen, Y., Wang, X., & Hou, C. (2017). Institutionalized socialization tactics as predictor of voice behavior among new employees. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 45(10), 1595-1606. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6353>
- Lo, M. C., Ramayah, T., & Jerome Kueh Swee, H. (2006). An Investigation of Leader Member Exchange Effects on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Malaysia. *Journal of Business and Management*, 12(1), 5-23.
- Madsen, V. T. (2018). Participatory communication on internal social media – a dream or reality? *Corporate Communications*, 23(4), 614-628. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-04-2018-0039>
- Major, D. A., & Morganson, V. J. (2011). Coping with work-family conflict: A leader-member exchange perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(1), 126-138. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021727>
- Markham, S. E., Yammarino, F. J., Murry, W. D., & Palanski, M. E. (2010). Leader–member exchange, shared values, and performance: Agreement and levels of analysis do matter. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(3), 469-480. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.010>
- Martin, D. F. (1999). *The impact of trust on leader-member exchange relationships*. (9933461 Ph.D.), The University of Memphis, Ann Arbor. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/304571730?accountid=48232> Health Research Premium Collection database.
- Maslyn, J. M., Schyns, B., & Farmer, S. M. (2017). Attachment style and leader-member exchange. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(3), 450-462.
- Maslyn, J. M., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leader–member exchange and its dimensions: Effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 697-708. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.697>
- Mauro, T. R. (2016). *A Systematic Review of Employee Voice Behavior and its Effect on Managerial Controlled Outcomes*. (10275520 D.Mgt.), University of Maryland University College, Ann Arbor. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1908924551?accountid=48232> Health Research Premium Collection database.
- McCabe, D. M., & Lewin, D. (1992). Employee Voice: A Human Resource Management Perspective. *California Management Review*, 34(3), 112.
- Morganson, V. J., Major, D. A., & Litano, M. L. (2017). A Multilevel Examination of the Relationship Between Leader-Member Exchange and Work-Family Outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(4), 379-393. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9447-8>
- Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 706-725.
- Morrison, E. W., Wheeler-Smith, S. L., & Kamdar, D. (2011). Speaking up in groups: A cross-level study of group voice climate and voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 183-191. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020744>

- Muldoon, J., Keough, S. M., & Lovett, S. (2018). The mediating role of workplace attitudes on the leader–member exchange—Turnover intention relationship. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 21(4), 229-248. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000079>
- Nikolaou, I., Vakola, M., & Bourantas, D. (2008). Who speaks up at work? Dispositional influences on employees' voice behavior. *Personnel Review*, 37(6), 666-679. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483480810906892>
- O'Donnell, M., Yukl, G., & Taber, T. (2012). Leader behavior and LMX: a constructive replication. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(2), 143-154. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941211199545>
- Oliver, S. (2000). Symmetrical communication: does reality support rhetoric? *Corporate Communications*, 5(1), 26-33.
- Othman, R., Ee, F. F., & Shi, N. L. (2010). Understanding dysfunctional leader-member exchange: Antecedents and outcomes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(4), 337-350. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437731011043357>
- Phillips, A. S., & Bedeian, A. G. (1994). Leader-follower exchange quality: The role of personal and interpersonal attributes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 990.
- Redman, T., & Snape, E. (1992). Upward and onward: Can staff appraise their managers? *Personnel Review*, 21(7), 32. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483489210021044>
- Robinson, R. (2019). Are you stifling employee voice? *Talent Development*, 73(1), 38-41.
- Rockstuhl, T., Dulebohn, J. H., Ang, S., & Shore, L. M. (2012). Leader–member exchange (LMX) and culture: A meta-analysis of correlates of LMX across 23 countries. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1097-1130. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029978>
- Rotteau, L., Shojania, K. G., & Webster, F. (2014). 'I think we should just listen and get out': a qualitative exploration of views and experiences of Patient Safety Walkrounds. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 23(10), 823. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001706>
- Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader–member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 428-436. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.3.428>
- Scandura, T. A., & Pellegrini, E. K. (2008). Trust and leader-member exchange: A closer look at relational vulnerability. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15(2), 101-110. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1548051808320986>
- Schermuly, C. C., Meyer, B., & Dämmer, L. (2013). Leader-member exchange and innovative behavior: The mediating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 12(3), 132-142. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000093>
- Schreurs, B., Guenter, H., Im, J. J., & De Cuyper, N. (2015). Speaking up when feeling job insecure. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 28(6), 1107-1128. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-02-2015-0027>
- Schriesheim, C. A., Neider, L. L., & Scandura, T. A. (1998). Delegation and leader-member exchange: Main effects, moderators, and measurement issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 298-318.
- Schyns, B., & Wolfram, H.-J. (2008). The relationship between leader-member exchange and outcomes as rated by leaders and followers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(7), 631-646. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730810906362>
- Sin, H.-P., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2009). Understanding why they don't see eye to eye: An examination of leader–member exchange (LMX) agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 1048-1057. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014827>
- Sobo, E. J., & Sadler, B. L. (2002). Improving organizational communication and cohesion in a health care setting through employee-leadership exchange. *Human Organization*, 61(3), 277-287. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.17730/humo.61.3.fnk9rkekacak6mkx>
- Son, S. (2019). The role of supervisors on employees' voice behavior. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40(1), 85-96. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2018-0230>

