

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

HOW SHOULD WE SPEAK: COMPARING EFFECTIVENESS OF PROMOTIVE
AND PROHIBITIVE VOICES

HO KWAN CHEUNG
SPRING 2014

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Psychology and Spanish
with honors in Psychology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Songqi Liu
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Thesis Supervisor

Rick R. Jacobs
Professor of Psychology
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

Within an organization, while supervisors are the ones who hold the power to implement changes and direct the daily operation, it is often the subordinates who hold valuable information about existing concerns and innovative ideas that can potentially contribute to the success of the organization. In order to ensure smooth running of the organizational and its continual growth, employee voice behavior is essential as it is linked to important outcomes such as employee psychological well-being and organizational performances. This study examines whether managerial responses to employee voice behavior is dependent upon the types of voice utilized. Specially, we argue that employee receive higher idea endorsement, liking and performance ratings when they employ promotive and group voices instead of prohibitive and individual voices. Results showed that managers rate higher performance for employees employing promotive voice. Findings also suggest that promotive voice is linked to higher liking and idea endorsement than prohibitive voice while group voice may be related to lower idea endorsement than individual voice. Inconsistent results may be partially due to small sample size and undergraduate student sample but have important implications upon how subordinates should speak up in the workplace. Supervisors do not perceive all speaking up behaviors equally. Subordinates are more likely to achieve a win-win situation of receiving higher idea endorsement, interpersonal liking, and favorable performance ratings when they provide a solution to address a concern that they have raised.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Methods.....	9
Chapter 3 Results	12
Chapter 4 Discussion	15
Chapter 5 Conclusion.....	20
Appendix A Research Materials- Reading Scenarios with Manipulations	21
Appendix B Research Materials- Scale Items.....	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	28

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables	14
---	----

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Deepest appreciation to my thesis advisor Dr. Songqi Liu for being the most invaluable resource to me throughout this entire project and to Robert Melloy for providing feedback to earlier version of this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Amie Skattebo, Dr. Rachel Tesler, Dr. Kisha Jones, Lawrence Houston, and Julian Haas for helping to facilitate the data collection process.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Within an organization, while supervisors are the ones who hold the power to implement changes and direct the daily organizational operation, it is often the subordinates who hold valuable information about existing concerns and innovative ideas that can potentially contribute to the success of the organization. As a result, much research for the past few decades has been devoted to study the antecedents of such important work behavior as well as its outcomes. Indeed, voice behavior has been linked to employee psychological well-being (Cortina & Magley, 2003), organizational justice perceptions (Avery & Quiñones, 2002), as well as team (Kim, MacDuffie, & Phil, 2010) and organizational performances (Argot & Ingram, 2000). In order to ensure smooth running of the organization and its continued growth, employee voice behavior is essential.

Despite such importance, employees are not always willing to speak up. They instead often opt for silence because of the perceived futility to change the status quo (Detert & Trevino, 2010), or the personal risks involved, such as being viewed negatively and damaging valuable relationships (Milliken, Morrison, & Hewlin, 2003). Before speaking up, subordinates often have to carefully assess the situations in order to determine whether it is safe and appropriate to speak up. It is understandable that they would only want to speak up when their ideas would be endorsed without any danger of

social repercussions. Research has shown that leadership behaviors are vital in facilitating or deterring voice behavior by signaling for a psychologically safe or unsafe environment; managerial openness and transformational leadership are especially impactful upon voice behaviors of the high performers (Detert & Burris, 2007). As such, it is important to study the specific conditions under which supervisors would view voice behavior positively and have intention to address the raised concerns.

To date, research examining specifically managerial responses to employee voice have been limited and shows mixed results. While some research suggests that supervisors view those who speak up more favorably as better performers (Whiting, Podsakoff, & Pierce, 2008), others found that voice behavior deters career progression (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001). Two reasons that may explain the inconsistency, as proposed by Burris (2012), are the lack of research that (1) examines managers' actual opinion toward the idea raised and (2) the different forms of voice employed. Depending on the way in which voice is raised, supervisors can have differential responses toward the idea raised and the person who raises it. The objective of the current study is to delve deeper into these effects of different forms of voice and examine how individual versus group voice and promotive versus prohibitive voice may impact idea endorsement, liking, and performance ratings. Specifically, we argue that subordinates receive higher idea endorsement, liking, and supervisor performance ratings when they employ group and promotive voice than when they utilize individual and prohibitive voices. This study will expand the research on specific ways subordinates should speak up in order to achieve the most favorable responses both textually and contextually and bridge the gap in understanding the effectiveness of voice behaviors.

Voice Behavior and Managerial Responses

Traditionally, employee voice behavior refers to making innovative suggestions for changes and recommending modifications for existing standard procedures even when others disagree (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). It is a form of extra-role behavior and differs from upward influence because the intention is to benefit and improve the company, not for personal gain. Unlike other organizational citizenship behaviors like altruism and civic virtue, voice behavior carries a communicative and challenging component by questioning the status quo. Although voice can be directed upward, downward, and horizontally, we are focusing upon upward voice behavior toward supervisors in this study because supervisors are the ones that hold the decision power to implement change and have direct control over the subordinates' career development. With higher stakes involved, upward voice is largely a planned behavior by the employees with careful appraisal of the situation to ensure that the behavior is needed and welcomed with no personal risks (Liang, Farh & Farh, 2012).

