



This is a repository copy of *The well-being and voice of migrant workers in participatory organizational interventions*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/174066/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Le, H., Nielsen, K. orcid.org/0000-0001-9685-9570 and Noblet, A. (2022) The well-being and voice of migrant workers in participatory organizational interventions. *International Migration*, 60 (3). pp. 52-71. ISSN 0020-7985

<https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12885>

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Le, H, Nielsen, K, Noblet, A. (2021). The well-being and voice of migrant workers in participatory organizational interventions. *International Migration*, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12885>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

The well-being and voice of migrant workers in participatory organizational interventions

Dr. Huong Le *, Prof. Karina Nielsen**, and Prof. Andrew Noblet*

Dr Huong Le (corresponding author)

Address:

Department of Management, Deakin Business School, Deakin University

221 Burwood Highway, Burwood, VIC 3125, Australia

Email: huong.le@deakin.edu.au

Dr Huong Le is a Senior Lecturer, Course Director for the Master of Commerce at Deakin Business School, Deakin University, Australia. Her research areas are employee well-being, diversity in organizations, migrant workers, and career development. She has published in leading journals such as British Journal of Management, Journal of Vocational Behavior, Journal of Business Ethics, Human Resource Management Review and The International Journal of Human Resource Management.

Professor Karina M. Nielsen is Chair of Work Psychology and Director of the Institute of Work Psychology, University of Sheffield, UK. She is affiliated with Karolinska Institutet, Sweden and the Center for the Promotion of Health in the New England Workplace (CPH-NEW), US. She researches the design, implementation and evaluation of participatory organizational interventions. (Email: k.m.nielsen@sheffield.ac.uk)

Professor Andrew Noblet is a Director of Research in the Department of Management, Deakin Business School. His research interests are in the areas of workplace mental health, job engagement, organizational fairness, leader-member relationships, and intervention research. Much of Andrew's recent work has focused on planning, implementing and evaluating strategies aimed to enhance the health of workers and the environments in which they work. Andrew is awarded several prestigious NHMRC grants for his research in health and wellbeing areas. (Email: andrew.noblet@deakin.edu.au)

*Deakin University, Australia

**The University of Sheffield, UK

The well-being and voice of migrant workers in participatory organizational interventions

ABSTRACT

Organizational interventions that draw on participatory processes to tap into the views of workers can benefit both the health of workers and their organizations. However, the frameworks used to develop participatory organizational interventions are often described in a generic, ‘one size fits all’ manner. Considering the specific needs of diverse groups such as migrants is important, given current migration rates globally. Using the migrant voice, cross-cultural management, organizational change, and organizational intervention literature, this paper extends the literature by conceptually discussing the theoretical insights to identify specific strategies that enable migrant workers to have a genuine voice in organizational interventions. Another contribution is to propose a participatory intervention framework that organizations can implement to maximize the voice of migrant workers and subsequently improve their well-being. The directions of future organizational intervention research involving migrant workers and implications on integration policy, integration support systems, and unionization are discussed.

Keywords: Intervention, migrant, well-being, participation, voice, job stress.

INTRODUCTION

Migrants are defined “by foreign birth, by foreign citizenship, or by their movement into a new country to stay temporarily (sometimes for as little as a year) or to settle for the long-term” (Anderson and Blinder, 2015: 2). We focus on migrants who have gained paid employment (i.e., full-time, part-time, short-term, or permanent employment) in their new country with or without job protections, from now termed ‘migrant workers’. We discuss migrant worker involvement within the context of Western countries, largely because these countries actively seek to attract migrant workers, are characterized by a culture that supports citizen participation, and generally have statutory regulations in place to manage adverse working conditions such as unsafe equipment, discriminatory practices (e.g., European Commission, 1989; US Department of Labor *et al.*, 2014). Western countries thus provide a suitable context to explore how organizational interventions that are designed to create healthier and more satisfying working environments for migrant workers. Hence, this paper aims, first, to identify specific strategies that enable migrant workers to have a genuine voice in organizational interventions, and second, to conceptually discuss and develop a participatory organizational intervention framework that practitioners and researchers can implement to maximize the voice of migrant workers in interventions and subsequently to improve their well-being.

Organizational interventions are defined as actions that are planned, behavioral, and theory-based, which aim to improve a range of employee health-related outcomes (i.e., reduced job stress, enhanced job satisfaction) through modifying how work is designed, organized, and managed (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). Interventions such as providing all workers with greater decision-making latitude, improving supervisory support, and strengthening team functioning can also benefit the organization through, for example, reductions in health care and insurance costs related to occupational injury; decreased absenteeism, turnover, and other withdrawal behaviors; and an increase in worker productivity and client satisfaction (Nielsen *et al.*, 2014).

Despite the above benefits, organizational interventions often fail to achieve their desired outcomes, particularly in organizations that have a diverse workforce (Nielsen and Miraglia, 2017). These mixed findings have been attributed, in-part, to the tendency to overlook the needs of a diverse workforce (Busch *et al.*, 2017), and to apply planning and implementation processes in a ‘one size fits all’ manner. Although in the migration literature, some studies have examined well-being of migrants (e.g., Bakker *et al.*, 2016; Cantekin, 2018), little is known about the importance of tailoring an organizational intervention to accommodate migrant workers at multicultural workplaces and to improve worker well-being. Two exceptions to this generic approach are studies undertaken by Busch *et al.* (2017) and Sorensen *et al.* and Peters *et al.* (2019; 2020). Busch *et al.* (2017) undertook a quasi-experimental study involving a mix of work groups from three German-based companies. They found that migrants and low-skilled workers who were actively involved in the development of an organizational intervention experienced less psychosomatic complaints and significant reductions in blood pressure, compared to the control group.

The study undertaken by Sorensen, Peters *et al.* (2019; 2020 – the same study) provided key insights into the types of participatory-based processes and techniques that can be used to engage and empower a low-wage diverse workforce. In collaboration with a large US-based food services company, their study drew on a comprehensive range of high-involvement data collection methods to identify problematic working conditions. They also incorporated specific techniques (e.g., photographic vignettes, body maps) to “bridge language, literacy and cultural backgrounds” (p. e37), and to ensure there was a strong fit between the intervention and the organizational context. The authors acknowledge that the active involvement of migrant workers would not have been possible without the ongoing, high-level support of senior managers. This support stemmed not only from management’s desire to ensure the respective organizations complied with workplace health and safety legislation, anti-discrimination laws

but also as a way of better utilizing the views of their diverse workforce to build healthier and more effective working environments. The above examples highlight the reasons why the participating organizations were motivated to adopt this more inclusive approach to intervention development.

In response to the scarcity of organizational intervention research that considers the needs of a diverse workforce, our paper advances the literature in three ways. First, we contribute to the literature by drawing on social exchange theory, the integrative model of organizational trust, and cross-cultural management theory, to identify the approaches and strategies organizations can use to engage migrant workers in intervention processes. These strategies help researchers/practitioners plan and implement these interventions in a way that enables migrant workers to have a genuine say, to feel included in organizational processes, and to improve their well-being. Second, we leverage off these theoretical insights and empirical research to propose a conceptual framework that simultaneously builds voice-promoting working environments for migrant workers. Such knowledge is useful to both agencies tasked with supporting migrants' health and well-being, and to organizations seeking to engage migrant workers in an organizational intervention. Finally, we provide implications on an integration policy and integration support systems for new migrants, as well as recommendations on unionization of migrant workers in Western countries.

