



**CEP Discussion Paper No 1006**

**October 2010**

**Individual Voice in Employment Relationships:  
A Comparison Under Different Collective Voice Regimes**

**David Marsden**

## **Abstract**

This article examines the relationship between individual and collective employee voice, and management-led voice (appraisal), under contrasted collective voice regimes. In the first, collective workplace voice depends on voluntary recognition by the employer, and in the second, it is based on statutory rights. It is argued that in the first, individual and collective voice act as substitutes, and in the second they act as complements. Management-led voice is also influenced by whether the preceding forms are substitutes or complements. The argument is tested using data from the British and French workplace employment relations surveys for 2004, combining responses from employees and from management. Within country differences are used to aid identification. In conclusion, it finds broad support for the main hypothesis.

**Keywords:** Labour-management relations; industrial jurisprudence; individual and collective voice, works councils

**JEL Classifications:** J53

This paper was produced as part of the Centre's Labour Markets Programme. The Centre for Economic Performance is financed by the Economic and Social Research Council.

## **Acknowledgements**

The author thanks the DARES of the French ministry of labour for funding this project and for access to the REPOSE data, and the sponsors of WERS (Department for Business, Industry and Skills (BIS), the Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS), the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Policy Studies Institute (PSI)), and the ESRC Data Archive for access to the WERS data. Thanks are due also to the British Academy of Management HRM track.

David Marsden is an Associate of the Labour Markets Programme at the Centre for Economic Performance and Professor of Industrial Relations, London School of Economics.

Published by  
Centre for Economic Performance  
London School of Economics and Political Science  
Houghton Street  
London WC2A 2AE

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form other than that in which it is published.

Requests for permission to reproduce any article or part of the Working Paper should be sent to the editor at the above address.

© D. Marsden, submitted 2010

## **1. Introduction**

Employee voice plays a key part in the governance of the employment relationship. This relationship is built upon a deal agreed at the time of hiring, and which is continuously adapted thereafter. In exchange for a salary, employees agree to let management direct their labour between duties included within their ‘zone of acceptance’, that is, the set of tasks over which they accept the employer’s right to manage. This zone is rarely codified in great detail, as recognised by both economic and psychological theories of contract. It relies on goodwill, with both parties free to terminate it should the terms no longer benefit them. Given the costs of termination, use of voice can benefit both parties by facilitating changes to the zone of acceptance as their needs evolve, and helping to avoid unnecessary breaches. Individual level voice contributes to this process because the decision to quit is an individual one, yet it does not exist in a vacuum. In many workplaces, it functions alongside collective, representative voice, such as that provided by unions, works councils, employee delegates and management-led voice channels, such as goal-setting and performance appraisal. This paper explores the working of individual employee voice in the workplace under two contrasted representative voice regimes, one based on voluntary recognition, and the other on statutory rights. The first case comprises unions and their workplace agents, shop stewards, and the second, works councils and personnel delegates. It argues that in the former, individual and collective voice are likely to function as substitutes, whereas in the latter, they complement each other’s action. It also considers the influence of management-led forms of employee voice, such as goal-setting and performance appraisal, which could substitute for or complement the other two. Examples of these two voice regimes are provided by Britain and France. In fact, neither country offers a pure example, and the within country variation is used later as an aid to identification. The article uses both countries’ 2004 workplace employment relations surveys, focusing on private sector establishments with 20 or more employees, the population covered by the French survey. The paper first examines the underlying theory on the relationship between individual and collective voice in employment relationships. Next it presents the data and descriptive differences between the two countries before outlining the statistical method and explaining the key variables used. Presentation of the regression results is then followed by the conclusion.

## **2. Theory and Hypotheses**

The role of voice in regulating the ‘zone of acceptance’ occupies a central place in the modern employment relationship (Williamson et al, 2009). The early theories of Coase (1937) and Simon (1951) emphasised the contractual flexibility provided by the zone of acceptance, but gave little thought to how its limits could be policed to the satisfaction of both parties, although it was widely recognised that the freedom to quit discourages potential abuse. More recently, psychological contract theories have likewise emphasised the zone of acceptance and its protection against breach by labour turnover, withdrawal of motivation and goodwill, and by individual voice between employees and their line-managers (see, Rousseau 1995, Conway and Briner, 2005). Such individual voice also plays a key role when incumbent employees negotiate idiosyncratic deals, ‘i-deals’, with their managers (Rousseau et al. 2006).

The importance of individual voice for regulating the zone of acceptance is easy to understand. As Williamson (1975) argued, detailed codification of its content would jeopardise the flexibility that makes such an open-ended relationship valuable to employers.

The absence of detailed codification is also recognised by the law. Under English law, a legally enforceable contract underpins the relationship, but as Collins argues, its purpose is to 'stabilise expectations' (Collins, 2006: 139). In similar vein, French employment law distinguishes between minor changes to the zone of acceptance, which are deemed to be part of the initial deal, and substantial ones that require renegotiation. The line between the two is determined in relation to the initial agreement, and hence to the intentions of the two parties when contracting (Lyon-Caen and Pélissier, 1988, pp.306ff). The exercise of voice enables the parties to clarify whether particular duties fall within the zone of acceptance, and if necessary, it allows them to protest that requesting them, or refusing to carry them out, constitutes a breach of their mutual understanding. It reduces the need to resort to more costly sanctions.

The early work on voice, when Freeman and Medoff (1984) first introduced Hirschman's (1970) theory of exit and voice, focused mainly on collective voice exercised through unions, and emphasised the benefits of sharing information that could improve productivity. Since then, the range of voice channels considered has greatly expanded, with growing interest in individual and management-led employee voice. For example, Batt et al. (2002) examine teams, and non-union dispute resolution. Dundon et al (2004) examine forms of voice ranging from the articulation of individual dissatisfaction, through expressions of collective action, to involvement in management decision-making, and identify different channels associated with each: from complaints and grievances through to quality circles and joint consultation. Silence and exit can be costly for employers through loss of information and workforce disaffection (Van Dyne et al. 2003). Thus, there has been growing interest in the encouragement of individual employee voice by management in goal-setting and performance appraisals, broadening their functions from the traditional emphasis on monitoring (Levy and Williams, 2004). In a large meta-study, Cawley et al (1998) identify five ways in which individual employees can express voice through goal-setting and performance appraisal, and the likely benefits that may arise when organisations facilitate the exercise of voice within these channels.

Given that these voice channels coexist in many organisations, it is appropriate to ask how they interact with each other. The next section explores the dynamics of individual voice, management-led, and representative voice. In doing so, it will also sketch out the theoretical reasons why different regimes of representative voice will influence the operation of individual voice and, to some extent, also that of management-led voice.

## **2.1 Individual voice and the employment relationship**

The efficacy of employees' individual voice depends on the resources they can use to back it up, such as their ability to inflict sanctions on their employers by quitting and the degree of support they receive from collective voice institutions. Thus, key factors are the marketability of their skills and a low level of asset specificity. Skills that have a buoyant external market make the quit threat more credible by reducing the cost of exercising it. This is more problematic when there are significant degrees of asset specificity, such as with firm-specific skills. In this case, the cost of the quit threat, and its counterpart, the dismissal threat, will be higher, so there may be greater reluctance to use it, but the threat has to remain credible if voice is to remain effective. Asset specificity may also encourage both parties to resolve their differences in ways that minimise use of termination threats. Employees may seek forms of collective voice to bolster the effectiveness of their individual voice. Employers may seek to develop management-led voice channels, to be discussed shortly.

Social proximity may also increase the effectiveness of individual direct voice. Thus, in small firms with short managerial hierarchies, and in which employees come into frequent contact with senior managers, opportunities for direct voice will be more frequent than in

large firms with long chains of command. Likewise, compared with those lower down the hierarchy, managerial and professional employees usually have more frequent opportunities to raise issues of concern with senior managers who have the power to allocate resources, . Frequency of contact also makes it possible to acquire a wider range of work-related information from management so that employees can better assess good faith as signalled by consistency of message. Such factors will tend to reduce the employee's demand for collective voice.