The two outcomes that are especially of concern to employees when speaking up are managerial responses to the voice behavior itself and the person who raises the voice. As the intention of voice is to speak up against the status quo for the benefit of the organization, employees hope to persuade supervisors into endorsing their idea and subsequently being willing to allocate resources to address the idea raised. Managerial endorsement is essential for any organizational changes to be made and is carefully assessed by the subordinates, albeit not always correctly, when they choose to speak up (Duton, Ashford, O'Neill, Hayes, & Wierba, 1997). Besides evaluating the idea and deciding whether to endorse it or not, supervisors also form an opinion toward the

subordinate who raises the voice, as reflected by their liking and performance ratings of the subordinate. Employee voice behavior can affect supervisors' perceptions of the employees as a person and contributing member to the organization. Prior research has suggested liking has an indirect effect toward performance ratings (Wayne & Liden, 1995) and a recent meta-analysis confirmed this by finding substantial overlap between rater liking and performance ratings (Sutton, Baldwin, Wood, & Hoffman, 2013).

Recognizing the employee's ability (or lack thereof) to perform, supervisors subsequently evaluate them. Though these two outcomes can be related, supervisors do not always perceive employees with ideas they do not endorse as a lesser performer (Burriss, 2012). Though higher liking and performance ratings are not the direct, primary motives of the employees who speak up, they are nevertheless important concerns as employees do not want to suffer personal consequences for engaging in this extra-role behavior.

Promotive and Prohibitive Voice

While most of the research to date has examined voice as a single dimension construct, the expansion of its definition by Van Dyne and colleagues (2003) to include both attempts to initiate constructive changes and express concerns calls for the need to examine different aspects of voice. The broadened construct includes both change-oriented, or promotive, as well as concern-oriented, or prohibitive, aspects of voice. Liang, Farh, and Farh (2012) defines promotive voice as speaking up to improve work practices and procedures and prohibitive voice as expression to raise concerns for existing practices or behaviors that may harm the organization. For example, an employee using promotive voice may suggest a new work schedule that can further

increase productivity of the work team, while an employee using prohibitive voice may point out the current lack of productivity in the work team instead. With their differences in framing and content, it is logical to predict that supervisors may perceive and respond to them differently.

Promotive voice is future oriented, and it is conceptualized to be associated with innovation and improvement in the workplace (Liang, et al., 2012), similar to the older definition of voice. Although it can be viewed as challenging by proposing ways to change the status quo, it is also constructive in nature, providing managers with solutions to address the issue of concern. As a result, it is more likely to lead to managerial endorsement because the good intention behind is easily recognized and generally interpreted as positive if the issue and solutions raised are valid. Because of the proactive attitude expressed by the employee when speaking up, supervisors may also form a better impression upon the employees and view them as both a competent employee and good organizational citizen.

On the other hand, prohibitive voice is more past oriented as it often seeks to stop harmful practices in the workplace. By not providing a solution to the problem, prohibitive voice can be viewed as less constructive in nature and more like a complaint, which limits the supervisor's likelihood of endorsing the idea. Unlike promotive voice, the good intention behind prohibitive voice may not be so easily recognizable because raising concerns implies failure in the system and may involve placing blame on those that are responsible (i.e. the supervisors themselves; Liang et al., 2012). Because of the implicit blame in prohibitive voice, supervisors may perceive this form of voice as a person-based rather than issue-based attack, similar to whistle-blowing. As a result, they

may view the employees more negatively, be less receptive to his ideas, or even retaliate by rating them lower in performance (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesveran, 2005). Even if prohibitive voice only leads to task conflict (De Drau & Weigant, 2003), it can easily have a negative spillover toward relationship conflict with the supervisor and the group. Speaking up in challenging ways can be seen as a threat to collective unity and organizational commitment (Morrison & Milken, 2000) as the employees fail to be a good sportsman. Hence, managers may view these employees as a troublemakers and their impression of those who speak up prohibitively may likewise suffer, leading to lower liking and performance ratings.

Hypothesis 1a: There is a significant main effect between the types of voice and idea endorsement, such that promotive voice is related to higher idea endorsement than prohibitive voice.

Hypothesis 1b: There is a significant main effect between the types of voice and liking such that promotive voice is related to higher liking than prohibitive voice.

Hypothesis 1c: There is a significant main effect between the types of voice and performance ratings such that promotive voice is related to higher performance ratings than prohibitive voice.