THE WELL-BEING OF MIGRANT WORKERS

Migration has become a global phenomenon, with international migrants accounting for 3.5% of the world population and is estimated to reach almost 272 million globally (International Organization for Migration, 2019). Thus, culturally diverse workplaces have become the norm rather than the exception in many Western countries, including the US, Australia, the UK, and

most European Union member states (Burke and Ng, 2006). The continued growth in migration shows no sign of abating, and therefore, the challenge of creating and managing a diverse workforce will remain for the foreseeable future (Burke and Ng, 2006). Suffice to say that high levels of migration coupled with increasing workforce diversity underline the need for research and policies that takes into account the specific needs and capacities of migrant workers.

Despite integration policies and support systems for migrants (including asylum seekers/refugees) existing in many Western countries such as the UK, Netherlands (Bakker *et al.*, 2016), and Australia (Sardana *et al.*, 2016), many migrant workers are unemployed or underemployed (Colic-Peisker and Tilbury, 2007), or employed in low-skilled jobs, due to unrecognized skills and/or qualifications (Sardana *et al.*, 2016), a lack of social and professional networks, discrimination, and other socio-economic barriers (Le *et al.*, 2014). The low-skilled jobs coupled with the precarious nature of the work are more likely to expose migrant workers to adverse working conditions such as low job control, heavy workloads, and chronic job insecurity (Busch *et al.*, 2017; Hanley *et al.*, 2020). While these conditions have all been linked to higher levels of depression, and other mental health concerns among migrant workers (Hiott *et al.*, 2008), the protracted and often ingrained nature of adverse working conditions is exacerbated by the inability of migrant workers to influence their environments (Busch *et al.*, 2017). Together with a generally poor understanding of relevant employment laws (e.g., workplace health and safety, unfair dismissal) (Donaghy, 2009) and language barriers, migrant workers often feel powerless to change adverse working conditions. In view of their heightened exposure to adverse working conditions and poor mental health outcomes, developing models and strategies that can help improve worker well-being by targeting how work is designed, organized and managed is especially important for migrant workers.

There are other structural and contextual constraints on many migrant workers' tenure that affect their participation in organizational interventions. The relationship between trade

unions and migrant workers is often challenging since migrant workers are more likely to accept lower wages, less favorable working, and employment conditions than native workers, thus, creating greater competition for jobs (Gorodzeisky and Richards, 2013; Kranendonk and De Beer, 2016; Marino *et al.*, 2015). In addition to various linguistic and cultural differences, migrants' attitudes toward unionization mean that substantially fewer migrant workers become union members than native workers in many Western countries (Gorodzeisky and Richards, 2013; Kranendonk and De Beer, 2016). At the same time, short-term, temporary, and precarious contracts have been expanded in many Western countries, where migrant workers account for a large percentage of these types of employment (Hanley *et al.*, 2020), posing another difficulty for unionization (Kranendonk and Beer, 2016). In all, the aforementioned constraints mean that migrant workers are more vulnerable to reduced workplace protection and job security, thus undermining their willingness to 'speak-up' and voice their views or concerns.

Despite inter-country migration agreements and ongoing efforts to improve international migration (e.g., Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (2018), many migrant workers hold temporary visas that reduce their access to important labor rights, compound their lack of power and undermine job security (see Hanley *et al.*, 2020 for the cases of agricultural migrant workers in Canada). Further, all European countries have introduced tougher rules aimed at reducing the numbers of regular and irregular migrants entering EU member states. Effectively, these rules have often resulted in migrant workers becoming more marginalized socially and economically, and less likely to secure decent employment (Adepoju *et al.*, 2010). The issues of unionization and migration arrangements demonstrate that migrant workers are much less likely to acquire and/or exercise labor rights, as compared to the local workers (Gorodzeisky and Richards, 2013), significantly hindering their meaningful participation in many organizational activities, including interventions. Thus, our proposed

conceptual model, that promotes migrant worker voice and well-being is one of the ways to overcome this issue.

THEORETICAL INSIGHTS: INCLUSION AND MIGRANT VOICE

As has been highlighted in the Busch et al (2017) and Sorensen, Peters et al (2019; 2020) studies, there are examples of where organizations have navigated the aforementioned structural constraints, gained the trust of migrant workers, and secured their commitment to identifying and addressing adverse working conditions. In the current section, we draw on social exchange theory, the integrative model of organizational trust, and cross-cultural management theory, to provide theoretical insights into the types of strategies and techniques that at a conceptual level, could help address the voice-related constraints faced by migrant workers. These strategies focus on two overlapping areas: (1) initiatives that target organizational conditions and aim to build working environments that motivate migrant workers to share their ideas on how to improve their work environments; and (2) strategies that are aimed at increasing the capacity of migrant workers (knowledge, skill and confidence) to express their views. We then use these insights to develop a participatory intervention framework that can guide the development of organizational interventions to better meet the needs of a culturally diverse workforce.

Building voice-promoting working environments. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) is the commonly used theoretical framework for understanding the motives underlying employees' voice behaviors and provides important insights into the types of situational variables that can help/hinder employees to volunteer their views (Ng and Feldman, 2012). In particular, norms of reciprocity suggest that if employees feel the organization is looking out

for their interests, that they provide opportunities for employees to undertake meaningful work, and there are training and developmental initiatives that facilitate workers' career prospects, then employees are more likely to reciprocate by providing constructive change-oriented suggestions. However, employees are unlikely to exercise voice if they experience stressful conditions such as low levels of job autonomy, poor supervisory support, and strained relationships with managers and/or co-workers (Ng and Feldman, 2012).

Given that large proportions of migrant workers might be exposed to adverse working conditions on a regular basis (Hiott *et al.*, 2008), any attempts to address these conditions via participatory interventions need to be preceded by extensive efforts to gain the trust of migrant workers. Employees' trust in management can be defined as their intention to accept management support when confronted with situations that entail risks (Gao *et al.*, 2011). The integrative model of organizational trust (Mayer *et al.*, 1995) suggests that employees' willingness to trust organizational leaders will rest heavily on workers' assessment of whether management has the ability (a perception that managerial personnel have the necessary leadership skills), integrity (perceptions that management will act in accordance with a set of acceptable principles, especially those involving fairness and congruence between words and actions), and benevolence (a belief that management will act in employees' best interests). Therefore, involving migrant workers in the intervention decision-making process provides a level of transparency and proximity whereby workers can make direct and more accurate assessments of managers' competence, integrity and benevolence (Gao *et al.*, 2011). Consequently, employees are more likely to voice, as they believe organizational leaders have a genuine need for their insights and trust their leaders to interpret and manage their comments in a constructive way.

Building migrant workers' capacity to voice. The second set of strategies is designed to enhance the capacity of migrant workers (knowledge, skill, and confidence) to express their

views. These strategies are largely grounded in cross-cultural management theory (Hofstede, 1980) and aimed at enhancing the inter-cultural management skills of both migrant workers and managers. Cultural norms can influence levels of employee voice (Brockner *et al.*, 2001), depending on the extent to which the worker's national culture considers voice to be a legitimate course of action. For example, power distance (the extent to which 'a society accepts that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally') (Hofstede, 1980: 45) could influence voice. Specifically, employees from high power distance societies (e.g., China) often accept the hierarchical order in organizations without requiring further justification, while employees from low power distance societies (e.g., Scandinavian countries) tend to strive for equal distribution of power and seek justification when levels of power are not uniform (Hofstede, 1980). Workers in high power distance countries may therefore be very reluctant to voice their views, whereas workers in low power distance countries feel enabled to do so (Brockner *et al.*, 2001). These results suggest that the home culture values will play a role in whether migrant workers voice their concerns.

Overall, the above theoretical perspectives suggest that building positive social exchange and organizational trust could secure the involvement and 'buy-in' of migrant workers. Further, cross-cultural training is required to overcome major impediments to migrant workers' voice in the workplace.

