**Theorizing worker voice for supply chain justice – communication, representation, and recognition.**

**Purpose –**The paper explores the notion of *worker voice* in terms of its implications for supply chain justice. The paper proposes the value of the recognition perspective on social justice for framing workers' experiences in global supply chains, and identifies opportunities for the advancement of the worker voice agenda with recognition justice in mind.

**Design/methodology/approach** – The paper adopts a conceptual approach to explore the notion of worker voice in supply chains in terms of the recognition perspective on social justice.

**Findings –** Sustainable supply chain management (SSCM) scholarship has considered worker voice in terms of two key paradigms, which we term *communication* and *representation*. To address recognition justice for workers in global supply chains, the worker voice agenda must consider: designing worker voice mechanisms to close recognition gaps for workers with marginalised identities; the shared responsibilities of supply chain actors to *listen* alongside the expectation of workers to use their voice; and the expansion of the concept of worker voice to cut across home-work boundaries.

**Originality/value –** The paper offers conceptual clarity on the emerging notion of worker voice in sustainable supply chain management (SSCM) and is the first to interrogate the implications of recognition justice for the emergent worker voice agenda. It articulates key opportunities for future research to further operationalise worker voice upon a recognition foundation.

**Keywords.** Conceptual, Worker Voice, Recognition, Social Justice, Sustainable Supply Chain.

## Introduction

Approximately 450 million people work in global supply chains across worksites such as factories, farms and shipping vessels, to supply the world's clothing, goods, and food (ILO, 2023). Long, complex, and often opaque global supply chains are at great risk of hosting poor working conditions and extreme labour abuses including forced labour. These are key issues of social sustainability that sustainable supply chain management must address. Although such issues have been the subject of a burgeoning body of literature on socially sustainable supply chain management (Benstead *et al*. 2018; Klassen and Vereecke, 2012; Sancha *et al*., 2015; Huq *et al*., 2014; Yawar and Seuring, 2018; Govindan et al., 2021), much work remains to be done to achieve meaningful improvements for workers. One idea which is emerging as important in this context is the notion of *worker voice*. References to workers' *voice* and *voices* are increasingly made within socially sustainable supply chain management literature, not always with explanation, but always with a sense of it being a positive and important development for addressing issues of social sustainability within supply chains. For example, Kuruvilla and Li (2021, p.52) recently articulated a key research avenue for socially sustainable supply chain scholarship as 'harnessing worker voice'.

The notion of worker voice has not yet been explicitly defined within the sustainable supply chain management (SSCM) field, but a wider literature on employee voice is well-established. This literature has conceptualised voice in an organisational context as 'the ways and means through which employees attempt to have a say and potentially influence organisational affairs about issues that affect their work and the interests of owners and managers' (Wilkinson *et al*. 2014, p.5). A broad-ranging literature on employee voice spans a number of related disciplines, including human resource management, organisational behaviour, and industrial relations (Mowbray *et al*., 2015). This literature has also conceptualised voice as a highly multi-faceted phenomenon, which is differentiable in several ways, such as in terms of voice *form*, voice *agenda* and voice *influence* (Kaufman, 2014).

The notion of voice assumes a particular ethical significance for workers in global supply chains who are often subject to severe workplace harms and abuses. This is evident in the way activist organisations describe worker voice as "the voice of thousands of workers who have the capacity to uncover risks in complex global supply chains and drive structural changes in the way business is done, from small changes at the individual supplier's level to large scale changes at the national industry level" (The Issara Institute, 2020). Taylor and Shih (2019, p.132) also suggest that "worker voice has emerged as a recent, often technology-enabled, approach to responsible sourcing, with the potential to achieve two critical ends: first, the collection of more and better data for supply chain due diligence and detection of labour risks, and second, the empowerment of workers so as to better hear their feedback and strengthen remediation accordingly". Beyond these conceptualisations, recent SSCM literature has begun to operationalise worker voice in terms of labour rights organisations that reflect a form of industrial democracy (Kuruvilla and Li, 2021; Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021).

In the context of SSCM research and practice, worker voice is distinguished from existing notions of employee voice because it concerns workers with whom a lead firm might have no direct employment relationship (Van Buren III and Schrempf-Stirling, 2022), but who are affected through their employment relationship with a supplying firm by the sourcing strategies employed (Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021). We build on implicit assumptions in the nascent worker voice discourse that workers *having a say* (however we may or should conceptualise this) is an important consideration in addressing social sustainability issues within supply chains. Within this discourse, we see an important opportunity to reflect upon worker voice with *social justice* in mind.

There have been cumulative calls for SSCM scholarship to move away from purely instrumental assumptions (Pagell and Shevchenko, 2014; Montabon *et al*., 2016; Matthews *et al*., 2016; Gold and Schleper, 2017). In this vein, recent work has called for greater consideration of the notion of supply chain justice (Matthews and Silva, 2023). For Matthews and Silva (2023) sustainable supply chain issues should not be relegated to traditional supply chain management goals, such as efficiency. Building on political philosopher John Rawls' conceptualisation of justice as *fairness* (Rawls, 2001; 2005), they call for justice, rather than efficiency, to be the dominant logic in supply chain management scholarship (Matthews and Silva, 2023).

In this paper, we address the notion of worker voice in terms of its implications for supply chain justice. We extend Matthews and Silva's (2023) notion of supply chain

justice in terms of the recognition perspective. Recognition is a perspective on justice which locates the experience of social (in)justice in symbolic and psychological (rather than purely material) realms. We suggest that this perspective is highly relevant for further understanding the injustices faced by workers in global supply chains. We therefore consider its implications for the worker voice agenda in SSCM scholarship. In so doing, we seek to contribute some conceptual clarity around worker voice within SSCM scholarship, while also seeking to root its future conceptual development more firmly within the recognition perspective on social justice.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. After outlining the conceptualisation approach that is used to develop our conceptual insights, we explore the emerging notion of worker voice in SSCM. We articulate two paradigms that reflect the dominant perspectives in the discourse thus far. Then, we explore the notion of justice within supply chain management literature, and justify our claim that recognition is an important complementary perspective for understanding justice for workers in global supply chains. We articulate key tenets of a recognition perspective and explore their implications for worker voice in terms of the dominant worker voice paradigms. We conclude the paper with discussion of the implications of our approach, focusing on key opportunities for future research.

## Conceptualisation approach

This paper adopts a conceptual research design. In contrast to empirical work which often seeks to verify existing theory, the focus of a conceptual article is generation and differentiation (Skilton, 2011). Conceptual research in supply chain management concerns scientific inquiry that "relies on abstract thinking to conceptualise, delimit and solve real-world problems" (Fawcett *et al.,* 2014, p.2). Fawcett *et al.* (2014) also asserted that conceptual research is particularly relevant when the concepts involved present ambiguity and different interpretations. This paper adopts an exploratory conceptual approach because the topic of theorising worker voice for supply chain justice has not previously been explored in supply chain scholarship, and the subject area is therefore not fully defined. Examining existing research, theories, and concepts through a critically engaged conceptual rethinking of the phenomenon (Touboulic *et al*., 2020) can therefore provide a sound basis for further, more nuanced empirical work and problem solving around worker voice and justice in SSCM.

## Worker voice and SSCM

Within the SSCM literature, the term *social sustainability* has been used to refer to research and practice which concerns "people and their working conditions" (Kuruvilla and Li, 2021, p.43). Common social sustainability issues in supply chains relate to low wages, working hours, health and safety, child and forced labour, freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining, as well as discrimination, harassment, and violence (Abbassi, 2017; Govindan et al., 2021). Nonetheless, supply chain management scholarship has tended to consider workers – the people who "are actually carrying out the production of goods" - as peripheral stakeholders (Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021, p.17). Carter *et al*.'s (2020) systematic review of the SSCM literature found that less than 5% of the articles sampled were focused specifically on workers (Kuruvilla and Li, 2021).

In recent years however, SSCM scholarship has given more attention to workers, both as the focus of study and as research participants. Among these works, a key theme is the importance of workers' so-called *voice*. For example, in their account of a new process of worker-driven supply chain governance, Reinecke and Donaghey (2021, p.25) state that such governance should "involve worker voice across different levels". Meanwhile, Kuruvilla and Li (2021, p.44) suggest that supply chain management must protect workers' rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining because such rights "provide vehicles for workers to exercise their 'voice' to improve working conditions."