Individual and Group Voice

Besides speaking up promotively or prohibitively, employees can also speak up either individually or as a group. As social beings, humans have a tendency to conform to the majority influence in attempt to assimilate and fit in. The power of group

or social opinion in influencing individual opinion change has long been established (Moore, 1921; Wheeler & Jordan, 1925), even when the group opinion may be false (Asch, 1951). Phenomena such as groupthink display the power of the group to drown out minority opinion when the group is strongly cohesive (Janis, 1982). There has been no research to date that specifically examines the effects of group influence in speaking up against the status quo in the workplace, but it is logical to predict that group voice, or speaking up as a group, carries more weight than individual voice, or speaking up as an individual, because it represents not just a singular opinion, but that of multiple people. In turn, supervisors are more likely to be persuaded to endorse the idea. In addition, due to our natural tendency as a social being, people who conform generally are generally more likable than those who do not (Kihlstrom & Cantor, 1984). Provided that the idea raised by the employees are valid, supervisors may also be more likely to perceive the employee as more likable as a team player when they represent not only themselves, but also a group of fellow employees. With the more collective and receptive nature of the voice, supervisors are more likely to rate the employee who employ group voice higher in performance as well.

Hypothesis 2a: There is a significant main effect between the number of voice and idea endorsement such that group voice is related to higher idea endorsement than individual voice.

Hypothesis 2b: There is a significant main effect between the types of voice and liking such that group voice related to higher liking than individual voice.

Hypothesis 2c: There is a significant main effect between the types of voice and performance ratings such that group voice is related to higher performance ratings than individual voice.

Due to the lack of theoretical and empirical evidence to suggest whether there will be interaction effects between the form (promotive versus prohibitive voices) and number (individual versus group. voices) of voices, we will study its relationship with the key outcomes variables (idea endorsement, liking, and performance ratings) for exploratory purpose.

Chapter 2

Methods

Participants

Potential participants were recruited from undergraduate students in a large East Coast university. Total of 99 students participated in the study, 40 of which are males and 59 of which are females. Mean age of the participants is 21 years and average years of leadership experience is 3 years.

Procedure

Emails were sent to large undergraduate classes with the permission of the instructors asking students to volunteer completing an anonymous online survey. The survey begins with a consent form that informed students of purpose of the study and ensured confidentiality of the results and then ask them to answer a series of scenario-based questions.

Measures and Manipulations

Forms of Voice. The design has 4 between-subject experimental conditions: promotive versus prohibitive voice and individual versus group voice. Participants were randomly assigned into two reading scenarios and asked to assume the role of a leader or supervisor in both of them. In the first scenario, adapted from Burris (2012), participants were asked to imagine being the manager for a local transportation company. The focal manager of the scenario was responsible for designing and implementing new bus routes. Several days before the implementation of the new routes, a meeting was held where an

employee spoke up, either promotively or prohibitively. Students are randomly assigned into one of the 4 conditions.

In light of the sample being a group of undergraduate students, a second scenario about THON, an annual dance marathon organized by students of the university to raise money for pediatric cancer, was created. In this scenario, participants were asked to imagine being the captain of the rules and regulation committee responsible for implementing the no-bag policy for the event venue. Several days before THON, a final meeting was held where a committee member spoke up. Participants were randomly assigned into one of the 4 conditions.

Idea Endorsement. Idea Endorsement was measured by the five-item scale adopted from Burris (2012) on a scale from 1 to 7 (1= *Strongly Disagree*; 7= *Strongly Agree*). Sample items include “I think this person’s comments should be implemented” and “I agree with this person’s comments” ($\alpha = 0.84$).

Liking. Liking was measured by the 4-item scale adopted from Wayne & Ferris (1990) on a scale from 1 to 7 (1= *Strongly Disagree*; 7= *Strongly Agree*). Sample items include “I think I will get along well with this subordinate” and “supervising this subordinate is a pleasure” ($\alpha = 0.84$).

Performance Ratings. Performance ratings was measured by the 3 item-scale adopted from Burris (2012) on a scale from 1 to 7. Items include “How would you rate this person’s performance based on what you know” (1= *Very Poorly*; 7= *Very Good*), “If a position were available, I would recommend this person for a promotion” (1= *Strongly Disagree*; 7= *Strongly Agree*), and “If this person was promoted and you are colleagues, I

would expect him to perform in his new position” (1= *Strongly Disagree*; 7= *Strongly Agree*) ($\alpha = 0.79$).

Agreeableness. Due to possible effect of personality upon people’s perception of voice behavior, agreeableness was measured as a control by an 8-item scale adopted from the Big Five Mini Markers (Saucier, 1994) on a scale of 1 to 7 (1= *Strongly Disagree*; 7= *Strongly Agree*). Sample items include “warm” and “cooperative” ($\alpha = 0.86$).

Chapter 3

Results

We conducted two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test all hypotheses. Descriptive statistics of focal variables can be found on Table 1.

In hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c, we predicted that there will be a significant main effect between the form of voice and idea endorsement, liking, and performance ratings respectively in that promotive voice will be related to higher idea endorsement, liking, and performance ratings than prohibitive voice. Results showed a significant main effect between the form of voice and idea endorsement in the THON scenario [$F(1, 95) = 6.06, p < 0.05$] but only marginally significant main effect in the business scenario [$F(1, 95) = 2.80, 0.05 < p < 0.10$]. Thus, idea endorsement is higher under promotive voice ($M = 5.65, SD = 0.83$) than under prohibitive voice ($M = 5.42, SD = 0.76$) in the business scenario, but idea endorsement is only maybe higher under promotive voice ($M = 4.75, SD = 0.95$) than under prohibitive voice ($M = 4.45, SD = 0.91$). There is also significant main effect between liking and form of voice in the business scenario [$F(1, 95) = 12.31, p < 0.01$] but no significant main effect in the THON scenario [$F(1, 95) = 0.73, p = \text{n.s.}$]. Liking is higher under promotive voice ($M = 5.07, SD = 0.78$) than under prohibitive voice ($M = 4.52, SD = 0.82$) in the business scenario, but is not significantly different under promotive ($M = 4.47, SD = 0.89$) or prohibitive voices ($M = 4.39, SD = 0.89$) in THON scenario. Moreover, there is significant main effect between performance ratings and form of voice in both business [$F(1, 95) = 7.25, p = 0.01$] and THON scenarios [$F(1, 95) =$

5.11, $p < 0.05$]. Performance ratings is higher under promotive voice ($M = 5.47$, $SD = 0.76$) than under prohibitive voice ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.98$) in the business scenario. The same relationship is found in the THON scenario as performance ratings is also higher under promotive ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 0.95$) than prohibitive voices ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 0.91$). Hypothesis 1a and b are partially supported and 1c is supported.

In hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c, we predicted that there will be a significant main effect between the number of voice and idea endorsement, liking, and performance ratings respectively, such that group voice will be related to higher idea endorsement, liking, and performance ratings than individual voice. Results showed that there was only marginal significant main effect between number of voice and idea endorsement in the business scenario [$F(1,95) = 3.57$, $0.05 < p < 0.10$] but no significant main effect in the THON scenario [$F(1,95) = 0.84$, $p = \text{n.s.}$]. Idea endorsement may be higher under individual voice ($M = 5.62$, $SD = 0.76$) than under group voice ($M = 5.43$, $SD = 0.83$) in business project scenario, but idea endorsement does not appear to be significantly different under individual ($M = 5.08$, $SD = 1.26$) or group voices ($M = 4.86$, $SD = 1.39$) in THON scenario. There was also no significant main effect between number of voice and liking in both business [$F(1,95) = 1.35$, $p = \text{n.s.}$] and THON scenarios [$F(1,95) = 0.73$, $p = \text{n.s.}$]. There was no statistically significant differences of liking under individual ($M = 4.81$, $SD = 0.89$) or group voice ($M = 4.77$, $SD = 0.82$) in business scenario and the same went under individual ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.93$) or group voices ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 0.86$) in THON scenario. Lastly, there was no significant main effect between number of voice and performance ratings in both business [$F(1,95) = 0.68$, $p = \text{n.s.}$] and THON [$F(1,95) = 0.53$, $p = \text{n.s.}$] scenarios. There was no statistically significant differences in performance

ratings under individual ($M= 5.22, SD= 0.99$) or group voice ($M= 5.24, SD= 0.83$) in the business scenario, and the same went under individual ($M= 4.55, SD= 0.93$) and group voices ($M= 4.36, SD= 0.86$) in THON scenario. Hypothesis 2a is partially supported but hypotheses 2b and 2c are not supported.

In addition, there are no significant interaction effects between form and number of voice upon the outcomes variables of interests: idea endorsement [$F (1, 95)= 1.80, p> 0.10$], liking [$F (1,95)= 1.17, p> 0.10$], and performance ratings [$F (1,95)= 0.09, p> 0.10$]in the business project scenario. There is also no significant interaction effects between form and number of voices upon the outcome variables of interests: idea endorsement [$F (1,95)= 0.15, p> 0.10$] , liking [$F (1,95)= 0.01, p> 0.10$], and performance ratings [$F (1,95)= 0.76, p> 0.10$]. Overall form and number of voices do not have an effect upon each other in influencing the focal variables.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables

		Business Project Scenario						THON Scenario		
Form of Voice	Number of Voice	N	Idea Endorsement	Liking	Performance Rating	N	Idea Endorsement	Liking	Performance Rating	
			M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)		M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	
Promotive	Individual	20	5.66 (0.86)	5.25 (0.74)	5.53 (0.79)	17	5.51 (1.13)	4.60 (0.94)	4.96 (1.09)	
	Group	28	5.64 (0.82)	4.95 (0.80)	5.43 (0.74)	32	5.11 (1.34)	4.40 (0.87)	4.64 (0.87)	
Prohibitive	Individual	30	5.61 (0.71)	4.51 (0.87)	5.01 (1.06)	21	4.74 (1.27)	4.50 (0.95)	4.42 (0.94)	
	Group	21	5.15 (0.76)	4.54 (0.77)	4.98 (0.89)	29	4.57 (1.42)	4.31 (0.86)	4.47 (0.90)	

Chapter 4

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to shed light upon the different outcomes associated with different forms of voice. Based on existing theory and literature, we proposed that both form and number of voice predicted idea endorsement, liking and performance ratings. Results only partially supported our predictions by suggesting that form of voice (promotive versus prohibitive) is a stronger predictor of overall effectiveness of speaking up behavior than the number (individual versus group) of voice.