PARTICIPATORY INTERVENTIONS AND MIGRANT WORKERS

We propose that to increase the success rate in implementing interventions, the participatory intervention is relevant for encouraging participation from migrant workers (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013: 327). The participatory intervention for diverse workplaces ideally consists of five phases: initiation, screening, action planning, implementation, and evaluation (Nielsen *et al.*,

2014). Each of these phases is made up of a series of actions that are designed to give migrant workers a voice in the decision-making process, alongside managers, specialist personnel and other key stakeholders, and to play an important role in shaping the environments in which they work. These five phases operate in a cycle, meaning that the outcomes of the initial phase inform and guide the actions taken in the subsequent phases.

The aim of the following section is therefore to propose the five phases (and the steps therein) to better meet the needs and capacities of a culturally diverse workplace. As the intervention development process requires effective change management strategies to modify workplace systems and practices, we also incorporate broader change management approaches to strengthen the proposed framework. These approaches include building readiness for change, minimizing resistance to change, adopting an incremental approach, and institutionalizing new ways of working.

Initiation phase

The initiation phase is arguably the most important stage of the intervention; it lays a strong foundation for gaining the trust and buy-in of key stakeholders (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013); ensuring that all initiatives are based on a sound understanding of the needs of workers and the organizations in which they work (Noblet and LaMontagne, 2009); and establishing communication and decision-making mechanisms that enable all levels and areas of the organization to contribute to the intervention initiatives (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). Another important purpose of the initiation phase is to enhance the organization's capacity or 'readiness for change' to plan, implement, and evaluate organizational interventions that consider the specific needs of migrant workers (Holt *et al.*, 2007). There is a real risk that migrant workers are unwilling to share their concerns, and/or their insights are overlooked. Hence, the following section elaborates on those activities where migrant worker voice could be integrated into the

intervention development process and describes how these initiatives can help build work settings where migrant workers can safely express their views. Figure 1 shows the theoretical insights, intervention activities and strategies in the five phases and outcomes of our proposed health and well-being intervention framework for migrant workers.

Insert Figure 1 here

Selecting steering group and project champion

The purpose of a steering group is to plan, implement and monitor the many strategies, processes and methods used in planning and implementing the intervention (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). At a functional level, the decisions made by the steering group can have a significant impact on the extent to which migrant workers understand the purpose of the intervention, and can play a key role in shaping the form and function of the associated initiatives. At a more symbolic level, the attitudes and actions of the steering committee will give migrant workers an insight into the motives and capacities of the steering committee responsible for guiding the project. From an organizational trust perspective (Mayer *et al.*, 1995; Sørensen *et al.*, 2011), it is important that migrant workers have faith in the abilities, integrity and benevolence of committee members, individually and collectively; hence these members need to be selected carefully.

There are a number of strategies that may ensure that the steering committee is viewed favorably by migrant workers. First, the steering group has the authority to change adverse operational systems and practices (i.e., ability), will give migrant workers a voice in discussions regarding the purpose and content of the interventions (integrity), and includes members that

are sympathetic to the needs of minority groups such as migrant workers, and have a genuine desire to create more positive working environments for these workers (benevolence). Often steering groups consist of senior managers, team leaders, human resource practitioners, and other specialist personnel (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013), predominantly from Western/white backgrounds. Therefore, drawing on the cross-cultural management theoretical perspective, we argue that migrant workers from high power distance cultures are intimidated by authority figures and tend to accept managerial decisions without question (Hofstede, 1980), limiting the number of senior or specialist personnel is an important way of enhancing migrant workers' willingness to voice. For example, having a couple of managers or team leaders who have little, or no direct supervision of migrant workers and a human resource professional could facilitate the communication and meetings with migrant workers.

Second, migrant workers should be represented in the steering group. As the similarity attraction paradigm suggests that people tend to be attracted to and influenced by those who are culturally similar to them (Byrne, 1971), having a number of migrant workers on the steering group, who are respected by their peers, can help migrant workers feel more comfortable speaking up, and have greater confidence that their voice will be heard. A valuable way of identifying such workers is to ask migrant workers to suggest fellow migrant workers to whom they turn for support (Busch *et al.*, 2017). A final strategy for improving the ability of the steering committee is to provide cultural intelligence (CQ, defined as a person's ability to function effectively in cross-cultural contexts (Earley and Ang, 2003) training for all committee members. This training can be beneficial for identifying culturally appropriate ways of seeking the input and engagement of a diverse workforce.

Another appointment that will play a pivotal role in gaining the commitment and buy-in of migrant workers is the project champion. The primary responsibility of the project champion is to manage the day-to-day running of the project and, together with the steering

committee, ensure that the interventions achieve their stated goals. In addition to possessing sound project management skills, the project champion needs to have strong process facilitation expertise, have a detailed understanding of migrant workers and the work they undertake, and be able to tailor the intervention planning and implementation processes to meet the needs of both migrant workers and the organization. It is important that the project champion is aware of the cultural diversity that exists within the organization and can use this awareness to develop trusting and positive relationships with migrant workers (Gao *et al.*, 2011). There is therefore a clear need for the project champion to undertake CQ training. Table 1 shows the theoretical underpinning of main activities and strategies in the initiation phase.

Insert Table 1 here

Organizing and delivering preparatory workshops

A key task of the project champion is to organize preparatory workshops with migrant workers, managers, steering committee members, and other key stakeholders (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). These workshops aim to develop and to agree on a set of ‘ground rules’ that will guide how migrant workers interact with each other in any discussions involving the intervention. The workshop should aim to break down organizational norms or practices that might inhibit voice and provide a clear message that migrant workers have an equal voice in the organization and that it is safe for them to express their views. From cross-cultural theoretical perspectives, this approach also aims to narrow the power distance between leaders and migrant workers. Furthermore, workshops should highlight why empowering migrant workers to voice change-oriented ideas is important, and that this broad-based input is expected both in the intervention process and in broader organizational decision-making processes. Emphasizing the dual employer-employee benefits associated with the high-involvement processes is critical for

convincing migrant workers that leaders have a genuine need for their insights and that these ideas can make important contributions to the longer-term performance of the organization, especially in relation to creativity, innovation and finding new ways of addressing existing and emerging issues (Ng and Feldman, 2012).

A separate workshop should be organized for managers, so that they understand the goals of the intervention activities, that they are aware of their responsibilities to ensure all ‘voices’ are heard, and that they are supportive of the process (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). This workshop should aim to provide managers with practical information on: (1) the health and operational benefits associated with the participatory intervention and (2) strategies for creating voice-promoting working environments, in particular those that leverage off the links between working conditions and voice behaviors (Ng and Feldman, 2012), and similarly, between trust in management and employee voice (Gao *et al.*, 2011).

Developing effective communication strategies

Targeted, well-timed communications play an important role in the intervention process, and we follow Nielsen *et al.*’s (2013) suggestions to ensure on-going two-way communication among all stakeholders, as required for successful organizational change management and for minimizing resistance to change (see Peus *et al.*, 2009; Whelan-Berry and Somerville, 2010). We add that a simple but clear communication strategy tailored to the local context is important, especially for migrant workers in low-skilled jobs. The project champion needs to be cognizant of the specific cultural and linguistic needs of the migrant workers; an important way of ensuring this occurs is to have several migrant workers represented on the steering committee, as the similarity paradigm indicates that people are often more comfortable with those who have similar cultural backgrounds to them (Byrne, 1971). This high-level involvement has symbolic as well as functional benefits, signaling to the migrant workers that their voices are valued and are fundamental to achieving the desired operational and health-related outcomes

and in turn, they might reciprocate by actively expressing their opinions. In terms of maximizing the benefits of ‘bottom-up’ and ‘top-down’ communication, both the methods and contents of the communication need to be tailored to the capacities of the workers involved. For example, people from collectivist cultures such as China often use ‘we’ rather than ‘I’, compared to people from individualist cultures (Hofstede, 1980). A number of communication strategies are summarized in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 here

Table 2 describes strategies that researchers and practitioners can use to develop effective communication between managers/project champions and migrant workers and to gain commitment from managers. The information should be communicated in verbal and written forms, and small group discussions with migrant workers would be a good way of engaging them. These discussions should be facilitated by members of the steering committee who, informed by cross-cultural awareness training, are able to use appropriate communication methods to explain the benefits of the intervention. These discussions should be accompanied by written materials (i.e., posters on the notice boards), and be written in simple language using visual approaches (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013), and using animation videos to facilitate migrant workers’ understanding of the intervention process and to overcome any language barriers. The above strategies help build trust and involvement by ensuring that the project champion has regular face-to-face conversations that are aimed at providing updates on progress and giving workers the opportunity to raise any concerns they may have. Providing that these intentions are perceived in an authentic, benevolent light, this level of engagement with organizational

leaders can enhance workers' trust in management (Mayer *et al.*, 1995), and help them feel safe expressing their views.