Other studies have suggested the importance of worker voice for academic research purposes. In an innovative longitudinal study which analysed factory workers' verbal diaries, Bellingan *et al*. (2020, p.1284) investigated the factors influencing the well-being of Chinese factory workers in order to inform and enhance the efficacy of brands' social audits. The authors suggest that their digital voice diary method is applicable to study "people who are otherwise difficult to reach, are under-represented in research or have limited voice" (Bellingan *et al*., 2020, p.1284). In a similar vein, Alghababsheh *et al*. (2023, p.2) surveyed shop floor workers in a Jordanian garment factory to frame internal social performance from the perspective of workers rather than top management because "managerial perceptions of what constitute acceptable working conditions may not match the views of the affected workers". They noted that workers' points of view had previously been neglected.

Based on the extant literature, we identify two key paradigms of worker voice in SSCM scholarship which we term *communication* and *representation*. We use the notion of paradigms in line with Matthews *et al*. (2016): a paradigm defines what problems are legitimate, what questions can be meaningfully asked, how they can be purposefully answered, and how those answers should be evaluated. Different paradigms are based on different assumptions, which therefore leads to the identification of different problems. In the remainder of this section, we outline and illustrate the *communication* and *representation* paradigms. Their key distinguishing assumption relates to *how essential* worker voice is to adequately address social sustainability issues in supply chains.

*SSCM worker voice as communication.*

The first paradigm of worker voice in SSCM is the communication paradigm. In this paradigm, worker voice means the ways and means by which workers communicate to other supply chain actors their knowledge, understanding and experiences of labouring in global supply chains. The key assumption in this paradigm is that workers and their interests can be *better* served if relevant supply chain actors and authorities understand worker experiences. Workers are an untapped source of knowledge for improving SSCM, meaning that worker voice can serve SSCM in two key ways.

Firstly, it can support lead firms' efforts to manage sustainability risks by providing information about the areas of the chain that may be beyond the visibility horizon (Carter *et al*., 2020). This could be through worker interviews as part of an enhanced social compliance audit procedure (Benstead *et al*., 2021). Alternatively, it could be via digital worker reporting tools which "present unprecedented opportunities for lead firms to reach out directly to hard-to-reach workers for feedback on their working conditions via their mobile phone" (Berg *et al*., 2020, p. 47).

Secondly, worker voice means asking workers to communicate information on what is meaningful to them regarding their working experiences, because "workers in supplying factories are the *most* knowledgeable about the very working conditions codes of conduct are designed to improve" (Kuruvilla and Li, 2021, p.52, emphasis in original). Excluding workers' input into the development of codes of conduct has led to the establishment of standards and conditions of work that do not effectively reflect the needs of workers (Prieto-Carron, 2004). For example, a worker survey at Gap Inc.'s supplier factories identified that issues such as relationships with immediate suppliers and opportunities for training and development, were important to workers, but had never been included in Gap Inc.'s supplier code of conduct (Kuruvilla and Li, 2021). Bellingan et *al*.'s (2020) study similarly revealed that Chinese production workers' concerns extended beyond the factors predominantly measured in factory audits. As has been mentioned, there has also been a parallel shift towards engaging workers as part of the SSCM research process, as survey respondents (Alghababsheh *et al*., 2023) and as diarists (Bellingan *et al*., 2020). In the communication paradigm, worker voice therefore also fills a gap within traditional socially sustainable supply chain research.

*SSCM worker voice as representation*

The second paradigm of worker voice in SSCM is the representation paradigm. In this paradigm, worker voice means the ways and means by which workers within global supply chains share responsibility for the systems designed to ensure the social sustainability of the supply chain. The key assumption in this paradigm is that the interests of workers can *only be* served by workers *having a say*. Reinecke and Donaghey (2021, p.24) believe that worker voice practices in the communication paradigm, such as hotlines, "can be highly valuable in providing remedy and analytic insight into the sources and frequency of abuses, [but do] relatively little to enable workers to pursue collectively their rights." Through their concept of worker-driven supply chain governance, they therefore introduce into the SSCM discussion the notion of worker-centredness which suggests that workers must lead in the initiatives designed to improve their conditions. Acting on this assumption, the Worker-Driven Social Responsibility Network (WSR) advocates that worker organisations "must drive the creation, monitoring and enforcement of programmes [which are] designed to improve their wages and working conditions" in global supply chains (WSR, 2023). Outhwaite and Martin-Ortega (2019, p.379) have similarly emphasised the importance of worker-led approaches. They call for workers' active involvement throughout the supply chain monitoring architecture "from the point of designing the systems that will be monitored, through to the point of remediation".

The assumptions of the representation paradigm are therefore closely associated with the intellectual tradition of industrial democracy, which refers to "the structures and institutional mechanisms that give workers or their representatives the opportunity to influence organisational decision-making in their places of employment" (Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021, p. 18). Both Reinecke and Donaghey (2021) and Kuruvilla and Li (2021) draw on the principles of industrial democracy to identify freedom of association and collective bargaining as *core* labour rights which are fundamental to improving social sustainability in global supply chains. A key symbol of the representation paradigm is therefore unionisation, which can mobilize a *collective* worker voice to demand changes in the interests of workers. Reinecke and Donaghey (2021) highlight the role of collective worker voice in supply chains both at the

workplace level (meaning workers interacting with their direct employer at supplier facilities) and at the transnational level (meaning workers interacting directly with buying companies through their representatives). The authors highlight recent developments in this space that are particularly relevant for sustainable supply chain scholars concerning global union federations (e.g., IndustriALL or UNI Global Union) who have partnered with buying firms (such as ASOS) to voice workers' collective interests.

Although they differ in their emphasis on *how essential* worker voice is, and therefore how voice is manifested, the communication and representation paradigms both assume that there *is* an important link between worker voice and social sustainability in supply chains. Consideration of the notion of *justice*, however, remains more implicit than explicit. Mechanisms for workers to report abuses to achieve remediation (as per Taylor and Shih, 2019) reflects legal forms of justice. But, as Reinecke and Donaghey (2021) hint, remediation does not achieve the fundamental changes required to prevent abuses in the first place; the *elimination* rather than remediation of injustice for workers more adequately reflects the goal of true sustainability in SSCM (Pagell and Shevchenko, 2014). At the same time, the nature of justice and injustice in supply chains needs to be clarified, particularly as it concerns workers. In the next section, we therefore explore alternative conceptualisations of justice in supply chains and introduce recognition justice as a key perspective for framing worker voice in SSCM.

## Justice and supply chain scholarship.

### *Conceptualizations of supply chain justice*

The concept of justice has become well-established within discussions of supply chain relationships, and specifically buyer-supplier relationship performance (Griffith *et al*., 2006; Liu *et al*., 2012; Narasimhan *et al*., 2013; Liu *et al*., 2019). These studies have used a conceptualisation of justice which was developed within the wider organisation and management literature (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt *et al*., 2001; Cropanzano *et al*., 2007). This conceptualisation articulates justice in terms of three key dimensions - *distributive*, *procedural*, and *interactional.*

*Distributive justice* is concerned with fairness in terms of outcomes (Cropanzano *et al*., 2007). Based on equity theory (Adams, 1965), it is concerned with fairness in the sharing of rewards relative to inputs and contributions. *Procedural justice* concerns fairness in terms of the processes by which those outcomes are allocated. According to Cropanzano *et al*. (2007, p. 38) a just process is one that is "applied consistently to all, free of bias, accurate, representative of relevant stakeholders, correctable and consistent with ethical norms." Finally, *interactional justice* concerns the nature of engagement between people and how a person is treated by another person. This has been defined in terms of informational components (which concerns sharing accurate and truthful information), and interpersonal components (which concerns being treated with respect and dignity).

The distributive, procedural and interactional dimensions of organisational justice have informed research on justice in supply chains and its impacts on supply chain management. For example, research has explored the impact of inter-organisational perceptions of justice on buyer-supplier relationship performance (Narashiman *et al*., 2013), on truck driver turnover in the US logistics sector (Cantor *et al*., 2011), and,

more recently, on efforts to orchestrate activities within a supply chain ecosystem in Indonesia (Liu *et al*., 2019).

This conceptualisation of supply chain justice, however, differs from the more recent work of Matthews and Silva (2023) who articulate a new conceptualisation of supply chain justice for SSCM scholarship. Matthews and Silva (2023) highlight that the notions of social and environmental justice were central to the original conceptualisation of the well-known triple bottom line concept (Elkington, 1994) but have become lost in SSCM scholarship. Re-engaging with these notions of justice, they therefore define supply chain justice as "the design and management of supply chains according to principles of social, economic and environmental justice": s*ocial justice* concerns the notions of fairness and compassion; *economic justice* concerns issues of egalitarianism in the distribution of resources; and *environmental justice* concerns fairness in how the worst effects of the environmental crisis are disproportionately experienced by those who are least responsible.