Major Findings and Implications

Results partially supported our first set of hypotheses by showing consistent results of promotive voice leading to higher performance ratings in both business and THON scenarios. Promotive voice also leads to higher idea endorsement and liking in the business project scenario but not THON scenarios. Collectively, these findings suggested that promotive voice are more effective overall in receiving high endorsement and increasing managerial perception of liking and performance ratings upon the employees. This is consistent with Liang, Farh, and Farh's (2012) assertion that promotive voice is generally better received than prohibitive voice, possibly because its good intention is more apparent when the focus of the voice is placed upon the improvements that can be made, not on the problem itself. Prohibitive voice, however, by focusing on the existing problem with no solution, implies the manager is at fault and is now responsible for

addressing the issue, thus appearing more challenging and threatening. This result is consistent with previous research that suggests that employees who challenge the status quo without offering innovative suggestions may suffer negative repercussions from supervisors and ultimately receive less career success (Seibert et al., 2001). Contrary to existent finding that managers see those who employ challenging voices that go against the status quo as poorer performers (Burris, 2012), this study suggest that there may be a distinction between different types of challenging voice and certain ways of voicing may be less threatening than others.

On the other hand, results only barely support our second set of hypotheses that group voices are more effective than individual voices. Results indicated that while individual voice may be more effective in leading to higher idea endorsement in the business project scenario, they do not appear to have any effect upon liking and performance ratings. It is possible that while group voice may carry more weight than individual voice, it may also be more threatening to the supervisor since more people are voicing out to challenge existent situations and possibly advocate for change. Supervisors may perceive this as a collective lack of sportsmanship and become more resistant and defensive against the ideas raised. In addition, the supervisor's personal attitude toward the idea raised may also influence their perception of individual versus group voice. Research on persuasion has shown that people tends to be more resistant toward influence attempts that goes strongly against their personal beliefs (Hovland, Harvey, & Sherif, 1957), while when they are only initially mildly disagreeing with the majority, people will eventually develop private acceptance of the majority position (Mackie, 1987). As this study has not considered the supervisor's personal attitude toward the issue

itself, group voice, which is similar to a majority opinion, is not shown to have a clear cut effect upon the managerial endorsement and perceptions of positive affect and performance. Another possible explanation is that the number of people voicing does not matter in managerial perception of the behavior at all. Supervisors focus more upon the content quality of the voice instead of whether it represents a single person or multiple people's opinions.

The most significant implication of this study is that confirming previous research, not all forms of voicing are perceived equally. Depending whether the employees focus on making changes to the workplace or simply express concerns toward existent conditions, there can be direct impact upon the perceived quality of their voice, their impression by the managers, and their performance ratings. Though the employees do not voice for self-interest, this study suggests that their forms of voice have an effect upon their performance ratings, which is linked to their career progression and financial interests. Therefore, if they raise a concern but do not suggest any concrete ways to improve it, they may not only fail to bring about the changes they want, but also suffer backlash despite having good intentions. Though innovation and acknowledging existing problems are often linked, organizations may also be more readily willing to improve based on current functional systems instead of seeing the current status quo as intrinsically flawed. Overall, by taking a more nuanced approach toward voice and examining its different dimensions, this study help bridging an existing research gap in different managerial responses to voice behavior and provide a possible explanation why voice behavior does not consistently lead to important outcomes such as performance ratings.

Limitations and Future Directions of Research

One major limitation of this study is the small undergraduate sample size that are limited in work and leadership experience. While we do attempt to address this with a student relevant scenario, results remain inconsistent between that and the business project scenarios. With a larger sample size, it is possible that those marginally significant relationships may become significant and our findings would be more conclusive. Future research should replicate this study on a bigger sample of working adults with managerial experiences and even examine whether there are age differences in perception of voice and decision making.

Moreover, the study only simulated the voice behavior in a group by asking the participants to imagine the scenario through an online survey, which may limit its generalizability to real life work situations. Other factors such as tone and speed of speech can also affect the perception of voice and the use of text scenario can open participants to personal interpretation. Future research should either conduct this in the field through surveys or through laboratory study where participants are asked to assume the role of a team leader for an actual simulated work group with confederates voicing out differently.

Additionally, we have only examined the direct effects of the form and number of voices upon work outcomes without consideration of its mechanisms or possible boundary conditions. Past research has suggested that perceptions of loyalty or threat can mediate the relationship between different forms of voice and performance ratings (Burris, 2012). Managerial willingness to endorse an idea can also be affected by

the ease of implementation and the extent to which the suggestion will benefit the organization and the supervisors themselves. Future studies can examine further their cognitive appraisal to the different types of voice as well as the situational factors that may influence their perception of both the behavior and the employees who speak up.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

The results of this study suggest despite the importance of voice behavior, not all forms of voice are perceived equally by managers. Specifically, while the use of promotive voice to bring about constructive change may lead to the positive effects of higher endorsement and performance ratings, the use of prohibitive voice to focus upon existing problems may be ineffective to improve current situation and even lead to negative personal consequences for the employees. Employees should carefully frame their ideas and concerns in order to achieve a win-win situation where both the organization and they themselves can benefit from their voice behavior.