## **2.2 Management-led voice channels**

Appraisal and goal-setting have two faces: to monitor and to involve. The first tends to deprive employees of voice, and the second, to enhance it. At the end of a their meta-study, the authors argue that the monitoring approach is no longer consistent with organisations that are moving towards involvement oriented climates (Cawley et al. 1998: 628). Emphasis on the monitoring function remains strong in the principal-agent literature. It has also been stressed in two recent studies of appraisal use in Australia and Britain, using the two countries' workplace employment relations surveys (Brown and Heywood, 2005, Addison and Belfield, 2008).

Within the HRM and procedural justice literature on appraisal, there has been a growing emphasis on appraisal for involvement, and on the importance of the 'trial' or 'due process' model in which the effectiveness of the goal-setting and its motivational functions depend upon employee voice and influence (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998, Levy and Williams, 2004). Procedural justice in appraisal requires management to set up mechanisms to ensure transparency, and to engage employees in informing and setting work objectives. This literature has highlighted two related employee concerns in appraisal: to have their voice heard, and to influence the decisions made, respectively, the *value expressive* and the *instrumental* explanations (Cawley et al, 1998). In some organisations, performance appraisal may extend the expressive mode to include an element of integrative, or problem-solving, negotiation in which employees can inform management about the need for organisational resources in order to achieve the objectives that management proposes. For example, extending the zone of acceptance to include new tasks may require additional training, or an employee may feel that the extra effort involved requires additional pay or some other kind of organisational support. Centre for Economic Performance research on public service performance pay systems has shown that goal setting and performance appraisal can involve a form of integrative negotiation in which individual managers and employees approach the establishment of new work objectives as a problem-solving process in which there is a two-way exchange (Marsden, 2007). Management may also use appraisal in order to renegotiate work norms. The resources that management brings to appraisal may include a measure of job redesign, training and merit pay increases. All of these different forms require significant degrees of employee voice.

Management's choice between the monitoring and involvement models is likely to depend upon how far it aids performance. Thus appraisal is more likely to be based on involvement when employees bring high levels of expertise and discretion to their work, as with the highly qualified, and on monitoring for the more routine tasks of the less skilled. The first, but not the second, is likely to facilitate individual voice.

Other management-led voice channels were considered, such as quality circles, and group meetings. However, their main focus tends to be on productive efficiency rather than governance of employment relationships, which extends beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice it to say that in the regressions soon to be reported, their inclusion had no significant effect on individual voice in either country.

### **2.3 Collective voice and its relationship with other forms**

In Freeman and Medoff's (1984) theory, collective voice is a substitute for individual voice. It was initially framed with the US-UK model of union bargaining in mind, whereby unions seek bargaining rights with individual employers on behalf of certain categories of employees. The merit of collective, compared with individual, voice arises because the costs facing those who exercise individual voice often exceed those of silence and quitting. Raising issues with management individually carries the risk of being branded as a troublemaker. Their theory proposes that voice is public goods: the individual who expresses it bears the risk, but the gains from improved management are available to all co-workers alike. Where the scope for free-riding is great, it will tend to drive out individual voice unless it is organised collectively and provides protection for those delegated to express it. In this model, individual and collective voice are alternative strategies, and to a large degree, substitutes.

The two kinds of voice also tend to be substitutes because, when collective voice depends on a voluntary agreement with the employer, the latter retains the right to withdraw. As a result, the union has to sustain the employer's involvement by a mix of the productivity gains from improved information flows, and the power to mobilise its members to maintain its recognition and bargaining rights. These organisational imperatives include the ability to mobilise coalitions of workers around issues of general concern; to sustain itself by recruiting new members; and to manage these coalitions as an effective bargaining force (Traxler, 1995). In other words, collective voice will represent individual employees' concerns by translating them into issues of more general concern around which it can mobilise, and maintain an effective coalition of work groups. Such aggregation may not suit all individuals and groups, especially if they already have a good measure of individual voice. On the other hand, if they opt to pursue their own concerns directly with management, they will detract from the union's collective strength. Another kind of organisational imperative affects the employer's decision whether to deal collectively or individually with different categories of employees. Its need, in the event of conflict, for the loyalty of the managerial hierarchy has long been a factor limiting its acceptance of collective voice for managerial and highly qualified employees, especially in the private sector. Thus, the stronger the collective voice for non-managerial employees, the more an employer is likely to resist collective voice for its managerial employees. The latter therefore become more dependent on individual voice and on management-led channels. Thus, in this regime, there will always be a tension between individual and collective voice and they will frequently be substitutes.

A different regime of collective voice applies in a number of continental European countries. It takes the form of statutory workplace representation by councils and special workplace representatives. In this case, the organisational imperatives are different. The same legal rights usually also bring an obligation of universal coverage: representatives should make their services available to all groups in the workplace. These two factors have a strong impact on the working of voice. Such rights to workplace representation mean that representatives no longer need to sustain the same levels of mobilisation to prevent the employer from withdrawing unilaterally. There is therefore less pressure to aggregate individual concerns into collective issues thus enabling representatives to accommodate greater heterogeneity of interests among their constituents. The representatives still need to appear credible in the employer's eyes, but this is a less demanding condition. As managers cannot threaten troublesome representatives with derecognition, they have to make the relationship work, which means investing resources and management time to ensure all types of voice channels are effective. As works councils have come to play a greater part in regulating lay-offs and dismissals, management often find it harder to use the dismissal threat to deal with discontented employees, which again means that they have to use a range of voice channels to discover the sources of dissatisfaction, and find ways of resolving them.

Thus, this form of collective voice can accommodate individual voice more easily. Whereas in the voluntary regime individual and collective voice are often rival goods, in the statutory regime, they are more often non-rival, and use of one does not undermine use of the other. There is an additional, related, feature which is likely to cause the two forms of voice to function as complements rather than substitutes. It is common in continental Europe for works councils to exist within multi-level systems of collective bargaining in which much of the distributive bargaining is conducted at sectoral level, leaving integrative bargaining to take place at company and workplace level. This framework means that many pay issues are taken out of contention in the workplace so that questions such as work organisation, coordination, and adaptation of zones of acceptance, can be handled less adversarially. This also helps workplace collective and individual employee voice to function side by side as complements.

The voluntary and statutory models of collective voice also affect the operation of management-led forms of individual employee voice. Firstly, the uneven coverage of the voluntary model, both between union and non-union workplaces, and between different categories of employees within workplaces, means that for many employees there will be no collective voice channels, unless the employer organises them. One might therefore expect management-led channels to fill the gap in the voluntary regime. Secondly, one might expect the content of appraisal discussions to vary between the two regimes. Under the voluntary regime, with employees keen to retain their exit option, one can expect employers to emphasise pay as a compensation for issues voiced and in order to retain. Under the statutory regime, as it has become to be associated with stronger employment protection, one can expect the nature of the discussion in appraisal to reflect joint investments in the future of the relationship, notably training.

In the voluntary model, joint consultation has an especially ambiguous position depending on the nature of its leadership and how its agenda is set. It can function as a form of management-led voice, as Willman et al (2009) suggest, a form of union-led voice, or as a channel in which employees in the workplace have a strong influence. In the voluntary model, this will often depend upon the objectives and relative power of the key players. As a form of management-led voice, it could reduce individual voice if it functions like monitoring appraisal, and serves primarily to streamline management exchanges with employees. As a form of union-led voice, it runs the risk of being subordinated to the organising constraints of unions, which would also cause it to diminish individual employee voice. On the other hand, if employees in the workplace are strongly influential, perhaps because of universal suffrage among their number, then the organising pressures would be weaker than if union-led, and it would be more autonomous than if strictly management-led, and so be more supportive to individual voice. In the statutory regime, the universal suffrage of employees in the workplace is guaranteed, so that their voice is more secure. Nevertheless, in large workplaces where unions are strong, the unions may seek to build up their influence in works councils causing them to become more union- than employee-led.

To summarise, a number of hypotheses can be proposed.

H1: Employees' individual voice will be more influenced by the strength of their outside option, the marketability of their skills, under the voluntary than the statutory regime.

H2: Social proximity to management will have a greater influence on perceived individual voice under the voluntary than the statutory regime.

H3a: Management-led voice in *monitoring* appraisal will be a substitute for individual employee voice in both collective voice regimes, and will be most strongly felt by the less-marketable occupations of blue and intermediate white collar workers;

H3b: Management-led voice in *involvement* appraisal will enhance individual voice under both regimes, but will focus on the resources to prevent quits in the voluntary regime, and hence pay, and on those to build up joint investments in the statutory one, and hence training.