The differences between these conceptualisations of supply chain justice can be explained by their conceptual roots in alternative literatures. Procedural, distributive, and interactional justice are dimensions of supply chain justice that have their roots in the literature on organisational justice. With roots in organisational justice, the dominant conceptualization of supply chain justice has been predominantly concerned with *perceptions* of fairness at the inter-organisational level, and specifically with the instrumental effects of such perceptions on supply chain performance. Meanwhile, the conceptual roots of Matthews and Silva's (2023) social, economic and environmental dimensions of supply chain justice exist within the discourse on *societal justice* (i.e., Elkington, 1994; Rawls, 2001; 2005) which is concerned with the broader question of what makes a society just [see Cropanzano *et al*., 2007 for a more extended comparison].

In line with the sentiment of Matthews and Silva (2023), we suggest that the question of what makes a society just is important when it comes to understanding the nature of the injustices experienced by workers in global supply chains. As much SSCM literature has evidenced, workers in global supply chains can be subject to terrible experiences. For example, they can be forced to work against their will, under threat of punishment (Mani et al., 2018), in conditions of poor hygiene and sanitation (Lipschutz, 2004), locked in factories to complete forced overtime (BBC, 2023), or subjected to sexual harassment and assault (Fair Wear Foundation, 2018). Such treatment denies workers their basic humanity. Such treatment demonstrates to workers that their status as human beings with equal moral worth is held in contempt. In the terminology of social justice, this is misrecognition[1]. Misrecognition is a social injustice that is rooted in phenomena of humiliation and disrespect (Fraser and Honneth, 2003). Humiliation and disrespect are sources of violation of a person's identity, which can lead to lasting damage in multiple respects, including social alienation and an impoverished sense of one's own individual and social worth (Honneth, 1995). We suggest that the notion of justice for workers in supply chains must therefore incorporate more explicitly a *recognition* perspective. The recognition perspective emphasizes that social justice is not only concerned with fairness in the

[1] A distinction has been drawn between the term *misrecognition*, which refers to behaviours that *actively* deny recognition, and *non-recognition*, which refers to behaviours that *passively* deny recognition through its lack (Schweiger, 2019). For simplicity, we use the term misrecognition to refer to all behaviours which deny recognition, whether actively or passively.

distribution of society's material resources, but also with the *standing* one has and deserves, in relation to other people and society (Young, 1990).

*The recognition perspective on social justice*

Recognition has received much attention from scholars in a wide variety of philosophical traditions (see Martin *et al*., 2016 for a useful overview). In the social justice literature, it has become well-known for challenging a prevailing view of justice as the fair distribution of society's material resources. The so-called *recognition versus redistribution* debate (Fraser and Honneth, 2003) has dominated recent discussions about the meaning of a just society. Building on the writings of Hegel, Axel Honneth observes that modern social movements reflect conflicts over non-material societal goods, such as dignity or respect, for which traditional notions of distributional justice do not make sense (Honneth, 2004). He therefore argues that "the justice or wellbeing of a society is measured according to the degree of its ability to secure conditions of mutual recognition in which personal identity formation, and hence individual self-realization can proceed sufficiently well" (Honneth, 2004, p.354). For Fraser (2003) the injustice of misrecognition relates to status subordination and participation imparity: institutionalized patterns of cultural value come to deem certain individuals or groups as comparatively unworthy of *respect* or *esteem* and prevents them from participating fully in society as peers on equal terms (Fraser, 2003)

To counter misrecognition, Honneth's (1995) theory constructs recognition in terms of three spheres. Each sphere of recognition refers to a distinct type of inter-subjective interaction which confers on an individual the conditions necessary to form a positive relation to oneself. The first sphere of recognition concerns recognition in the form of *love and care*, which confers on an individual their sense of basic *self-confidence.* Self-confidence refers to a trust in oneself and an underlying capacity to express one's needs and desires without fear of being abandoned. It is developed through experiences of love and care among close personal relations. The second sphere of recognition concerns recognition in the form of *acknowledging a person's human rights*, which confers on an individual their sense of *self-respect*. Self-respect refers to a developed sense of one's entitlement to the same status and treatment as every other person, on the basis of one's equal moral worth as a human being. This develops through experiences of acting autonomously on the basis of reason, and through participating in the political and moral laws to which one is subject. The third sphere of recognition concerns recognition in the form of *identifying a person's particular strengths and social contribution* which confers on an individual an ability to develop a sense of *self-esteem*. Self-esteem refers to a person's sense of what makes them unique, special, and irreplaceable, which is developed through experiences of contributing *to* society something which is valued *by* that society. These three spheres have also been conceptualised as *affective*, *status* and *capacity* recognition respectively (Bhatnagar *et al*., 2023; Bernacchio, 2022).

Some scholars have expressed concern that Honneth's recognition perspective on justice distracts attention away from distributional injustices (Fraser, 2003). Lamont (2018, p.422) acknowledges that the recognition perspective may evoke some scepticism because "what difference does recognition [make] if people are hungry…?" Such views may resonate with sustainable supply chain scholars who have sought to address the inequitable distribution of economic value caused by structural supply chain injustices (Van Buren III and Schrempf-Stirling, 2021). However, recognition scholars have emphasised that *misrecognition* can lead to a sense of *invisibility* or

*social alienation* (Honneth and Margalit, 2001) which can have very real psychological and material effects (Taylor, 1994; Lamont, 2018). Honneth's (2004) view is that misrecognition is *related to* distributional justice, because the inequitable distribution of society's material resources can be seen to be *a consequence of* misrecognition. Misrecognition can also cause psychological harm (Taylor, 1994; Lamont, 2018): Taylor (1994, p.25) suggests that a person or group of people can "suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves".

We suggest that the justice turn in SSCM scholarship requires that social sustainability issues are considered through the lens of recognition justice. Against this backdrop, we consider the implications of the recognition perspective for the emergent worker voice agenda. As has already been mentioned, the worker voice literature assumes that worker voice is important for addressing social sustainability issues in supply chains. Adopting the justice lens of recognition, we next consider how recognition implicates the ways in which SSCM might conceptualise and operationalise worker voice.

**Towards a recognition foundation for worker voice.**

In this section, we draw on the recognition perspective introduced in the previous section to propose a conceptual framework which constructs worker voice upon a recognition foundation. We identify three key ways in which the recognition perspective informs the worker voice agenda in SSCM scholarship (Table 1).

1. Worker voice and inter-sectional identities

Firstly, the recognition perspective draws particular attention to the experiences of *marginalised* individuals and groups within society who are denied respect and esteem. In SSCM, it therefore draws attention to those members of a supply chain, such as production workers, who are rendered invisible, disrespected, or "forgotten" in SSCM research and practice (Gold and Schleper, 2017, p.428). Scholars have acknowledged that workers in global supply chains have been neglected in comparison with other supply chain stakeholders (Alghababsheh *et al*., 2023), which has partly stimulated the worker voice agenda.

However, workers in global supply chains are often also members of groups which may be marginalised in societal terms, for example, in terms of gender, migrant status, or religious or ethnic backgrounds (Prieto-Carron *et al*., 2006). Such marginalisation can be reproduced within the supply chain workforce. For example, studies of women workers have illustrated that the complex lived reality of women workers is often rendered invisible in institutional structures, perpetuating the inability of women to participate on equal terms with other workers within global supply chains. For example, Barrientos *et al*. (2019) highlighted that the United Nations Guiding Principles, a key development in the governance of workers' rights, did not originally include any explicit consideration of the lived reality of women. Other research has also illustrated how corporate codes of conduct have failed to acknowledge women workers' specific responsibilities around maternity, childcare, elder care, housework, or personal safety (Prieto-Carrón, 2004).

The recognition perspective therefore prompts SSCM scholars to consider how the abstract and hegemonic classification of *workers* ignores the inter-sectional identities that inform many people's experiences of participating *as workers* within global supply

chains. If the worker voice agenda similarly ignores these identities, it risks reproducing recognition gaps (Lamont, 2018) in the supply chain workforce. Recognition gaps refer to disparities in worth and membership between groups of workers within global supply chains. Recent work by the International Centre for Research on Women (ICRW) suggests that this has been a "longstanding issue" in worker voice mechanisms associated with the communication paradigm. The ICRW suggest that the design of worker voice surveys in retail supply chains has led to "the systemic underreporting of the most salient risks and opportunities for women" (ICRW, 2022). Working with a range of well-known brands and retailers in the footwear and apparel industry, such as Amazon, Nike, PUMA, and Ralph Lauren, the ICRW therefore aim to improve worker voice surveys to go "beyond simply disaggregating and comparing men's and women's responses to general worker wellbeing questions…[by] carefully crafting a new set of questions" (ICRW, 2022).