Appendix A

Research Materials- Reading Scenarios with Manipulations

Business Project Scenario

Please imagine the following scenario:

You are the manager of a local transportation company and are in charge of a project to reorganize the bus routes in the community in order to reduce cost. Several days before the new routes would start, a staff in your team spoke up. Please read the following scenario carefully and answer the questions after.

Promotive x Individual Voice

At the final meeting a few days before the new routes would start, a staff member raised his hand and asked to make a suggestion about the new plan. He then proceeded to explain he thought more time should be allowed in the bus schedule in order to ensure there is sufficient time for daily maintenance (fueling, cleaning, etc.), scheduled breaks, and monthly maintenance (checking the breaks, engine tune-up etc.). The new plan can ensure a high quality of service as well as protect the bus drivers' well-being.

Prohibitive x Individual Voice

At the final meeting a few days before the new routes would start, a staff member raised his hand and asked to raise a small concern with the new plan. He then proceeded to explain that he is not sure if the plan would work because there is not enough time for the daily bus maintenance (fueling, cleaning, etc.),

scheduled breaks and monthly maintenance (checking the breaks, engine tune-up etc.). In the long run, it seems the plan would decrease the quality of service as well as damaging to the bus drivers' well-being

Promotive x Group Voice

At the final meeting a few days before the new routes would start, a staff member raised his hand and asked to make a suggestion about the new plan. He then proceeded to explain that he and several fellow staff members thought more time should be allowed in the bus schedule in order to ensure there is sufficient time for daily maintenance (fueling, cleaning, etc.), scheduled breaks and monthly maintenance (checking the breaks, engine tune-up etc.). The new plan can ensure a high quality of service provided as well as protect the bus drivers' well-being.

Prohibitive x Group Voice

At the final meeting a few days before the new routes would start, a staff member raised his hand and asked to raise a small concern with your new plan. He then proceeded to explain that he and several fellow staff members were not sure if the plan would work because there is not enough time for the daily bus maintenance (fueling, cleaning, etc.), scheduled breaks and monthly maintenance (checking the breaks, engine tune-up etc.). In the long run, it seems the current plan would decrease the quality of service as well as damaging to the bus drivers' well-being.

THON Scenario

Please imagine the following scenario:

You are the captain of the rules and regulations committee of THON (the annual Penn State IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon that raises money for pediatric cancer), and are in charge of implementing the new no-bag policy for Bryce Jordan Center (BJC), where the event is held. On the day before THON starts, a committee member spoke up during the final meeting. Please read the following scenario carefully and answer the questions after.

Promotive x Individual Voice

At the final meeting the day before THON starts, a committee member raised his hand and asked to make a suggestion about the new policy. He then proceeded to explain that he thinks instead of prohibiting people who are entering the BJC from bringing any bags, they can be allowed to bring a small, clear bag no larger than the size of a wristlet. The new suggestion can ensure security in the BJC while minimizing the inconvenience for THON participants.

Prohibitive x Individual Voice

At the final meeting before THON starts, a committee member raised his hand and asked to raise concern about the new policy. He then proceeded to explain that people need something to carry their mobile devices, camera, coat, etc. into BJC and the no-bag policy would be too inconvenient and impractical. This new policy will prevent people from fully enjoying the THON experience.

Promotive x Group Voice

At the final meeting the day before THON starts, a committee member raised his hand and asked to make a suggestion about the new policy. He then proceeded to explain he and several fellow committee members think instead of prohibiting people who are entering the BJC from bringing any bags, they can be allowed to bring a small, clear bag no larger than the size of a wristlet. The new suggestion can ensure security in the BJC while minimizing the inconvenience for THON participants.

Prohibitive x Group Voice

At the final meeting before THON starts, a committee member raised his hand and asked to raise concern about the new policy. He then proceeded to explain that he and several fellow committee members think people need something to carry their mobile devices, camera, coat, etc. into BJC and the no-bag policy would be too inconvenient and impractical. This new policy will prevent people from fully enjoying the THON experience.

Scale Items

Endorsement (Burriss, 2012) Scale 1-7

1. How likely is it that you will take this person's comments to your supervisors?
2. How likely is it that you will support this person's comments when talking with your supervisors?
3. I think this person's comments should be implemented.
4. I agree with this person's comments.
5. This person's comments are valuable.

Liking (Wayne & Ferris, 1990) Scale 1-5

1. How much do you like this subordinate?
2. I think I will get along well with this subordinate.
3. Supervising this subordinate is a pleasure.
4. I think this subordinate would make a good friend.

Performance (Burriss, 2012) Scale 1-7

1. How would you rate this person's performance based on what you know?
2. If a position were available, I would recommend this person for a promotion.
3. If this person was promoted and you were colleagues, I would expect him to perform in his new position.

Agreeableness- Big Five Personality Traits Minimarkers (Saucier, 1994)

1. Sympathetic
2. Warm
3. Kind
4. Cooperative
5. Cold
6. Unsympathetic
7. Rude
8. Harsh

Appendix B

Research Materials- Scale Items

Endorsement (Burriss, 2012) Scale 1-7

6. How likely is it that you will take this person's comments to your supervisors?
7. How likely is it that you will support this person's comments when talking with your supervisors?
8. I think this person's comments should be implemented.
9. I agree with this person's comments.
10. This person's comments are valuable.