Integrating voice interventions into daily organizational activities

Nielsen *et al.* (2013) argue that the long-term effectiveness of interventions, and change management more generally, relies heavily on the extent to which they are integrated into the organization and execution of everyday work tasks, also referred to as institutionalizing new ways of working (Kotter and Cohen, 2002). A critical goal of the initiation phase should therefore be to develop and refine decision-making mechanisms (voice opportunities) that work best for the migrant workers taking part in the current intervention. One way that this evaluation could be undertaken is for the project champion to have informal conversations with migrant workers (individually or in small groups), to gauge the extent to which they have taken the opportunity to express their views and, most importantly, to find out why they do not speak up when given the chance. Since developing effective decision-making mechanisms take time, facilitators need to be prepared to 'start small' and gradually expand the scope and scale of the voice opportunities, but ultimately the ability of the organization to tap into the 'hearts and minds' of their members will hinge on these processes.

Screening phase

This phase aims to conduct a systematic screening of the organization's demands and resources, to identify problematic aspects of the environments in which employees work, and to ensure that all levels of the organization are involved in establishing the most effective way of addressing these issues with available resources (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). In this phase, all workers are invited to express their views on the physical and organizational working conditions. The prospect of providing open and honest feedback that may reflect poorly on key authority figures can be stressful for low-skilled, precariously-employed migrant workers

(Wilkinson *et al.*, 2018). Together with the difficulty of expressing complex ideas, the possibility of unfavorable retaliation from managers may prove insurmountable for migrant workers, resulting in low response rates and/or inaccurate findings. Given that the greater level of trust and good-will generated during the preparatory phase a ‘two-step approach’ of semi-structured interviews and an anonymous tailored survey (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013) offers workers considerable protection during the data collection process and may allay migrant workers’ fears.

Semi-structured interviews

Using semi-structured interviews benefits workers from having the opportunity to describe the specific situations that they find stressful (or uplifting) and to offer insights into how these conditions could be improved (Ng *et al.*, 2019). Semi-structured interviews allow the interviewer to develop a positive rapport with participants (Miles and Huberman, 1994), and in turn, for participants to feel comfortable sharing their views on their working environments. Thus, the interviews are best conducted by a neutral (non-management) observer, who is familiar with the types of cross-cultural barriers typically experienced by migrant workers, and who has the communication skills to encourage participants to ‘open-up’ in the discussions. Further, semi-structured, one-to-one interviews are likely to signal to workers that the organization is genuinely interested in their concerns and respects them. This more thorough, time-intensive approach can further increase employees’ trust in the motives of managers and convey the message that authorities are serious about their attempts to improve working conditions and respect their inputs. Ng *et al.* (2019) confirm that when workers believe that they are respected by co-workers and/or managers, they are more likely to voice their concerns or ideas.

Another approach to conducting semi-structured interviews that can benefit migrant workers is to undertake these with teams of workers (i.e., focus groups). Adopting the ‘post-it-

note' approach is recommended (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013) whereby individual participants are asked to write short, simple descriptions of the top three critical issues they face, and what they like about their work environment, on colored post-it-notes. All notes are then placed on a large poster, thereby helping to generate a more complete picture of the critical issues impacting on the team. Members of the team are then asked to work together to draw on each other's responses to prioritize the top issues and map ways to improve working conditions, using another different colored post-it-note. Visual methods of collecting data also help researchers analyze the data in a more efficient way without the need to transcribe and synthesize the interview data, as is the case with traditional interviewing methods (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The 'post-it-note' approach is more cost-effective, especially when working with large numbers of cross-cultural groups, as the time and effort involved in forward and backward translation across multiple languages is minimized.

Once the semi-structured interviews have been undertaken, the overall findings should be summarized in a bullet-point format, and fed back to migrant workers to ensure that the contents accurately capture participants' insights. This process gives participants the opportunity to reflect on their views, and to build on, refine, or modify their suggestions. The final outcomes of the interviews are then discussed in the steering group to help facilitators design a tailored questionnaire to be used in a subsequent survey (Nielsen *et al.*, 2014).

Tailored survey

The purpose of the tailored survey is to help gauge the extent to which the issues raised in the interviews apply across the entire organization, and to provide a reference point against which to assess the impact of the interventions (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). The measures of specific demands and resources included in the survey should be extracted from the qualitative interviews. The tailored survey should also assess migrant workers' voice behaviors and variables linked to their willingness to speak up and contribute to decision-making processes

(e.g., organizational trust, empowering leadership, CQ). The inclusion of these measures serves the dual purpose of examining the extent to which the voice-promoting environment and capacities change over the intervention period, and establishing their relationship with the aforementioned health and performance-related outcomes. The survey should be piloted to ensure that all migrant workers can understand and complete the questionnaire correctly.

Overall, the more context-specific approach to the screening phase helps to develop an in-depth understanding of the particular circumstances that migrant workers find stressful (or supportive), which in-turn, to avoid the ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach to setting goals and developing strategies. Drawing on social exchange theory, this approach also reinforces the message that all workers are valued and that developing healthier work environments cannot be created without everyone’s input (Nielsen *et al.*, 2014).

Action planning phase

The aim of the action planning phase is to convert the results of the screening activities into well-targeted, feasible initiatives (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). A major challenge is to decide on the best way of managing these interventions to ensure that they are implemented on time, within budget, and in the way that they were intended. Support for the interventions can be quickly lost during this phase if the ideas and insights of key stakeholders are not taken into account; hence every effort should be made to ensure that the strategy development and action planning processes are as inclusive as possible. Thus, high trust in leaders and cross-cultural sensitive communication should be maintained throughout this phase. We propose the following four components of the action planning process to ensure that the migrant worker’s voice is heard throughout this phase.

Interpreting the results of the interviews and surveys

Reports detailing the results of the screening phase will help identify areas where organization-wide policies and work practices need to be modified and/or developed while also helping to inform interventions targeting the specific needs of each work unit (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). These reports serve two functions that are especially relevant to a diverse workforce. The first is to establish the relative levels of well-being experienced by migrant and non-migrant workers and to identify circumstances where migrant workers may be at particular risk of experiencing heightened stress (i.e., those on casual contracts or shift workers). The second is to document the levels of voice behavior experienced by all workers and to establish those conditions that are associated with those behaviors (e.g., organizational trust, cultural intelligence). In both cases, the above results can be used to identify groups of workers and/or work areas where priority action is required, and then to provide benchmark data against which to evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions.

Once the above reports have been produced, members of the steering group, managers and worker representatives will review and interpret the results (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). This review aims to identify about five most frequently raised issues arising from the organization-wide data. Ideally, these issues should involve work-based systems, policies, or practices that have positive and/or negative implications for employee well-being.