For worker voice in the communication paradigm, inadequate recognition of inter-sectional identities can mean that worker voice mechanisms, such as worker voice surveys, will fail to detect certain social risks, such as harassment, which are more particular to certain worker identities. However, the risks of recognition gaps may be even greater for worker voice in the representation paradigm, which assumes that worker voice is *essential* for achieving meaningful change for workers. Previous research has shown that there remain challenges in the representativeness of organisations which are designed to represent and collectively voice the interests of workers, particularly those who are more likely to be marginalised within the workforce, such as workers who are women (Ahmed, 2018), or migrants (Gardner *et al*., 2022). Nonetheless, the recognition perspective similarly entreats worker voice in the representation paradigm to ensure that the collective voice is meaningfully representative of the different inter-sectional identities that construct the workforce. Processes of worker voice aimed at enhancing the democratic participation of workers in global supply chains (as in the representation paradigm) must not misrecognise, subordinate or impair full participation among certain groups of workers.

2. Responding to voice through listening.

Secondly, the recognition perspective emphasises that social justice is an inter-subjective phenomenon. A central tenet of recognition is therefore the notion of *response*. Honneth (2004, p.60) characterizes recognition as "a *reactive* behaviour that *responds* to valuable attributes in others [*emphases added*]." Bernacchio (2022, p.1) has similarly conceptualised recognition as "the regard or stance that one takes to others, specifically one's *response* to them, in thought, word and deed, as persons [*emphases added*]". For Honneth (1995) the most basic form of recognition is visibility, which means confirming another person's existence and presence by acting (i.e. responding to that person) in a way which signals that a person is *seen*. A lack of such response can come to render a person invisible, creating a sense of social meaninglessness (Honneth and Margalit, 2001). Recognition therefore suggests that a person or group's sense of worth and status is conferred on them through another's reactive behaviour and response (Bhatnagar *et al*. 2023). Applied to the discussion of worker *voice*, recognition therefore emphasises the importance of other supply chain actors' responsibilities of *listening.*

The principle of listening is implicit within discussions of *influence* within the wider employee voice discourse (Wilkinson *et al*., 2020), and within discussions of workplace *dialogue* within industrial relations (Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021), but has received

comparatively less attention than the concept of voice (Macnamara, 2020). Drawing on Honneth's (2007) recognition perspective, Couldry (2009, p.580) suggests that listening is a form of *status* recognition, which refers to the recognition of a person's status as a person who deserves equal treatment alongside all other persons. In Honneth's (1995) terminology, this suggests that listening is a form of acknowledging a person's basic moral worth with rights as a fellow human, which then supports a person's development of self-respect. Couldry (2009, p.581) therefore calls it paradoxical that "voice can be offered without any attention to whether it is matched by processes for listening". A similar charge has been made against worker voice in the communication paradigm, which might focus on eliciting information from workers without commensurate consideration of response (Berg *et al*., 2020; Gardner *et al.,* 2022). For example, Berg *et al*. (2020, p.61) highlighted ethical issues associated with digital worker reporting tools which they suggest "neither yield outcomes for workers nor transform power relations within the structures in which they work". A more symbolic and tragic example concerns the workers who died at work on April 24, 2013 despite having lodged complaints about the safety of the Rana Plaza factory (Ahmed, 2018).

Developing supply chain actors' responsibilities and capabilities for listening will be essential for operationalising worker voice in terms of recognition justice in both the communication and the representation paradigms. A useful resource in this regard may be Macnamara's (2016) seven canons of organisational listening. Based on evidence from the literature on inter-personal listening, psychology, and ethics, including Honneth's (2007) notion of disrespect, Macnamara (2016) articulates the seven canons of organisational listening as: recognition (*listening inclusively* rather than selectively), *acknowledgement* (of difference in views), paying *attention*, *interpretation* towards achieving *understanding* of different views, careful *consideration*, and *responding* in an appropriate way. According to Macnamara (2016), operationalising these canons requires an organisational architecture involving *culture*, *policies*, *systems*, *technologies*, *resources*, *skills* as well as the *politics of listening*, which can lead some groups to being ignored. Adapting Macnamara's (2016) proposed architecture, listening to worker voice in SSCM will likely require the development of supply chain actors' capabilities and intent to *acknowledge* the issues voiced by workers, to *accept* responsibility which may include acceptance of misrecognition, and to *action* the necessary supply chain change. In this way workers' voice can have agency and lead to organisations which act on what they hear, while prioritising social justice within competing supply chain priorities (Lukic *et al.*, 2012).

Key within this discussion is also the question of *who* is listening and responding to worker voice. Recognised voice requires a response by the right person or institution. For worker voice to be recognised, there are certain actors who have greatest responsibilities for listening, including policy makers and lead firms and brands, whose decisions and actions are central to creating the symbolic, cultural, discursive as well as material structures that either recognise or ignore workers. Listening is therefore not transferrable between supply chain actors. The importance of NGOs cannot be disputed but may perhaps best be seen as amplifying worker voice (Benstead *et al.*, 2021), which based on our recognition perspective, is necessary but not sufficient: NGOs alone cannot fulfil the requirements of listening for recognitional justice for workers in supply chains.

Reinecke and Donaghey's (2021) framework of worker voice at the workplace and transnational levels (meaning workers' engagement with employers and with buying firms respectively) suggests that the key responsibilities for supply chain listening will be held by the supplier, and the buying firm. Macnamara's (2016) architecture for listening may therefore be useful to inform sustainable supply chain management practices to develop capabilities for listening at supplier facilities. For example, they may support buyer firms' efforts at developing workplace dialogue at supplier facilities (Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021) through supplier capacity building and training which includes more explicit emphasis on recognition and listening (Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021; Bai and Satir, 2022).

With its emphasis on *response,* the recognition perspective therefore prompts what we consider to be an important re-balancing of the framing around worker voice. Worker voice efforts have often been framed as enabling *workers* to realize their rights to a voice in their workplace (Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021). The recognition perspective on worker voice requires supervisors and managers at supplier facilities to realize *their* responsibility for operationalising these rights. Such responsibility must be based on recognition of workers' particular *capacity* to contribute to supply chain governance processes. According to Honneth's (1995) second sphere of recognition, workers' capacity to participate in shaping the rules to which they are subject can only become a basis for self-respect *if it can be exercised*. Built on a recognition foundation, the worker voice agenda must therefore confront the possibilities of the ways in which key supply chain actors *silence* or *prefer to unhear* (Scheyett, 2021) workers' voices. To the extent that working conditions and labour rights violations are a product of sourcing squeezes (Anner, 2020), the listening requirements of a recognition perspective of worker voice also implicates the organizations responsible for the purchasing practices and business models that impact workers.

3. Voice across home-work boundaries

The discussion thus far has primarily concerned Honneth's (1995) second and third spheres of recognition, relating to self-respect (status recognition) and self-esteem (capacity recognition). A recognition foundation of worker voice in the communication paradigm seems to align closely with opportunities around status recognition. For example, the design of a gender-inclusive worker voice survey to elicit concerns which are then addressed through effective listening is an act of status recognition for women workers because it *demonstrates to* women workers' that they are seen as having equal *status* as workers alongside their male counterparts. Meanwhile, a recognition foundation of worker voice in the representation paradigm seems to align closely with opportunities around *capacity* recognition. The representation paradigm assumes that social sustainability for workers is *dependent* on the unique contributions of the workers themselves and, to the extent that those capacities can be exercised through effective workplace dialogue which balances *voice* and *listening*, it may also have positive implications for *self-esteem* for the individual and groups of workers whose labour adds much value to the supply chain.

However, a social justice perspective on SSCM requires SSCM to adopt a *proactive* approach to designing and managing supply chains in ways which ensure justice for all supply chain stakeholders (Matthews and Silva, 2023). For Honneth (1995) social justice requires recognition in all three spheres, and the development of basic *self-*

*confidence* is a foundation for the development of *self-respect* and *self-esteem*. As has been mentioned earlier in the paper, affective recognition refers to recognition in the form of *love and care* which confers on an individual their sense of basic *self-confidence.* Self-confidence refers to a trust in oneself and an underlying capacity to express one's needs and desires without fear of being abandoned. It is developed through experiences of love and care among close personal relations.