H4: Collective voice will be inversely related to individual voice under the voluntary model because they are substitutes, whereas it will be positively related when they are complements under the statutory regime. However, there will be important nuances according to the type of representation:

H4a: Establishments covered by local collective agreements on pay will tend to have lower rates of individual voice in the voluntary regime, but not so in the statutory one. Likewise, under the voluntary regime there will be an inverse relationship between individual voice and joint consultation if it is management-, or union-led. Under the statutory regime, a negative relationship is expected if the works councils has become union-dominated, as is more likely in large establishments;

H4b: Workplace representatives dependent on their capacity to mobilise will be negatively related with individual voice because they are substitutes;

H4c: Workplace representatives based on statutory rights, being complements, should have a positive relationship with individual voice

H5: Employees with strong individual voice will be better able to manage their zone of acceptance with their line-managers under both voice regimes, and so are more likely to be satisfied with their pay.

### **3. Data and Descriptive Statistics on Voice Channels in the Two Countries**

Britain and France provide examples of these two collective voice regimes which are reflected in their respective employment laws. In Britain, the main form of collective voice in the workplace depends upon the employers' decision to recognise a trade union for collective bargaining purposes. Continued recognition also depends upon the employer's decision. The Employment Relations Act of 1999 bolstered employee rights for union representation, and recognition procedures were strengthened, so it is not a pure voluntary model, but the bar required to force an unwilling employer was set high: 50% of the employees in the proposed bargaining group should be union members, or 40% and a majority of those voting in a ballot. The strong presumption was that voluntary arrangements were to be preferred. Employers have long been free to set up joint consultation committees (JCCs) to discuss non-bargaining issues, and this is widely practiced. Consultation rights were strengthened by the Information and Consultation of Employees Regulations Act (2004), but it was not yet in force at the time of the survey. Employee voice may also be expressed through grievance procedures, which are also set up voluntarily, and exist in most organisations. Thus although Britain is not a pure example of the voluntary regime, in this particular area, it lies well towards to voluntary end of the spectrum.

In contrast, under French employment law, employers in establishments with at least 50 employees are obliged to organise elections for a works council (*comité d'entreprise*), and those in establishments with ten or more employees are similarly obliged to organise the election personnel delegates (*délégué du personnel*). The burden of proof is on French employers to show that their employees do not want either institution. Although the primary function of French works councils is consultation, pay negotiations take place elsewhere, legislation has enabled them to build up considerable powers over a range of workplace issues including training and lay-offs. The personnel delegates' main function is to represent employee grievances to the employer, and they benefit from legal protection against victimisation. In addition, unions have the right to appoint union delegates (*délégué syndical*) in workplaces, although, in smaller establishments, these are often the same person as the personnel delegate elected by the workforce. Employees also have the right to raise grievances directly with management. Because of the multiple grievance channels available to French employees, there is less need than in Britain for additional dedicated grievance procedures, and they were not mentioned in the REPOSE surveys.

Based on the two surveys, Table 1 summarizes information on key workplace representative institutions in the two countries in 2004. It shows substantial differences between the two countries with the voluntary regime in Britain covering a much smaller percentage of establishments compared with the statutory regime in France: the percentage of workplaces with a steward or delegate being 10% in Britain compared with nearly 70% in France, and those with joint consultation, respectively 18% and 33%, with a greater gap for larger establishments. A fuller breakdown by size is given in Appendix Table 3. In contrast, the development of management-led employee voice through appraisal is at comparable levels, covering about three quarters of establishments in each country. The more frequent link to pay in France reflects the much greater use by French firms of merit pay (Marsden and Belfield 2010), and the weaker link to training may reflect the greater involvement of works councils in training decisions in French firms.

Turning to individual voice (Table 2), the two countries' workplace surveys do not provide a refined survey instrument to measure different aspects of individual voice. They use a single question in the employee questionnaires. In Britain, they are asked 'Ideally, who do you think would best represent you in dealing with managers [in this workplace] about the following?', and are offered a menu of replies which includes a number of possible representatives from unions to other employees, and includes the option 'I would be best represented by myself'. In France, employees were asked whether they agreed or not with a series of statements about representation in their workplace, including 'Employees can defend their own interests directly'. Both countries' questions appear oriented towards the instrumental facet of voice.

In both countries, a substantial percentage of employees believe that they can look after their own interests in their workplaces. In Britain, about 50% of employees thought they could best represent themselves for getting a pay increase and over discipline, and over 60% thought they could do so for training and making complaints. In France, just under 40% of employees agree that they can look after their own interests themselves. In France, the same question was put to the employee representative and management respondents. Respectively, 51% and 86% replied that employees in their establishments could represent themselves directly. In Table 2 it is also possible to see how perceptions of individual voice vary with the presence of collective voice. Thus for pay, 34% of employees in British establishments with a recognised union reported individual voice, but nearly 60% did so in plants without a recognised union. Likewise in France, 37% of those in plants with collective representation reported individual voice compared with 44% in those without. On the surface, it seems that in both countries they are to some degree substitutes. Table 3 examines the same questions in

relation to appraisal. In Britain, whatever the issue, a greater share of employees reports individual voice in plants where appraisal schemes cover all employees than in those where they do not. In contrast, this is not the case in France, where there were two questions: concerning the existence of a scheme and whether employees had themselves been appraised.

#### **4. Statistical Method and Key Variables**

Because this paper focuses on the comparison of voice regimes, a great deal of care has been taken to match variables across the two country's surveys. In fact, this is never entirely possible, not least because the major institutional differences mean that many similar functions have to be explored with differently phrased questions. As explained below, the key measures of individual voice comprise employee perceptions of the effectiveness of their own voice. That said, a key merit of the two surveys is that they combine employer and employee questionnaires making it possible to use the employee questionnaire to measure individual voice and some of the determinants of individual marketability with the institutional characteristics of their workplaces. To avoid problems of common method variance, the regressions use just the one attitudinal variable from the employee survey, all others being of a descriptive nature. Details of the survey questions and the variable means are given in appendix.

a) Employee perceptions of individual voice, and of the fairness of their pay are captured from the employee questionnaire shown in Tables 2 and 3 above. Both sets of questions have been used in a number of studies looking at employee attitudes towards union voice (for example Belfield and Heywood 2004, Bender and Sloane, 1998, and Bryson et al 2004), and on the effects of various policies on employee satisfaction (for example, Harley, 2001, Peccei and Lee, 2005) and more generally on employee reports about their working conditions and work loads (Green, 2004). Similar questions were used in 1998 and in 2004. The significance of the results of these studies lends confidence to the general validity of the questions.

Nevertheless, employees' perceptions of the efficacy of individual voice in their workplaces could give an upwardly biased account of actual individual voice because of cognitive dissonance. They may overstate its effectiveness to compensate for feelings of powerlessness. The variables used in this paper compare individual employees within the same country so that a generalised upwards bias, and one that differed between the countries, should not affect the results. Although it was not possible to match other employee influence questions between the two surveys, responses were compared with those on voice, and they were consistent.<sup>1</sup> One question that could be matched was pay satisfaction. As individual voice is hypothesised to help keep the two sides of the deal in alignment, its success should lead to greater satisfaction with pay for work done (examined in Table 5 below). Also supporting the idea that perceptions of individual voice are aligned with its actual levels are the regression results to be shown in Table 4 concerning individual voice and marketability of skills.

b) The marketability of skills affects the risks employees bear in expressing individual voice, and lowers its cost to them. This can be assessed by a number of indicators. More

---

<sup>1</sup> In Britain, the questions from the employee questionnaire related to their overall satisfaction with involvement in decision-making in their workplace (QB9), and how good were their managers at allowing employees or their representatives to influence decisions (QB8c). In France, employees were asked whether their fear of losing their job motivated them and whether job insecurity held them back in their work (Q12, Q13). In both cases, the questions were included in the equation of Table 4, and obtained the expected sign and were significant.

highly educated workers generally have more transferable skills by virtue of their general analytical and problem-solving knowledge than those who learn their skills on the job. High ability workers also usually have more outside options. A rough indicator can be found in whether someone is paid above the average for their occupation, and so earns more than those with similar human capital investments. Recently hired workers generally have more marketable skills. In contrast, a high degree of skill specificity raises the cost of quitting and so can make the threats less credible. This can be captured by means of length of service, by the amount of training provided by the employer, both of which are associated with firm-specific skills, and by whether on-the-job training is needed for core workplace skills. The high cost of individual voice in such circumstances may discourage its use unless there are institutional arrangements to protect them.