Liking (Wayne & Ferris, 1990) Scale 1-5

5. How much do you like this subordinate?
6. I think I will get along well with this subordinate.
7. Supervising this subordinate is a pleasure.
8. I think this subordinate would make a good friend.

Performance (Burriss, 2012) Scale 1-7

4. How would you rate this person's performance based on what you know?
5. If a position were available, I would recommend this person for a promotion.
6. If this person was promoted and you were colleagues, I would expect him to perform in his new position.

Agreeableness- Big Five Personality Traits Minimarkers (Saucier, 1994)

9. Sympathetic
10. Warm
11. Kind
12. Cooperative
13. Cold
14. Unsympathetic
15. Rude
16. Harsh

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argote, L., & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 82(1), 150-169.

Asch, S. E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. *Groups, Leadership, and Men. S*, 222-236.

Avery, D. R., & Quiñones, M. A. (2002). Disentangling the effects of voice: the incremental roles of opportunity, behavior, and instrumentality in predicting procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 81-86.

Burris, E. R. (2012). The risks and rewards of speaking up: Managerial responses to employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 851-875.

Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2003). Raising voice, risking retaliation: Events following interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 8(4), 247-265.

De Dreu, C. K., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 88(4), 741.

Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: is the door really open?. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869-884.

Detert, J. R., & Treviño, L. K. (2010). Speaking up to higher-ups: How supervisors and skip-level leaders influence employee voice. *Organization Science*, 21(1), 249-270.

Dutton, J. E., Ashford, S. J., O'Neill, R. M., Hayes, E., & Wierba, E. E. (1997). Reading the wind: How middle managers assess the context for selling issues to top managers. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18 (5), 407-425.

Hovland, C. I., Harvey, O. J., & Sherif, M. (1957). Assimilation and contrast effects in reactions to communication and attitude change. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 55(2), 244-252.

Janis, I. L. (1982). *Groupthink: Psychological studies of policy decisions and fiascoes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kihlstrom, J. F., & Cantor, N. (1984). Mental representations of the self. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 17, 1-47.

Kim, J., MacDuffie, J. P., & Pil, F. K. (2010). Employee voice and organizational performance: Team versus representative influence. *Human Relations*, 63(3), 371-394.

Liang, J., Farh, C. I., & Farh, J. L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 71-92.

Mackie, D. M. (1987). Systematic and nonsystematic processing of majority and minority persuasive communications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(1), 41-52.

Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). Whistleblowing in organizations: An examination of correlates of whistleblowing intentions, actions, and retaliation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 62(3), 277-297.

Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An Exploratory Study of Employee Silence: Issues that Employees Don't Communicate Upward and Why*. *Journal of management studies*, 40(6), 1453-1476.

Moore, H. T. (1921). The comparative influence of majority and expert opinion. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 16-20.

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 706-725.

Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-markers: A brief version of Goldberg's unipolar Big-Five markers. *Journal of personality assessment*, 63(3), 506-516.

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel psychology*, 54(4), 845-874.

Sutton, A. W., Baldwin, S. P., Wood, L., & Hoffman, B. J. (2013). A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between Rater Liking and Performance Ratings. *Human Performance*, 26(5), 409-429.

Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee Voice as Multidimensional Constructs*. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1359-1392.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(1), 108-119.

Wayne, S. J., & Liden, R. C. (1995). Effects of impression management on performance ratings: A longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(1), 232-260.

Wheeler, D., & Jordan, H. (1929). Change of individual opinion to accord with group opinion. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *24*(2), 203-206.

Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Pierce, J. R. (2008). Effects of task performance, helping, voice, and organizational loyalty on performance appraisal ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(1), 125-139.

ACADEMIC VITA

Ho Kwan Cheung
Current Address: Rm 327 Simmons Hall, University Park, PA 16802
Permanent Address: 182 Windsong Circle, East Brunswick, NJ 08816
(732) 668-8239; hkcheung24@gmail.com

EDUCATION

2010-2014 **The Pennsylvania State University**, University Park, PA

Schreyer Honors College
B.S. Psychology with Business Option (expected in Spring 2014)
B.S. Spanish with Applied Spanish Option (expected in Spring 2014)
Business with Liberal Arts Minor
Sociology Minor

RESEARCH INTERESTS

- Occupational Health Psychology, Work-family issues, Stress
- Diversity, discrimination and inclusion
- Cross-cultural aspects of Industrial-Organizational Psychology

MANUSCRIPT

Cheung, H., Lindsey, A. P., King, E. B., Hebl, M. R. Beyond sex: exploring the influence of gender identity on women's influence tactics. Under Review for *Sex Roles*.

CONFERENCE PAPER/POSTER

Cheung, H., Lindsey, A. P., King, E. B., Hebl, M. R. (2013). Beyond sex: exploring the influence of gender identity on women's influence tactics. Poster submitted to 29th annual meeting of the Society of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, Honolulu, HI. (Submitted).