Feeding back the findings to work units and prioritizing issues

The second stage of the action phase focuses on presenting the results of the interviews and surveys to each team and giving team members the opportunity to reflect on and to modify the priority issues. For multicultural teams, the migrant worker representatives should be involved in presenting the results to help overcome any language barriers. This process strengthens the legitimacy of the migrant worker voice and also serves the more functional purpose of

generating discussion among workers and accurately eliciting their views on the specific situations that contribute to the stress experienced by workers (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). The diagrammatic approach described in the previous section should be used when prioritizing the issues to be addressed in the interventions. For example, a series of emoticons could be used to indicate which issues migrant workers would like to address. The number of smiley faces is then tallied to decide which issues should be given priority in the intervention development process.

Intervention development, change management and action planning

In the third stage of this phase, the specific strategies for addressing the priority issues (i.e., the interventions) and for managing the organizational change process need to be developed. For organizations where there has been a history of marginalizing migrant workers and where distrust in management is a key concern, there is a distinct possibility that workers will still be cynical of managements' motives and/or their ability to bring about positive change. This distrust and cynicism represent major sources of resistance to change and hence the survey data involving organizational trust in combination with the interview findings will provide important insights into whether trust in organizational leaders is a critical issue. Yet, if this is the case, a valuable 'trust repair' strategy is to adopt an incremental approach to organizational change (Al-Haddad and Kotnour, 2015; Peus *et al.*, 2009). That is, individual teams should focus on a number of discrete targets that are amenable to change within a short timeframe and with minimal resources (Tsutsumi *et al.*, 2009). The overall goal is to demonstrate to all parties that (a) organizational leaders are capable of following through on their promises to improve organizational conditions and, (b) that empowering migrant workers and giving them genuine decision-making responsibility can result in improved operational and health-related outcomes.

The incremental approach to change (Al-Haddad and Kotnour, 2015) can be equally valuable to migrant workers themselves who can draw on the high-involvement, 'learn by

doing' mechanisms to progressively develop the skills and confidence to play a greater role in creating more satisfying working environments as part of the participatory action research process (Dickens and Watkins, 1997). Finally, the cyclical and developmental nature of incremental organizational change is consistent with social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), and when undertaken in an ethical and competent manner, can play a key role in establishing systems and practices that are both adaptable and sustainable. That is, the willingness of leaders to change adverse working conditions during the first cycle can enhance migrant workers' willingness to reciprocate and help drive intervention planning, implementation, and evaluation during subsequent cycles (Nielsen and Noblet, 2018).

Once the interventions have been developed, the goal is then to formulate the associated action plans. These plans need to outline who is responsible for each component of the intervention/s; to specify clear goals and sub-goals for the components; and to map these components and goals onto a timeline (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). The action plans also need to consider potential issues that may be encountered when implementing the interventions and outline strategies for overcoming these barriers.

Designing monitoring mechanisms

The intervention monitoring mechanisms are designed to track how the interventions are progressing, relative to the specified goals and timelines, and a key aim should be to rectify emerging problems as early as possible (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). The steering committee needs to be aware that migrant workers are less likely to speak up regarding potential implementation problems; hence, strategies need to be developed for monitoring progress (e.g., reporting intervention progress at team meetings; having informally 'check-in' with a cross-section of migrant workers on a regular basis). Tracking the progress of an action plan should be completed on an on-going basis, and the results of this checking made as accessible as possible. Kaizen boards can be used to visualize and track progress of problem solving efforts in

workplaces, where any barriers or issues are reported and placed on the board with labels: ‘plan’, ‘do’, ‘check’ and ‘act’ (Imai, 1986). The Kaizen board approach is particularly useful for migrant workers, given their language barriers.

Implementation phase

An overarching goal in the implementation phase is to ensure that all intervention activities are implemented in the way they were intended, within the allocated timeframe and with a view to ‘institutionalizing’ effective interventions into the daily operations of the organization (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). For this to occur, the monitoring mechanisms discussed in the previous phase need to be deployed according to plan and, where changes are required, the project champion needs to be prepared to implement these quickly and effectively. Much of the trust and support that has been generated in the earlier phases can be undermined if the interventions are poorly implemented. Hence, a comprehensive approach to monitoring the implementation phase is essential.

The first task in the implementation phase is for the project champion to systematically monitor the implementation of intervention activities. At the work unit level, the project champion needs to work closely with team leaders to ensure migrant workers have opportunities during team meetings to discuss how the action plan is progressing and to highlight any aspects of the plan that could be improved. In line with organizational trust theory (Mayer *et al.*, 1995), the project champion or migrant worker representatives should meet with individual workers, particularly migrant workers, who might be reluctant to voice their concerns in a group setting, as high trust in leaders would encourage migrant workers to voice (Gao *et al.*, 2011). In keeping with social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and the incremental approach to organizational change (Al-Haddad and Kotnour, 2015), it is important to recognize and celebrate the ‘small successes’ as this will help reinforce management’s appreciation for workers’ involvement in the intervention.

The second task for project coordinators is to recognize that team leaders themselves are likely to need high levels of guidance and support throughout this phase. Findings from Busch et al. (2017) highlighted that middle-managers' support for interventions targeting the needs of migrant workers is by no means guaranteed, particularly given the competing operational demands often experienced by this group. Organizing regular meetings and maintaining active communication with team leaders can therefore be a valuable way of monitoring their support needs while ensuring that the interventions remain on-track, leading to successful implementing organizational change (Al-Haddad and Kotnour, 2015).

Evaluation phase

An evaluation of effectiveness and process will build on the information gained during the monitoring phase and develop a clear understanding of how the intervention/s worked, why and under which circumstances they worked, and for whom (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). Effectiveness evaluation should be conducted using the same tailored questionnaire as that used in the screening phase, so that comparisons with baseline data can be made. The findings should be analyzed in conjunction with other organizational data (i.e., absenteeism, turnover, productivity measures) to help identify the extent to which adverse working conditions have been addressed. Two important goals of these analyzes are to establish the levels of health and performance experienced by migrant workers, and to understand the circumstances in which the interventions are likely to be more (or less) effective for these workers. The post-intervention survey results aim to establish the degree to which migrant workers' voice behaviors and key antecedent conditions (e.g., organizational trust, cross-cultural intelligence) have changed.

Process evaluation assesses workers' appraisals of the intervention itself and the activities involved in planning and implementing the intervention (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). To achieve an accurate intervention evaluation, we recommend involving migrant workers in

evaluating the processes used to plan and implement the intervention. This approach would give migrant workers a greater sense of ownership and inclusion over the intervention processes and would also reinforce the cyclical, ‘continuous improvement’ approach to building healthier and more effective working environments. Semi-structured interviews are particularly useful in eliciting experiences of the intervention process. Special attention should be given to understanding why migrant workers chose to contribute to the intervention development processes – or not, and how these processes should be modified to create more ‘voice-promoting’ working environments. Once the effectiveness data are collated and analyzed, the key findings are used to identify how future interventions can be improved. That is, a critical goal of the evaluation data is to inform the next cycle of planning, implementation and evaluation (Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). We have developed a checklist which shows key steps in a participatory organizational intervention framework to help practitioners and researchers to implement the interventions.

Insert Table 3 here

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The current paper extends the literature by drawing on three theoretical perspectives – social exchange theory, the integrative model of organizational trust and cross-cultural management theory to provide theoretical insights into the types of strategies that can help maximize the voice of migrant workers and enhance their well-being. We add to the literature by conceptually developing a participatory organizational intervention framework and by identifying specific techniques, including change management strategies that will enable migrant workers to have

a genuine say in the intervention processes and outcomes. Finally, we highlight implications for policy and practice.