Because of gender inequality, many women have more restricted labour market opportunities than men. On the one hand, this could increase the benefit they obtain from the exercise of individual voice, but on the other, for this reason and for reasons of discrimination, they might be less willing to exercise it.

c) Social proximity to management may enhance the exercise of individual voice. Thus in small firms with short managerial hierarchies, more frequent interactions with managers open up opportunities to raise issues that would be more difficult in larger workplaces. This effect is captured by establishment size. Social proximity may also be greater for those in managerial and professional occupations.

d) Management-led individual voice can be measured by the presence and operation of appraisal systems and by the presence of quality circles and workplace meetings. The more supportive involvement appraisals are captured by whether appraisal is linked to measures of organisational support such as pay and training. Appraisals for monitoring are captured by interactions with intermediate level white and blue collar occupations as employees in them are more likely to be subject to performance monitoring than those in professional and higher technical occupations. In France, it is also possible to know whether individual employee respondents have been appraised which is valuable evidence because many appraisal schemes are poorly enforced.

e) The presence of collective voice institutions is gauged by management responses concerning workplace employee representatives, joint consultation committees, works councils, and collective agreement coverage. As suggested earlier, representative institutions dependent on the capacity to mobilise are likely to function as substitutes for individual voice, whereas those free of such organisational imperatives can function more as complements. Where they are substitutes, one can expect individual variations in bargaining power that arise from marketability to be sharply differentiated so that the coefficients will be positive and well-determined. In contrast, when the representational channels are complements, they will even out the effects of differences in marketability among employees so that the coefficients will be less well determined, and possibly non-significant if complementarity is strong. Although the difference of voice regimes is captured primarily by the inter-country difference, there is scope to test this hypothesis within France by comparing the relationship with individual voice, on the one hand, for union stewards who are dependent on the unions' ability to mobilise support, and on the other, for personnel delegates whose basis is statutory. The former should have a negative, and the latter, a positive relationship with individual voice. The employment relations environment, highlighted in some North American studies (Bellman 1992), can also affect the working of job level voice. This is captured by the management respondent's estimate in order to be independent of the employees' estimates of individual voice.

f) Some control variables are needed to capture the effects of different types of work situation and of industries. Use of flexible teams, job autonomy and technical level of work

may all create environments in which the zone of acceptance has to work more flexibly, and so need greater voice. For the two country analysis, the range of variables is restricted because of the manner in which the questions were phrased. Measures of team working, job autonomy, use of computers and time pressure were used. Unfortunately, the team variable masks a great deal of diversity between those with very little and those with a great deal of autonomy. Job autonomy captures similar features of work but could be expected to give opposite signs in the two countries because of the way the question is phrased (Marsden and Belfield, 2010). Use of computers also spans a range of tightly monitored to highly sophisticated work (Green, 2008). High work pressure is used to signal a lack of employee influence.

Employers who invest in their employees can be expected to seek to reduce quits and encourage voice as an alternative. Two indicators of this are provided by employer investments in training, and whether the firm pays above its sectoral average, a crude measure of 'efficiency wages', in order to induce stronger motivation and loyalty. High rates of labour turnover, and high rates of absence provide an inverse measure of these HR policies on the assumption that firms choose the rates of turnover and absence with which they wish to work. It is usually possible to reduce turnover by offering higher pay. Similarly, firms whose production systems need predictable attendance may invest more resources in reducing absenteeism (Coles et al, 2007). Use of industry dummies should capture some of the effect of different production systems on voice. They will also capture other industry-specific practices.

Finally, the identification strategy uses the within country variation to establish the effect of voice regimes on individual voice. Clearly, this could not be done purely on the basis of the two-country comparison because there could be other country-specific factors at work. The first element of variation concerns the coexistence of statutory workplace delegates and union appointed stewards in France, and the second, the difference between the effects of works councils in large and in small establishments. The union stewards can be expected to respond to the same organising imperatives as the unions they represent, with their strength dependent on a capacity to mobilise. Works councils in large establishments function differently from those in small ones, the threshold used being 500 employees. Bangoura (2001) and Amossé and Wolff (2009) show that many large establishments are now characterised by enterprise unions (*syndicats d'entreprise*) and that the works councils are an integral part of their collective voice activities. Thus although they remain statutory, they are becoming more closely bound up with the logic of union representation.

## **5. Regression Results**

The regression results for Britain indicate that the marketability of employees' skills and talents has a significant effect on their perceived individual voice. Higher levels of education, being paid above the average for one's occupation, and holding professional or technician qualifications all boost perceived voice. Possessing organisation specific skills, as indicated by long service and by the establishment's training intensity both diminish perceived individual voice. These indicators of individual marketability hold their strength and significance as management-led and collective voice variables are added, as they do when establishment characteristics and sector are added in. In France, in contrast, individual marketability has only a muted impact: being paid above average for one's skill has the wrong sign, but becomes non-significant once all the establishment and sectoral variables are included. Belonging to the managerial and professional group, in some specifications, came out positive and significant but did not prove robust. The same is true of the measures of

social proximity to management. The muted nature of the effects of these variables in France is consistent with complementarity between individual voice and the institutions of the statutory model, thus supporting Hypotheses 1 and 2.

Appraisal was the chief indicator of management-led voice. It was argued that the effect of monitoring appraisal through diminishing individual voice would be similar under both voice regimes. This is borne out by the experience of the intermediate-level blue and white collar groups for which there is a negative relationship between appraisal and individual voice. The underlying reason seems to be that monitoring appraisal by line managers restricts employees' access to higher managers who control resources. This can be seen in the grievance handling variable. For France, it relates to employees' access to senior managers, and its positive coefficient suggests that such access boosts employees' perceived voice. The same question relating to middle managers, who do not control resources, was not statistically significant. Likewise in Britain, the negative relationship between voice and the existence of a grievance procedure suggests that these are often used to ring-fence issues so they cannot be negotiated. Involvement appraisal, on the other hand, which implies some give and take over resources, was captured by the link with pay and training. It was expected that a link between pay and appraisal would emerge in the voluntary model, reflecting retention needs, whereas a link with training would signal joint investments under the statutory model. The first but not the second was confirmed by the regressions. However, the link with training may have been obscured by the very high percentage of firms in both countries reporting use of appraisal for training needs. In France, being appraised personally appears to increase individual voice, but which of the monitoring and involvement models held sway could not be identified. Its coefficient, not shown in Table 4, was 0.11, significant at 1%. Thus, hypothesis 3a, that monitoring appraisal reduces voice in both regimes is borne out, whereas hypothesis 3b is borne out for the link with pay in Britain, but the expected positive coefficient on appraisal for training in France was not significant.

Collective voice in the workplace, as measured by the presence of collective arrangements and local pay agreements, were hypothesised to diminish individual voice in the voluntary regime, but not necessarily so under the statutory one where the needs to mobilise were less pressing (Hypothesis 4a). In fact, under the voluntary regime, as represented by Britain, coverage by a local collective agreement is indeed negatively associated with individual voice, whereas there is no significant relationship in France. On the other hand, the presence of joint consultative committees and works councils is negatively associated with individual voice in both voice regimes. However, in France unlike in Britain, this negative relationship is considerably stronger in large plants (>500 employees), reflecting greater union involvement in their affairs. This suggests that voice exercised through works councils in smaller establishments, where union involvement is weaker, is less of a substitute, and more of a complement, for individual voice. In Britain, in a separate specification, not shown in Table 4, measures of whether the JCC was management-, union- or employee-led were used based on who selected its membership. While using these interactions, JCCs retained their strongly negative coefficient. Of the three interactions only that for employee-led JCCs was positive, and significant (at 10%). Its effect was to moderate, but not reverse, the negative influence of JCCs on voice, however, its positive coefficient was about half the size of the negative one on JCCs (respectively 0.188 and -0.304 in the revised regression). Thus under both regimes, strong employee influence on joint consultation appears to attenuate markedly its otherwise negative effect on individual voice.

