



**Center for
Effective
Organizations**

**Employee Involvement: Research
Foundations**

**CEO Publication
G 13-09 (628)**

George S. Benson

Associate Professor

University of Texas at Arlington

College of Business Administration

Edward E. Lawler III

Director

Center for Effective Organizations

Marshall School of Business

University of Southern California

July 2013

Employee Involvement: Research Foundations

George S. Benson
College of Business Administration
University of Texas at Arlington
701 S. West Street Box 19467
Arlington, TX 76019-0377
(817) 272 – 3856
benson@uta.edu

Edward E. Lawler III
Center for Effective Organizations
Marshall School of Business
University of Southern California
3415 S. Figueroa Street
Davidson Conference Center 200
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0871
elawler@marshall.usc.edu

Employee involvement is an approach to work-system design that emphasizes high levels of employee decision-making authority. There is an extensive body of research literature going back decades that supports the principles of employee involvement systems as well as the effectiveness of specific practices such as self-managing teams, cross-training, quality circles, gain-sharing, employee ownership and participative decision making in the workplace. High-involvement management practices (defined as an integrated set of Human Resource and work design practices that are designed to give all employees the skills, information, power, and rewards to make decisions in the workplace) have generated enormous interest among researchers in many different disciplines and geographies. Taken together, this work clearly indicates the multiple benefits of employee involvement in terms of productivity, profitability, and employee well-being. This chapter reviews the research foundation of these practices and puts the current use of these practices in context.

Employee involvement began in the 1950s and 1960s as a movement for “industrial democracy” and “participative management.” It has evolved into a variety of management practices that emphasize participation and decision making among front-line employees. Over the last 30 years, these practices have been part of a larger movement in research and organizational practice that has focused on workplace transformation through high-involvement, high-performance, and high-commitment practices. Recent research seeking to demonstrate the relationship between HR practices and performance draws heavily on the theory and research dealing with employee involvement (Benson & Lawler, 2010). Research on employee involvement began in earnest in the 1950s, but it reaches back to the work of Elton Mayo and the Hawthorne experiments of the late 1920s. Early researchers, including Argyris

(1957), Likert (1961), and McGregor (1960) reacted against the legacy of Taylorism and “Scientific Management,” in which managers were responsible for making decisions and workers were generally regarded as tools of production. In the post-World War II U.S., Taylorism led to tension in unionized plants and mistrust between workers and management that made it difficult to implement changes and increase productivity.

The basic principles of employee involvement were first tested in the 1960s and 1970s, with important experiments in Europe and the United States in large manufacturing plants. One of the most visible was in a Volvo plant in Sweden which used “semi-autonomous” teams to assemble cars. However, employee involvement did not gain wide acceptance by industry until the 1980s (Boxall & Macky, 2009; Cappelli & Neumark, 2001). This was the beginning of the quality movement in manufacturing and new high-involvement “greenfield” manufacturing plants. Broad adoption of such high-involvement practices as work teams, flat organization structures, cross-training, skill-based pay, and cooperative union management relationships followed (Lawler, 1986).

By the middle of the 1990s there was significant growth in “high-involvement” work practices (also labeled “participative,” “flexible,” or “high-performance” practices) in the U.S. and Europe. At that time there was also significant interest in the popular business press, and there was academic research demonstrating their effectiveness through case studies and larger surveys of organizational performance (Lawler, Mohrman, & Ledford, 1998).

In the U.S. the rising interest in new work systems in the 1980s was due in part to a perceived global competitiveness gap in manufacturing. To compete with Japanese firms and get the most out of their workforce, many firms began adopting total quality programs, quality

circles, work teams and union-sponsored quality of work life programs (Lawler, 1992; Lawler, Mohrman, & Benson, 2001). Foreign competition and technological changes spurred widespread “reengineering” in large corporations (Hammer & Champy, 1988). Firms were under pressure to downsize and, in many cases, to cut large numbers of managers and eliminate hierarchy. This resulted in reduced direct supervision of front-line employees and the use of teams. It gave front-line employees more responsibility for quality and production decisions. In Europe and Australia, trends similar to those in the U.S. were taking place as companies worked to remake traditional job designs and union-management relations.

Increasing competition and the transformation of manufacturing industries appear to have driven the widespread adoption of employee involvement (Locke, Kochan, & Piore, 1995). By 2000, studies showed that some form of employee involvement practices were in place in a large proportion of workplaces in industrialized countries, including half of all U.S. firms and two-thirds of the Fortune 1000 (Cooke, 1994; Freeman, Kleiner, & Ostroff, 2000; Gittleman, Horrigan, & Joyce, 1998; Kling, 1995; Osterman, 1994; O’Toole, Lawler & Messinger, 2007).

Over the last 10 years there have been no new notable large-scale surveys of employee involvement work practices in the U.S.. The Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS) in the UK was last conducted in 2011. Comparing the adoption of various involvement practices with 2004 surveys indicates that employee involvement has remained stable or decreased slightly (Wanrooy et al., 2011). In the US the last available surveys indicate that the rates of adoption of employee involvement have leveled off or begun to decline slightly (O’Toole et al., 2007). It is unclear whether this represents companies pulling back from the use of employee involvement practices or that the acceptance of these practices has become so widespread that

employee involvement has reached a saturation point, with few organizations and industries left as good candidates to transform.

At this point so much research on high-involvement and high-performance work practices has accumulated over the last 25 years that the basic foundations of the employee involvement are now largely unquestioned. To some degree they have simply become the way work is organized and longer seen as transformative practices. In the following pages we review these foundations and the current state of research on employee involvement, organizational performance and employee well-being.

Theoretical Foundations of Employee Involvement

Employee involvement at its core is based on theories of human motivation that grew out of the cognitive revolution in psychology in the 1950s. Maslow's work on "high-order needs" and "self-actualization" was particularly important because it indicated that individuals could be motivated by intrinsic rewards, not just by tangible rewards and punishments. Also influential was the work on expectancy theory and job satisfaction that showed relationships between attitudes and behavior. The work on motivation influenced subsequent research on job enrichment and job design (Oldham, Hackman & Pearce, 1976; Oldham & Hackman, 1980), which took several forms, though all included a strong emphasis on information, decision-making power, incentives and feedback as factors that influenced job performance.