In relation to the first objective, the theoretical analyzes identified two overlapping sets of strategies: (1) initiatives that aim to build voice-promoting working environments that motivate migrant workers, to share their ideas on how to improve work-based systems, policies and practices; and (2) strategies aimed at increasing the capacity of migrant workers (knowledge, skill and confidence) to express their views. The social exchange and organizational trust literature helped inform the first set of initiatives (i.e., building voice-promoting working environments) and suggest that securing the involvement and ‘buy-in’ of migrant workers rests heavily on migrant workers’ perceptions that management is firmly committed to changing the conditions in which they work and that organizational leaders have the ability, integrity and benevolent motives to fulfil this commitment. The second set of strategies (i.e., building migrant workers’ capacity to voice) are informed largely by cross-cultural management theory (Hofstede, 1980) and similarity paradigm (Brockner *et al.*, 2001) and indicate that differences in cross-cultural practices can be a major impediment to migrant workers’ voice. The use of CQ training for migrant workers and their managers is, therefore, suggested to overcome this barrier (Jiang *et al.*, 2018). That is, heightened levels of CQ can help migrant workers form higher quality relationships with their direct supervisor (i.e., relationships characterized by mutual trust and open communication) and, in turn, these stronger relationships can enhance workers’ propensity to voice.

In terms of the second objective, we drew on the theoretical insights of organizational trust and cross-cultural management theories to identify where and how participatory intervention could be modified to maximize the voice of migrant workers, and in turn, to improve their health and well-being. We emphasized the need for building trust between migrant workers and managers to enable migrant workers to be involved in making decisions

regarding the content of the intervention (e.g., during the screening and the action planning phases) and the processes used to plan and implement the interventions (e.g., using the interviews with migrant workers to help establish the worker survey). Our proposed intervention framework is designed to capture the input of migrant workers and emphasizes the need to view their participation as a goal in itself, and a means to achieving the goals of the intervention (e.g., to improve working conditions).

The value of our proposed intervention framework can also be gauged by the extent to which the changes are consistent with the theoretical perspectives guiding the intervention process. In relation to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), we drew on the norms of reciprocity to identify approaches and techniques that could motivate migrant workers to voice. For example, the two-way consultation processes used throughout the initiation, screening and action planning phases were designed, in a large part, to demonstrate management's willingness to support the experiences and judgments of migrant workers in the hope that this would generate reciprocal exchanges (i.e., for migrant workers to 'buy-in' into the intervention development process and contribute their ideas and views).

Similarly, the incremental approach to organizational change was aimed at fast-tracking the time taken for migrant workers to see genuine change in their working environments, to recognize that senior personnel were firmly committed to creating healthier working conditions and, in-turn, for migrant workers to 'return the favor' by looking out for the interests of the organization and playing a more meaningful role in identifying and addressing stressful/ineffective operational practices. An important feature of the strategies informed by social exchange theory is that these initiatives could help build and, in many cases, repair workers' trust in management. The collaborative problem solving and joint decision making, together with actual improvements in working conditions, were aimed at giving workers' first-

hand insights into the competencies, integrity, and benevolence of management (Mayer *et al.*, 1995).

Finally, we recognized that many workers from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds not only needed the opportunity to voice, but they also required access to training and development that enhanced their ability to express their views in a culturally appropriate manner. To that end, the purpose of incorporating the CQ training in the preparatory workshops (initiation phase) was to help all levels of the organization understand the different cultural norms, customs and practices represented in the organization (and teams therein) and to help overcome any conflict between these norms (Brockner *et al.* 2001).

A number of implications for policy are proposed. An integration policy and integration support systems are important for new migrants, as Bakker *et al.* (2016) found that a provision of integration courses enhanced significantly the health outcomes and social network developments of refugees in the Netherland. At the national level, the integration policy might outline strategies and practical support services provided by governments and agencies to enhance migrant workers to integrate into the host country as well as new workplaces. At the organizational level, Newman *et al.* (2017) highlighted that social support from organizations fostered well-being of migrant workers, via psychological capital. Thus, organizations might create opportunities to develop positive social exchange relationships and trust between migrant workers and their supervisors, and between migrant workers and other non-migrant workers. Managers could develop an inclusive work context at the organizational level through actively seeking suggestions from migrant workers in the decision-making processes or by encouraging them to provide de-identified feedback on workplace issues. These processes can lead to a sense of belonging, voice promoting, and organizational inclusion, which can enhance employee well-being (Le *et al.*, 2018).

At the national level, there are a number of recommendations in relation to unionization among migrant workers in Western countries and inter-countries arrangements. First, organizations and national institutions might need to modify their financial support to the unions to improve the rate of unionization among migrant workers. This means if there is less organizational security through the form of state funding, it might create greater incentives and competitions for the unions to strive for achieving higher rates of unionization among migrant workers than the locals (Gorodzeisky and Richards, 2013; Kranendonk and De Beer, 2016; Marino *et al.*, 2015). This is essential for many European countries because the unionization gap is particularly greater “in countries where trade unions are most institutionally embedded (i.e., in countries with a social corporatist industrial relations regime)” (Kranendonk and De Beer, 2016, p. 864)

To encourage and ensure organizations employ our proposed principles and methods, national governments, and international bodies, such as the International Labor Organization and the World Health Organization that already provide guidelines of how to implement organizational interventions should integrate these recommendations into their national policies, where possible. For example, the UK Health and Safety Executive has developed the Management Standards which outlines four phases of intervention to prevent work-related stress. The Management Standards offers tools and methods to complete these four phases, and these could be easily amended to include considerations of the needs of migrant workers (Health and Safety Executive, 2009).

The final implication for policy and practice is how to prevent discrimination at workplaces when applying the strategies proposed in the intervention in line with anti-discrimination laws. For example, according to Australian Human Rights Commission (2014), it is essential for organizations in Western countries to develop a good anti-discrimination policy, and this policy should align with the national and state legislations on anti-

discrimination. Employers have an important legal responsibility to develop policies and procedures to ensure a discrimination-free work environment. Furthermore, clear procedures (i.e., how and where to seek help confidentially) are needed to deal with allegations of discrimination and consequences. Therefore, prior to the intervention process, the strategies and approaches proposed in the intervention should be consulted with human resources managers, and all intervention activities should comply with the anti-discrimination laws at organizational, state, and national levels.

Despite the strengths of the proposed intervention framework, its limitations need to be acknowledged. First, the strategies are organization-centric. That is, the five phases (and sub-phases therein) focus on the intra-organizational policies, practices and processes that can support migrant worker voice behaviors. Overlooked aspects are the external, industry or societal-level forces that can help or hinder voice-promoting policies or practices within the organization. As per socio-environmental perspectives of worker health (Polanyi, 2000), achieving lasting industry-wide levels of change require tripartite, coordinated action involving governments, statutory authorities (particularly in workplace health and safety, employee relations), labor groups, and migrant worker advocates. Second, the proposed framework lacks participatory decision-making and employee voice research that addresses the needs of employees from diverse ethnic backgrounds. There is a tendency in the employee voice literature to treat workers as a homogenous group and to theorize about avenues to voice in a universal way (Wilkinson *et al.*, 2018).

In view of the above limitations, future research should focus on organizational interventions involving multicultural workgroups, to test the effectiveness of the proposed framework. Ideally, these studies should adopt experimental methodologies that incorporate realist evaluation techniques and can identify ‘what works for whom and under what circumstances’ (Nielsen and Miraglia, 2017). Future research could evaluate the

implementation of the entire framework or could target specific phases or sub-phases (e.g., generating migrant workers' readiness to voice during the initiation and screening phases, or examining the efficacy of embedding CQ training). The realist approach to intervention evaluation can identify the specific circumstances in which internal factors can help or hinder the application of the tailored components and shed light on the role played by the macro-level and external forces (e.g., anti-discrimination legislation at both national and organizational levels).