Turning to voice exercised through individual representatives, there is a notable difference among workplace stewards depending on whether they are union-based, and so dependent on the capacity to mobilise, and whether they are statutorily based. Under both regimes, the presence of union stewards is negatively related to individual voice, whereas that

of the statutory personnel delegates is positively related. Interactions with plant size made no difference. The presence of the two kinds of representative in French establishments also provides a valuable methodological check. It shows that within the same country, voice institutions associated with one or other regime have contrasted effects on individual voice. This supports hypotheses 4b and 4c.

Among the workplace characteristics, high rates of absence, but not labour turnover, were associated with low individual voice in Britain. Absence has often been interpreted as a silent form of protest (Edwards, 1979) hence indicating a lack of voice. In France, there was no significant effect, but this may be due to use of proxy variables relating to management reports of recruitment and absence difficulties. In neither country did work organisation appear to have much effect on employee individual voice, except for work pressure, which in France had a negative relationship. A key workplace characteristic in both countries was employment size, which was negatively related to individual voice, with similar marginal effects in both countries.

Hypothesis 5 concerned the relationship between individual voice and the employee's satisfaction with the deal provided by the employer, measured by satisfaction with pay. It is also intended as a partial check that the measures of individual voice are associated with similar outcomes in both countries. The probit regression results shown in Table 5 bear this out for both countries. The top two coefficients for each country show perceived individual voice on feeling fairly paid, without and with controls (as in Table 4). In both countries, they are significant and positive. Because of possible halo effects between feeling fairly paid perceptions of voice, the analysis was repeated using the predicted values of voice from the equations with the full set of variables in Table 4. Note that the predicted values are not based on any attitudinal variables. The coefficients are somewhat higher, and they are all positive and significant. Because of the effect of plant size on voice, the regressions were also run using different employment thresholds, and this made very little difference.

Finally, one has to ask why the effects of the selected variables should be generally much stronger and more significant in Britain than in France, and why they explain so much less of the overall variance in perceptions of individual voice, around 15% in Britain but only 3% in France. This is consistent with the main argument that, under the statutory regime, the effect of the different factors contributing to individual voice will be muted. Reliance upon voluntary recognition in Britain means that there will be considerable variation both between and within workplaces as some recognise no collective voice, and others may do so only for certain categories of employees. It was argued earlier that this has a knock-on effect on employees who need to maintain their individual negotiation skills as job changes take them from one type of workplace to another. In contrast, the greater institutional uniformity between and within establishments in France, shown in Table 1 above, means that there is less statistical variation between workplaces in the sample, and there is also less incentive for employees to retain individual bargaining skills. Nevertheless, some caution is needed because of possible differences in the measures of individual voice between the two surveys.

## **6. Conclusion**

This article set out to explore the workings of individual employee voice in the governance of employment relationships under different regimes of collective voice in the workplace. It hypothesised that they operate as substitutes under the voluntary regime, and as complements under the statutory one. Although neither Britain nor France provide pure examples of voluntary and statutory models of workplace collective voice, the differences between them on this axis are great, as shown by differences in legal rights to representation by these

channels, and the evidence on their diffusion across different workplaces shown in Table 1. The evidence from the two workplace surveys suggests quite strongly that under the voluntary regime, individual and collective voice tend indeed to operate as substitutes. This is borne out most strongly by the negative relationship between individual employee voice and union-based voice, be it in the form of collective agreements or representation by union stewards. In contrast, the personnel delegates, who are their counterparts in the statutory regime, appear as complements to individual voice. The same tensions between individual and collective voice in the voluntary model are apparent in the workings of joint consultation, which has a strong negative relationship with individual voice when it is management or union led. In contrast, when employees are more influential in joint consultation, as under the statutory regime, and when employees elect members under the voluntary regime, the negative effect on individual voice is much attenuated. Because of its uneven coverage of workplaces and occupational groups, the voluntary regime also puts a premium on employees' retaining their individual voice skills and keeping their outside options open. For this reason, one observes the much stronger relationship between occupation, and education and individual voice under the voluntary than under the statutory regime.

Identifying a causal link between voice regimes and individual voice was assisted by the coexistence in France of both statutory and voluntary individual workplace representatives. The workplace delegates can take up issues on behalf of any employees in the workplace, and their power base does not depend upon mobilisation, so their presence reinforces individual voice. In contrast, the union stewards have a more sectionalist vocation, and do depend upon mobilisation, and so are more there as alternatives to individual voice. A supplementary, albeit weaker, test was provided by the difference between the relationship between individual voice and works councils in small and large establishments. In the latter case, where they are frequently involved with enterprise unionism, they are strongly substitutes, but in smaller establishments, this is only weakly so. There was also indication in Britain that having employees elect JCC members, instead of unions or management appointing them, moderates the negative influence on JCCs on individual voice.

Although Britain and France appear at opposite poles, if one is to generalise, then one has to ask whether other manifestations of the regimes they represent would influence individual voice in a similar manner. Could the same results be expected if coverage or enforcement were more even, or more uneven? Implicit within the mobilisation argument is the idea that the greater the threat to union presence, the more likely collective and individual voice would be substitutes. If the British data had been available at the time when British unions were much stronger, and British employers more accommodating of collective voice, might the mobilisation imperatives have been weaker so that voluntary collective voice could act as a complement rather than a substitute for individual voice? Might a voluntary model with universal coverage function in the same way as the statutory model? One can also ask the same question of France. If the statutory voice channels in France become increasingly integrated into a system of enterprise unionism, extending this pattern to a much wider range of establishments, might their mode of operation change? Would the logic of mobilisation, or would that of security provided by statutory rights? Unfortunately, with the present data, there is no easy way to resolve these questions.

## 7. References

- Addison, John T., and Belfield, Clive R. (2008) 'The Determinants of Performance Appraisal Systems: A Note (Do Brown and Heywood's Results for Australia Hold Up for Britain?)', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46: 3, pp.521-531.
- Amossé, Thomas; Bloch-London, C., and Wolff, Loup (eds.) (2008) *Les relations sociales en entreprise, un portrait à partir des enquêtes "Relations professionnelles et négociations d'entreprise"*, REPONSE 1992-1993, 1998-1999, 2004-2005. Coll. Recherche, La Découverte, Paris.
- Amossé, Thomas and Wolff, Loup (2009) Ce que représentent les syndicats en entreprise. Connaissance de l'emploi, No. 69, *Centre d'Études de l'Emploi*, 93166 Noisy-le-Grand Cedex. [www.cee-recherche.fr](http://www.cee-recherche.fr).
- Bangoura, Simone and Dayan, Jean-Louis (2001) Négocier les salaires dans l'entreprise : une pratique courante mais souvent informelle. *DARES Premières Synthèses*, 05. 1, Feb 1.
- Belman, Dale (1992) 'Unions, the Quality of Labor Relations, and Firm Performance'. In Voos, P. and Mishel, L. (eds.), *Unions and Economic Competitiveness*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1992, pp.41-108.
- Batt, Rosemary; Colvin, Alexander J. S. and Keefe, Jeffrey (2002) 'Employee Voice, Human Resource Practices, and Quit Rates: Evidence from the Telecommunications Industry', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 55: 4, July, pp.573-594.
- Belfield, Clive and Heywood, John S. (2004) 'Do HRM Practices Influence the Desire for Unionization? Evidence across Workers, Workplaces, and Co-Workers for Great Britain', *Journal of Labor Research*, 25: 2, Spring, pp.279-299.
- Brown, Michelle and Heywood, John D. (2005) 'Performance Appraisal Systems: Determinants and Change', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43:4 December pp.659-679.
- Bryson, Alex; Cappellari, Lorenzo and Lucifora, Claudio (2004) 'Does Union Membership Really Reduce Job Satisfaction?', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42: 3, pp.439-459.
- Cawley, Brian; Keeping, Lisa and Levy, Paul (1998) 'Participation in the Performance Appraisal Process and Employee Reactions: A Meta-Analytic Review of Field Investigations', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83: 4, August, pp.615-633.
- Coase, R. H. (1937) 'The Nature of the Firm', *Economica*, 4: 16, November, pp.386-405.
- Coles, Melvyn; Lanfranchi, Joseph; Skalli, Ali and Treble, John (2007) 'Pay, Technology, and the Cost of Worker Absence', *Economic Inquiry*, 45: 2, April, pp.268-285.
- Collins, Hugh (2006) 'Flexibility and Stability of Expectation in the Contract of Employment', *Socio-Economic Review*, 4: 1, pp.139-153.