In a series of books, Lawler (1986, 1992, 1996) built on this work and detailed an integrated set of principles for organizational design. He included practices that distribute information and decision-making power to employees, give them incentives for success, and

give them the skills and knowledge they need to be effective. Table 1 shows how Lawler saw the relationship between management practices and employees having the knowledge, foundation, power and rewards they must have to make employee involvement effective. He stressed that effectiveness requires employees to have all four: power, information, knowledge and reward.

Based on classic motivation theory, employee involvement suggests that employees will exert effort and work efficiently when they feel they are in control of their work, are given meaningful work, receive feedback on their performance, and are rewarded for the success of the business. Lawler and others persuasively argued that employees will work harder and smarter in organizations where they are incented to make decisions concerning the conduct of their jobs and participate in the business as a whole (e.g., Cotton, 1993; Lawler, 1986).

While there are different theories of employee involvement, they all call for decision-making power, incentives for employees to take responsibility for their performance, skill development, the provision of information to make decisions, and job security. The motivation theory that underlies employee involvement suggests that these practices are complementary and generally need to be implemented together to create an effective work system. This separates employee involvement research from research that has studied the individual management practices that are included in a high-involvement approach. For example, participative decision making has been so extensively studied that more than a dozen comprehensive reviews of this work have been published over the last 30 years. Research at the work-unit level tends to show the importance of implementing the elements of employee involvement together. In a study of steel finishing lines, Ichniowski, Shaw, and Prenushi (1995)

showed that individual practices including work teams, flexible job design, and incentive pay used in isolation had little to no effect on productivity. Using these practices together, however, increased productivity over plants with “traditional” work systems. In a 2006 meta-analysis of 92 studies examining the link between HR practices and firm performance, Combs, Liu, Hall, & Ketchen (2006) addressed this question and found that high-performance work “systems” were more strongly correlated with performance than were individual HR practices.

While this work suggests that employee involvement is an integrated set of practices, researchers have seldom agreed on what the exact combination of practices should be. As a result, most of the studies have used measurement scales representing multiple practices determined by factor or cluster analysis to address the natural variation in the practices used by firms (Fernie & Metcalf, 1995; Huselid, 1995; Koch & McGrath, 1996; Lawler et al., 2001; Scholarios, Ramsay, & Harley, 2000; Wood & de Mensezes, 1998). A recent review by Pothsuma and colleagues (2013) identified more than 60 practices in nine clusters. These include the core practices of employee involvement (participation, incentive compensation, information sharing, training and job security) along with additional HR practices including performance appraisal, selection, and internal promotion. While the specific practices included varies by study, this review of research focuses on those studies that examine employee decision making, incentive rewards (which can also relate to the practice of employee recognition), access to information on business performance, and providing workers with appropriate skills.

Research on Employee Involvement and Organizational Performance

Employee involvement has attracted the attention of management scholars, psychologists, sociologists, and economists. There are literally hundreds of case studies and small-sample studies that have documented the positive relationship between employee involvement, productivity and employee well-being across a wide range of settings and industries (e.g., Adler, Goldoftas, & Levine, 1997; Baily, 1993; Cutcher-Gershenfeld, 1991; Ichniowski et al., 1995; McDuffie, 1995; Youndt, Snell, Dean, & Lepak, 1996). These studies are so numerous that they have been the subject of multiple review articles and edited books over the last 20 years (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kallenberg, 2000; Appelbaum & Batt, 1995; Ichnioski, Kochan, Levine, Olson, & Strauss, 1996).

Research generally shows that employee involvement increases individual, team, and unit productivity in industries as diverse as professional services, steel manufacturing, apparel, medical imaging and semiconductor fabrication. Hodson and Roscigno (2004) coded organizational practices and work-life experience from 204 English-language ethnographies published in books and sociology journals and concluded that employee involvement showed positive relationships with both organizational success and employee well-being. The consistency of positive results from employee involvement across a number of studies in so many sectors of the economy suggests that the benefits of employee involvement are real and robust across most sectors.

The relationship between employee involvement and organizational performance has been addressed in a series of large-scale multi-industry studies going back to the early 1990s. However, these studies often focused on a set of HR practices that went beyond employee involvement. Becker and Gerhart (1996) reviewed this work and found marginal overlap among

the more than 20 different practices included in a review of only five studies. Wood and Wall (2007) reviewed 27 studies of performance and found an even larger range of practices and labels. They concluded that only 14 of the 27 studies of high-involvement practices included some aspect of work enrichment or expanded job designs. More recently, Pothsuma et al (2013) reviewed 193 articles 1993-2011 and identified 61 different practices which they organized into nine categories. When reviewing this work, it is important to make the distinction between studies that specifically examine employee involvement versus those in which some employee involvement practices, such as self-managed teams or job enrichment, are included in a larger bundle of HR practices.

Studies examining employee involvement practices as part of a larger set of “high-involvement” or “high-performance” practices have generally indicated positive relationships with organizational performance. In one of the first studies on HR and performance, Ichniowski (1990) found that firms that used HR practices (including training and flexible job design) had higher sales per employee and higher overall firm performance. He concluded that a complementary set of HR practices, which includes elements of employee involvement, were positively related to firm performance if they were implemented together. Numerous studies of gain-sharing, profit sharing and employee ownership plans show that they increase organizational performance (Lawler, 2003; Rosen, Case, & Staubus, 2005). Many of these studies show that giving employees a piece of the act is most effective when it is combined with other employee involvement practices such as problem-solving groups, participative decision making and the provision of business information.

The most widely-cited paper on HR practices and performance is Huselid (1995). It reported significant relationships between HR practices and two performance indices: sales per employee and gross return on assets. The two HR indices were labeled “skills and work structures” (which included employee participation programs) and “motivation” (which included incentive rewards). For large organizations, studies conducted by the Center for Effective Organizations at the University of Southern California have found consistent relationships between the adoption of employee involvement by the Fortune 1000 companies and several measures of financial and market performance (Lawler et al., 2001). Finally, Combs et al. (2006) examined 92 studies of high performance work practices and estimated a low, but significant, overall correlation of .20 with organizational performance. They concluded that employee involvement practices, including incentive compensation, training, information sharing, and team working, were all positively and significantly correlated with performance.