Cheung, H. (2013). How should we speak: comparing effectiveness of promotive and prohibitive voice. Poster will be presented to Penn State Undergraduate Research Exhibition, University Park, PA. (Accepted).

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Aug 2013- Present

Research Assistant

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
Mentor: Aparna Joshi, Ph.D. and Stephen Humphrey, Ph.D.

- Coded extensive demographics and political performance data of female Congress members for National Science Foundation-funded study on female politicians and issue selling

June 2013- July 2013 American Psychological Association Summer Research Fellow

George Mason University, Fairfax, VA

Mentor: Eden B. King, Ph.D.

- One of 12 fellow undergraduate psychology students selected out of 480 applicants for highly competitive summer research fellowship
- Conducted literature review on influence tactics in the workplace
- Conducted data analysis for study on the within gender differences of influence tactics and effects upon performance ratings
- Developed manuscript based on research findings
- Prepared final presentation on research findings
- Attended weekly professional development sessions to learn about different stages of research such as developing research questions, scientific writing, presentation, etc.

Jan 2013- Present Senior Honors Thesis

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

Mentor: Songqi Liu, Ph.D.

- Principal investigator for a study that examines effects of prohibitive and promotive voice upon idea endorsement, liking and performance ratings.
- Designed experimental study and collect data
- Conducted data analysis and prepared manuscript on research findings
-

Aug 2012- Present Research Assistant

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

Mentor: Songqi Liu, Ph.D.

- Conducted literature search on antecedents and outcomes of newcomer socialization, employee voice behavior, and job rehabilitation programs meta-analysis
- Translated research questionnaires for an alcohol and newcomer adjustment study and an innovation newcomers study proposal between Chinese and English
- Organized information into appendix charts for job rehabilitation meta-analysis
- Assisted in item generation and preliminary data collection in a leader network facilitation (LNF) scale development project
- Actively participated in brainstorming sessions for new research ideas and study designs for newcomer socialization

Aug 2010- May 2012 Center of Language Science Lab Assistant

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

Mentor: Paola (Giuli) Dussias, Ph.D.

- Conducted EEG and eye tracker upon 50 study participants
- Coded over 100 acoustic files for data in study on bilingualism between Spanish and English

- Assisted professor in preparing materials and setting up experiments

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

- Aug 2011- Present Teaching Assistant for BB H 146 (Introduction to Human Sexuality)**
The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
Instructor: Patricia B. Koch, Ph.D.
- Facilitated weekly discussion class of 25 students, kept track of attendance and graded weekly homework
 - Created open and comfortable atmosphere for students to share opinions on sensitive topics
 - Worked closely with professors and other teaching assistants to draw up lesson plans and devise activities for students to effectively learn sensitive materials
 - Trained new fellow undergraduate teaching assistants
- Jan 2013- May 2013 Teaching Assistant for Soc 406 (Sociology of Deviance)**
The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
Instructor: Eric Silver, Ph.D.
- Pioneered and facilitated weekly discussion class of 12 students to further explore controversial topics brought up by lectures
 - Created open and comfortable atmosphere for students to share opinions on sensitive topics
 - Worked closely with professors and other teaching assistants devise new material and generate new ideas for the course
- Aug 2012- Dec 2012 Teaching Assistant for Soc 030 (Sociology of Family)**
The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
Instructor: Stacy Silver, Ph.D.
- Graded 50-60 reaction papers biweekly
 - Worked closely with professor to generate new ideas for the course

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- May 2012- July 2013 Human Resources Intern**
New Wide Group, Taipei, Taiwan
- Edited and translated weekly newsletters and training and development material
 - Heavily involved with internal seminar programs and guest lecture series
 - Planned and hosted orientation programs for newcoming employees
 - Attended weekly HR meetings and worked closely with branch offices in mainland China

RELEVANT COURSEWORK

Work Attitude and Motivation, Leadership Theories, Selection and Assessment, Principles of Testing and Measurements, Occupational Health Psychology, Introduction to Social Psychology,

Research Methodology in Psychology, Introduction to Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Introduction to Social Psychology, Introduction to Cognitive Psychology, Introduction to Personality Psychology, Ethics and Science in Psychology, Survey of Management

AWARDS AND HONORS

Schreyer Honors Scholar (Fall 2010- Present)

Dean's List (Fall 2010- Present)

Penn State Department of Spanish Undergraduate Certificate of Excellence (Spring 2014)

Penn State Schreyer Academic Excellence Scholarship (Fall 2010- Present)

Phillips Van Heusen Corporation Academic Excellence Scholarship (Fall 2010- Present)

Hugh and Lynn J. Arnelle Liberal Arts Scholarship (Fall 2012- Present)

Penn State Schreyer Summer Travel Ambassador and Internship Grant (Summer 2012)

Penn State Paterno Fellowship Enrichment Grant (Summer 2012)

SKILLS AND INTERESTS

Native fluency in English, Cantonese, Mandarin and native writing proficiency in English and Chinese Intermediate fluency and written proficiency in Spanish

Knowledge in SPSS, MS Word, Excel, and PowerPoint

Passionate toward vocal music, musical theatre, travelling, and learning different languages