- Conway, Neil and Briner, Rob (2005) *Understanding Psychological Contracts at Work: A Critical Evaluation of Theory and Research*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Dundon, Tony; Wilkinson, Adrian; Marchington, Mick, and Ackers, Peter (2004) 'The Meanings and Purpose of Employee Voice', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15: 6, September, pp.1149-1170.
- Edwards, P. K. (1979) 'Strikes and Unorganized Conflict: Some Further Considerations', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*; March, Volume 17 Issue 1, pp.95-98.
- Folger, Robert, and Cropanzano, Russell (2001) 'Fairness Theory: Justice as Accountability'. In Greenberg, Jerald and Cropanzano, Russell (eds.), *Advances in Organizational Justice*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Ca.
- Freeman, R. B, and Medoff, J. L. (1984) *What Do Unions Do?* Basic Books, New York.
- Green, Francis (2004) 'Why Has Work Effort Become More Intense?', *Industrial Relations*, 43: 4, October, pp.709-741.
- Green, Francis (2008) 'Leeway for the Loyal: A Model of Employee Discretion', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46: 1, pp.1-32.
- Harley, Bill (2001) 'Team Membership and the Experience of Work in Britain: An Analysis of the WERS98 Data', *Work, Employment & Society*, 15: 4, pp.721-742.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970) *Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organisations and States*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass.
- Kersley, Barbara; Alpin, Carmen; Forth, John; Bryson, Alex; Bewley, Helen; Dix, Gill and Oxenbridge, Sarah (2006) *Inside the Workplace: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*. Routledge, London.
- Levy, Paul E. and Williams, Jane R. (2004) 'The Social Context of Performance Appraisal: A Review and Framework for the Future', *Journal of Management*, 30: 6, pp.881-905.
- Lyon-Caen, Gérard and Pelissier, Jean (1988) *Droit du travail*, 14th Edition, Dalloz, Paris.
- Marsden, David W. (2004) 'The Role of Performance Related Pay in Renegotiating the 'Effort Bargain': the Case of the British Public Service', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 57: 3, April, pp.350-370.
- Marsden, David W. (2007) 'Individual Employee Voice: Renegotiation and Performance Management in Public Services', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18: 7, July, pp.1263-1278.
- Marsden, David and Belfield, Richard (2010) 'Institutions and the Management of Human Resources: Incentive Pay Systems in France and Great Britain', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* (forthcoming).
- Peccei, Riccardo and Lee, Hyun-Jung (2005) 'The Impact of Gender Similarity on Employee Satisfaction at Work: A Review and Re-Evaluation', *Journal of Management Studies*, 42: 8, pp.1571-1592.

- Rousseau, Denise (1995) *Psychological Contracts in Organisations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, Ca.
- Rousseau, Denise; Ho, Violet and Greenberg, Jerald (2006) 'I-deals: Idiosyncratic Terms in Employment Relationships', *Academy of Management Review*, 31: 4, October, pp.977-994.
- Simon, Herbert (1991) 'Organisations and Markets', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5:2, Spring, pp.25-44.
- Traxler, F. (1995) 'Two Logics of Collective Action in Industrial Relations?'. In Crouch, C. and Traxler, F. (eds.), *Organised Industrial Relations in Europe: What Future?* Avebury, Aldershot.
- Van Dyne, Linn; Ang, Song and Botero, Isabel C. (2003) 'Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee Voice as Multidimensional Constructs', *Journal of Management Studies*, 40:6, September, pp.1359-1392.
- Willman, Paul; Gomez, Rafael and Bryson, Alex (2009) 'Voice at the Workplace: Where do We Find It, Why it is There and Where is it Going?'. In Brown, William; Bryson, Alex; Forth, John and Whitfield, Keith (eds.), *The Evolution of the Modern Workplace*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

## 8. Tables and Charts

**Table 1. Voice institutions in Britain and France in 2004**  
**% of estabs (private estabs with  $\geq 20$  employees)**

Britain		France	
	%		%
Shop steward	10.1	Workplace/union delegate	67.5
Joint consultation committee		Works council	
<i>Employment size :</i>			
Estabs $\geq 20$	18.4		33.1
Estabs $\geq 50$	36.4		57.5
Estabs $\geq 100$	51.0		74.1
Coverage by a collective agreement on pay (at least some employees)	21.1	Establishment pay agreement negotiated in past 3 years	58.5
Collective representation (JCC, steward or coll agt)		Representative institutions: (Works council or delegate)	
<i>Employment size:</i>			
Estabs $\geq 20$	32.7		69.8
Estabs $\geq 50$	49.2		82.4
Appraisal scheme	77.9	Appraisal scheme	73.0
<i>of which:</i>		<i>of which:</i>	
Appraisal linked to pay	38.2	Appraisal linked to pay	71.5
Appraisal linked to training	96.8	Appraisal linked to training	71.0

*Source:* WERS and REPOSE 2004, Management questionnaires, private establishments with  $\geq 20$  employees, using establishment weights.

*Notes:* Workplace/union delegate: délégué du personnel or délégué syndical; Works council: comité d'entreprise or comité d'établissement. Appraisal: appraisal scheme covering some or all non-managerial employees. Linkage of appraisal: Britain, unspecified, France, direct or indirect/long-term link.

**Table 2. Employees perceived individual voice**

**Table 2a. Britain: percentage of employees stating they would be best represented by ‘myself’**

	All estabs	Estabs with a recognised TU	Estabs with no recognised TU
% of employees replying ‘I would be best represented by myself’ on the following issues:	%	%	%
Getting increases in my pay	49.9	33.9	59.8
Getting training	68.9	67.3	69.9
If I wanted to make a complaint about working here	60.9	51.1	67.0
If a manager wanted to discipline me	47.4	32.9	56.5

Private estabs with  $\geq 20$  employees. Employee respondents= 12,942. Weights: seqwtnr; sampling unit: persid.

Employee questionnaire Q D.2. ‘Ideally, who do you think would best represent you in dealing with managers here about the following?’ Response: ‘Myself’.

**Table 2b. France: employee, representative, and management views whether employees can defend their interests themselves.**

Employees (in this workplace) can defend their own interests directly.	Employee respondents			Employee representative	Management respondent
	All estabs	Estabs with employee rep institutions	Estabs with no employee rep institutions		
	%	%	%	%	%
Disagree	26.0	26.9	17.2	19.5	2.3
Disagree	24.2	24.8	19.2	28.3	10.3
Neutral	12.0	11.1	19.2	0.7	1.7
Agree	25.8	26.1	22.9	30.5	46.8
Agree strongly	12.0	11.0	21.5	21.0	38.9
<i>Total agree</i>	<i>37.8</i>	<i>37.1</i>	<i>44.4</i>	<i>51.5</i>	<i>85.7</i>
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Employee questionnaire Q 20. ‘Les salariés sont en mesure de défendre directement leurs intérêts’.

Private establishments with  $\geq 20$  employees. Weight: poids\_sal2, sampling unit: num.

**Table 3. Individual voice under different appraisal regimes:**

Employees responding they can defend their own interests by type of appraisal scheme in operation (% of employees agreeing in each category)

Individual employee voice	Share of employees in a workplace covered by its appraisal scheme			Sig
	None	Some	All	
<b>Britain</b>	%	%	%	
<i>I can best represent myself for:</i>				
Getting increases in my pay	42.3	41.4	49.0	****
Getting training	56.7	64.1	71.3	****
If I wanted to make a complaint about working here	54.2	54.8	60.3	****
If a manager wanted to discipline me	43.6	39.4	45.0	****
<b>France</b>				
<i>Establishment appraisal system</i>				
I can defend my own interests	42.9	40.0	35.4	
<i>Have personally been appraised</i>	Have not been appraised		Have been appraised	
I can defend my own interests	39.2		36.4	

Private estabs  $\geq 20$  employees, weight seqwtnr, su persid; poid\_sal2, su num. Britain, N=9,907, France N=7,587. Appraisal for non-managerial employees.

\*\*\*\* significant at 1%.