- Subhakaran, S. E., & Dyaram, L. (2018). Individual disposition and manager behaviour on employee upward voice. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 26(5), 875-889. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-12-2017-1315>
- Sumanth, J. J. (2011). *Be careful what you ask for: How highly inclusive leaders diminish upward communication quality*. (3464994 Ph.D.), The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Ann Arbor. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/887900570?accountid=48232> Health Research Premium Collection database.
- Svendsen, M., & Joensson, T. S. (2016). Transformational leadership and change related voice behavior. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37(3), 357-368.
- Timing, A. R., & Johnstone, S. (2015). Employee silence and the authoritarian personality. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 23(1), 154-171. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-06-2013-0685>
- Tourish, D., & Robson, P. (2003). Critical upward feedback in organisations: Processes, problems and implications for communication management. *Journal of Communication Management*, 8(2), 150-167.
- Tourish, D., & Robson, P. (2006). Sensemaking and the Distortion of Critical Upward Communication in Organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(4), 711-730. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00608.x>
- Townsend, J., Phillips, J. S., & Elkins, T. J. (2000). Employee retaliation: The neglected consequence of poor leader-member exchange relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(4), 457-463. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.4.457>
- Tse, H. H. M., Lam, C. K., Lawrence, S. A., & Huang, X. (2013). When my supervisor dislikes you more than me: The effect of dissimilarity in leader-member exchange on coworkers' interpersonal emotion and perceived help. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(6), 974-988. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033862>
- Tucker, S., & Turner, N. (2015). Sometimes it hurts when supervisors don't listen: The antecedents and consequences of safety voice among young workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(1), 72-81. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037756>
- Umamaheswara Rao, J., & Mukhopadhyay, S. (2019). Understanding the effects of empowering, transformational and ethical leadership on promotive and prohibitive voice. *Personnel Review*, 48(3), 707-730. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2017-0365>
- Van Buren, H. J., & Greenwood, M. (2008). Enhancing Employee Voice: Are Voluntary Employer-Employee Partnerships Enough? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(1), 209-221. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9489-y>
- Venkataramani, V., Green, S. G., & Schleicher, D. J. (2010). Well-connected leaders: The impact of leaders' social network ties on LMX and members' work attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(6), 1071-1084. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020214>
- Walumbwa, F. O., & Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader personality traits and employee voice behavior: Mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1275-1286. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015848>
- Wang, D., Gan, C., & Wu, C. (2016). LMX and employee voice. *Personnel Review*, 45(3), 605-615. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2014-0255>
- Wang, H.-Q., Zhang, G.-L., Ding, Z.-H., & Cheng, Z.-H. (2018). How supervisor narcissism contributes to employee silence: roles of negative anticipations and leader-member exchange. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 46(4), 653-666. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6815>
- Wang, Y., Yuan, C., & Zhu, Y. (2017). Coaching leadership and employee voice behavior: a multilevel study. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 45(10), 1655-1664. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6593>
- Wang, Y., Zheng, Y., & Zhu, Y. (2018). How transformational leadership influences employee voice behavior: the roles of psychological capital and organisational identification. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 46(2), 313-321. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6619>

- Wharton, J. D. (2016). *Examining Employee Voice Behavior: A Systematic Review of Voice Antecedents*. (10113133 D.Mgt.), University of Maryland University College, Ann Arbor. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1800548433?accountid=48232> Health Research Premium Collection database.
- Wiley, J. W., Brooks, S. M., & Lundby, K. M. (2006). Put Your Employees on the Other Side of the Microscope. *HR. Human Resource Planning*, 29(2), 15-21.
- Xie, J., Chu, X., Zhang, J., & Huang, J. (2014). Proactive personality and voice behavior: the influence of voice self-efficacy and delegation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42(7), 1191-1200. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.7.1191>
- Zhao, H., Liu, W., Li, J., & Yu, X. (2019). Leader–member exchange, organizational identification, and knowledge hiding: The moderating role of relative leader–member exchange. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.2359>
- Zhou, X., Liao, J.-Q., Liu, Y., & Liao, S. (2017). Leader impression management and employee voice behavior: trust and suspicion as mediators. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 45(11), 1843-1854. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6686>