An important reality for SSCM scholarship is that many workers in global supply chains are migrants who are separated from their families, perhaps for long periods of time. This can deny migrant workers recognition in the form of love and care that comes from interactions with close personal relations, such as family and friends. Empirical evidence from Bellingan *et al.*'s (2020, p.1278) study of migrant workers in Chinese factories suggests that "social contact is a particularly important facet of well-being, particularly for migrant workers who are separated from their families". A recognition justice perspective on SSCM emphasises workers *as real human beings*, whose sense of identity and lived realities are inextricably intertwined with their participation in the supply chain. From this perspective, worker voice can also be conceptualised as a proactive SSCM strategy by which supply chain actors seek to proactively facilitate for workers opportunities for *affective* recognition as well as status and capacity recognition through worker voice.

A recent example of the use of worker voice tools within the Thai fishing industry illustrates the notion of worker voice as a means for facilitating affective recognition in line with Honneth's (1995) first sphere of recognition. The Thai Union Group developed an innovative worker voice app for workers on Thai fishing vessels. Recalling their process for designing the system, they said: "[w]e said to [workers], 'who do you really want to connect to'?...[W]e thought they're going to want to talk to an NGO…or the Thai government…Overwhelmingly, they said, 'we want to speak to our families – we're going out to sea for weeks at a time; we want to know what's happening at home" (Kearns, 2019). The app is now promoted as a worker voice app which allows workers "to stay in contact with families and loved ones for the first time when at sea" (Inmarsat, 2018). This example presents an interesting reframing of worker voice which is consistent with the assumptions of recognition justice. It constructs worker voice in terms of connection to loved ones, and thus the facilitation of affective recognition.

----INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE-----

## Discussion

In this paper, we have considered the notion of *voice* in the context of workers in global supply chains and SSCM efforts to address prevailing social sustainability issues. We have focused on the notion of worker voice because it is emerging as important within SSCM literature on social sustainability. We have attempted to make sense of the emerging worker voice discourse in SSCM by identifying the communication and representation paradigms of worker voice. Additionally, in response to recent calls for justice to be applied more explicitly as a lens on SSCM scholarship (Matthews and Silva, 2023) we have attempted to shape the emerging worker voice agenda meaningfully and more explicitly in terms of what we consider to be a relevant and fruitful perspective on social justice- recognition (Table 1). There is not enough space within this article to fully capture the rich and wide-ranging literature and debates on voice and justice. Our conceptualisation of worker voice in terms of recognition justice needs to be contextualized within the broader literatures on voice and justice.

We acknowledge that the notion of voice has a long history which can been traced back to early industrial discourses and the writings of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations (1776/1937)*, Karl Marx's *Capital* (1906/1987) and Sidney and Beatrice Webb's *Industrial Democracy* (1897) (Kaufman, 2020). Much work has since sought to give structure to the term, for example through typologies which distinguish between *individual* and *group* expressions of voice (Smith, 1776;1937; Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021), or between different purposes of voice, such as for transmitting *information* or exerting *influence* (Kaufman, 2020). It is also important to note that the notions of voice and justice have often been closely interconnected. Although explicit considerations of justice within the wider employee voice literature have generally focused on the influence of employees' perceptions of organisational justice *on* employees' use of voice (Takeuchi *et al*., 2012; Kim and Kiura, 2020; Babadag and Kersem, 2022), distributive justice often appears to be an implicit goal of employee voice, particularly in the industrial relations literature and the intellectual tradition of industrial democracy (Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021). Meanwhile, in wider social justice literatures, societal inequity and marginalisation have been explained in terms of a lack of voice (Dreher, 2009; Husband, 2000). The emergent worker voice agenda in SSCM should therefore be seen to be inherently connected to emerging discussions of supply chain justice (Matthews and Silva, 2023; Gold and Schleper, 2017). As we have suggested, the recognition perspective resonates with the experiences of workers in global supply chains which are not fully accommodated by traditionally material notions of social justice (i.e. distributive justice). We suggest that the recognition perspective therefore offers a fruitful foundation on which to make the connection between worker voice and supply chain justice more explicit.

It will be important to remember however that supply chain justice can be conceptualized in different ways. As has been mentioned, the dominant view of supply chain justice in SCM is based on organizational justice literature and concerns *perceptions* of fairness in supply chain relationships and the impact on supply chain performance (e.g. Narasimhan *et al*., 2013). The more recent conceptualization of supply chain justice in SSCM is based on societal justice literature and considers objective conditions of fairness for all supply chain stakeholders (as per Matthews and Silva, 2023). SSCM scholars may wish to consider if and how the distributive and recognition dimensions of social justice may inform traditional notions of supply chain justice for the study of worker voice[2]. Although we acknowledge that obvious connections may be made between recognition justice and the interactional dimension of organisational justice because both concern the concepts of respect and dignity in inter-personal treatment, we would suggest that recognition justice (as per Honneth, 1995) should not be reduced to interactional justice in the study of social sustainability and worker voice. Honneth's (1995) view of recognition justice roots the imperative of respect and dignity, and the avoidance of humiliation and disrespect, in the much more fundamental terms of psychological risk, identity-formation, and self-realization. Recognition justice should therefore be seen as a supply chain justice outcome in its own right (Honneth, 1995).

[2] While the supply chain literature has tended to treat the three dimensions of organisational justice (distributive, procedural, interactional) as distinct, other scholars have instead suggested that interactional justice is a social *form* of procedural justice (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997).

Nonetheless, we also suggest that the recognition perspective on justice should accompany, rather than supersede, concerns around distributive injustice (material inequities) for workers within global supply chains. Following Honneth (1995) we suggest that recognition can inform our understanding of the nature of the unequal distribution of economic value in supply chain, and therefore help SSCM scholarship to better understand the role of worker voice in addressing it. This potential may be well-illustrated by the phenomenon of forced labour in global supply chains. The phenomenon of forced labour complicates the current worker voice agenda in SSCM, because forced labour is characterised by the active repression of victims' voice. At the same time, forced labour represents some of the very worst of examples of misrecognition of workers in global supply chains. While the SSCM discourse has emphasised the structural issues that create the material and economic conditions within which extreme forms of labour abuse can occur (New, 2015; Anner, 2020), scholars have also shown that marginalization along lines of race, ethnicity and religion (Gold *et al*., 2015) provides "accommodative" conditions for forced labour to occur (Crane, 2013, p.57). We suggest that the notion of misrecognition can therefore be very fruitful for complementing structural discourses to explore and explain forced labour in supply chains in general, and to explore the role of worker voice in eliminating forced labour, in particular.

The imperative of addressing forced labour also illustrates the need to expand the worker voice agenda in ways that can more adequately account for those sections of the workforce who labour in and for the supply chain but are denied a meaningful voice. To address forced labour, SSCM scholarship will need to reflect on the dominant construction of *worker voice* with its assumptions of verbal acts, and its focus on workers. Relevant recent conceptual developments in the SSCM literature in this regard include the *targeted audit approach*, which enhances the traditional ethical audit by emphasizing *finding clues* in worker interviews in order to identify modern slavery (Benstead *et al*., 2021), and community level whistleblowing (Stevenson, 2021) which elaborates the concept of whistleblowing as a voice practice to include community members because voice may be impossible by workers who victims of modern slavery.

Therefore although we acknowledge that our suggestions around *listening* may seem at odds with the recent turn to workers in SSCM literature and appears to shift focus back on to the more powerful and well-recognized supply chain actors, recognition justice strongly implicates the responsibility of other supply chain actors in terms of *response* if worker voice is to be operationalized in justice terms. Supply chain actors' response to workers' voice is necessary to demonstrate to workers that voice is valued, and therefore to demonstrate that workers are respected and esteemed. We have followed the 'voice' metaphor to conceptualize response as 'listening' but emphasise that listening is an active process (Macnamara, 2016) which involves acknowledging, accepting and acting on necessary changes in order to enact and sustain status and capacity recognition (as well as distributive justice) for workers. Our view therefore complements existing critical discourses related to the need for structural change in global supply chains.

We also want to acknowledge that while we have focused on global supply chains, misrecognition is not confined to supply chains operating in so-called 'developing' economies. New (2015) has shown that social sustainability issues such as forced

labour are equally a product of structural conditions and power relations between buyers and local suppliers in 'developed' economies. Likewise, we note that recent revelations of the scale of workplace abuses in garment factories in Leicester, U.K., which have been labelled as an *open secret* (Centre for Social Justice, 2020; Onita, 2020) signal supply chain and institutional misrecognition in UK fashion supply chains: fast-fashion brands and public authorities have failed to *respond* to garment workers' reports of abuse through official hotlines (Gardner *et al*., 2022; BBC, 2023)

We therefore propose that recognition is an important perspective for addressing the injustices which are at the heart of socially sustainable supply chain scholarship. With its emphasis on the inter-subjective experiences that underpin a person's positive relation to themselves, the recognition perspective reminds SSCM scholars that justice cannot simply be engineered, and must think about what real people think and feel (Heins, 2008). It offers fruitful conceptual resources for further exploring the causes and consequences of traditional 'social sustainability issues', including conceptually elaborating the nature of the injustice enfolding issues of discrimination, harassment, and gender-based violence which are not exclusively about the (un)fair distribution of supply chain value. Finally, through the notions of status and capacity recognition, the recognition perspective enlivens the notion of *rights* beyond workers' abstract entitlements by connecting them to psychological harms and the enhancement of personal identity (Houston, 2016). We therefore also propose that while worker voice has the potential to enact recognition for workers in line with Honneth's (1995) theory of recognition it may in fact sustain misrecognition in the supply chain, if it fails to acknowledge certain realities around inter-sectional identities of workers (e.g. as women workers or migrant workers), or to acknowledge the responsibilities of supply chain actors to *respond* to workers' acts of voice.