**Table 4. Determinants of perceived employee individual voice in Britain and France 2004**

	Britain				France													
	Coef.		Coef.		Coef.		Coef.		dy/dx	Coef.		Coef.		Coef.		Coef.		dy/dx
<b>Employee individual voice</b>																		
Years of education	0.021	****	0.021	****	0.027	****	0.028	****	0.011	-0.011	*	-0.008	+	-0.008	-	-0.006	-	-0.002
Pay > average for my occupation	0.271	****	0.271	****	0.316	****	0.287	****	0.114	-0.114	****	-0.094	***	-0.059	+	-0.009	-	-0.003
Mgr/Professional	0.840	****	0.826	****	0.775	****	0.848	****	0.319	0.027	-	-0.058	-	-0.049	-	0.045	-	0.017
Technician	0.478	****	0.463	****	0.426	****	0.500	****	0.194	-0.062	-	-0.141	*	-0.143	*	-0.104	+	-0.039
Admin/sales	0.215	****	0.425	****	0.403	****	0.469	****	0.184	-0.050	-	-0.014	-	-0.036	-	-0.009	-	-0.003
Semi/unskilled manual	-0.273	****	-0.286	****	-0.311	****	-0.207	***	-0.082	0.014	-	-0.080	-	-0.069	-	-0.093	-	-0.035
Other occupation										0.067	-	-0.038	-	-0.028	-	0.009	-	0.003
Length of service (log)	-0.107	****	-0.101		-0.061		-0.070	****	-0.028	-0.010	-	-0.004	-	0.008	-	0.003	-	0.001
Training intensity	-0.234	****	-0.159	**	-0.168	***	-0.131	*	-0.052	-0.179	**	-0.104	-	-0.003	-	0.142	+	0.054
Female	-0.046	+	-0.048	+	-0.101	****	-0.037	-	-0.015	-0.005	-	-0.014	-	-0.013	-	0.031	-	0.012
<b>Management-led voice indicators</b>																		
Appraisal scheme			0.230	*	0.032	-	0.097	-	0.039			-0.051	-	-0.032	-	0.062	-	0.023
Appraisal & admin/sales			-0.273	***	-0.275	***	-0.276	***	-0.110			-0.188	+	-0.201	*	-0.205	*	-0.078
Appraisal & skilled			-0.043	-	-0.066	-	-0.028	-	-0.011			-0.189	*	-0.202	**	-0.249	***	-0.094
Appraisal for pay			0.145	****	0.130	****	0.115	***	0.046			-0.050	-	-0.035	-	-0.016	-	-0.006
Appraisal for training			-0.229	*	-0.029	-	-0.019	-	-0.008			0.011	-	0.019	-	0.004	-	0.002
Quality circles			-0.205	****	0.009	-	-0.004	-	-0.002			0.022	-	0.033	-	0.029	-	0.011
Workplace meetings			-0.058	-	-0.024	-	0.018	-	0.007			-0.089	+	-0.057	-	-0.053	-	-0.020
Grievance procedure			-0.589	****	-0.274	****	-0.188	+	-0.074			0.175	****	0.105	****	0.094	***	0.035
<b>Collective voice indicators</b>																		
Estab level pay agreement					-0.257	****	-0.241	****	-0.096					0.010	-	0.007	-	0.003
JCC or works council					-0.340	****	-0.286	****	-0.114					-0.236	****	-0.186	****	-0.071
Union steward					-0.361	****	-0.320	****	-0.127					-0.189	****	-0.128	****	-0.049
Personnel delegate														0.189	****	0.187	****	0.070
Good employment relations					0.090	****	0.053	*	0.021					0.071	****	0.063	****	0.024
<b>Work organisation</b>																		



**Table 5. Satisfaction with pay and individual voice**

Probit coefficients (robust, cluster estimation)

<b>Establishments</b>	Perceived individual voice	Coef.	Sig	Pseudo R2	n	clusters
<b>GB</b>						
>=20 employees	Actual values no controls	0.264	****	0.0081	12,942	882
>=20 employees	Actual values full controls	0.181	****	0.0432	11,816	807
>=20 employees	Predicted values	0.634	****	0.0094	11,816	807
>=100 employees	Predicted values	0.670	****	0.0103	7,106	458
<b>France</b>						
		Coef.		Pseudo R2	n	clusters
>=20 employees	Actual values (no controls)	0.415	****	0.0187	7,625	2,571
>=20 employees	Actual values (full controls)	0.442	****	0.0864	7,012	2,491
>=20 employees	Predicted values	2.730	****	0.0858	7,012	2,491
>=100 employees	Predicted values	2.695	****	0.0834	4,333	1,528

Predicted values based on equations in Table 4. significance: \*\*\*\* 1%. No controls simply regressed pay satisfaction on individual voice, and full controls used all the variables in Table 4. The predicted values for voice were derived from the full model in Table 4.

## **9. Appendices**

### **9.1 Appendix 1. The two surveys**

WERS (Workplace Employment Relations Survey) and REPONSE (Relations Professionnelles et Négociations d'Entreprise) are surveys of representative samples of about 2000 establishments carried out respectively in Great Britain and France. The surveys were carried for the Department for Trade and Industry (DTI), Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS), the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), and the Policy Studies Institute (PSI) in Britain, and the DARES of the Ministry of Labour in France. The analysis is restricted to private sector establishments with 20 or more employees, the coverage of the 2004 REPONSE, and uses the establishment weights provided to adjust for sample stratification and a measure of non-response. It also excludes private firms classified as Public Administration in France. More information about the surveys can be found in Kersley et al (2006) for WERS 2004 and in Amossé et al (2008) for REPONSE.

**Appendix Table 1. Means and standard deviations of key variables**

	GB				France			
	mean	std dev	min	max	mean	std dev	min	max
Individual voice	0.501	0.500	0	1	0.378	0.485	0	1
Satisfaction with pay	0.349	0.477	0	1	0.422	0.494	0	1
Years of education	13.599	2.541	11	18	11.748	3.195	6	16
Pay> average for my occupation	0.501	0.500	0	1	0.356	0.479	0	1
Mgr/Professional	0.212	0.409	0	1	0.181	0.385	0	1
Technician	0.132	0.339	0	1	0.180	0.384	0	1
Admin/sales	0.271	0.444	0	1	0.185	0.388	0	1
Semi/unskilled manual	0.290	0.454	0	1	0.173	0.379	0	1
Other occupation					0.063	0.243	0	1
Length of service (log)	1.285	1.167	-0.693	2.708	2.031	1.037	0	3.807
Training intensity	0.590	0.278	0	1	0.498	0.239	0.167	1
Female	0.454	0.498	0	1	0.384	0.486	0	1
Appraisal scheme	0.762	0.377	0	1	0.700	0.404	0	1
Appraisal & admin/sales	0.228	0.411	0	1	0.133	0.328	0	1
Appraisal & skilled	0.054	0.216	0	1	0.117	0.306	0	1
Appraisal for pay	0.340	0.474	0	1	0.530	0.429	0	1
Appraisal for training	0.819	0.385	0	1	0.627	0.484	0	1
Quality circles	0.406	0.491	0	1	0.582	0.493	0	1
Workplace meetings	0.875	0.331	0	1	0.857	0.350	0	1
Grievance procedure	0.977	0.151	0	1	0.619	0.486	0	1
JCC or works council	0.427	0.495	0	1	0.620	0.485	0	1
Union steward	0.315	0.465	0	1	0.651	0.477	0	1
Personnel delegate					0.736	0.441	0	1
Estab level pay agreement	0.374	0.484	0	1	0.704	0.456	0	1
Good employment relations	4.185	0.649	1	5	3.312	0.861	1	4
Teams	0.851	0.356	0	1	0.250	0.433	0	1
Job autonomy	0.554	0.239	0	1	0.375	0.291	0	1

Use of computers	0.529	0.279	0.025	0.75		3.004	1.092	0	4
Time pressure	3.123	1.048	1	5		3.050	0.734	2	4
Plant pay > industry average	0.493	0.500	0	1		0.396	0.489	0	1
OJT for key skills	0.708	0.193	0.25	1		0.744	0.216	0.25	1
Turnover rate/problems	0.139	0.148	0	1		0.622	0.485	0	1
Absence rate/problems	0.041	0.053	0	0.77		0.519	0.500	0	1
Employment size (log)	5.158	1.360	2.996	8.954		5.023	1.264	3.045	9.577
Utilities	0.007	0.083	0	1		0.015	0.121	0	1
Construction	0.046	0.209	0	1		0.060	0.237	0	1
Distribution	0.224	0.417	0	1		0.162	0.368	0	1
Transport & communication	0.073	0.260	0	1		0.066	0.248	0	1
Business services	0.171	0.377	0	1		0.186	0.389	0	1
Finance	0.094	0.291	0	1		0.049	0.215	0	1
Education, health & welfare	0.108	0.310	0	1		0.074	0.261	0	1
Personal services	0.038	0.192	0	1		0.038	0.192	0	1