While the positive correlations between EI and HPWS with unit and organizational performance have been consistent across various settings, research over the last twenty years has also shown these practices to have greater impacts on some organizations than others. Research has moved away from a universalistic theory of practices on performance to a contingency or fit based theory of effectiveness (Delery & Doty, 1996; Boxall & Mackey, 2009; Kaufman, 2010). Specifically, studies have identified industry conditions, company strategy, organizational climate and the nature of the tasks performed by workers as moderators of EI and HPWS effectiveness.

HPWS appear to be more common and more effective in high growth industries and industries with competitive rivalry to incentivize innovation in management practices (Datta,

Guthrie & Wright, 2005; Batt, 2002). Research has also demonstrated that strategy also plays a role in the effectiveness of EI and HPWS (Guthrie, Spell & Nyamari, 2002; Lepak & Snell, 2002; Youndt & Snell, 2004; Michie & Sheehan, 2006; Camps & Luna-Arocas, 2009). Specifically, HPWS are more common and effective in firms pursuing differentiation or innovation strategies (Batt, 2002; Guthrie, 2002; Lepak et al. 2007). Finally, EI is more effective in firms with low capital intensity where human capital is more central to operations (Batt, 2002, McClean & Collins, 2011).

In addition to research on the moderating conditions of the EI and performance relationship there has also been some debate over the relationship of employee involvement to firm financial performance for two main reasons. First, there is some evidence that employee involvement practices are often accompanied by wage increases that are needed to attract higher-skilled employees, and they may offset some or all of the gains in productivity. Unfortunately, only a small number of studies have actually examined the effect of employee involvement on wage costs and profitability. Cooke (1994) concluded, based on a sample of manufacturing firms in Michigan, that the use of self-managed teams and quality circles was associated with both higher wages and productivity. In that study, the productivity gains outweighed the higher labor costs incurred by the firms. Employee involvement was associated with 21% better net performance as measured by value added per employee less wage costs, even though those firms had 6-7% higher wages. On the other hand, Cappelli and Neumark (2001) found that the productivity gains from high-performance work practices are largely offset by increased labor costs. With two waves of data from the 1992 and 1997 National

Employer Survey (NES), they concluded that firms did not see an increase in labor productivity as measured by output per dollar spent on labor.

The second major point of debate is the question of causality. While many studies find a positive correlation between the adoption of high-involvement practices and organizational performance, the question arises as to whether high involvement leads to increased business performance, or whether firms with above-average performance are more likely to adopt involvement practices. There is the possibility that firms with high performance have the resources needed to make investments in employees and adopt high-involvement practices. It may also be the case that firms with higher-quality managers and employees are more likely to perform better and also to adopt high involvement practices.

Reverse causality, self-selection, and heterogeneity bias have been specifically addressed in several studies. In response to questions about reverse causality, Huselid and Becker (1996) conducted a longitudinal study with a second wave of data from Huselid's (1995) earlier work. They did not find statistically significant results and argued that the differences were largely due to measurement error and range restriction that occurred because the research design focused only on firms that adopted the high-performance practices during the two-year study period. Using statistical methods to correct this bias, Huselid and Becker (1996) estimated results similar to Huselid's (1995) estimates, but these findings have been widely debated (Gerhart et al., 2000).

The direction of causality was also addressed by Wright, Gardner, Moynihan, & Allen (2005), who examined 68 empirical studies that reported significant correlations between HR practices and performance and found that only five used a research design in which HR

practices were used to predict future organizational performance. Using a 2-year longitudinal design, they examined involvement practices, including incentive rewards, participation, and employee training, on attitudes and performance in 17 independent business units of a food service company. They found significant correlations between involvement practices and performance, but the results were inconclusive as to the direction of causality. Their results were similar to those of Guest, Michi, Conway, and Sheehan (2003), who found that HR practices were related to higher profits among a sample of firms in the U.K., but that the correlation disappeared when prior performance was controlled. Overall, the research on employee involvement suggests that the positive relationship between employee involvement and organizational performance is reciprocal and evolves over time. Except in cases of new facilities or greenfield projects, organizations are not likely to see large changes in employee involvement practices from year to year. Further, the effects of employee involvement on profits may also take time to materialize. On balance the research evidence is clear that employee involvement is positively correlated with individual productivity, operational performance, and financial results.

Research on Employee Involvement and Growth, Development and Wages

Advocates of employee involvement have made strong theoretical arguments that employee involvement practices should also lead to higher skills and wages for employees. The primary reason is that employee involvement requires higher levels of responsibility and subsequently requires higher wages to attract and retain qualified employees. For example, Macduffie (1995) described how the adoption of flexible work practices in the automobile industry, including employee involvement, effectively shifts the responsibility for dealing with

production problems to employees. Whereas automobile manufacturers previously dealt with disruptions by maintaining large inventories as a buffer against production delays, in the new flexible “just-in-time” environment, employees with the knowledge and discretion to make decisions are expected to deal with problems as they arise. Increased participation in decision making creates additional value for the organization but also demands more training and skills.

There is evidence that employee involvement reduces demand for unskilled labor (Caroli & Van Reenen, 2001) and increases investment in employee development (Frazis, Gittleman, & Joyce, 2000; Black & Lynch, 1996; Lawler et al., 2001). Cappelli and Neumark (2001) found that high-involvement practices were associated with increased labor costs per employee, which suggests that it increased investment in employee training and wages. Organizations that adopt employee involvement practices are also likely to invest in technology, particularly information technology, which requires additional education and training to operate (Black & Lynch, 1996; Bresnahan, Brynjolfsson, & Hitt, 2002). Using data from four representative surveys from 1992 to 2006 Green (2012) concluded that employee involvement has promoted the use of higher order cognitive and interactive skills in workplaces across the UK.

Along with increased skills employee involvement should lead to increased wages (Osterman, 2006). One reason is that employee involvement increases productivity, which should increase an employer’s ability to pay workers. Another reason is that employee involvement can increase the power of employees to demand higher wages either formally through union representation or indirectly as a byproduct of their expanded contributions and new roles within organizations.

However, research results regarding the relationship between employee involvement and wages are mixed. Several studies have concluded that organizations with employee involvement and related practices generally pay higher wages. For example, Freeman and Lazear (1995) found that participative decision making through work councils led to higher wages. Cooke (1994) found higher wages in companies with teams and incentive pay. Chadwick and Fister (2001) found that wages were positively related to the use of self-managed teams. Other researchers have concluded that wages rise in some cases and not in others. Batt (2004) found in samples of sales and service employees that employee discretion at work was positively related to wages, while the use of specific practices (e.g., problem-solving teams) were not. Hunter and Lafkas (2003) found positive effects for quality circles but not for general increased decision making in a study of call center employees. Arthur (1992) and Black, Lynch, and Krivelyova (2004) both found that wages rise with high performance work only when unions are present.

Finally, there are studies that conclude that wages do not rise with the adoption of high-involvement practices. Osterman (1994; 2000) found no relationship between the adoption of high-performance work practices and subsequent wage increases. He concluded that despite the large increase in the use of employee involvement practices in the 1990s, “aggregate measures of employee welfare do not show commensurate gains” (Osterman, 2000, p. 180). Similarly, Handel and Gittleman (2004) concluded using the Survey of Employer Provided Training that there is little evidence that high performance work is associated with higher wages.

Osterman (2004) attributed the lack of consistency in the findings concerning pay changes to differences in the data and the measurement of high involvement and employee wages across studies. In a re-analysis of data from the 1997 National Establishment Survey (NES), he also raised the possibility that the wage benefits of employee involvement are not spread evenly across different types of organizations, or even within organizations to different types of employees. Osterman concluded that core blue-collar employees enjoy higher wages in high-performance work systems, while managerial and clerical employees do not. He argued that this may account for the non-findings in some studies, given that they fail to differentiate between core and managerial employees; they also do not account for the fact that front-line employees in high involvement workplaces likely reduce the need for higher-paid managerial employees. This argument regarding the adoption of employee involvement in traditional low-wage manufacturing was supported by Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, and Kallenberg (2000). They found significant wage increases from high involvement in steel and apparel manufacturing industries, but not in medical imaging.

Research on Employee Involvement and Employee Attitudes and Motivation

Employee involvement practices are theorized to positively affect organizational performance through some combination of creating more efficient work processes and increasing the motivation of workers (Bodah, McHugh, & Kim, 2008; Huselid, 1995; Ichniowsky et al., 1996; Lawler, 1986; Wood & Wall, 2007). That is, the positive effects of employee involvement on organizational performance come from the increased utilization of the knowledge and skills of employees. This increased efficacy of workers then motivates them to

give extra effort, resulting in higher productivity coupled with lower absenteeism, grievances and turnover, all of which ultimately have a positive effect on the bottom line.

A major critique of the early research on “high-performance” practices was that most studies of the performance effects of employee involvement tended to assume a positive effect on employee attitudes, abilities, and effort when examining organizational performance. They focused on the relationship between practices and organizational outcomes, such as sales per employee, return on assets, and market returns leaving the effect of the work practices on employees as a “black box”. Research over the last 10-20 years research has shifted toward employee attitudes and motivation as the source of the productivity and profitability gains that arise from employee involvement.

This work has consistently shown positive effects of involvement practices on employee attitudes and work climate. For example, Freeman and Rogers (1995) reported that 79% of non-managerial participants in employee involvement programs report having “personally benefited from [their] involvement in the program by getting more influence on how [their] job is done” (p. 340). Freeman, Kleiner, and Ostroff (2000) further concluded that employee involvement practices are associated with increased job satisfaction and greater trust in management. Studies of worker reactions to employee involvement in the U.K. show similar results (Guest; 1999; Guest & Conway, 1999). Goddard (2001) found that involvement has positive relationships with satisfaction, commitment, and belongingness among Canadian employees. Kalmi and Kauhanen (2008) found similar beneficial effects for teamwork and participation among Finish employees.

There is also research which shows that employee involvement practices promote positive attitudes toward the organization, which in turn lead to extra effort (Cappelli & Rogovsky, 1998), prosocial behavior (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), safety (Probst & Brubaker, 2001) and employee retention (Koys, 2001). Several studies have shown that high involvement contributes to "HR climates" that are associated with greater employee commitment and discretionary effort. There are many studies which find that employee involvement, as part of a larger set of "high commitment" work practices, positively influences employee attitudes, absenteeism, turnover, and subsequent firm performance (Arthur, 1994; Lam & White, 1998; Scholarios et al., 2000; Tsui, Pearce, Porter, & Tripoli, 1997; Takeuchi, Chen & Lepak, 2009).

In a large study of insurance company employees, Vandenberg et al. (1999) found that employee involvement leads to positive employee attitudes, which, in turn, lead to improved individual and organizational performance. Employee involvement was directly related to the commitment and satisfaction of workers, which, in turn, were associated with higher individual performance rankings for employees and greater customer satisfaction with their work units. Similarly, Morrison (1995) and Koys (2001) found that employee attitudes, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover likely mediate the effects of employee involvement and other HR practices on customer satisfaction and organizational effectiveness. Overall, research suggests that employees respond positively to high-involvement practices under most conditions, and this leads to greater job satisfaction and organizational commitment. These attitudes then have benefits for employee performance, safety, and the service climate in organizations.

This research shows that employee attitudes and well being provides one of the critical pathways through which employee involvement leads to organizational performance. The common link between these studies appears to be the process of social exchange in which employees see EI practices as an effort to promote worker interests and well being and reciprocate with positive attitudes and discretionary effort towards company goals (Evans & Davis, 2005; Takeuchi et al. 2007; Kehoe & Wright, 2010). This means that in order for employee involvement programs to thrive the employees need to interpret the involvement practices as a genuine reflection of value that the organization places in the front-line worker. (Takeuchi et al. 2007; Chuang & Liao, 2010; Messersmith, Patel, Lepak & Gould-Williams, 2011). While most studies show that employees are likely to perceive involvement practices in a positive manner, this may not always be the case (Nishii & Wright, 2008; Nishii, Lepak & Schneider, 2008; Kuvaas, 2008; Searle et al. 2011).

Recent work on how employees react to HPWS suggest that the ways in which the motivation for implementing the practices is perceived by employees is a key determinant in whether they embrace the practices. If employees perceive that the practices are only implemented to increase productivity or get more out of employees they tend to resist and undermine the changes. For example, using data from a large supermarket chain Nishii and colleagues studied the attributions that employees make for the “why” of high involvement practices and found that employees who view the practices as a “win-win” situation have different behavioral and attitudinal reactions to the practices than those who felt the practices were implemented simply to get the most out of employees (Nishii & Wright, 2008; Nishii, Lepak & Schneider, 2008).

Research on Employee Involvement and Workload, Stress, and Injuries

While there is significant research demonstrating the benefits of employee involvement, there is an alternate perspective which argues that employee involvement practices are implemented as a means to subvert unionism and increase workloads rather than to benefit employees (Bodah et al., 2008; Goddard, 2004). There is the possibility of employers using expanded responsibility of front-line employees to increase job demands, raise production targets and decrease headcounts without supporting employees, developing skills, and increasing wages. If increased performance demands are accompanied by the threat of layoff or the replacement of workers who are not able to adapt to an environment of higher expectations, then employee involvement will ultimately be labeled as the next chapter in the continuing efforts of management to “exploit” workers.

Using data on British employees, Ramsay, Scholarios, & Harley (2000) argued that new work practices in general have had the effect of increasing stress and workload on employees. Increased stress from employee involvement is thought to arise from several sources. First, while employees are given discretion in their jobs, the pace of the work usually increases. In a study of the NUMMI plant in Fremont California, for example, researchers concluded that time spent per car decreased while output increased (Berggren, 1993). Second, the nature of the work itself can become more stressful for front-line employees as responsibility and uncertainty increases. Third, Barker (1993) argued that self-managed teams encourage workers to monitor each other, which can be an even more coercive and stressful form of control than traditional supervision.

There has been some research which finds workplace transformation increases workloads, work hours, and stress. For example, Mackie, Holahan and Gottlieb (2001) found that healthcare workers in participatory environments reported a decrease in the sense of coherence and control in the workplace, which increased stress and symptoms of depression. Danford and colleagues (2008) studied six unionized firms in the UK and concluded that team-based work and a partnership environment were associated with increased work hours and worker stress. There is also some evidence that employee involvement leads to greater stress and insecurity for supervisors who are included in involvement practices (Mahoney, 2007). In a study of telephone operating companies, Batt (2004) found that while workers in participative teams had higher job satisfaction related to their increased discretion, their supervisors reported lower perceived job security and lower job satisfaction relative to supervisors in work groups without participation.

In addition to stress there have also been studies which conclude that work transformation may be associated with injury. Fairris and Brenner (2001) and Brenner, Fairris, and Ruser (2004) investigated the relationship between “flexible” work practices and workplace safety and cumulative trauma injuries, such as carpal tunnel syndrome. They note that the cumulative trauma injuries increased significantly during the same time periods that new work practices became popular in the U.S. and conclude that there is evidence that practices, including just in time inventory (JIT) systems, Total Quality Management (TQM), and performance-based pay are related to repetitive motion injuries. To be clear, most of the practices studied go well beyond what are considered the core practices of employee involvement and are more likely to be associated with work speedups.

While the empirical evidence for increased stress, injuries, and hours is mixed, the negative findings are balanced by the larger number of studies showing positive effects of employee involvement on stress and safety. While there are certainly examples where employee involvement practices are associated with negative worker outcomes in terms of stress and workload, these appear to represent extreme versions of involvement practices. In a telephone survey of Canadians, Goddard (2001) found that teamwork and similar work practices had positive relationships with belongingness, empowerment, satisfaction and esteem. However, he also found that these benefits were diminished at high levels of implementation, suggesting that there were limited or potentially negative effects of extreme levels of teamwork and participation. Employees are also likely to have more negative experiences with involvement practices if they are not fully implemented. Being held responsible for production and given variable pay but not control over work processes leads to anxiety and role overload (Jensen, Patel and Messersmith, 2011).

Advocates of employee involvement acknowledge that the nature of work performed by front-line employees often involves greater risk, higher-level skills, and more difficult decisions. However, when high-involvement practices are implemented, these new stresses are thought to be outweighed by the motivational and psychological benefits of greater autonomy, responsibility, and the opportunity to develop and use new skills and knowledge. Appelbaum et al. (2006) argued that additional discretionary effort from employees does not necessarily mean that their workload has increased; only that employees are performing higher order work. In a representative sample of UK employees Wood and de Menezes (2011) found

enriched jobs and high involvement management practices both negatively related to anxiety on the job.

As for the relationship between EI and workplace safety there is a significant body of work that shows that individual involvement practices including information sharing, participation and team working promote a climate of safety and reduce accidents on the job. Studies done in industrial settings including chemical plants and manufacturing demonstrate that teams with more decision-making authority and control over the different aspects of their work have fewer work-related injuries (Hechanova-Alampay & Beehr, 2001; Kaminski, 2001). In a study of Canadian companies Zacharatos, Barling and Iverson (2005) found that HPWS promote both trust in management and a safety climate which in turn increased employees safety awareness and the number of accidents on the job.

Employee Involvement and the Healthy Workplace: Conclusion

Employee involvement is a core aspect of the healthy workplace and this review of the research foundations of employee involvement suggests clear benefits for firms and workers. Evidence has accumulated over the decades as the core practices of involvement have evolved from early experimentation in the 1960's to widespread adoption in the 1990's to acceptance today. From its beginnings on the factory floor employee involvement has grown into common operating procedure in many companies and a basic expectation for the experience of work by many different kinds of employees. Today we see a movement to reaffirm the basic principles of involvement in work on the healthy workplace and positive organizational psychology. Contemporary models of employee thriving at work, for example, draw heavily on employee involvement theory in predicting the benefits of learning and agentic work behavior (Spreitzer

et al., 2005). Employee involvement is also core part the healthy workplace model (Gratwich, Gottschalk & Munz, 2006).

Employee involvement contributes to healthy workplaces by allowing employees to identify “high-leverage practices” that help improve their work experience and organizational effectiveness (Grawitch, Ledford, Ballard & Barber, 2009). As this review of the research foundations of EI demonstrates, involvement also plays a key role in supporting other aspects of the healthy workplace including recognition, growth and development, safety and overall well-being. If done well employee involvement allows employees to do more meaningful work, experience a more positive contribution and reap the intrinsic rewards of a job well done.

This review also shows that there are important differences in the success of the practices depending on how and where they are implemented. Employee involvement is not suited for every employer, sector, and strategy, and it is becoming increasingly clear where it fits and where it does not. In the late 1980s and 1990s, there was a wholesale push toward the adoption of employee involvement; some firms, no doubt, implemented the practices simply because everyone else was doing it. It is now clear that what once looked like an easy universal route to productivity improvement is actually a complex change that requires the right type of work, the right motivations, effective leadership and a sustained commitment.

While there are some dissenters, there appears to be a general consensus that employee involvement practices have benefited workers and firms both economically and qualitatively through more satisfying and interesting jobs. At the same time, it also seems clear that employee involvement has not met the promise suggested by the strongest advocates as a means to truly transform all workplaces into healthy workplaces or “mutual gains enterprises.”

Many questions remain concerning the future of specific employee involvement practices, but given the evidence that many involvement work practices yield a consistent competitive advantage along with benefits for workers, there is good reason to believe that employee involvement practices will continue to be utilized. However, we are likely to see less talk about the “transformation” of workplaces and how employee involvement is a progressive approach to management. Many practices that are associated with employee involvement are simply assumed best practice in companies and will continue to be adopted and utilized as such. Thus, rather than being seen as part of a new approach to management, employee involvement management practices will simply be adopted because they are seen as the right way to manage an effective organization.

Table 1

~~IMPACT OF~~ EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT PRACTICES

| | PRACTICES |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Knowledge | Skill Based Pay Commitment to training |
| Information | Gainsharing Open books |
| Power | Job Enrichment Work teams |
| Rewards | Gainsharing Employee ownership Profit sharing |

- Adler, P., B. Goldoftas, and D. Levine. 1997. "Ergonomics, Employee Involvement, and the Toyota Production System: A Case Study of NUMMI's 1993 Model Introduction." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 416–38.
- Appelbaum, E., T. Bailey, P. Berg, and A. Kallenberg. 2000. *Manufacturing Advantage: Why High-Performance Work Systems Pay Off*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Appelbaum, E., and R. Batt. 1995. *The New American Workplace: Transforming Work Systems in the United States*. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- Argyris, C. 1957. *Personality and Organizations*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Arthur, J. B. 1994. Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3): 670–687.
- Bailey, T. 1993. Organizational innovation in the apparel industry. *Industrial Relations*, 32(1), 30.
- Barker, J. R. 1993. Tightening the Iron Cage: Concertive Control in Self-Managing Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38(3): 408–437.
- Batt, R. 2002. Managing customer services: human resource practices, quit rates, and sales growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 587–597.
- Batt, R. 2004. Who Benefits from Teams? Comparing Workers, Supervisors, and Managers. *Industrial Relations*, 43(1), 183–212.
- Barker, J. 1993. "Tightening the Iron Cage: Concertive Control in Self-Managing Teams." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 408–37.
- Becker, B., & Gerhart, B., 1996. The impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 779-801
- Benson, G. & Lawler, L. 2010. *Raising skill demand: Generating Good Jobs*. In *Transforming the US Workforce Development System* (Finegold, D. Gatta, M. Salzman, H., and Schurman, S. Eds.), Champaign, IL: Labor and Employment Relations Association.
- Berggren, C. 1994. NUMMI vs. Uddevalla. *Sloan Management Review*, 35(2), 37-45.
- Black, S. E., & Lynch, L. M. 1996. Human-capital investments and productivity. *American Economic Review*, 86(2), 263.
- Black, S., L. Lynch, and A. Krivelyova. 2004. "How Workers Fare When Employers Innovate." *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 44–66.

- Bodah, M. M., McHugh, P. P., & Yim, S. J. 2008. Employee Involvement Programs and Collective Bargaining: The Role of Labor Relations Climate. *Journal of Collective Negotiations*, 32(3): 245–260.
- Boxall, P., & Macky, K. (2009). Research and theory on high-performance work systems: progressing the high-involvement stream. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19(1), 3–23.
- Brenner, M.D., D. Fairris, and J.W. Ruser. 2004. “ ‘Flexible’ Work Practices and Occupational Safety and Health: Exploring the Relationship Between Cumulative Trauma Disorders and Workplace Transformation.” *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 242–66.
- Bresnahan, T., E. Brynjolfsson, and L. Hitt. 2000. “Information Technology, Workplace Organization, and the Demand for Skilled Labor: Firm-Level Evidence. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 117, no. 1, pp. 339–76.
- Camps, J., & Luna-Arocas, R. 2009. High involvement work practices and firm performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(5): 1056–1077.
- Cappelli, P., & Neumark, D. 2001. Do “high-performance” work practices improve establishment-level outcome? *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 54(4): 737–775.
- Cappelli, P., & Rogovsky, N. 1998. Employee involvement and organizational citizenship: Implications for labor law reform and “lean production.” *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 51(4): 633–653.
- Caroli, E., and J. Van Reenen. 2001. “Skill-Based Organizational Change? Evidence from a Panel of British and French Establishments.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 116, no. 4, pp. 1449–92.
- Chadwick, C., and T. Fister. 2001. *Innovative Human Resource Practices and Outcomes for Workers*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Chuang, C. H., & Liao, H. U. I. 2010. Strategic human resource management in service context: Taking care of business by taking care of employees and customers. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(1): 153–196.
- Cooke, W. N. 1994. Employee participation programs, group-based incentives, and company performance: A union-non-union comparison, *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 47(4), 594.
- Combs, J., Yongmei Liu, Hall, A., & Ketchen, D. 2006. How much do high performance practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(3), 501–528.

- Cotton, J., 1993. *Employee Involvement*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J. 1991. The impact of economic performance of a transformation in workplace relations. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 44(2), 241–260.
- Danford, A., Richardson, M., Stewart, P., Tailby, S., and Upchurch, M. 2008. Partnership, high performance work systems and quality of working life. *New Technology, Work & Employment*, 23:3, 151-166.
- Datta, D., Guthrie, J., & Wright, P. 2005. Human resource management and labor productivity: Does industry matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(1), 135-145.
- Delery, J., & Doty, D.H. 1996. Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic, contingency, and configurational performance predictions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 802-835.
- Evans, W. R., & Davis, W. D. 2005. High-performance work systems and organizational performance: The mediating role of internal social structure. *Journal of Management*, 31(5): 758–775.
- Fairris, D., and M. Brenner, 2001. “Workplace Transformation and the Rise in Cumulative Trauma disorders: Is There a Connection?” *Journal of Labor Research*. Vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 15–28.
- Fernie, S., & Metcalf, D. 1995. Participation, contingent pay, representation and workplace performance: Evidence from Great Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 33(3), 380-415.
- Frazis, H., M. Gittleman, and M. Joyce. 2000. “Correlates of Training: An Analysis of Both Employer and Employee Characteristics.” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 443–62.
- Freeman, R. B., Kleiner, M. M., & Ostroff, C. 2000. The anatomy of employee involvement and its effects on firms and workers. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Freeman, R. B., & Rogers, J. 1995. Worker representation and participation survey. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Freeman, R., and J. Rogers. 1999. *What Workers Want*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Freeman, R., and E. Lazear. 1994. *An Economic Effects of Works Councils*. Working Paper No. 4918. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Gant, J., Ichniowski, C., & Shaw, K. 2002. Social capital and organizational change in high involvement and traditional work organizations. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 11(2), 289-328.
- Gerhart, B., Wright, P., McMahan, G., & Snell, S. 2000. Measurement Error in Research on Human Resources and Firm Performance: How Much Error Is there and How Does it Influence Effect Size Estimates?. *Personnel Psychology* (53), 803-834.
- Gittleman, M., Horrigan, M., & Joyce, M. 1998. "Flexible" workplace practices: Evidence of a nationally representative survey. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 52(1), 99–115.
- Goddard, J. 2001. "High Performance and the Transformation of Work? The Implications of Alternative Work Practices for the Experience of Outcomes at Work." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 776–805.
- Godard, J. 2004. A critical assessment of the high-performance paradigm. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42(2), 349–378.
- Godard, J., & Delaney, J. T. 2000. Reflections on the "high performance" paradigm's implications for industrial relations as a field. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 482–502.
- Grawitch, M., Gottschalk, M., and Munz, D. 2006. The path to a healthy workplace: A critical review linking healthy practices, employee well-being and organizational improvements. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 58, 129-147.
- Grawitch, M. J., Ledford, J. E., Ballard, D. W., & Barber, L. K. 2009. Leading the healthy workforce: The integral role of employee involvement. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research*, 61(2), 122-135.
- Green, F. 2012. Employee involvement, technology and evolution in job skills: A task-based analysis. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 65:1, 36-66.
- Guest, D., & Conway, N. 1999. Peering into the Black Hole: The Downside of the New Employment Relations in the UK. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 37(3): 367–389.
- Guest, D. E. 1999. Human resource management — the workers' verdict. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 9(3): 5–25.
- Guest, D., Michie, J., Sheehan, M and Conway, N. 2003. "A UK study of the relationship between human resource management and corporate performance" *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41, 2, 291-314.

- Guthrie, J., Spell, C., & Nyamori, R. O. 2002 Correlates and consequences of high involvement work practices: The role of competitive strategy. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(1), 183-197.
- Hammer, M., & Champy, J. 1988. *Reengineering the Corporation*. New York: Harper Business.
- Handel, M.J., and M. Gittleman, 2004. "Is There a Wage Payoff to Innovative Work Practices?" *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 67–97.
- Harley, B., Allen, B. C., & Sargent, L. D. 2007. High Performance Work Systems and Employee Experience of Work in the Service Sector: The Case of Aged Care. *British Journal Of Industrial Relations*, 45(3), 607-633.
- Hechanova-Alampay, R., and Beehr, T. 2001. Empowerment, span of control and safety performance in work teams after workforce reduction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 275-282.
- Hodson, R., and Roscigno, V. 2004. "Organizational Success and Worker Dignity: Complementary or Contradictory?" *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 110, no. 3, pp. 672–708.
- Hunter, L., and J. Lufkas. 2003. "Opening the Box: Information Technology, Work Practices and Wages." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 224–43.
- Huselid, M. 1995. "The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Turnover, Productivity, and Corporate Performance." *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 635–72.
- Huselid, M., & Becker, B. 1996. Methodological issues in cross-sectional and panel estimates of the human resource-firm performance link. *Industrial Relations*. 35(3), 400-422.
- Ichniowski, C. 1990. *Human Resource Management Systems and the Performance of U.S. Manufacturing Businesses*. Working Paper No.3449. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Ichniowski, C., Shaw, K., & Prenzushi, G. 1995. The effects of human resource management practices on productivity. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Ichniowski, C., Kochan, T., Levine, D., Olson, C., & Strauss, G. 1996. What works at work: Overview and Assessment. *Industrial Relations*, 35(3), 299-333.
- Jensen, J. M., Patel, P. C., & Messersmith, J. G. 2011. High-Performance Work Systems and Job Control: Consequences for Anxiety, Role Overload, and Turnover Intentions. *Journal of Management*.

- Kalmi, P., & Kauhanen, A. 2008. Workplace Innovations and Employee Outcomes: Evidence from Finland. *Industrial Relations*, 47(3): 430–459.
- Kaminski, M. 2001. Unintended consequences: Organizational practices and their impact on workplace safety and productivity. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 127-138.
- Kaufman, B. E. 2010. SHRM Theory in the Post-Huselid Era: Why It Is Fundamentally Misspecified. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 49(2): 286–313.
- Kehoe, R. R., & Wright, P. M. 2010. The impact of high performance human resource practices on employees' attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Management*.
- Kling, J. 1995. High performance work systems and firm performance. *Monthly Labor Review*, May, 29-36.
- Koch, M., & McGrath, R. 1996. Improving labor productivity: Human resource management policies do matter. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 335-354.
- Koys, D. 2001. "The Effects of Employee Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Turnover on Organizational Effectiveness: A Unit-Level Longitudinal Study." *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 54, pp. 101–14.
- Kuvaas, B. 2008. An Exploration of How the Employee–Organization Relationship Affects the Linkage Between Perception of Developmental Human Resource Practices and Employee Outcomes. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(1): 1–25.
- Lam, L. W., & White, L. P. 1998. Human Resource Orientation and Corporate Performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(4): 351–364.
- Lawler, E. E. 1986. *High involvement management: Participative strategies for improving organizational performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. 1992. *The Ultimate Advantage: Creating the High Involvement Organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. 1996. *From the Ground Up: Six Principles for Creating the New Logic Organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E. 2003. *Treat people right!: How organizations and individuals can propel each other into a virtuous spiral of success*. Jossey-Bass.

- Lawler, E. E., Mohrman, S. A., & Benson, G. 2001. *Organizing for high performance: Employee involvement, TQM, reengineering, and knowledge management in the Fortune 1000: The CEO report*. Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E., Mohrman, S. A., & Ledford, G. E. 1998. *Strategies for high performance organizations: Employee involvement, TQM, and reengineering programs in Fortune 1000 corporations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. 2002. Examining the human resource architecture: The relationships among human capital, employment, and human resource configurations. *Journal of Management*, 28(4): 517–543.
- Lepak, D., Taylor, M.S., Tekleab, A., Marrone, J., & Cohen, D. 2007. An examination of the use of high investment human resource systems for core and support employees. *Human Resource Management*, 46(2), 223-246.
- Likert, R. 1961. *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Locke, R., Kochan, T., Piore, M. 1995. Reconceptualizing comparative industrial relations: Lessons from international research. *International Labour Review*, 134(2), 139-162.
- Macduffie, J. P. 1995. Human resource bundles and manufacturing performance: organizational logic and flexible production systems in the world auto industry. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 48(2): 197–221.
- Mackie, K. S., Holahan, C. K., & Gottlieb, N. H. 2001. Employee involvement management practices, work stress, and depression in employees of a human services residential care facility. *Human Relations*, 54(8): 1065–1092.
- Mahony, D. 2007. How Participatory Work Practices Affect Front-Line Supervisors. *Journal of Labor Research*, 28(1), 147–168.
- McClean, E., & Collins, C. J. 2011. High-commitment HR practices, employee effort, and firm performance: Investigating the effects of HR practices across employee groups within professional services firms. *Human Resource Management*, 50(3): 341–363.
- McGregor, D. 1960. *The Human Side of the Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Messersmith, Jake G., Patel, Pankaj C., Lepak, David P., & Gould-Williams, J. S. 2011. Unlocking the black box: Exploring the link between high-performance work systems and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6): 1105–1118.

- Michie, J., & Sheehan, M. 2005. Business strategy, human resources, labour market flexibility and competitive advantage. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(3): 445–464.
- Morrison, E. W. 1995. Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a Critical Link between HRM Practices and Service Quality. *Human Resource Management*, 35(4): 493–512.
- Nishii, L. & Wright, P. 2008. *Variability at multiple levels of analysis: Implications for strategic human resource management*. In Smith DB (Ed.), *The People Make the Place* (pp. 225-248). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nishii, L., Lepak, D. & Schneider, B. 2008. Employee attributions of the “why” of HR practices: Their effects on employee attitudes and behaviors, and customer satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 503-545.
- Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. 1980. Work design in the organizational context. *Research In Organizational Behavior*, 2247.
- Oldham, G. R., Hackman, J., & Pearce, J. L. 1976. Conditions Under Which Employees Respond Positively to Enriched Work. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 61(4), 395-403.
- O’Reilly, C., and J. Chatman. 1986. “Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior.” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71, no. XX, pp. 492–9.
- Osterman, Paul. 1994. How common is workplace transformation and who adopts it? *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 47(2), 173–188.
- Osterman, P. 2000. “Work Restructuring in an Era of Restructuring: Trends in Diffusion and Effect on Employee Welfare.” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 179–96.
- Osterman, P. 2006. “The Wage Effects of High Performance Work Organization in Manufacturing.” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 187–204.
- O’Toole, J., Lawler III, E. E., & Meisinger, S. R. 2007. *The new American workplace*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Posthuma, R., Campion, M., Masimova, M., and Campion, M. 2013. A high performance work practices taxonomy: Integrating the literature and directing future research. *Journal of Management*, 39:5, p. 1184-1220.
- Preuss, G. & Lautsch, B. 2002. The effect of formal versus informal job security on employee involvement programs. *Industrial Relations*, 57:3, pp.517-539.

- Probst, T., and T. Brubaker. 2001. "The Effects of Job Insecurity on Employee Safety Outcomes: Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Explorations." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 6, no. 2, 139–59.
- Ramsay, H., Scholarios, D., & Harley, Bill. 2000. Employees and High-Performance Work Systems: Testing inside the Black Box. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 38(4): 501–531.
- Rosen, C., Case, J., & Staubus, M. 2005. Every Employee an Owner. [Really.]. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(6), 122-130.
- Scholarios, D., Ramsay, D., Harley, B. 2000. 'High Commitment' Management Practices and Employee Outcomes: Evidence from Britain and Australia. *Working Paper in Human Resource Management, ER, and OS, Number 9*. University of Melbourne.
- Searle, R., Den Hartog, D. N., Weibel, A., Gillespie, N., Six, F., Hatzakis, T., et al. 2011. Trust in the employer: the role of high-involvement work practices and procedural justice in European organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(05): 1069–1092.
- Spreitzer, G.M., Sutcliffe, K.M., Dutton, J.E., Sonenshein, S., & Grant, A.M. (2005). A socially-embedded model of thriving at work. *Organization Science*, 16, 537–549.
- Takeuchi, R., Chen, G., & Lepak, D. 2009. Through the looking glass of a social system: Cross-level effects of high-performance work systems of employees' attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(1), 1–29.
- Tsui, A. S., Pearce, J. L., Porter, L. W., & Tripoli, A. M. 1997. Alternative approaches to the employee-organization relationship: Does investment in employees pay off? *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(5): 1089–1997.
- Vandenberg, Robert J., Richardson, Hettie A., & Eastman, L. J. 1999. The Impact of High Involvement Work Processes on Organizational Effectiveness. *Group & Organization Management*, 24(3): 300–339.
- Youndt, M. A., & Snell, S. A. 2004. Human resource configurations, intellectual capital, and organizational performance. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 337–360.
- Youndt, M., Snell, S., Dean, J. and Lepak, D. 1996. Human resource management manufacturing strategy and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 836–866.

- Wanrooy, B., Bewley, H., Bryson, A., Forth, J., Freeth, S., Stokes, L, and Wood, S. 2011. *The 2011 Workplace Employment Relations Study: First Findings*. UK Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.
- Wood, S. & de Menezes, L. 1998, High commitment management in the UK: Evidence from the Workplace Industrial Relations Survey, and Employers' Manpower and Skills Practices Survey, *Human Relations*, 51(4), 485-515.
- Wood, S. & de Menezes, L. 2011. High-involvement management, high performance work systems and well-being. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22:7, 1586-1610.
- Wood, S. J., & Wall, T. D. 2007. Work enrichment and employee voice in human resource management-performance studies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(7), 1335–1372.
- Wright, P. M., Gardner, T. M., Moynihan, L. M., & Allen, M. R. 2005. The relationship between HR practices and firm performance: Examining the causal order. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 409-446.
- Zachartos, A., Barling, J., and Iverson, R. 2005. High performance work systems and occupational safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90:1, 77-93.