These suggestions are consistent with wider literature. For example, our suggestion that worker voice initiatives, whether in the communication or representation paradigms should proactively consider inter-sectional identities is consistent with existing discourses on the importance of gendered governance within global value chains (Ahmed, 2018; Barrientos *et al*., 2019). Similarly, our suggestion that worker voice must be accompanied by comparable concern for supply chain listening re-iterates observations of the relative absence of 'listening' as a component of 'voice' in wider literatures. It is also consistent with evidence that the presumed productivity effects of voice in an organisational context may be undermined if expressions of voice are not accompanied by appropriate organizational response (Macnamara, 2016; Purcell and Hall, 2012; Ruck, 2021). Nonetheless, in line with the sentiments of Matthews and Silva (2023) requirements for SSCM to deliver recognition justice outcomes for workers means that efforts to enhance the *listening* dimension of the worker voice agenda in SSCM cannot be constrained by purely productivity or efficiency goals.

## Conclusion

This paper has sought to conceptualize worker voice in SSCM in terms of the recognition perspective on social justice. It has highlighted three key dimensions of a recognition perspective on worker voice, and considered their implications in terms of the two dominant paradigms of worker voice in SSCM literature, *communication* and *representation*. The conceptual approach we have adopted has been relevant for addressing the purpose of this paper because the recognition perspective is not yet well-developed within SSCM discourse (Gold and Schleper, 2017; Matthews et al.,

2022) but is has a rich literature within wider social justice discourse (Honneth, 1995; Martin et al., 2016). Similarly the notion of worker voice is not yet a defined topic of SSCM study. Our conceptual approach therefore seeks to clarify the conceptual foundations upon which future worker voice research may build with recognition justice for workers in mind. Nonetheless, the paper is limited in its ability to demonstrate empirically the connections between worker voice and recognition justice. The study therefore signals important opportunities for future SSCM research, particularly through critical engaged research methods (Touboulic et al., 2020).

We believe the principles of critical engaged research are highly consistent with the sentiments of our recognition lens on worker voice: understanding and enacting recognition justice for workers in global supply chains, through worker voice, will necessarily require research methods which emphasise inclusivity, participatory problematization, experiential knowledge and performativity towards meaningful change (Touboulic et al., 2020). In particular, critical engaged research will be valuable for the communication paradigm in terms of gaining *experiential knowledge* of the recognitive effects of worker voice in collaboration with supply chain workers. In terms of the representation paradigm, critical engaged research will be particularly valuable for its focus on relevance and context so that SSCM scholarship might work to drive and collaboratively construct specific relations between 'traditional' supply chain actors and worker-led organizations which are rooted in recognition. Additionally, we believe that recognition justice requires that all future research in both the communication and representation paradigms should proceed with explicit attention to marginalised identities and responsive actions (the first two aspects of recognition we have highlighted. See Table 1). The focus of such research will naturally differ between the paradigms. Therefore, to conclude the paper, we hope to encourage future critical engaged research on worker voice in terms of recognition justice by articulating some relevant opportunities for future research.

In terms of the communication paradigm a central and immediate concern will likely be how workers in global supply chains experience (mis)recognition, directly and indirectly, through SSCM worker voice initiatives. The theory of recognition, alongside empirical evidence from the literature suggests strongly that there are significant risks of misrecognition if workers' use of voice (for example to report abuses through hotlines) is encouraged and then ignored. This amounts to no more than an illusion of voice, which may be the 'ultimate disrespect' (Lister, 2008). There are therefore immediate practical implications for managers to prevent such misrecognition through ensuring the resources and processes are in place to 'listen' to the voice that they are eliciting from workers. However, for scholars, more research is required to better understand how worker voice initiatives work to sustain and reproduce misrecognition of certain inter-sectional identities in the supply chain at the meso and macro levels. For example, to what extent and how do dominant approaches to worker voice initiatives ignore sections of the workforce? Previous non-academic research has alluded to this problem (e.g. ICRW, 2022). SCM scholars might engage with key supply chain actors as participants to assess the extent to which this is systemic in institutionalised, or particular industrial approaches to eliciting worker voice in firms' supply chains. At the micro level, consideration must also be given to how *workers experience* worker voice initiatives. For example, what are the recognitive effects of workers' experiences of auditors' interviews?

Recognition's requirements around the importance of *response*, which we have framed as *listening* to voice, also prompt a rich research agenda around the supply chain listening architecture, which is particularly relevant for the communication paradigm. To balance recent calls for more research on the efficacy and accuracy of worker voice tools for information gathering and managing risk, future research should also seek to better understand the methods, tools and technologies required for organizations to be able to demonstrate to workers in their supply chains, through adequate response to the issues raised, that they are respected and esteemed.

The representation paradigm on worker voice is arguably less mature than the communication paradigm in SSCM literature having appeared in the SSCM discourse only recently (as per Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021). The representation paradigm's associations with the intellectual tradition of industrial democracy might connect it more naturally with traditional concerns around distributive, rather than recognition, perspectives on social justice. Recognition may therefore help scholarship on worker voice in the representation paradigm to better understand the recognitive conditions required for worker voice initiatives to be effective, such as union-led negotiations or workplace dialogue at supplier facilities. The representation paradigm will need to contend with the fact that "in many (sourcing) countries…the most significant difficulty is getting employers to recognize the unions and commit to bargaining with it. In some countries…employers consistently refuse to recognize and bargain with elected union representatives" (Kuruvilla and Li, 2021, p. 51). Future research can therefore explore the contextual nature of misrecognition in alternative institutional landscapes and sourcing countries. SSCM research has begun to acknowledge that supply chains are socio-ecological systems which do not operate within a vacuum (Wieland, 2021), and the need to consider the interconnections between supply chains and their institutional and policy landscapes. In the same vein, to enact recognition justice for workers in supply chains will require an understanding of worker voice within an ecosystem of (mis)recognition, where worker organizations are (mis)recognised by key institutional actors, including governmental bodies at the local and global levels, as well as traditional supply chain actors.

Interestingly, in the representation paradigm, recognition draws particular attention to inter-subjective experiences *between workers* in the supply chain workforce. Engaged research methods can therefore also explore how (marginalised) workers experience processes of worker-led organising and unionisation? And, to what extent and how does membership of representative worker voice organisations reflect and sustain marginalisation of certain sections of the work force? These questions will be important for ensuring that SSCM efforts to enhance worker-driven supply chain governance are designed in line with recognition justice. For example, they have implications for how the SSCM practices of buying firms should work to enhance workers' collective voice at supplier facilities. A key question concerns whether and how key SSCM practices, such as supplier management training in labour relations, or encouraging worker voice through supplier incentives and rewards (Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021) need to be adapted to effect recognition for workers. (How) do these supplier development opportunities or incentives for worker voice translate into inter-subjective experiences of recognition for workers, either in terms of status or esteem?

Finally, critical engaged research will be useful for exploring how recognition effects of voice across both paradigms interact with each other. Research has shown that

experiences of misrecognition can be enfolded within experiences of recognition (Sebrechts, Tonkens and Roit, 2019). This prompts future research into how proactive approaches to voice which seek to support and maintain workers' connections with their loved ones and communities (i.e. recognition in the form of love/care to develop self-confidence) can enhance, or indeed, conflict with, the recognitive effects of voice in terms self-respect or self-esteem in either the communication or representation paradigms. These will be important considerations in building just supply chains that drive conditions of recognition for workers for equal access to dignity and respect, alongside all other supply chain stakeholders.

**References**


Abbasi, M. (2017), "Towards socially sustainable supply chains-themes and challenges", *European Business Review*, Vol. 29 No.3, pp.261-303.

Ahmed, F.E. (2018), "Voice and power: Feminist governance as transnational justice in the globalized value chain", *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol. 27 No.4, pp.324-336.