**Appendix Table 2. Definitions of key variables**

	Questionnaire	Britain	France
Individual voice	EQ	'Ideally, who do you think would best represent you in dealing with managers here about getting increases in your pay?' Response: Myself, Trade Union, Employee representative (non-union), Another employee, Somebody else	Employees are able to defend their own interests directly; (Les salariés sont en mesure de défendre directement leurs intérêts) (Likert scale: disagree to agree strongly (Q 20).
Satisfaction with pay	EQ	How satisfied are you with the amount of pay you receive? Response: Likert scale very dissatisfied to very satisfied.	Overall, taking into account the effort you put in, do you consider that the firm recognises your work at its true value? (Au final, compte tenu des efforts que vous faites, estimez-vous que l'entreprise reconnaît votre travail à sa juste valeur ?) Responses : yes entirely, yes, no, not at all. (Q14)
Years of education	EQ	Based on highest diploma	Based on highest diploma
Pay> average for my occupation	EQ	Weekly pay for individual compared with average for reported occupation	Hourly pay for individual compared with average for reported occupation
Occupation	EQ	Matched GB/F from one-digit responses	Matched GB/F from one-digit responses
Length of service (log)	EQ	Derived from ranges	Derived from year of joining
Training intensity	MQ	Days of training in last year relative to mean	Annual expenditure relative to mean
Female	EQ		
Appraisal scheme	MQ	Appraisal for some or all non-managerial employees	Appraisal for some or all non-managerial employees
Appraisal for pay	MQ	Appraisal linked to pay	Appraisal linked to pay
Appraisal for training	MQ	Appraisal linked to training	Appraisal linked to training
Quality circles	MQ	Use of quality circles	Use of quality circles
Workplace meetings	MQ	Use of workplace meetings	Use of workplace meetings
Grievance procedure	MQ (GB); EQ (Fr)	Formal grievance procedure	Employees take problems first to senior management
JCC or works council	MQ	Joint consultative committee	Works council
Union steward	MQ	Shop steward	Union steward (délégué syndical)
Personnel delegate	MQ	n/a	Personnel delegate (délégué du personnel)
Estab level pay agreement	MQ	Existence of a local pay agreement	Existence of a local pay agreement
Good employment relations	MQ	Good employment relations climate	Good employment relations climate

Teams	MQ	Teams for majority of largest occupational group	Teams for majority of largest occupational group
Job autonomy	MQ	Index based on problem-solving, job discretion & control	Index based on problem-solving, job discretion & control
Use of computers	MQ	Share of employees using computers	Share of employees using computers
Time pressure	EQ	I never seem to have enough time to get my work done; Likert scale disagree to agree strongly.	In your work, are you obliged to hurry: Dans votre travail, êtes-vous obligé de vous dépêcher ? never, sometimes, often, always.
Plant pay > industry average	MQ	Plant average pay > average for establishments in the same sector	Plant average pay > average for establishments in the same sector
OJT for key skills	MQ	How long for new hire in LOG to become proficient. TPSFORM_R	How long for new hire in LOG to become proficient. CSTUCKIN
Turnover rate/problems	MQ	Labour turnover rate	Recruitment difficulties reported for 2004 DIFRECR
Absence rate/problems	MQ	Absence rate (provided by respondent)	Was absence a problem in 2004 for specified categories of employees? ABSCAD-ABSOUV
Employment size (log)	MQ	Number of employees	Number of employees
Economic sector	MQ	Sector of establishment, 9 categories matched GB/F	Sector of establishment, 9 categories matched GB/F

Key: EQ, MQ, employee or management questionnaire. LOG: largest occupational group.

**Appendix Table 3. Table Establishments with the following types of reps (%)**

	GB	France	GB	France	GB	France	France	GB	France
Employment size	Grievance proc	Access to top mgt	JCC	Works council	Shop steward	Union steward	Personnel delegate	Appraisal scheme	Appraisal scheme
20-49	89.2	79.8	8.7	19.1	4.7	22.9	56.9	74.6	69.5
50-99	98.7	70.1	24.8	44.4	8.8	48.5	54.4	83.2	77.4
100-299	99.4	63.2	44.2	61.6	28.1	73.8	63.2	81.7	77.9
200-499	98.4	48.5	57.8	91.7	42.3	87.4	92.0	89.8	84.1
500-999	100.0	41.5	68.8	96.4	39.5	96.8	97.4	89.7	91.6
>=1000	100.0	40.8	68.0	97.1	54.8	98.1	99.4	95.2	95.3
Total	92.6	74.1	18.4	33.1	10.1	37.2	59.4	77.9	73.0

Private sector establishments with >=20 employees, establishment weights.

**CENTRE FOR ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE**  
**Recent Discussion Papers**

1005	Sharon Belenzon Mark Schankerman	Spreading the Word: Geography, Policy and University Knowledge Diffusion
1004	Florence Kondylis Marco Manacords	School Proximity and Child Labor Evidence from Rural Tanzania
1003	Alex Bryson John Forth	Trade Union Membership and Influence 1999-2009
1002	Christian Helmers	The Effect of Market Entry on Innovation: Evidence from UK University Incubators
1001	Alex Bryson Richard Freeman	To Join or Not to Join? Factors Influencing Employee Share Plan Membership in a Multinational Corporation
1000	John Van Reenen	Title TBC
999	Leonardo Iacovone Ferdinand Rauch L. Alan Winters	Trade as an Engine of Creative Destruction: Mexican Experience with Chinese Competition
998	David Marsden	The End of National Models in Employment Relations?
997	Ralf Martin	Productivity Spreads, Market Power Spreads and Trade
996	Rachel Smithies	A Map of Mental Health
995	Kristian Behrens Gregory Corcos Giordano Miron	Trade Crisis? What Trade Crisis?
994	Stephen Redding	Theories of Heterogeneous Firms and Trade
993	Jordi Blanes I Vidal Mirko Draca Christian Fons Rosen	Revolving Door Lobbyists
992	Susan Scott John Van Reenen Markos Zachariadis	The Impact of the Diffusion of a Financial Innovation on Company Performance: An Analysis of SWIFT Adoption
991	Sergey Lychagin Joris Pinkse Margaret E. Slade John Van Reenen	Spillovers in Space: Does Geography Matter?

990	Luis Garicano Rosa Lastra	Towards a New Architecture for Financial Stability: Seven Principles
989	David Marsden	The Growth of Extended 'Entry Tournaments' and the Decline of Institutionalised Occupational Labour Markets in Britain
988	Zack Cooper Stephen Gibbons Simon Jones Alistair McGuire	Does Hospital Competition Improve Efficiency? An Analysis of the Recent Market-Based Reforms to the English NHS
987	Guy Michaels Ashwini Natraj John Van Reenen	Has ICT Polarized Skill Demand? Evidence from Eleven Countries Over 25 Years
986	J. M. C. Santos Silva Silvana Tenreyro	Currency Unions in Prospect and Retrospect
985	Fabian Waldinger	Quality Matters – The Expulsion of Professors and Ph.D. Student Outcomes in Nazi Germany
984	Brian Bell Stephen Machin Francesco Fasani	Crime and Immigration: Evidence from Large Immigrant Waves
983	Nicholas Bloom Carol Propper Stephan Seiler John Van Reenen	The Impact of Competition on Management Quality: Evidence from Public Hospitals
982	Nicholas Bloom John Van Reenen	Human Resource Management and Productivity
981	Alan Manning	Imperfect Competition in the Labour Market
980	Ana Fernandes Heiwai Tang	The Determinants of Vertical Integration in Export Processing: Theory and Evidence from China
979	Stephen Machin Olivier Marie Sunčica Vujić	The Crime Reducing Effect of Education
978	Andrew B. Bernard J. Bradford Jensen Stephen Redding Peter K. Schott	Intra-Firm Trade and Product Contractibility (Long Version)