REFERENCES

- Adepoju, A., Van Noorloos, F., and Zoomers, A.
2010 "Europe's migration agreements with migrant-sending countries in the global south: A critical review", *International Migration*, 48(3), 42-75.
- Anderson, B. and Blinder, S.
2015 *Who counts as a migrant? Definitions and their consequences*, University of Oxford, Oxford.
- Australian Human Rights Commission
2014 *Good practice, good business*, Australian Human Rights Commission, retrieved 15 March 2021, <<https://humanrights.gov.au/education/employers>>.
- Bakker, L., Cheung, S. Y., and Phillimore, J.
2016 "The asylum-integration paradox: Comparing asylum support systems and refugee integration in the Netherlands and the UK", *International Migration*, 54(4): 118-132.
- Blau, P.M.
1964 *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M.J., Francesco, A.M., Chen, Z.X., Leung, K., Bierbrauer, G., Gomez, C., Kirkman, B.L. and Shapiro, D.
2001 "Culture and procedural justice: The influence of power distance on reactions to voice", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(4): 300-315.
- Burke, R.J. and Ng, E.
2006, "The changing nature of work and organizations: Implications for human resource management", *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2): 86-94.
- Busch, C., Koch, T., Clasen, J., Winkler, E. and Vowinkel, J.
2017 "Evaluation of an organizational health intervention for low-skilled workers and immigrants", *Human Relations*, 70(8): 994-1016.
- Byrne, D.E.
1971 *The Attraction Paradigm*, vol. 11, Academic Press, New York.
- Cantekin, D.
2019 "Syrian refugees living on the edge: policy and practice implications for mental health and psychosocial wellbeing". *International Migration*, 57(2): 200-220.
- Colic-Peisker, V., and Tilbury, F.

- 2007 "Integration into the Australian labour market: the experience of three "visibly different" groups of recently arrived refugees". *International Migration*, 45(1): 59-85.
- Dickens, L., and Watkins, K.
1999 "Action research: Rethinking Lewin", *Management Learning*, 30(2), 127-140.
- Donaghy, R.
2009 *One death is too many: Inquiry into the underlying causes of construction fatal accidents, Rita Donaghy's report to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*, vol. 7657, TSO, Surrey.
- Earley, P.C. and Ang, S.
2003 *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*, Stanford University Press, California, CA.
- European Commission
1989 *Council Directive of 12 June 1989 on the Introduction of Measures to Encourage Improvements in the Safety and Health of Workers at Work (89/391/EEC)*, Commission of the European Communities, Luxembourg.
- Gao, L., Janssen, O. and Shi, K.
2011 "Leader trust and employee voice: The moderating role of empowering leader behaviors", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(4): 787-98.
- Global Compact for Migration
2018 "Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration: Intergovernmentally negotiated and agreed outcome", *Global Compact for Migration*, retrieved 1 March 2021, <<https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/migration-compact>>.
- Gorodzeisky, A., and Richards, A.
2013 "Trade unions and migrant workers in Western Europe", *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 19(3), 239-254.
- Hanley, J., Paul, L., Ravinthiran, J., Malhaire, L., and Mosseau, N.
2020 "Protecting the rights of migrant farmworkers in Quebec: To what extent can unionization overcome the effects of precarious immigration status?", *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 15(2), 122-146.
- Health and Safety Executive
2009 *How to Tackle Work-related Stress: A Guide for Employers on Making the Management Standards Work*, retrieved 18 March 2021, <<https://www.hse.gov.uk/stress/standards/change.htm>>
- Holt, D.T., Armenakis, A.A., Harris, S.G. and Feild, H.S.
2007 "Toward a Comprehensive Definition of Readiness for Change: A Review of Research and Instrumentation", in Pasmore, W.A. and Woodman, R.W. (Ed.) *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Vol. 16, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp. 289-336
- Hiott, A.E., Grzywacz, J.G., Davis, S.W., Quandt, S.A. and Arcury, T.A.
2008 "Migrant farmworker stress: Mental health implications", *The Journal of Rural Health*, 24(1): 32-39.
- Hofstede, G.
1980 "Culture and organizations", *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 10(4): 15-41.
- Imai, M.
1986 *Kaizen: The Key to Japan's Competitive Success*, McGraw-Hill Education, New York.
- International Organization for Migration

- 2019 *World Migration Report 2020*, retrieved 29 December 2020, <
https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/wmr_2020.pdf>
- Kotter J, and Cohen D.
 2002 *The Heart of Change: Real Life Stories of How People Change Their Organization*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Kranendonk, M., and De Beer, P.
 2016 "What explains the union membership gap between migrants and natives?", *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 54(4), 846-869.
- Jiang, Z., Le, H. and Gollan, P.J.
 2018 "Cultural intelligence and voice behavior among migrant workers: The mediating role of leader-member exchange". *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(5): 1082-1112.
- Le, H., Jogulu, U. and Rentschler, R.
 2014 "Understanding Australian ethnic minority artists' careers", *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 23 (2): 57-68.
- Le, H., Jiang, Z., Fujimoto, Y., and Nielsen, I.
 2018 "Inclusion and affective well-being: roles of justice perceptions. *Personnel Review*, 47 (4): 805-820.
- Marino, S., Penninx, R., and Roosblad, J.
 2015 "Trade unions, immigration and immigrants in Europe revisited: Unions' attitudes and actions under new conditions", *Comparative Migration Studies*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H. and Schoorman, F.D.
 1995 "An integrative model of organizational trust", *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3): 709-34.
- Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M.
 1994 *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Newman, A., Nielsen, I., Smyth, R., & Hirst, G.
 2018 "Mediating role of Psychological capital in the relationship between social support and wellbeing of refugees", *International Migration*, 56(2), 117-132.
- Ng, T.W.H. and Feldman, D.C.
 2012 "Employee voice behavior: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources framework", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(2): 216-34.
- Ng, T.W.H., Hsu, D.Y. and Parker, S.K.
 2019 "Received Respect and Constructive Voice: The Roles of Proactive Motivation and Perspective Taking", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 0 No. 0, p. (Early online).
- Nielsen, K., Abildgaard, J.S. and Daniels, K.
 2014 "Putting context into organizational intervention design: Using tailored questionnaires to measure initiatives for worker well-being", *Human Relations*, 67(12): 1537-60.
- Nielsen, K. and Miraglia, M.
 2017 "What works for whom in which circumstances? On the need to move beyond the 'what works?' question in organizational intervention research", *Human Relations*, 70(1): 40-62.
- Nielsen, K. and Noblet, A.
 2018 "Organizational interventions: where we are, where we go from here?", in K Nielsen & A Noblet (eds), *Organizational Interventions for Health and Well-being*, Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon, pp. 1-21.
- Nielsen, K., Stage, M., Abildgaard, J.S. and Brauer, C.V.

- 2013 "Participatory intervention from an organizational perspective: employees as active agents in creating a healthy work environment", in GF Bauer & GJ Jenny (eds), *Salutogenic Organizations and Change: The Concepts Behind Organizational Health Intervention Research*, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 327-50.
- Noblet, A.J. and LaMontagne, A.D.
 2009 "The challenges of developing, implementing, and evaluating interventions", in S Cartwright & CL Cooper (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Well Being*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 466-96.
- Peters, S. E., Nielsen, K. M., Nagler, E. M., Revette, A. C., Madden, J., and Sorensen, G.
 2020 "Ensuring organization-intervention fit for a participatory organizational intervention to improve food service workers' health and wellbeing: Workplace organizational health study", *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 62(2), e33-e45.
- Peus, C., Frey, D., Gerhardt, M., Fischer, P., and Traut-Mattausch, E.
 2009 "Leading and managing organizational change initiatives", *Management Revue*, 20(2): 158-175.
- Polanyi, M.
 2000 "The republic of science: Its political and economic theory", *Minerva*, 38(1): 1-21.
- Richardson, K.M. and Rothstein, H.R.
 2008 "Effects of occupational stress management intervention programs: A meta-analysis", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(1): 69-93.
- Sardana, D., Zhu, Y., and van der Veen, R.
 2016 "Unlocking the Talents-in-Waiting: Case Study Analysis of Chinese and Indian High-Skilled Migrants in South Australia", *International Migration*, 54(6), 74-93.
- Sørensen, O.H., Hasle, P. and Pejtersen, J.H.
 2011 "Trust relations in management of change", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 27(4): 405-417.
- Sørensen, G., Peters, S., Nielsen, K., Nagler, E., Karapanos, M., Wallace, L., Burke, L., Dennerlein, J. T. and Wagner, G. R.
 2019 "Improving working conditions to promote worker safety, health, and wellbeing for low-wage workers: the workplace organizational health study", *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(8), 1449.
- Tsutsumi, A., Nagami, M., Yoshikawa, T., Kogi, K. and Kawakami, N.
 2009 "Participatory Intervention for Workplace Improvements on Mental Health and Job Performance Among Blue-Collar Workers: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial", *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 51(5): 554-63.
- US Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)
 2014 *Recommended Practices: Protecting Temporary Workers*, retrieve 10 April 2021 <<https://www.osha.gov/temporaryworkers>>.
- Wilkinson, A., Gollan, P.J., Kalfa, S. and Xu, Y.
 2018 "Voices unheard: employee voice in the new century", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29 (5): 711-724.
- Whelan-Berry, K. S., and Somerville, K. A.
 2010 "Linking change drivers and the organizational change process: A review and synthesis", *Journal of Change Management*, 10(2), 175-193.

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF THE INITIATION PHASE

Theories	Activities	Strategies
<p>- Trust need to develop among stakeholders (Mayer et al., 1995) → employees have faith in the abilities, integrity, and benevolence of committee members</p> <p>- Similarity paradigm (Byrne, 1971)</p> <p>- Cross-cultural management theory (Hofstede (1980))</p> <p>- Cultural intelligence (CQ) (Earley and Ang, 2003)</p>	<p>1) Selecting steering group and project champion → creating a psychologically safe environment for employees to voice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having managers with the authority to change adverse operational systems, and having a balanced representation of non-migrants and migrant leaders in the steering group. • Having migrant workers on the steering group. • Appointing a project champion, who has good people and project management skills. • Having CQ training for members of the steering group and the project champion.
<p>- Trust theory (Mayer et al., 1995)</p> <p>- Cultural intelligence (Earley and Ang, 2003)</p>	<p>2) Organising and delivering the preparatory workshops</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For employees: To develop an agreed set of rules to enable migrant voice and build trust. • For managers: To help understand the goals of the intervention activities and managers' responsibility.
<p>Cultural intelligence (Earley and Ang, 2003)</p> <p>Trust theory (Mayer et al., 1995)</p>	<p>3) Developing effective communication strategies</p>	<p>Having simple, clear & effective messages using</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Verbal presentation</i> in a small group of employees; • <i>Written form</i> (i.e., poster, notice board); • <i>Video</i> - animation about intervention; • <i>Follow-up strategies</i>: regular updates on intervention to allow feedback.

- Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) 4) Integrating voice intervention into group with migrant workers to give them an opportunity to voice.

- Trust theory (Mayer et al., 1995) the daily organizational activities

TABLE 2
COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES DURING THE INITIATION PHASE

Aims	Strategies
<p>Help migrant workers feel safe expressing their views by building trust in management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information should be communicated in verbal and written forms to overcome language barriers. • Small group discussions with the workers to enable them to voice. • Steering committee members explain the benefits of the intervention: how and why migrants workers' voice is critical for the success of the intervention. • Intervention discussions should be accompanied by written materials, i.e., posters on the notice boards, and be written in simple language using visual approaches (Nielsen et al., 2013). • Using animation videos to facilitate migrant workers' understanding of the intervention process and to overcome language barriers.
<p>Gain commitments from managers</p> <p>Active two-way communication to enhance quality social exchange relationships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up strategies are required to ensure that all workers are well informed. • The project champion has regular informal, face-to-face conversations to provide updates regarding progress and allow workers to voice. • Incentivising supervisors/managers to help create voice-enhancing working environments. • Senior managers take responsibility for voice-enhancing initiatives via written forms into performance appraisal documents. • Having high levels of two-way dialogue: include relevant participatory mechanisms (e.g., stand-up meetings, quality circles), associated training and development (e.g., management workshops), and desired outcomes (e.g., improved staff satisfaction ratings).

TABLE 3
THE CHECKLIST FOR THE PARTICIPATORY INTERVENTION PROCESS FOR MIGRANT WORKERS

If you can answer 'yes' to all the questions, then your approach is likely to be considered suitable for work-related stress in the participatory intervention process for migrant workers.

<input type="checkbox"/>	INITIATION PHASE
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you have a balanced representation of migrant leaders and workers in the steering group?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you have separate workshops for managers and migrant workers to develop an agreed set of 'ground rules' to guide how migrant workers interact with each other in intervention?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you develop effective communication with migrant workers by having simple and clear messages using <i>verbal</i> and <i>written</i> forms, <i>video</i> to overcome any language barriers?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you integrate voice interventions in daily activities by having weekly meetings in a small group with migrant workers to give them opportunities to voice?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you have strategies to ensure commitments from all parties (senior management, migrant workers)?
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCREENING PHASE
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you collect data (i.e., interviews, surveys) enabling you to identify those aspects of the work, work organization, or environment that are known to be risk factors for migrant workers? (e.g., to identify circumstances where migrant workers may be at particular risk of experiencing heightened stress)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you have arrangements to ease language barriers and to facilitate the voice of migrant workers in the intervention process?
<input type="checkbox"/>	ACTION PLANNING PHASE
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you involve the migrant workforce throughout the action planning phase?
<input type="checkbox"/>	By interpreting their views regarding the good and bad features of workplace conditions?
<input type="checkbox"/>	By ensuring that people are empowered to contribute and feel that their views are listened to in the intervention development and action planning?
<input type="checkbox"/>	By seeking their suggestions, views, and comments on potential solutions to problems (e.g., improvements to working conditions, changes in the way work is organized) as

	intervention development?
<input type="checkbox"/>	By communicating outcomes (e.g., action plans) to allow feedback/voice from migrant workers?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you empower migrant workers to develop and adopt solutions that are ‘reasonably practicable’ and ways to track the progress of the action plans?
<input type="checkbox"/>	IMPLEMENTATION PHASE
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you have strategies to ensure that intervention activities were implemented as the plans?
<input type="checkbox"/>	By having the project champion systematically monitored the implementation of intervention activities weekly and meetings with migrant workers to discuss if any aspects of the plan could be improved?
<input type="checkbox"/>	By ensuring the implementation of the action plans is visible to all migrant workers?
<input type="checkbox"/>	By providing active support to team leaders and organizing regular meetings and maintaining active communication with team leaders?
<input type="checkbox"/>	EVALUATION PHASE
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you employ effectiveness evaluation by using the tailored questionnaire to evaluate the outcomes of intervention to compare with the outcomes of a baseline measurement in the screening phase to identify the extent to which the voice intervention improves migrant worker well-being?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you include the views of migrant workers in the process evaluation by having migrant workers to self-evaluate the intervention process and outcomes and use the feedback to improve the next phases?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you ensure that attention was given to understanding why migrant workers chose to contribute to the intervention development processes – or not, and how these processes should be modified to create more ‘voice-promoting’ working environments that benefit their well-being?

Source: This checklist is adapted from Health and Safety Executive (2009), Management Standards – Change, Equivalence checklist (<https://www.hse.gov.uk/stress/standards/change.htm>)

FIGURE 1

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING INTERVENTION
PROCESS FOR MIGRANT WORKERS