Alghababsheh, M., Butt, A.S. and Ali, S.M. (2023), "The role of buyers justice in achieving socially sustainable global supply chain: a perspective of apparel suppliers and their workers", *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management,* Vol. 29 No. 2, 110820.

Anderson, J. and Honneth, A. (2005), "Autonomy, vulnerability, recognition and justice", in Christman, J. and Anderson, J. (Eds.) *Autonomy and the challenges to liberalism: New essays*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.127-149.

Anner, M. (2020), "Squeezing workers' rights in global supply chains: Purchasing practices in the Bangladesh garment export sector in comparative perspective", *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 320–347.

Babadag, M and Kersem G. (2022), "Justice for employee voice: a dimensional analysis", *Independent Journal of Management and Production*, Vol. 13 No. 5, pp. 995-1025.

Bai, C. and Satir, A., (2022), "A critical content-analysis of sustainable supplier development literature and future research directions". *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. *365*, 132443.

Barrientos, S., Bianchi, L. and Berman, C. (2019), *"*Gender and governance of global value chains: Promoting the rights of women workers*"*, *International Labour Review*, Vol. 158 No. 4, pp. 729-752.

BBC (2023), *Fast Fashion: Boohoo breaks promises on ethical overhaul*, Available online at https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-67218916.amp (accessed 7 November 2023].

Bellingan, M., Tilley, C., Batista, L., Kumar, M. and Evans, S. (2020), "Capturing the psychological well-being of Chinese factory workers", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 40 No. 7/8, pp.1269-1289.

Benstead, A.V., Hendry, L.C. and Stevenson, M. (2018), "Horizontal collaboration in response to modern slavery legislation: An action research project", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 38 No. 82, pp.2286-2312.

Benstead, A.V., Hendry, L.C. and Stevenson, M. (2021), "Detecting and remediating modern slavery in supply chains: a targeted audit approach", *Production Planning and Control*, Vol. 32 No. 13, pp.1136-1157.

Berg, L., Farbenblum, B. and Kintominas, A. (2020) “Addressing Exploitation in Supply Chains: Is technology a game changer for worker voice?”, *Anti-Trafficking Review*, Vol. 14, pp.47-66.

Bernacchio, C. (2022), *“*Business and the ethics of recognition*”, Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 185, pp. 1-16.

Bhatnagar, K., Cayla, J., Dion, D. and Fuschillo, G. (2023) *"*Consumer Sovereignty and the Ethics of Recognition*”*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05512-y.

Cantor, D.E., Macdonald, J.R., Crum, M.R. (2011), “The influence of workplace justice perceptions on commercial driver turnover intentions”*, Journal of Business Logistics*, Vol. 32 No.3, pp.274-286.

Carter, C. R., Hatton, M. R., Chao, W., and Chen, X. (2020), “Sustainable supply chain management: Continuing evolution and future directions”, I*nternational Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp.122–146.

Centre for Social Justice (2020), “Parallel societies: slavery, exploitation and criminal subculture in Leicester”, available at: https://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/CSJ-JC_Parallel-Societies-Leicester_FINAL.pdf, (accessed 2 November 2023]

Colquitt, J.A. (2001), “On the dimensionality of organisational justice: A construct validation of a measure”. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Vol. 86 No.3, pp.386–400.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., and Ng, K. Y. (2001), “Justice at the Millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organisational justice research.” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 3, pp. 425-445.

Couldry, N. (2009), “Commentary: Rethinking the politics of voice”, *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, Vol .23 No. 4, pp.579–582.

Crane (2013), "Modern Slavery as a Management Practice: Exploring the Conditions and Capabilities for Human Exploitation", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 45-69.

Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D.E., Gilliland, S.W., (2007), “The management of organisational justice”, *Academy of Management Perspectives* Vol.21 No.4, pp. 34–48.

Cropanzano, R., and Greenberg, J. (1997), “Progress in organisational justice: tunnelling through the maze” In C. Cooper and I. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organisational psychology,* New York: Wiley, pp. 317-372.

Dreher, T. (2009), “Listening across difference: Media and multiculturalism beyond the politics of voice”, *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, Vol.23 No.4, pp. 445–458.

Fair Wear Foundation (2018), *Breaking the Silence. The FWF Violent and Harassment Prevention Programme, a*vailable at https://api.fairwear.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/2018_FWF_Breaking-the-silence.pdf (accessed 29 November 2023)

Fawcett, S. E., Waller, M. A., Miller, J. W., Schwieterman, M. A., Hazen, B. T. and Overstreet, R. E. (2014), ‘A trail guide to publishing success: Tips on writing influential conceptual, qualitative, and survey research’, *Journal of Business Logistics*, Vol.35 No.1, pp. 1–16.

Fraser, N. and Honneth, A. (2003), *Redistribution or recognition? A political-philosophical exchange*, Verso: London, New York

Gardner, A., Blair, K., Pajon, L., Burcu, O., Phelan, K., Gray, C., Michelle, E. and Walsh, D. (2022), “Fashioning a beautiful future? Supporting workers and addressing labour exploitation in Leicester’s textile and garment industry, University of Nottingham Rights Lab, Available online at: https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/Research/Beacons-of-Excellence/Rights-Lab/resources/reports-and-briefings/2022/June/Fashioning-a-beautiful-future.pdf (accessed 28 June 2023)

Gold, S., Trautrims, A. and Trodd Z., (2015),"Modern slavery challenges to supply chain management", *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 5 pp. 485 – 494.

Gold, S. and Schleper, M.C. (2017), “A pathway towards true sustainability: A recognition foundation of sustainable supply chain management”, *European Management Journal*, Vol.35 No.4, pp.425-429.

Griffith, D.A., Harvey, M.G., Lusch, R.F., 2006. “Social exchange in supply chain relationships: the resulting benefits of procedural and distributive justice,” J*ournal of Operations Management,* Vol.24 No.2, pp. 85–98.

Honneth, A. (1995). *The struggle for recognition. The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Honneth, A. (2004) “Recognition and justice: Outline of a plural theory of justice”, *Acta Sociologica,* Vol 47 No 4, pp. 351-64.

Honneth, A., and Margalit, A. (2001), “Recognition”, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian society, Supplementary Volumes*, Vol.75 2001, pp. 111–139.

Houston, S. (2016), “Empowering the ‘shamed’ self: Recognition and critical social work”, *Journal of Social Work*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 3–21.

Huq, F. A., Stevenson, M., and Zorzini, M. (2014), “Social sustainability in developing country suppliers: An exploratory study in the ready-made garments industry of Bangladesh”, *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 34 No 5, pp. 610–638.

Husband, C. (2009), “Commentary: Between listening and understanding”, *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 441–443.

ICRW (2022), "A holistic approach to worker voice and well-being: Innovating with a gender lens", Available online at: https://www.icrw.org/a-holistic-approach-to-worker-voice-and-well-being-innovating-with-a-gender-lens/ (Accessed 25 Oct 2023).

ILO (2023) Integrated Strategy of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work 2017-2023, International Labour Organisation, available at: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---ipec/documents/publication/wcms_648801.pdf (accessed 10 October 2023].

Inmarsat (2018), “Inmarsat fleet one brings worker voice at sea to Thai fisheries”, available at: https://www.inmarsat.com/en/news/latest-news/maritime/2018/inmarsat-fleet-one-brings-worker-voice-at-sea-to-thai-fisheries.html (accessed 26 June 2023).

ISSARA (2017), “*What is worker voice in the context of global supply chains”,* available at: https://respect.international/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/What-is-Worker-Voice-in-thecontext-of-global-supply-chains.pdf (accessed: 27 August 2023).

Jenkins, K., McCauley, D., Heffron, R., Stephan, H., Rehner, R. (2016), "Energy Justice: A conceptual review”, *Energy Research and Social Science*, Vol. 11, pp.174-182.

Jepsen, D. and Rodwell, J. (2009), “A new dimension of organisational justice: procedural voice”, *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 105 No.2, pp.411-426.

Kaufman, B. E. (2014), “Explaining breadth and depth of employee voice across firms: A voice factor demand model”, *Journal of Labor Research*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 296–319.
Kaufman, B.E. (2020), 'Employee voice before Hirschman: its early history, conceptualisation and practice', in Wilkinson, J. Donaghey, T., Dundon and R.B. Freeman (Eds), *Handbook of Research on Employee Voice*, Edgar Elgar: Northampton [Online].
Kim, H. and Kiura, M. (2020), “The influences of social status and organisational justice on employee voice: a case of customer care workers”, *International Journal of Business Communication*, Vol. 60 No. 3, pp.802-822.
Kirchher, J. (2021), “Towards circular justice: A proposition”, *Resources, Conservation and Recycling,* Vol. 173, 105712.
Klassen, R. D., and Vereecke, A. (2012), “Social issues in supply chains: Capabilities link responsibility, risk (opportunity), and performance”, *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 140 No. 1, pp.103–115.
Kuruvilla, S., Liu, M., Li, C., and Chen, W. (2020), “Field Opacity and Practice-Outcome Decoupling: Private Regulation of Labor Standards in Global Supply”, *ILR Review*, Vol. 73 No. 4, pp.841–872.
Lamont, M. (2018), “Addressing recognition gaps: Destigmatization and the reduction of inequality”, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 83 No. 3, pp.419–444.
Lister, R. (2008), "Recognition and voice: the challenge for social justice", In G. Craig, T. Burchardt, and D. Gordon (Eds), *Social justice and public policy*, Policy Press: Bristol, UK.
Liu, G., Aroean, L., Ko, W. (2019), “A business ecosystem perspective of supply chain justice practices: A study of a marina resort supply chain ecosystem in Indonesia”, *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 39 No 9/10, pp.1122-1143.
Liu, Y., Huang, Y., Luo, Y., Zhao, Y. (2012), “How does justice matter in achieving buyer–supplier relationship performance?” *Journal of Operations Management* Vol. 30 No.5, pp.355–367
Lukic, D., Margaryan, A. and Littlejohn, A., (2013), “Individual agency in learning from incidents”, *Human Resource Development International*, Vol 16 No 4, pp.409-425.
Macnamara, J. (2016), *Organisational Listening: The Missing Essential in Public Communication*, Peter Lang, New York, NY.
Macnamara, J. (2020), “Corporate listening: Unlocking insights from VOC, VOE and VOS for mutual benefits”. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol 25 No 3, pp.377–393.
Mani, V., Gunasekaran, A., Delgado, C. (2018) “Enhancing supply chain performance through supplier social sustainability: an emerging economy perspective”. International Journal of Production Economics, Vol. 195, 259e272.
Maria-Ariana, D., 2017. *Brief considerations on the rights and working conditions of employees in the textile and clothing industry globally and in Romania*. Ann. Univ. Oradea Fascicle Text. Leatherwork XVIII, 177e182
Martin, A., Coolsaet, B., Corbera, E., Dawson, N.M., Fraser, J.A., Lehmann, I. and Rodriguez, I. (2016), "Justice and conservation: the need to incorporate recognition", *Biological Conservation*, Vol. 197, pp.254-261.
Marx, Karl (1906 [1867]), *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. 1, New York: Modern Library

Matthews, L., Power, D., Touboulic, A. and Marques, L. (2016), “Building bridges: Toward alternative theory of sustainable supply chain management”, *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 52 No.1, pp.82-94.

Matthews, L., Marques, L., and Power, D. (2023), "Social purpose sourcing: How an ‘ethic of care’ approach to sourcing can produce transformative systemic change", IPSERA 2023, EADA Business School, Barcelona, Spain.

Matthews, L. and Silva, M.E. (2023). Supply Chain Justice. In: Wieland, A. and Gold, S. (Org.). *The Supply Chain: A System in Crisis*. Edward Elgar Publishing

Montabon, F. L., Pagell, M., and Wu, Z. (2016), “Making sustainability sustainable”. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 52 No.2, pp.11–27.

Mowbray, P., Wilkinson, A. and Tse, H. (2015), “An integrative review of employee voice: identifying a common conceptualisation and research agenda”, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 382-400.

Narasimhan, R., Narayan, S., Srinivasan, R. (2013), “An investigation of justice in supply chain relationships and their performance impact”, *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 31, pp.236-247.

New, S.J. (2015), “Modern slavery and the supply chain: the limits of corporate social responsibility?”, *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 20 No 6, pp.697-707.

Onita, L. (2020), “Fast fashion’s sins have been hiding in plain sight”, Available online at: www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2020/07/14/fast-fashions-sins-have-hiding-plain-sight/ (accessed 3 November 2023).

Outhwaite, O. and Martin-Ortega, P. (2019), "Worker-driven monitoring-Redefining supply chain monitoring to improve labour rights in global supply chains”, *Competition and Change*, Vol 23 No 4, pp.378-396.

Pagell, M., and Shevchenko, A. (2014), “Why research in sustainable supply chain management should have no future”, *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol.50 No. 1, pp. 44–55.

Prieto-Carron, M. (2004), 'Is there anyone listening? Women Workers in factories in Central America, and Corporate Codes of Conduct', *Development*, Vol.47, No. 3, pp.101-105.

Prieto-Carron, M., Lund-Thomsen, P., Chan, A., Muro, A. and Bhushan, C. (2006), “Critical perspectives on CSR and development: what we know, what we don't know and what we need to know", *International Affairs*, Vol. 82 No 5, pp.977-987.

Purcell, J., and Hall, M. (2012), “Voice and participation in the modern workplace: Challenges and prospects. Future of Workplace Relations Discussion Paper Series. Acas.

Rawls, J. (2005). *A theory of justice: Original edition*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA

Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as fairness* (2nd revised edition), Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA

Rees, C., Alfes, A., and Gatenby, M. (2013), “Employee voice and engagement: Connections and consequences”, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 24 No. 14, pp.2780–2798.

Reinecke, J. and Donaghey, J. (2021), “Towards worker-driven supply chain governance: developing decent work through democratic worker participation”, *Journal of Supply Chain Managemen*t, Vol. 57 No. 2, pp.14-28.

Ruck, K. (2021) "Employee Voice and Internal Listening: Towards Dialogue in the Workplace", in Men, L.R. and Tkalac Vercic, A. (eds), *Current trends and issues*

*in internal communication. New Perspectives in Organisational Communication,* Palgrave Macmillan: Cham,
Sancha, C., Gimenez, C., Sierra, V., and Kazeminia, A. (2015), “Does implementing social supplier development practices pay of?” *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal,* Vol. 20 No 4, pp.389–403.
Scheyett, A. (2021), “Voice and Justice”. *Social Work,* Vol. 66, pp.5-7.
Schweiger, G. (2019), 'Recognition, Misrecognition and Justice', Ethics and Global Politics, 12(4), 1693870
Sebrechts, M., Tonkens, E., and Roit, B.D. (2019), 'Unfolding recognition: an empirical-theoretical contribution to the concept', Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory, 20(2), pp.173-189
Skilton, P.F., (2011), “Getting the reader to 'I get it': Clarification, Differentiation, and Illustration”, *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 47 No 2, pp.22-28.
Smith, Adam (1937), *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, New York: Modern Library.
Stevenson, M. (2021), "Hidden in plain sight: the bystander effect and the mobilisation of modern slavery whistleblowing", *Supply Chain Management: an International Journal,* Vol. 27 No 1, pp. 128-139.
Takeuchi, R., Chen, Z., Cheung, S.Y. (2012), 'Applying Uncertainty Management Theory to Employee Voice Behaviour: An Integrative Investigation, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol 65 Vol.2, pp.283-323.
Taylor, C. (1994), “The politics of recognition”, In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition,* Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey, pp. 25–74
Taylor, L.R. and Shih, E. (2019), “Worker Feedback Technologies and Combatting Modern Slavery in Global Supply Chains: Examining the effectiveness of remediation-oriented and due-diligence-oriented technologies in identifying and addressing forced labour and human trafficking”, *Journal of British Academy*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 131-165.
Touboulic, A., McCarthy, L. and Matthews, L. (2020), “Re-imagining supply chain challenges through critical engaged research”, *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol.*56* No. 2, pp.36-51.
Van Buren III, H. J. and Schrempf-Stirling, J. (2022), “Beyond structural injustice: Pursuing justice for workers in post-pandemic global value chains”, *Business Ethics, the Environment and Responsibility*, Vol. 31 No.4, pp. 969–980.
Webb, Sidney, and Beatrice Webb (1897), *Industrial Democracy*, Longmans, Green: London
Wieland, A. (2021), "Dancing the supply chain: toward transformative supply chain management*”*, *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol.57 No.1, pp.58-73.
Wilkinson, A., Barry, M. and Morrison, E. (2020), “Toward an integration of research on employee voice”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 30 No.1, 100677.
WSR (2023), *Mission-Worker Driven Social Responsibility Network*, Available at https://wsr-network.org/about-us/mission/ (accessed 24 October 2023).
Yawar, S. A., and Seuring, S. (2018), “The role of supplier development in managing social and societal issues in supply chains”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 182, pp. 227–237.
Young, I. M. (1990), *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey.